

(Confirmed minutes)

(Translation)

**Sai Kung District Council
Minutes of the First Special Meeting in 2016**

Date: 19 January 2016 (Tuesday)

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Venue: Conference Room of the Sai Kung District Council

| <u>Present</u> | <u>From</u> | <u>To</u> |
|--|--|------------------|
| Mr. NG Sze-fuk, George, GBS, JP (Chairman) | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. SING Hon-keung, BBS, MH (Vice Chairman) | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. AU Ning-fat, Alfred, MH | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. CHAN Kai-wai | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. CHAN Pok-chi, Jonathan | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. CHAU Yin-ming, Francis, BBS, MH | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. CHEUNG Chin-pang, Edwin | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. CHUNG Kam-lun | 9:48 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Ms. FONG Kwok-shan, Christine | 9:30 a.m. | 2:00 p.m. |
| Mr. HIEW Moo-siew | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. HO Man-kit, Raymond | 9:33 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. KAN Siu-kei | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. LAI Ming-chak | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. LAM Siu-chung, Frankie | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. LAU Wai-cheung, Peter, MH | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. LEUNG Li | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. LI Ka-leung, Philip | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. LING Man-hoi, BBS, MH | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. LUI Man-kwong | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. TAM Lanny, Stanley | 9:35 a.m. | 2:11 p.m. |
| Mr. TSE Ching-fung | 9:32 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. WAN Kai-ming | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. WAN Yuet-cheung, BBS, MH, JP | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Mr. WONG Shui-sang | 9:30 a.m. | 12:18 p.m. |
| Mr. YAU Yuk-lun | 9:30 a.m. | 2:25 p.m. |
| Miss LAU Tang, Moira | Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Sai Kung District Office | |

In Attendance

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Ms. SIU Mo-lin, Maureen, JP | District Officer (Sai Kung), Sai Kung District Office |
| Mr. WAN Sheung-him, Frankie | Assistant District Officer (Sai Kung) 2, Sai Kung District Office |
| Mr. NG Wing-keung, Henry | Senior Liaison Officer (1), Sai Kung District Office |

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Ms. LAM Yee-lai, Decem | Senior Liaison Officer (2), Sai Kung District Office |
| Mr. WU Tat-chee, Mike | Executive Officer I (District Council), Sai Kung District Office |
| Ms. FUNG Ka-wai, Annie | District Leisure Manger (Sai Kung), Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Mr. FUNG Kwok-cheung, Cliff | Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Sai Kung, Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Miss TSANG Mei-ying, May | Senior Manager (New Territories East) Promotion, Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Miss NG Sheung-han, Alice | Manager (New Territories East) Marketing and District Activities, Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Mr. LEUNG Chung-fat, Andy | Assistant District Leisure Manger (District Support) Sai Kung, Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Ms. YUEN Suet-fei, Agatha | Senior Librarian (Sai Kung), Leisure and Cultural Services Department |

Absent

Mr. LUK Ping-choi

The Chairman said that the quorum for the meeting was met and announced the commencement of the meeting.

2. The Chairman said that each Member might speak twice on each item for two minutes for effective discussion. Members were asked to peruse the declaration of interests in the funding application overview and make declaration immediately if the information was incorrect or incomplete. Anyone who was in doubt about the declaration of a certain Member or his/her affiliation with the organisation should bring up the matter for discussion and resolution immediately at the meeting.

3. The Chairman said that before the meeting, the Secretariat had been notified that Mr. LUK Ping-choi would be absent from the meeting due to sickness. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the approval of the absence from meetings according to Order 51(1) of the Sai Kung District Council Standing Orders (Standing Orders). The Chairman also said that any Member who was unable to attend the meeting should notify the Secretariat about the reason for absence before the meeting, so that the Members could consider whether consent should be given to the absence.

I. Time-table of Sai Kung District Council and Committee Meetings for 2016
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 5/16)

4. Members noted the contents of the paper. The Chairman said that the time-table of each Committee had been endorsed at the respective Committee meetings just held.

5. There being no further comments, the Chairman announced the endorsement of time-tables of all the full council meetings.

II. Election of Convenors for the Working Groups under the Sai Kung District Council

6. The Chairman said that Members had agreed to the establishment of the following five working groups under the Sai Kung District Council (SKDC) at the meeting held on 5 January. All of them were standing working groups:

- (i) Working Group on Hiram's Highway Improvement Project
- (ii) Working Group on Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel and the Cross Bay Link
- (iii) Working Group on Tourism and Economic Development
- (iv) Working Group on Organising Festival Celebrations
- (v) Working Group on Appreciation of Local Personalities

7. The Chairman continued that Members also agreed at the meeting held on 5 January that the convenors of those working groups should be elected by a show of hands. A Member would make the nomination while another Member would second the proposal. Then Members would elect the Convenor by a show of hands. The term of those working groups was two years and would expire on 31 December 2017. The convenor of a working group could serve another tenure upon expiry of the current tenure.

8. The Chairman said that the endorsed member lists of the working groups had been sent to Members by email on 18 January 2016. However, after sending the membership lists by email to SKDC Members for circulation and endorsement on 11 January 2016, the Secretariat received a notification from Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung, stating that he did not want to join the Working Group on Tourism and Economic Development. In view of this, Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung's name should be stricken off the membership list of that working group. Besides, Mr. WONG Shui-sang also informed the Secretariat that he wanted to join the Working Group on Organising Festival Celebrations. Hence, Mr. WONG Shui-sang's name would be included in the membership list of that working group.

9. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the latest member lists of the above two working groups.

10. The Chairman announced that the meeting would proceed to elect the convenor for the Working Group on Hiram's Highway Improvement Project. He asked Members to make nominations.

11. Mr. Philip LI nominated Mr. HIEW Moo-siew as the convenor of the working group. Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung seconded the nomination.

12. Mr. HIEW Moo-siew said that he was willing to accept the nomination.

13. Since there was only one nomination with no opposition to it, the Chairman announced that Mr. HIEW Moo-siew was elected unopposed as the convenor of the working group.

14. The Chairman announced that the meeting would proceed to elect the convenor for the Working Group on Tourism and Economic Development. He asked Members to make nominations.

15. Mr. HIEW Moo-siew nominated Mr. Philip LI as the convener of the working group. Mr. Peter LAU seconded the nomination.
16. Mr. Philip LI said that he was willing to accept the nomination.
17. Since there was only one nomination with no opposition to it, the Chairman announced that Mr. Philip LI was elected unopposed as the convener of the working group.
18. The Chairman announced that the meeting would proceed to elect the convener for the Working Group on Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel and the Cross Bay Link. He asked Members to make nominations.
19. Mr. Jonathan CHAN nominated Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung as the convener of the working group. Mr. KAN Siu-kei seconded the nomination.
20. Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung said that he was willing to accept the nomination.
21. Since there was only one nomination with no opposition to it, the Chairman announced that Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung was elected unopposed as the convener of the working group.
22. The Chairman announced that the meeting would proceed to elect the convener for the Working Group on Organising Festival Celebrations. He asked Members to make nominations.
23. Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung nominated Mr. Peter LAU as the convener of the working group. Mr. WAN Kai-ming seconded the nomination.
24. Mr. Peter LAU said that he was willing to accept the nomination.
25. Since there was only one nomination with no opposition to it, the Chairman announced that Mr. Peter LAU was elected unopposed as the convener of the working group.
26. The Chairman announced that the meeting would proceed to elect the convener for the Working Group on Appreciation of Local Personalities. He asked Members to make nominations.
27. Mr. Peter LAU nominated the Vice Chairman as the convener of the working group. Mr. Philip LI seconded the nomination.
28. The Vice Chairman said that he was willing to accept the nomination.
29. Since there was only one nomination with no opposition to it, the Chairman announced that the Vice Chairman was elected unopposed as the convener of the working group.

III. Suggested Amendments to the Sai Kung District Council Standing Orders (SKDC(M) Paper No. 6/16)

30. Members noted the contents of the paper. The Chairman asked the Secretary to briefly explain the proposals set out at Annex 1 of the paper one by one. He then asked Members to offer their views and make a decision.

31. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendments to Orders 1(5), 7(3) and 8 one by one as set out in the paper.

32. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above three proposed amendments.

33. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Order 11 of the Standing Orders as set out in the paper.

34. Mr. Francis CHAU enquired whether the words “at least half” were used in other parts of the Standing Orders.

35. The Chairman asked the Secretary to follow up Mr. Francis CHAU’s enquiry. The meeting would continue the discussion of the above proposed amendment later.

(Post-meeting note: Please refer to paragraphs 44 to 50)

36. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Order 15(2) of the Standing Orders as set out in the paper.

37. Mr. LAI Ming-chak asked why those two actions were singled out as other actions could also disrupt the conduct of a meeting. He said that although the Standing Orders only mentioned those two actions, the Chairman could decide whether other actions of Members had disrupted the conduct of a meeting. Hence he believed that there was no need to give examples.

38. The Chairman said that the proposal was put forward to the meeting for discussion because similar scenarios had unfolded during SKDC meetings of the last term. The presiding Member of a meeting could also decide whether other actions had disrupted the conduct of a meeting except those two actions.

39. Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung asked whether conversation or discussion with other Members would be perceived as murmurings or interrupting other people’s speeches.

40. Hon Gary FAN remarked the introduction of any systems should be aimed at enhancing the effective operation of the council. He opined that the original clause had already authorised the Chairman to exercise power during a meeting and the current amendment simply served to clarify the clause and justify the Chairman’s decision. He indicated that if any persons sitting in on or attending a meeting disrupted the meeting, the Chairman might deal with them under Order 15(2) as long as reasonable justifications were given; therefore, it all depended on whether the Chairman could make proper decisions. He suggested adding the words “but not limited to” after “for example”. He stated that he did

not oppose the proposal but as a matter of fact, the Chairman could already exercise his power under the Standing Orders to order the person to leave the place of the meeting. What was of importance was whether the Chairman's decision was sensible and whether the Chairman was able to explain to the public afterwards that the decision was justified. It all depended on whether the Chairman was confident and capable of providing justifications.

41. Mr. Francis CHAU opined that the proposed amendment was acceptable and Hon Gary FAN's suggestion was worth considering. He was serving as the Chairman of a committee in the current DC term and was not confident enough of exercising the power. Therefore, he considered that it was fine to give examples in the clause.

42. Mr. Raymond HO opined that good Standing Orders should be concise and clear, setting out general principles rather than every fine detail. For example, disruptive behaviours in meetings could take many forms. It was therefore impossible to make an exhaustive list of all such behaviours. Instead of listing only two past scenarios of disruptive behaviour, it would be better to leave the decision-making power to the Chairman who would judge whether such behaviours would disrupt the conduct of a meeting in light of the actual circumstances. Giving examples would only cause more unnecessary disputes. He opined that what was needed at present was simply to clarify that the Chairman could exercise his right to maintain order in the future.

43. There being no objections, the Chairman announced that in future it should be left to the person presiding at a meeting to make proper judgment on disruptive behaviours at meetings, and that there was no need to include examples in the clause. The amendment was withdrawn accordingly. He hoped that Members would observe order at meetings.

44. The Chairman went back to the proposed amendment to Order 11 of the Standing Orders and invited Members to give comments.

45. Hon Gary FAN said that the original Order 11 of the Standing Orders was "The Chairman may, with the approval of a majority of the members present, adjourn a meeting of the Council..." In his view, adjourning a meeting was a relatively major decision. He said that to his knowledge as a student in politics and social sciences, "a majority" was generally interpreted as two-thirds rather than more than a half. The term "majority" was used in the councils of many countries and societies to forge consensus on more complicated and controversial issues, such as making constitutional amendments and important decisions. Thus, as far as the amendment was concerned, what mattered was whether it served to modify the principle of the clause or to address the fact that the term "majority" was undefined in the Standing Orders.

46. The Secretary responded to the enquiry made earlier by Mr. Francis CHAU at the meeting, saying that the words "at least half" were also used in Orders 36(2), 40(4) and 40(5) of the Standing Orders.

47. Mr. WAN Yuet-cheung said that in the past, the SKDC usually adjourned a meeting to forge consensus on a certain issue. Members did not have much disagreement about this point. He agreed that in case of major amendments or disputes, the consent of two-thirds of the Members was required to adjourn the meeting but considered that the consent of half of the Members was also acceptable.

48. The Chairman indicated that adjourning a meeting was a major decision, so he

considered it was more reasonable to obtain the consent of two-thirds of the Members present.

49. Hon Gary FAN added that what he had just said referred to two-thirds of the Members present as opposed to two-thirds of all Members of the Council or its committees. The relevant words were contained in the pre-existing Order 11 of the Standing Orders.

50. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the proposal to amend Order 11 of the Standing Orders to “The Chairman may, with the approval of two-thirds of the members present, adjourn a meeting of the Council....”.

51. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Order 20 of the Standing Orders as set out in the paper.

52. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the proposed amendment.

53. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Order 22 of the Standing Orders as set out in the paper. She added that the amendment served to introduce flexibility into the rigid requirement that motions could only be withdrawn with the unanimous consent of the Members present.

54. Mr. Raymond HO opposed the proposal and explained why a motion could only be withdrawn with the unanimous consent of the Members present. He said that once moved, a motion concerned the whole SKDC rather than individual Members, so any decision not to deal with the motion could only be made with the endorsement of the SKDC. He stated that if a Member had moved a motion on a certain matter, other Members might decide not to put forward the same motion; but if the mover suddenly withdrew the motion before the meeting, the other Members would have been deprived of the chance to move or discuss the motion.

55. Mr. Alfred AU indicated that if Members were allowed to withdraw motions by themselves, they might take advantage by moving motions against other Members and then withdrawing them before a meeting. He held the view that once moved, motions concerned the SKDC rather than individual persons and therefore, withdrawals of motions should not be allowed casually.

56. As there were objections, the Chairman announced that the proposed amendment was not endorsed.

57. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendments to Orders 23, 30, 31(1), 35(1), 35(2), 35(3) and 37(1) of the Standing Orders one by one as set out in the paper.

58. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above seven proposed amendments.

59. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Order 37(2) of the Standing Orders as set out in the paper. She added that it was stated in the model Standing Orders of the Home Affairs Department (HAD) that the minutes of the meetings of a committee should be recorded anonymously.

60. Ms. Christine FONG opined that it was not desirable to record the minutes on an anonymous basis as Members would tend to disregard the meetings. Moreover, the amendment could not help enhancing Members' ability to deliberate or address the matters of concern. She opined that apart from the closed-door meetings about tender or other important items which should not be recorded, other closed-door committee meetings had to be audio recorded and uploaded to the SKDC website to enhance the SKDC's transparency and accountability to the public.

61. Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung remarked that the committees under the SKDC had moved one of the largest numbers of motions among the District Councils (DCs) in Hong Kong. He heard that as the minutes of meetings would have to be prepared in both Chinese and English, the workload of the Secretariat would significantly increase. If the minutes were continued to be recorded on a named basis, they would be very lengthy and would create unnecessary workload. He believed that all Members had the same goal and opinions in serving the community pragmatically. Therefore, he considered it unnecessary to record the minutes of committee meetings on a named basis, but he agreed that the minutes of the full council meetings should continue to be recorded on a named basis.

62. Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung agreed with Ms. Christine FONG that each item proposed at the committee meeting was aimed at addressing specific problems. He believed that not every Member would have exactly the same opinion towards different agenda items. He opined that anonymous minutes might not be able to record Members' positions clearly on controversial issues and that would be unfair to the SKDC. Since Sai Kung was a relatively large district, issues affecting a particular area had to be recorded on a named basis so as to let the public have a clearer understanding.

63. The Chairman added that the audio records of all committee meetings had been uploaded to the DC website.

64. Mr. CHUNG Kam-lun objected to the proposal. He understood the difficulties of the Secretariat in preparing the minutes of meetings. Although he welcomed the arrangement that the Secretariat would prepare both Chinese and English versions of the minutes as mentioned by Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung just then, he opined that the Government should provide more resources to the Secretariat to increase manpower. If the proposal was endorsed, the public's understanding of the minutes would be hindered. Furthermore, Members were not able to listen to the audio record of previous discussion during the meeting, so that they were not able to make a remark in response to the views of different political parties on the opinion of a certain Member. Therefore, he opined that it was not necessary to record the minutes on an anonymous basis.

65. The Chairman asked Hon Gary FAN whether the minutes of Legislative Council (LegCo) panels were recorded on an anonymous basis.

66. Hon Gary FAN stated that the minutes of LegCo panels were recorded on a named basis, but the establishment of the DC Secretariat was not on a par with that of LegCo Secretariat. The former was a law-making body in the constitutional structure while the latter was an advisory body. Therefore, they were not horizontally comparable, or else there would be a huge increase in the demand for manpower.

67. Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung added that although a Member had said that different opinions would be expressed in discussions, Members could still know about the opinions and positions of others through audio records and voting results.

68. Mr. Francis CHAU opined that it was the principle of the SKDC that the minutes and audio records of closed-door meetings should not be uploaded to the website except for the parts agreed by the SKDC. Whether to record the minutes of committees on a named basis depended on the resources available. Members could decide whether members should be given chances to bring their skills and talents into full play at the full council meetings or committee meetings. He considered that the minutes of some committee meetings were too lengthy. While he appreciated that anonymous minutes could hardly show the different opinions of different Members about a certain issue, he pointed out that the problem could be solved by voting by open ballot. Moreover, the committee meeting would be audio recorded and uploaded to the DC website in parts, which would make it easier for Members and the public to listen to the discussion. He opined that the SKDC should take into account the current establishment and consider whether to maintain the current arrangement or to put more resources into important work. He suggested that the two proposed amendments to the clause be put to vote separately.

69. The Chairman said that the meeting should vote on the proposed amendment to the clause, which read as follows: “Unless otherwise determined by a committee under special circumstances (for example, involving a motion or a ballot), the minutes of the meetings of a committee shall be anonymous and prepared in a concise manner”.

70. Mr. CHUNG Kam-lun said that the clause involved two amendments, i.e. how to handle closed-door meetings and whether the minutes of committee meetings should be recorded on a named basis.

71. Mr. Francis CHAU said that as a Member had mentioned that all minutes and audio records of closed-door meetings should be uploaded to the SKDC website unconditionally but he had put forward another argument, he proposed that the two amendments be put to vote separately.

72. The Chairman asked the Secretary to explain the voting.

73. The Secretary said that the meeting could first vote on the proposed amendment to the clause, which read as follows: “Unless otherwise determined by a committee under special circumstances (for example, involving a motion or a ballot), the minutes of the meetings of a committee shall be anonymous and prepared in a concise manner”.

74. Hon Gary FAN clarified that the minutes of LegCo standing committees were normally recorded on a named basis while a division would only be held by request.

75. The Chairman announced the commencement of voting. The voting result was as follows: 10 votes for the amendment, 11 votes against it and one abstention.

(Post-meeting note: Please refer to paragraph 81)

76. Mr. Stanley TAM enquired whether the amendments that “the minutes of the meetings of a committee shall be...prepared in a concise manner” should still be handled. He considered that since it was laborious to prepare a meeting minutes of 50 to 60 pages and

not many Members would read the entire minutes, the minutes could be prepared in a more concise manner and only the main points of Members' speeches should be recorded.

77. Mr. WAN Kai-ming pointed out that the system might have malfunctioned as it showed that he had abstained from voting while he had actually cast an affirmative vote.

78. Mr. TSE Ching-fung said that the system also showed that he had abstained from voting.

79. The Chairman asked the Secretary to explain the voting method as new Members were not familiar with the voting procedures.

80. The Secretary said that Members should press the affirmative or negative button and then release it. If the affirmative or negative button was held down until the end of voting, the system would take that as no signal received.

81. The Chairman announced that voting would be conducted again for the proposed amendment, which read as follows: "Unless otherwise determined by a committee under special circumstances (for example, involving a motion or a ballot), the minutes of the meetings of a committee shall be anonymous and prepared in a concise manner". The voting result was as follows: 12 votes for it, 12 votes against it and one abstention. The Chairman said that he had to give his casting vote as the affirmative and negative votes were equally divided. The Chairman cast an affirmative vote and therefore declared that the proposed amendment was endorsed.

82. Ms. Christine FONG opined that the minutes of the meetings of a committee should be recorded on a named basis as it was essential to show the transparency of the whole SKDC and the stance of each Member. It was even more important to do so when it came to more controversial agenda items. She said that the Home Affairs Bureau had no power to interfere in DC operation. She considered that it was very important to the public that the SKDC attached importance to meeting minutes.

83. The Chairman asked Members to raise their views on whether meeting minutes should be prepared in a concise manner.

84. Hon Gary FAN agreed with Mr. Stanley TAM's proposal. He remarked that from his observation over the past two DC terms, the Secretariat's workload had exceeded its capacity and the meeting minutes were too detailed. Unless Members proposed a more specific amendment, he considered that the principle was to authorise the Secretariat to prepare the minutes in a concise and precise manner so as to increase efficiency. Secondly, he was of the view that the Chairman should have handled the voting impartially. Although some Members said that the voting result was incorrect, he held that voting on the same matter again after the result was known had in a way turned the secret ballot into an open ballot. Furthermore, he pointed out that the SKDC voting system was different from that of the LegCo in that Members could not confirm whether his vote had been cast correctly after pressing the button, thus leading to errors. As a result, Members might have misunderstanding and Mr. WAN Kai-ming's difficulty was understandable. To make up for the inadequacy of the system, he suggested that the Chairman ask the Secretariat to confirm whether Members had voted in accordance with their intention when using the voting system in the future. He considered that the Chairman's handling method just then might be

criticised by the public.

85. The Chairman asked Members to be understanding as Mr. WAN Kai-ming and Mr. TSE Ching-fung were unfamiliar with the operation of the voting system.

86. Mr. Raymond HO considered that the voting should not have been conducted again as the mistake was simply due to Mr. TSE Ching-fung's late response. Nevertheless, the meeting had made the decision and there was still chance to make amendments in future. Besides, the issue might have to be discussed again if the voting was criticised by the public. He suggested that the audio records of meetings should be kept on SKDC's website as far as possible so that the public could know Members' remarks through the records if the minutes were to be anonymous.

87. The Chairman suggested conducting a voting on whether the minutes should be prepared in a concise manner since Members had different views.

88. Mr. TSE Ching-fung enquired about the definition of "concise".

89. Mr. CHUNG Kam-lun enquired whether the Secretariat had always been preparing the meeting minutes in a concise manner. He pointed out that in the past when some Members had proposed amendments to the minutes, the Council would take into consideration whether the Member concerned had made the comments and whether the amendments were lengthy. Therefore, he doubted whether it was necessary to vote on the matter.

90. Mr. LAI Ming-chak said that the word "concise" was used in both the existing clause and the proposed amendment, and therefore questioned whether voting was necessary.

91. Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung shared Mr. LAI Ming-chak's opinion. He said that the SKDC had always tried to draft the minutes in a concise manner, so amendment was not involved and voting was not required. He considered that the meeting should vote on the amendments related to the minutes and recordings of closed-door meetings.

92. Mr. LEUNG Li doubted if the issue of conciseness should be left to the discussion of another paper where there was a specific part on minutes.

93. Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung said that as the minutes were already recorded on an anonymous basis, he questioned whether only Members' affirmative or negative stance on a matter, or the main points of Members' opinions would be recorded if the minutes were to be concise as well. He considered it a retrogressive proposal.

94. The Chairman asked the Secretary to give supplementary information. The Secretary said it was stipulated in Order 37(2) of the Standing Orders that the minutes of the meetings of a committee should be prepared in a concise manner. It was also proposed in SKDC(M) Paper No. 7/16 that similar comments of Members should be consolidated and summarised. The established practice was that even if the opinions raised by several Members were similar, the Secretariat needed to record them one by one as the minutes had to be recorded on a named basis. Given that the proposal for anonymous minutes was just adopted, the Secretariat would not need to record similar comments separately in the future. She further explained that since the proposal on anonymous minutes involved amendments to

the Standing Orders, it was put in SKDC(M) Paper No. 6/16 for Members' consideration.

95. The Chairman said that as Members held different views on the proposed amendment, which read as follows: "The minutes and the audio record of the meetings should be uploaded to the homepage of the Council except for the minutes of the closed-door meetings which are subject to the consent of the committee", it was necessary to have a vote on it.

96. Ms. Christine FONG opined that minutes must not be recorded on an anonymous basis. Thus, she expressed her utmost regret over the voting results. While she found the usual practice of drafting minutes in a concise manner acceptable, there would be a lack of transparency if both practices were adopted. In addition, she enquired about the definition of closed-door meetings and the conditions for holding such meetings. She pointed out that when the Secretary for the Environment visited the SKDC in the last term, the meeting was held behind closed doors. She wanted to know the reason behind the arrangement. In order to enhance the transparency of the SKDC, she suggested amending Order 37(2) of the Standing Orders to "The minutes and the audio record of the meetings should be uploaded to the homepage of the Council except for meetings on discussion of tenders". She was of the view that it was time-consuming for Members to decide whether to upload minutes and audio records of every closed-door meeting to the homepage of the SKDC.

97. The Chairman said that chairmen of committees and convenors of working groups would decide whether to convene closed-door meetings depending on the discussion items and views of Members. The decision was not solely made by the chairmen and convenors.

98. Mr. WONG Shui-sang said that closed-door meetings would no doubt handle matters involving confidential matters but not public matters. Hence, he opined that the minutes and audio records of closed-door meetings should not be uploaded to the homepage of the SKDC.

99. Ms. Christine FONG said that the response just made by the Chairman had to be recorded on a named basis because it would only be influential if the response was from the Chairman. This was exactly the differences between recording minutes on a named basis and on an anonymous basis.

100. The Chairman said that every Member had taken part in the discussion on the amendments to the Standing Orders, and the SKDC had handled the matter in accordance with its guidelines. In light of this, he opined that no Members could dominate the meeting or disrespect the views of other Members. He urged Members to show mutual respect and not to be bad losers.

101. Ms. Christine FONG said that voting had actually been conducted twice just then. She had taken pictures of the two voting results and would keep the photos. She said that serious problems would arise if minutes were recorded on an anonymous basis and considered the practice a regression in the work of the SKDC.

102. Mr. Francis CHAU said that the latter half of Order 37(2) of the Standing Orders was similar to Order 7(4). The proposal was put forward merely to make the two orders consistent. Moreover, as the arrangement under the amendment would be looser, he agreed to the proposal. Second, the Standing Orders did not stipulate how closed-door meetings were to be convened. As far as he knew, closed-door meetings were rarely held by the

SKDC. Therefore, regulations on closed-door meetings might need to be established later, otherwise the SKDC might face criticism.

103. The Chairman said that committees could follow up on how to convene closed-door meetings. The Chairman asked the Secretary to explain the voting.

104. The Secretary said that Members had to vote on the proposed amendment to Order 37(2) of the Standing Orders, which read as follows: “The minutes and the audio record of the meetings should be uploaded to the homepage of the Council except for the minutes of the closed-door meetings which are subject to the consent of the committee”. Under the proposed arrangement, the minutes and audio records of closed-door meetings could be uploaded to the homepage of the SKDC upon consent by committees, but there were no exceptions in the original one. The amended arrangement was looser than the original one and enhanced the flexibility of the SKDC.

105. Mr. Raymond HO was worried that the amendment would give Members more excuses to convene closed-door meetings, because the SKDC could still upload part of the minutes and audio records of closed-door meetings to the Internet for public monitoring. During the discussion so far, Members and the public were still unclear about the mechanism for determining when to convene closed-door meetings. He remarked that the past practice of letting the chairmen decide whether to convene closed-door meetings was undesirable. Unless Members would consider amending the Standing Orders and establishing a system for closed-door meetings, the rule should instead be tightened in order to avoid holding closed-door meetings too easily.

106. The Chairman said that closed-door meetings were rarely convened by the SKDC in the past. Moreover, consent of the majority of Members had to be obtained if closed-door meetings were to be convened to discuss a certain matter. Therefore, it was believed that the future operation of the SKDC would not be affected and the closed-door meeting system would not be abused.

107. The Chairman announced the commencement of voting. The voting result was as follows: 21 votes for the amendment, two votes against it and one abstention. The Chairman declared that the proposal was endorsed.

(The Vice Chairman temporarily took the chair of the meeting.)

108. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendments to Orders 39(2), 39(3), 40(3) and 41(2) of the Standing Orders one by one as set out in the paper.

109. There being no objections, the Vice Chairman announced the endorsement of the above four proposed amendments.

110. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Order 42 of the Standing Orders as set out in the paper. She added that “Chairman” and “Vice Chairman” were used in Order 6(2). When Order 6(2) was applied in the context of working groups, the words would be changed to “Convenor” and “Vice Convenor” respectively.

111. There being no objections, the Vice Chairman announced the endorsement of the above proposed amendment.

112. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Order 43 of the Standing Orders as set out in the paper.

113. There being no objections, the Vice Chairman announced the endorsement of the above proposed amendment.

(The Chairman resumed the chair of the meeting.)

114. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Order 47(1) of the Standing Orders as set out in the paper. She added that for some of the circulation papers, the Secretariat provided a column on the reply slip for Members to write their other views in addition to indicating whether they agreed or disagreed. In the past, the Secretariat had received some reply slips on which only other views were written, without indicating agreement or disagreement. Thus it was hoped to stipulate that unclear replies would not be counted as valid votes. In fact, this practice had been approved at the special meeting of the previous term on 17 January 2012.

115. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above proposed amendment.

116. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Order 47(2) of the Standing Orders as set out in the paper.

117. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above proposed amendment.

118. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Order 48(1) of the Standing Orders as set out in the paper and asked Members to use the form at Appendix IV for registration of personal interests in the future. She added that the HAD suggested uploading the Registration Forms on Personal Interests (registration form) to the SKDC homepage for public inspection. Therefore, Members were reminded to submit updated forms to the Secretariat every year. If no updated forms were received from Members, the Secretariat would keep the old forms on the homepage.

119. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above proposed amendment.

120. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendments to Orders 48(5), 48(6), 48(7), 48(8), 48(12), 48(14) and 50 of the Standing Orders one by one as set out in the paper.

121. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above seven proposed amendments.

122. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Order 51(1) of the Standing Orders as set out in the paper.

123. Mr. Raymond HO enquired whether pregnancy was defined as the 10 months of pregnancy period.

124. Mr. TSE Ching-fung enquired about the number of days of paternity leave.

125. The Chairman replied that pregnancy and paternity were only valid reasons for absence from meetings and the amendment was to allow Members additional reasons for absence. Therefore, the details of which should not be discussed at the meeting.

126. Ms. Christine FONG welcomed and supported the amendment.

127. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above proposed amendment.

128. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Order 53 of the Standing Orders as set out in the paper. She added that since it was impossible for the Standing Orders to cover all possible situations, it was hoped to stipulate that the chairmen or convenors of individual meetings could make decisions on issues that were not clearly specified in the Orders.

129. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above proposed amendment.

130. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Order 54 of the Standing Orders as set out in the paper.

131. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above proposed amendment.

132. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendments to Section 5 of Appendix II, Section 6 of Appendix II, Section 7 of Appendix II, Section 10 of Appendix II, Annex A to Appendix II and Annex B to Appendix II to the Standing Orders as set out in the paper. She said that the above amendments were about the elections of the SKDC Chairman and Vice Chairman. A document in relation to the amendments had been issued to Members before the first meeting of the current-term SKDC held on 5 January 2016.

133. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above proposed amendments.

134. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendments to Note 1 to the Annex to Appendix III and Section 21(1)(e) of the Annex to Appendix III to the Standing Orders as set out in the paper.

135. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above two proposed amendments.

136. Ms. Christine FONG said that ordinances like the Prevention of Bribery Ordinance and the Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Conduct) Ordinance were mentioned in Section 30 of the Annex to Appendix III. She enquired about the intent of deleting such clauses, the original purpose of the Section, and the impact on the SKDC after the deletion.

137. The Secretary replied that the above Section was amended by the HAD with reference to the relevant legislation. Since the clauses mentioned by Ms. FONG had been repealed by Section 9 of Ordinance No. 7 of 2009, it was necessary to amend the Standing

Orders correspondingly.

138. Ms. Christine FONG asked whether the amendment was made to save Members from being disqualified from holding office under the Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Conduct) Ordinance in the future and what consequences there would be.

139. The Secretary replied that Section 30 of the Annex to Appendix III was titled “When an elector is disqualified from voting at an election”, which set out the situations where an elector was disqualified from voting at an election. After the amendment, an elector who had been disqualified from voting was allowed to vote.

(Post-meeting note: For the background information on the above amendment, please refer to LC Paper No. CB(2)1622/08-09(02) entitled “Background brief prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat for the Bills Committee on Voting by Imprisoned Persons Bill”.)

140. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above proposed amendment.

141. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Appendix IV to the Standing Orders as set out in the paper. She added that the amendment made by the HAD mainly involved changes to the format and layout of the form and incorporation of notes into the corresponding parts of the form.

142. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above proposed amendment.

143. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Appendix VI(a) and (b) to the Standing Orders as set out in the paper.

144. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above proposed amendment.

145. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Appendix VII to the Standing Orders as set out in the paper.

146. Ms. Christine FONG enquired whether reasons for absence from meetings had to be related to the business of the SKDC and whether attendance at meetings of another nature would be accepted as a valid reason. It happened that a Member was absent from this meeting due to sickness, so she asked how Members should deal with the situation of attending other activities.

147. The Chairman replied that if Members had to be absent from meetings because of commitments unrelated to the SKDC, they could choose to give the details under “Other reasons” on the notification form.

148. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above proposed amendment.

149. The Secretary laid out the proposed amendment to Appendix VIII to the Standing Orders as set out in the paper.

150. Mr. Francis CHAU said that as there was no Co-opted Member in committees, all committee members were DC Members. In the case of some working groups, there might be members from other parties. He enquired whether the amendment also applied to those members and members in attendance of committees.

151. The Secretary said that committees could decide the individuals in attendance by invitation. If Members found the conduct of individual members in attendance questionable, the committees could decide whether to continue to invite them to attend the meeting.

152. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above proposed amendment.

153. The Chairman said that the SKDC had discussed the proposed amendment to the Standing Orders in detail. The Secretariat would revise the Standing Orders according to the views of Members and the amendment concerned would be endorsed by circulation of papers through e-mail. Members were welcome to raise their views, if any, on the Standing Orders in future.

154. The Chairman reminded Members that according to the Standing Orders, every Member should, within one month from the commencement of each term and annually thereafter, furnish the Secretary of the SKDC with particulars of his or her registrable interests. Moreover, Members should furnish the Secretary with particulars of any change in such registrable interests within 14 clear working days of any such change. As mentioned just then, the registration form would be uploaded onto the website of SKDC starting from this DC term.

155. The Chairman continued that as the registration form should be uploaded onto the website of the SKDC by the end of January, he asked Members to endorse the section in relation to declaration of interests (i.e. Section L) and Appendices IV and V to the Standing Orders first. The Secretariat had e-mailed the registration form to Members on 6 January. Members were requested to return the completed registration form to the Secretariat as soon as possible. There being no objections, the Chairman declared the endorsement of the section in relation to declaration of interests and relevant appendices.

IV. Review on the Operation of the SKDC, Its Committees and Working Groups (SKDC(M) Paper No. 7/16)

156. Members noted the contents of the above paper. The Chairman asked the Secretary to explain the proposals one by one as set out in the paper and asked Members to raise views and make decisions.

157. The Secretary laid out the relevant proposal in relation to the “limitations on arrangement of attendance of meetings by heads of departments” as set out in the paper and asked Members to consider whether to continue to adopt the practice of the last DC term.

158. Ms. Christine FONG said that she had no comment on the rules of speaking during the visits of heads of departments (HoDs), but she hoped that more than one HoD could attend meetings every time since there was sufficient time at plenary meetings and it was only a matter of arrangement. Secondly, she suggested that Members be informed in advance

whenever HoDs were invited to meetings so that Members could prepare relevant papers in advance. She did not hope that Members only knew which HoDs would attend the meeting when they received the agenda.

159. The Chairman said that whether HoDs would be arranged to attend meetings depended on the time available at meetings. If time permitted, he would allow more time for discussion having regard to the issue under discussion and SKDC's concerns about the department. The SKDC would make flexible arrangement if more than one HoD was invited to attend a meeting. He said that the Secretariat would try to notify Members in advance as far as possible whenever HoDs would attend meetings and the SKDC would also communicate with the departments having regard to the views of Members. He asked Members to note that if few motions were submitted by Members at plenary meetings or committee meetings, more than one HoD would be invited to attend meetings as far as practicable. However, if the schedule of the meeting was already tight, the deliberation at the meeting would be affected due to lack of time. He appealed for Members' co-operation.

160. Mr. Francis CHAU agreed to the arrangement of the Chairman. As Members were supposed to understand the work of government departments, he suggested limiting the presentation time of HoDs to 15 to 20 minutes.

161. Mr. Peter LAU agreed with Mr. Francis CHAU. He pointed out that as HoDs had already submitted the relevant papers and presentation slides to Members before the meeting, there was no need to repeat the contents of papers at the meeting, or it would reduce the number of questions Members could ask and their speaking time.

162. Mr. Raymond HO shared the views of Mr. Francis CHAU and Mr. Peter LAU that the speaking time of HoDs should be shortened. HoDs only prepared presentation slides right before the meetings and there were also instances where the slides were not uploaded onto the website of the SKDC. He understood that the Secretariat had repeatedly pressed departments for paper submission, but the SKDC still hoped that departments could provide written information to Members before the meeting.

163. Mr. Stanley TAM said that the initiative of the current-term Government to encourage HoDs to visit DCs to listen to their views was well worth support. He hoped that interaction between departments and Members could be enhanced in future. He suggested the SKDC take the initiative to make a wish list of HoDs to be invited to meetings within the year for the Government's consideration so that Members would not be uninformed about their visits until one to two weeks prior to the meeting. He considered it more effective to invite HoDs to attend meetings to discuss matters of concern to the SKDC.

164. Ms. Christine FONG asked the District Officer (Sai Kung) and the Secretariat whether they had a list of HoDs who would attend SKDC meetings this year. If yes, she would like to know about the schedule concerned for early preparation.

165. The Chairman noted Members' views. However, HoDs had spent most of their time on attending LegCo meetings and they also had to attend relevant meetings at the LegCo's request. It was therefore hard to make the arrangement in advance. He would convey Members' views to the Government on appropriate occasions. At the same time, he hoped that Hon Gary FAN could relay the message to the LegCo, requesting the LegCo to reduce inviting HoDs to its meetings as far as possible so that they could be given more

opportunities to know about the local characteristics and needs of the 18 districts.

166. Hon Gary FAN said that some bureau secretaries attended the LegCo meetings less frequently. If the Chairman shared Members' views, it would be most desirable for him to try to invite HoDs to attend meetings and plan ahead, or to consider spreading the attendance of HoDs at meetings evenly. The Chairman could even proactively invite relevant officials to attend meetings having regard to Members' needs. This was also the Members' expectation about the Chairman.

167. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to give Members a form after the meeting so that they could indicate their choice of HoDs to be invited to SKDC meetings. A list would then be drawn up to prioritise the HoDs to be invited to the meetings.

168. Ms. Christine FONG agreed with the Chairman's suggestion. Indicating that there was a number of different developments in Tseung Kwan O recently, she suggested that the Secretary for Food and Health as well as the Secretary for Transport and Housing should first be invited to SKDC meetings to discuss items relating to the development of a Chinese medicine hospital, Tseung Kwan O Development at Area 137, housing developments and provision of ancillary transport and commercial facilities. In addition, she suggested that the Secretary for Transport and Housing should maintain close communication with the SKDC on matters relating to transport and Tseung Kwan O-Lam Tin Tunnel and Cross Bay Link. She also suggested that the Secretary for the Environment should be invited to discuss matters relating to the cessation of receiving domestic waste and treatment of construction waste.

169. Mr. Raymond HO suggested that that the Secretary for Development should be invited to discuss the planning issues of Tseung Kwan O Area 137.

170. The Chairman concluded that the meeting would like to invite the Secretary for Development, Secretary for the Environment, Secretary for Food and Health, and the Secretary for Transport and Housing to SKDC meetings. He asked the Secretariat to take follow-up action.

171. There being no objections, the Chairman declared that the practice adopted in the last DC term of "limitations on arrangement of attendance of meetings by Heads of Departments" would be followed.

172. The Secretary explained the proposal concerning the "speaking arrangement of Members" as set out in SKDC paper.

173. Mr. Stanley TAM did not agree to shorten Members' speaking time. However, the focus of the discussion should be on the number of motions and questions raised by Members. He said that if Members' speaking time was shortened, they might not be able to make their points clear within the limited time.

174. Mr. CHAN Kai-wai said that the existing speaking arrangement was already inadequate for Members to clearly express all their views when discussing important issues. He worried that Members' comments would be more incomprehensible to the audience if the speaking time was shortened. In addition, as the Chairman would arrange Members to speak in turn on certain important issues, it would be difficult for them to voice the views of all residents in one and a half minutes.

175. Mr. Edwin CHEUNG said that the nature of the two items in the paper, namely the “speaking arrangement of Members” and “the number of motions and questions raised by Members” were related. If limitations were imposed on both aspects, it would be difficult for Members to fully voice the aspirations of the public. In this connection, he suggested that the above-mentioned two proposals be discussed together.

176. The Chairman said that the number of motions and questions raised by Members would be discussed under a separate item later. As there was objection to the proposal concerning the speaking arrangement, the Chairman declared that the proposal was rejected. The existing practice would be continued in which each Member could speak up to two minutes twice on each agenda item.

177. The Secretary laid out the proposed arrangement for “minutes” as set out in the paper and added that subject to Members’ approval, the arrangement would take effect from the SKDC meeting held on 5 January 2016.

178. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the proposal was endorsed.

179. The Secretary laid out the proposal concerning the “list of absentees in minutes” as set out in the paper.

180. There being no objections, the Chairman declared that the list of absentees would be included in minutes, but there was no need to specify the reasons for Members’ absence.

181. The Secretary added that the arrangement would be effective from the SKDC meeting held on 5 January 2016.

182. Mr. Francis CHAU said that a Member’s application for absence might or might not be approved by the SKDC. In this connection, he asked whether each situation would be specified in the list of absentees in the minutes.

183. The Chairman said that as the minutes would record whether the application for absence was approved by the SKDC, he proposed not to put the reason in the list of absentees.

184. There being no objections, the proposal was endorsed.

185. The Secretary laid out the proposal concerning “amending minutes” as set out in the paper.

186. Ms. Christine FONG said that Members might not be able to submit the proposed amendments within the specified time because of time pressure. Similarly, directors or government departments might be late in submitting papers to the Secretariat which, in turn, might not be able to forward the documents to Members in a timely manner. This was what Members had requested the Secretariat to make improvement. As Members received a number of public views, and the existing practice was acceptable, the Secretariat should handle amendments to minutes with flexibility and should not introduce any additional restrictions. Otherwise, this would affect the work of Members.

187. The Chairman hoped that Members would consider the manpower problem of the

Secretariat and said that Members had been given sufficient time to read the minutes before the meeting. If Members had to make any amendments to their own remarks, they should propose amendments as early as possible and follow the rules of the SKDC.

188. Mr. LAI Ming-chak said given that the minutes would be provided in English in future and it was mentioned in the paper that Members should provide the actual words for the amendment, he asked whether Members had to provide the proposed amendments in both Chinese and English.

189. The Chairman said that Members should provide the amendments in Chinese. The Chairman added that given the heavy workload of the Secretariat, he hoped that Members could try their best to be co-operative if they did not want any changes.

190. Mr. Francis CHAU said that the meeting had not yet reached a conclusion on the issue but he personally supported the proposal. The meeting had just agreed that the minutes of committee meetings should be recorded on an anonymous basis. Such arrangement would have reduced the possibility of raising amendments by Members. In fact, some Members might hope that their speeches could be recorded verbatim. However, since this might render the style of the verbatim records greatly different from the remainder of the minutes, discussion in advance was needed to maintain consistency in the style of the minutes. He opined that it was unnecessary to indicate which Member had made amendments at the amended paragraphs. The Secretariat should instead be authorised to modify the amendments made by Members so as to maintain a consistent style of the minutes. He held the view that minutes should not be recorded verbatim with a view to keeping them short and concise.

191. Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung said that the meeting had just endorsed the proposal that committee minutes should be recorded on an anonymous basis. He found that the paper had not defined how long the specific period was and he deemed one working day acceptable. He therefore supported Ms. Christine FONG's views that the meeting should stick to the current rules and should not introduce more restrictions.

192. The Chairman remarked that according to the current rules, Members had to inform the Secretariat of the SKDC in writing one clear working day before the meeting was held if they had any proposed amendments to the minutes. However, some Members did not follow the rule concerned. If it was agreed that Members should comply with the above rule, the SKDC would no longer accept late submissions or proposed amendments with no actual wording provided.

193. Ms. Maureen SIU, District Officer (Sai Kung) said that the above rules meant to allow Members to have advance knowledge of the proposed amendments put forth by other Members to facilitate discussion at the meeting. Some Members had informed the Secretariat that they would submit proposed amendments before the deadline but eventually did so after the deadline or even did not submit the amendment at all. In view of this, the Secretariat would like to ask Members to decide whether their proposed amendments should be accepted under the above circumstances.

194. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the proposal of not accepting any proposed amendments submitted after a specific time or those with no actual words provided.

195. Mr. Francis CHAU said that the Secretariat might consider modifying the wording of Members' proposed amendments so as to maintain a consistent style throughout the whole minutes. He deemed that unless there were mistakes in the minutes, it was the responsibility of the Secretary to prepare the minutes. He opined that there was no need to indicate who had made the amendment in the paragraph with endorsed amendment. Otherwise, Members would make a lot of amendments so that their names could appear again and again in the minutes.

196. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of Mr. Francis CHAU's proposal of authorising the Secretariat to modify the proposed amendments made by Members so as to maintain a consistent style throughout the minutes.

197. The Secretary laid out the proposal on "photos contained in motion papers/discussion papers/project proposals" as set out in the paper.

198. The Chairman said that the documents submitted by Members should belong to the SKDC. Yet some Members had made use of the documents they submitted to help their own staff. He asked Members to consider whether such practice should be allowed to persist.

199. Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung opined that the meeting should follow the past practice as the issue was not controversial and was no big deal at all. There was nothing unusual for Members to use photos (including their own ones) when preparing documents.

200. Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung did not oppose the proposal but opined that there should be some consistent criteria. The purpose of attaching photos to motion papers was to allow readers to get a better understanding of the issue and the locations concerned. If no restrictions were imposed, community organisers, local residents or people from different organisations might appear in the photos, which was against the intended purpose of adding photos to papers. He therefore suggested that criteria be worked out, requiring that no other persons should appear in those photos. However, if that was unavoidable, Members should mask the face of the people appeared in those photos.

201. Mr. HIEW Moo-siew said that Members should be allowed to appear in photos in motion papers. Besides, they should also be allowed to use letter paper with their photos on it to submit motions.

202. Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung was of the view that no persons should be allowed in the photos attached to a motion paper across the board to avoid the trouble of establishing different criteria. Nevertheless, Members should be allowed to use letter paper with their photos to prepare motions for submission.

203. Mr. LAI Ming-chak suggested dividing the item into two parts for voting. The first part concerned whether Members were allowed to submit motion papers/discussion papers/project proposals with photos of themselves/their assistants/community organisers/staff of their offices. The second part concerned whether Members were allowed to use letter paper with their own photos to prepare discussion papers for submission.

204. Hon Gary FAN called for Members' support for the part pertaining to the letter paper. He stated that Members had the freedom to design their own letter paper and

envelope; and problems might arise if the rules were too rigid. The main point of contention was that some Members had taken the chance of paper submission to help promote their assistants or staff of their offices.

205. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the proposal to allow Members to submit documents using papers with their own photos. The voting result was as follows: 20 voted for the motion, one vote against it and one abstention. The Chairman announced that Members were allowed to use letter paper with their own photos when preparing discussion papers for submission.

206. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the proposal to allow Members to put photos with the appearance of themselves/their assistants/community organisers/staff of their offices in motion papers/discussion papers/project proposals submitted by Members.

207. Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung asked whether Members were allowed to appear in the photos to be attached to motion papers/discussion papers/project proposals under the proposal.

208. Mr. Stanley TAM opined that if Members were allowed to use letter paper with their own photos to submit documents, the meeting should consider also allowing Members to put photos with the appearance of themselves in the documents.

209. Mr. Raymond HO enquired about the reason for not allowing Members to use photos with the appearance of other people in the documents. He understood that the appearance of Members' assistants in a photo might be an intention to help promote them in a coming election. However, if a pedestrian appeared in the photo, he asked whether that should be masked as well. He enquired if the crux of the amendment lay in the presence of staff in the photo. He opined that the amendment should be fully justified and a less restrictive approach was preferred. If the photo was used to show the over-narrowness of a pedestrian crossing, it was no big deal to allow appearance of pedestrians or even Members' assistants in the photo. Therefore, it was not necessary to ban the appearance of other people in discussion papers unless there were specific reasons.

210. Mr. Stanley TAM agreed with Mr. Raymond HO that there was a difference between the subject and the people in the background. Members could not ask all pedestrians to leave before taking pictures. If the photo was used to show a particular place, then only the appearance of Members should be allowed. He opined that the meeting could not go into every detail. The purpose of the above proposal was just to prevent people other than Members from using discussion papers for personal publicity.

211. Mr. WAN Kai-ming enquired whether the proposal for allowing only Members, but not other people, to be the subject of photos was covered in the voting matter.

212. Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung enquired whether the DC would accept documents with photos with the appearance of other people if only Members were allowed to appear in photos.

213. Mr. WAN Kai-ming said that the person pointing to a certain place was the subject of the photo and the pedestrians were the background. He suggested that there should only

be one subject in a photo and the other people should be masked, otherwise the Secretariat could refuse to accept such photo.

214. Mr. Philip LI pointed out that no photos had been attached to previous motion papers in the SKDC. He had attached photos of himself to the motion papers in the last term when he first served as a Member and that might be the cause of the problem. He opined that a uniform practice should be adopted to ban all photos with the appearance of any persons; if any, they should be masked. In the case of election materials, prior written consent from a person must be obtained if a photo of that person was used in election materials. Likewise, pedestrians appearing in the photos used by Members might not want the photos to be uploaded onto the website.

215. Ms. Maureen SIU, District Officer (Sai Kung), believed that the meeting would vote on the above matter later. She pointed out that actually there would be some difficulties in masking the people in the photos. If the meeting decided later that only Members could appear in the photos, she had strong reservations about leaving the work of masking the faces of other people to the Secretariat. She counter-proposed that the Secretariat should refuse to accept all such photos if Members violated the rules passed by the SKDC.

216. Mr. CHAN Kai-wai asked whether it was acceptable for government officials to appear in photos.

217. Mr. Stanley TAM said that Members only had to decide whether it was necessary to attach photos to discussion papers. Since the documents were for submission to the SKDC but not working reports, it was appropriate to impose restrictions on the photos. He thought that the main issue was whether the public would mistake meeting papers as publicity materials.

218. Ms. Maureen SIU, District Officer (Sai Kung) said that Members should use photos which only contained themselves as far as possible, because government officials who were on site visit with the Members would not expect to have their photos taken and uploaded onto the SKDC website.

219. Mr. YAU Yuk-lun concurred with the opinion of Mr. Stanley TAM.

220. Mr. TSE Ching-fung enquired whether people other than Members were not allowed to appear in photos. He asked because people appeared in photos might have multiple identities, such as being a Member's assistant and a local resident.

221. Mr. LAI Ming-chak enquired whether the intention was that only Members should be allowed to appear in photos. If so, the Secretariat only had to handle the photos with irregularities according to Members' decisions. The meeting needed not consider all the possible scenarios.

222. The Chairman understood that some Members hoped to encourage more local residents to participate in district work, so he asked Members to consider whether the SKDC should follow the previous practice that no restriction was imposed on photos in motion papers. He opined that the attachment of someone's photo to motion papers did not help much in electioneering.

223. Mr. Stanley TAM opined that the Chairman's proposal might become an incentive for Members to attach more photos of the relevant parties to motion papers. In his opinion, meeting papers should look like meeting papers.

224. Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung enquired whether the proposal only allowed Members, but not Members' assistants/community organisers/staff of their offices to appear in photos.

225. The Chairman replied that Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung's understanding was correct.

226. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the proposal to allow only Members, but not other persons, to appear in photos attached to motion papers/discussion papers/project proposals submitted. The voting result was as follows: 16 votes for the proposal, four votes against it and three abstentions. The Chairman declared the endorsement of the proposal.

227. The Secretary concluded the voting result and said that Members were allowed to use letter paper with their own photos for submission of motion papers/discussion papers/project proposals, and that only Members themselves were allowed to appear in photos attached to documents. If any persons other than Members appeared in photos attached to meeting papers in the future, the Secretariat would remove such photos and only upload the papers and photos that complied with the requirements onto the SKDC website.

228. There being no objections, the Chairman declared that the Secretariat's supplementary note was accepted.

229. The Secretary laid out the proposals on "moving similar motions repeatedly", "moving motions without notice" and "delivery of speech by a Member moving a motion or raising a question" one by one as set out in the paper.

230. There being no objections, the Chairman announced the endorsement of the above proposals.

231. The Chairman said that the number of motions and questions put forward by the SKDC was the largest among all 18 DCs and had even exceeded the sum of the other 17 districts in the previous term. To facilitate the SKDC's operation, he urged Members to seriously discuss introducing a quota on the number of motions and questions at the meetings of the full council and committees.

232. Mr. Stanley TAM said that the SKDC had discussed limiting the number of motions at the first meeting of every term. In the last term, he had proposed deciding which motions to be submitted to the meeting for discussion by drawing lots. However, there had been various views at the meeting and it had been decided that the number of motions should not be limited as in the past. He pointed out that Members had proposed a total of 53 motions at the full council meeting on 1 September 2015 and the minutes of meeting were 55 pages long. Among those motions, over ten were carried without discussion. He asked Members to adequately address the problems. Although he respected Members' right to move a motion, they should give a thought to whether all issues should be submitted for discussion at the full council meeting. He pointed out that many motions raised by Members were livelihood issues such as water leakage and facility damage in individual constituencies, which could be solved by writing to relevant departments or discussing at committee meetings. He had reservation about submitting all such issues for discussion at the full council meeting, and considered that a reasonable limit on the number of motions each Member could move should

be set, so that there would not be an absurdly large number of motions. He recalled Hon Gary FAN's remark that the meeting should consider limiting the number of motions when the quality of discussion dropped due to lengthy meeting time. Therefore, he urged Members to handle the above problem in a serious manner.

233. Mr. HIEW Moo-siew shared Mr. Stanley TAM's views. He said that if there were too many motions, government departments would attach less importance to the motions. He considered that improvements should be made as problems would arise when dozens of motions were handled at a meeting at once.

234. Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung shared Mr. Stanley TAM's and Mr. HIEW Moo-siew's views. He said that both the full council meetings and the committee meetings were too lengthy, which would have negative impact on Members' and other staff's health. He said that many motions moved by Members were repeated. This would not only prolong the meeting, but would impair the efficiency of government departments which had to make repeated responses to the same issue. Therefore, he asked Members to consider setting a limit on the number of motions each Member was allowed to move at both the full council meeting and committee meetings every year. He suggested that every Member could move up to six motions each year, i.e. an average of one motion at each meeting. He believed that the limit could enable the meeting to focus on more important issues and prevent repeated motions on similar issues. Moreover, the Council could consider cancelling the role of seconder for easier calculation of the number of motions moved by Members.

235. Mr. Frankie LAM said that a lot of motions moved at full council meetings in the last DC term should actually be handled by committees. Thus, he considered that the Chairman could pass those motions to the relevant committees for follow-up. He disagreed to limit the number of motions because he often received requests from the public and he would be deprived of the chance to relay public aspiration. As a result, Members could hardly be accountable to the public.

236. Mr. Edwin CHEUNG said just then some Members mentioned that the motions on trivial livelihood matters could be solved by writing to departments. He suggested that Members should provide sufficient grounds in the motion paper on such matters. For example, no improvement had been made after writing to the department for several times. Then the matters could be put to the full council for follow-up by liaising with the departments concerned. He considered that it was undesirable to limit the number of motions since Members needed to handle numerous livelihood issues. He considered that the Chairman could consolidate similar motions in terms of their focuses and main ideas to reduce the time of full council meetings.

237. Mr. LUI Man-kwong said that it was Members' responsibility to help members of the public. Limiting the number of motions would affect Members' work. Nevertheless, he shared the view that motions on relatively trivial matters could be forwarded to committees, so that the full council's workload could be reduced. This could facilitate the meeting's operation without affecting elected Members' responsibility.

238. Mr. Stanley TAM made supplementary remarks. What he had proposed was to limit the number of motions at the full council only, and opined that whether there would be the same limitation on the number of motions put to committees should not be discussed at this meeting. He said that it was impossible for the Secretariat to determine whether motions from Members should be discussed by the full council or by other committees. Instead, the

meeting should decide whether motions would be debated at the full council or be forwarded to committees. He reiterated that at the last full council meeting, Members had submitted a total of 53 motions, of which more than 10 were not discussed at all. He understood that all livelihood issues were of great importance, but it was worth considering whether the full council meeting was the most suitable platform to discuss all such issues. He added that during his early days as a DC member, representatives of government departments would attend meetings to give explanations and responses regarding relevant motions, but they had stopped doing so and only gave a written reply to Members' motions. In view of this, he appealed to Members to think if such a meeting was healthy. In addition, he opined that many motions were indeed worth discussing. It was Members' hope that they could exchange views on more important issues, apart from amendment proposals, and to invite representatives of government departments to give an account. He agreed that the number of motions should be limited. If the SKDC endorsed the proposal that each Member could only move one motion at each meeting, there would still be 27 motions at each meeting given that the Chairman and the Vice Chairman did not move any motion. He held the view that the above method was palatable compared with drawing lots.

239. Mr. CHUNG Kam-lun disagreed with the limitation on the number of motions because many methods had been proposed but were not handled properly. Although the number of motions at full council meetings was large, this was only because different parties would move similar motions, resulting in the submission of several papers regarding the same issue to the meeting. Hence, he was of the view that the Chairman could liaise with different parties before the meeting to jointly move a motion. It was believed that it could enhance the efficiency of council business. Indeed, there had been quite a number of examples of successful cross-party co-operation. He opined that Members would understand that the submission of every minor issue to the bi-monthly full council meeting for discussion would only undermine the efficiency of the SKDC. He considered that imposing a quota on the number of motions was tantamount to punishing Members who raised opinions more frequently. As Sai Kung and Tseung Kwan O were an ever-developing community, many issues had to be discussed with the Government. Hence, it was only natural that there were more motions.

240. The Chairman said that several senior Members, including himself, were of the view that Members had abused the mechanism of motion submission in recent years. He agreed with Mr. CHUNG Kam-lun that motions should be moved for community development, livelihood issues and requests for development in the district. It would be an abuse of the mechanism if motions were submitted merely for matters in specific constituencies or demand of individuals. He opined that motions should be aimed at requesting the Government to initiate a certain development or expedite existing projects. Moreover, moving motions should not be treated as being accountable to voters. In fact, livelihood issues could easily be solved as long as Members could refer them to suitable departments. Therefore, the quota on the number of motions would not affect the efficiency of Members in handling livelihood issues. In contrast, too many motions would reduce the efficiency of other Members in handling other more important issues. Even if every Member was allowed to move only one motion at every meeting, the meeting would still be long and tedious if Members used up the speaking time on every item. If Members moved motions just for the sake of it, and such motions were carried without in-depth discussion, the workload of the Secretariat would become heavier and the departments would not attach importance to Members' motions. He asked Members to first decide if they agreed to set an upper limit on the number of motions and questions allowed at every meeting. If the decision was in the affirmative, the meeting would proceed to discuss the details.

241. Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung agreed with the direction of other Members. If the limitation on the number of motions was endorsed, he hoped that government departments could take action accordingly to meet Members' expectations. However, according to his observation, even if Members put forward constructive suggestions, departmental representatives would only give bureaucratic remarks and regard that as a response to Members' views. If there was a quota on the number of motions in the future SKDC, the past practice of the departments would only waste Members' precious opportunity to move motions. He considered that it was not only the responsibility of Members, but was also the responsibility of the Secretariat, officials and different departments to support the new arrangement.

242. Mr. LEUNG Li opposed the restriction on the number of motions. He said that moving motions was the duty and right of Members. If the restriction was imposed only for the purpose of ensuring the smooth conduct of meetings and shortening the meeting time, the proposals just adopted by Members, for instance, "delivery of speech by a Member moving a motion or raising a question", had already served the purpose. Past experience showed that the smooth conduct of meetings depended on whether the Chairman or the person presiding at the meeting could strictly enforce the rule that Members might speak twice on each item for two minutes each time. If the number of motions moved by Members was restricted, he asked if the number of project proposals raised by Members at the District Facilities Management Committee (DFMC) meetings should also be restricted. In fact, the DFMC needed to handle dozens of projects and Members were allowed to speak on every project. It would be problematic if the restriction on the number of motions was imposed only for the smooth conduct of meetings. In addition, the present proposal applied to motions submitted before the meeting. If the proposal also covered motions moved at the meeting without notice, Members who had given notice to move motions before the meeting would be unable to move any motions without notice at the meeting. As this issue was not addressed in the paper, he enquired why Members' right of moving motions was restricted.

243. The Chairman said that submission of motions without notice would also be regarded as using the quota. The Chairman suggested that Members should first decide whether to limit the number of motions by voting, and then determine the upper limit on the number of motions.

244. Mr. Frankie LAM opined that the meeting should vote on whether to stick to the old practice first. There would be no need to continue the discussion if the meeting decided not to make any changes.

245. Mr. Philip LI said that the opposition to the setting of a quota would amount virtually to the keeping of the old practice, which was similar to Mr. Frankie LAM's suggestion.

246. Mr. CHAN Kai-wai said that he could only make a decision after knowing the maximum number of motions one could submit. He suggested Members decide the quota first and he would oppose the proposal if the quota was too small.

247. Mr. LAI Ming-chak agreed that a maximum number should be set to allow Members to make an informed decision.

248. Mr. Stanley TAM restated his idea that supposing there were six meetings in a year,

each Member could submit one motion on average at each meeting and there would be 27 motions submitted to each meeting on average. Besides, the number of motions submitted by Members for each meeting would be limited to no more than two and the submission of two motions would mean they had used up their annual quota of two motions.

249. The Chairman concluded that under Mr. Stanley TAM's proposal, each Member could submit six motions in a year and could submit no more than two motions at each meeting.

250. Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung remarked that 27 motions at one meeting was not a small number. If all Members were to submit two motions at the same meeting, there would be 54 motions in total, which would be similar to the full Council meetings in the past. He said that the limitation on the number of motions aimed to ensure that meetings could be carried out smoothly and that departments would not misuse written response to fob Members off. He continued to ask whether the scrapping of seconder would make the calculation of Members' motions much easier. He added that each motion should have only one mover.

251. The Chairman held the view that 27 motions for each meeting after a quota was imposed were still too much. He hoped Members could reach a consensus after discussion. He suggested that the organisations to which Members belonged should discuss the motions to be submitted before the meeting and Members needed not use up their quotas. In fact, the secretariat support of DCs was not comparable with that of the LegCo. The SKDC Secretariat had witnessed a substantial increase in workload which had topped the list of the 18 districts; and its staff had to work around the clock to handle meeting matters. He hoped Members could be more pragmatic and ceased submitting motions just for the sake of it. It would be meaningless if the ideas of those motions could not be put into implementation.

252. Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung opined that one motion for each meeting was not enough because only issues requiring inter-departmental efforts to handle were submitted for the SKDC's discussion. If Members could only submit one motion, they might not be able to deal with all kinds of issues in the district. He opined that further discussion was needed on the imposing of a quota on it.

253. The Chairman said that the total number of motions submitted in the 17 DCs might not be as many as the number of the SKDC. However, it did not mean that Members of other districts did not follow up on district work because there were other channels to do so.

254. Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung enquired about the number of motions submitted in the 17 DCs. The Chairman replied that the relevant information would be sent to Members after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The relevant information had been emailed to Members on 26 February 2016.)

255. Mr. Edwin CHEUNG asked whether the issue would be reviewed during the current term if it was endorsed.

256. The Chairman said that Members could consider whether to review the issue two years later.

257. Mr. LAI Ming-chak asked whether the meeting should adjourn for discussion first.

258. Mr. Francis CHAU suggested handling the remaining agenda items first or allowing representatives of various organisations to discuss the issue outside the meeting room. He remarked that all Members supporting a motion should be deemed as seconders and that Members should reduce unnecessary amendments to other Members' motions in the future.

259. There being no objections, the Chairman announced that the meeting would adjourn for 10 minutes for discussion of Members.

(The meeting resumed after 10 minutes.)

260. Mr. Stanley TAM remarked that after discussion, it was proposed that a quota should be imposed on the number of motions proposed at full council meetings. Each Member could submit a maximum of six motions each year, with two motions for each meeting at most. Since some motions might involve the whole district or Hong Kong as a whole, Members held the view that the mechanism of seconders should be retained. A Member would not be regarded as having moved a motion as a seconder. Members also opined that the arrangement should be put on trial for a year first and reviewed at the first meeting of the full council next year.

261. Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung said that he and Mr. CHAN Kai-wai proposed to set an annual quota of nine motions for each Member. Moreover, he deemed that there was no need to have seconders.

262. Hon Gary FAN disagreed with Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung's proposal. Given that Mr. Stanley TAM had proposed a maximum of two motions for each Member at a meeting, the annual quota of nine was unworkable because nine was not divisible by six. He opined that Members should think about how to execute the plan before making any proposals.

263. Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung said that he failed to understand Hon Gary FAN's remarks. He only suggested increasing the quota for Members so that they could submit more than one motion at a meeting when necessary.

264. The Chairman said that Mr. Stanley TAM's proposal was to put the arrangement on trial for one year before reviewing it. He therefore opined that the proposal was feasible.

265. Since the meeting had different views on the issue, the Chairman asked Members to vote on the proposal made by Mr. Stanley TAM.

266. Mr. CHAN Kai-wai asked whether the SKDC should first vote on the proposal put forth at a later time.

267. Mr. WAN Yuet-cheung was of the opinion that a vote should be first taken on Mr. Stanley TAM's proposal. Only when it was negative would there be a vote on Mr. CHEUNG Mei-hung's proposal since the Standing Orders only stipulated the voting order for amended motions, i.e., motions put in later would be voted first.

268. The Chairman asked Members to vote on Mr. Stanley TAM's proposal. The voting result was as follows: 22 votes for it, no vote against it and three abstentions.

269. Since the meeting considered it not necessary to vote on the other proposal, the Chairman declared that Mr. Stanley TAM's proposal was endorsed. He added that

submitting a motion without notice would be regarded as using the quota, and Members could not transfer their quota for motion submission to other Members.

270. The Chairman hoped that Members would strictly abide by the Standing Orders and rules and order laid down by the DC during this term so that meetings would not be disrupted. He hoped that Members would respect persons presiding at the meetings who should have the final say and allow them to act with flexibility where necessary.

V. Meet-the-Public Scheme
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 8/16)

271. Members noted the contents of the paper. The Secretary added that there were three sessions of Meet-the-Public Scheme in total during the last DC term, with one session in 2012 and two in 2013. In the last term, SKDC Members took turns to be on duty on Mondays and Wednesdays and meet members of the public who had made an appointment via the Secretariat. Moreover, the Secretariat received from time to time requests from members of the public to meet designated DC Members, rather than those who were on duty under the Meet-the-Public Scheme. Members were asked to consider if the previous arrangement should be continued.

272. The Chairman asked Members to consider if the Scheme should be run by appointment instead of the previous regular session system.

273. There being no objections, the Chairman declared that the Meet-the-Public Scheme of this term would be run by appointment instead of the previous regular session system.

VI. Financial Position of DC Funds as at 10 January 2016
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 9/16)

274. Members noted the contents of the paper.

VII. Funding Applications for the Community Involvement Projects under the SKDC 2015/2016 Submitted for Vetting at the First Special Meeting of the SKDC in 2016
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 10/16)

275. Members noted the contents of the paper and funding applications. The Chairman said that funding applications submitted for consideration had been vetted and recommended for approval by the Secretariat in accordance with the relevant guidelines. Items not covered in the guidelines would be regarded as “non-standard”. Members might determine whether to approve funding to such “non-standard” items or not. Members were requested to vet each funding application carefully so that the use of resources could be optimised.

276. The Secretary reported that as decided at the meeting on 5 January, the SKDO had looked for groups and organisations with which it could jointly organise arts and cultural activities. At the invitation of the SKDO, Sai Kung District Community Centre had already filed a funding application with the SKDC. There was one funding application for the year 2015/2016 in the paper, for which a total of \$169,530 was recommended for approval. The

unspent balance of this item in the current DC term was \$ 121,000. If the recommended amount was approved in full, the estimate would be exceeded by \$48,350. Nonetheless, there would be remaining DC funds in the current financial year even if the funding for the said activity was approved in full.

277. The Secretary reported further that at the meeting on 5 January, some Members suggested that the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) organise more activities such as rock climbing classes to make good use of the remaining DC funds of this financial year. The LCSD responded that time was tight because it had to make arrangements to meet the schedules of instructors and to invite applications. As a result, no additional activities or rock climbing classes could be arranged in the current financial year.

278. There being no objections, the Chairman declared that the above funding application was endorsed.

VIII. Funding Applications for the Community Involvement Projects under the SKDC 2016/2017 Submitted for Vetting at the First Special Meeting of the SKDC in 2016

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 11/16)

279. Members noted the contents of the paper and funding applications.

280. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives to the meeting:

- Ms. Annie FUNG, District Leisure Manger (Sai Kung) of the LCSD
- Mr. Cliff FUNG, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Sai Kung of the LCSD
- Miss May TSANG, Senior Manager (New Territories East) Promotion of the LCSD
- Miss Alice NG, Manager (New Territories East) Marketing and District Activities of the LCSD
- Ms. Agatha YUEN, Senior Librarian (Sai Kung) of the LCSD

281. The Secretary reported that there were three applications of the Partnership Scheme under the LCSD, including recreational and sports activities, free entertainment programmes and promotion activities in libraries to be organised by the LCSD in the district in 2016/17. The LCSD had consulted the District Facilities Management and Community Involvement Working Group under the District Facilities Management Committee on 11 August the year before. The total amount of funding of the three applications was approximately \$7,290,000. Based on past experience, the SKDC would first endorse in principle the activities and programmes of the LCSD, and then adjust in the beginning of the next financial year the actual amount of funding according to the provision available to the SKDC.

282. The Secretary briefly explained the three applications of the LCSD. She said that the first application was “Recreational and sports activity programmes in Sai Kung district between April 2016 and March 2017 organised by the LCSD”. The amount of funding recommended for approval was \$6,400,000, from which an expenditure of HK\$250,000 would have to be paid in the 2017/18 financial year.

283. Mr. Francis CHAU suggested endorsing the funding application.

284. The Chairman said that just as what mentioned by the Secretary, the SKDC would, in principle, endorse the LCSD's activity proposals first and adjust the actual amount of allocation in the beginning of the next financial year according to the DC funds received.

285. There being no objections, the Chairman declared that the above funding application was endorsed.

286. The Secretary reported that the second application was "Proposals of Free Local Cultural Programmes in Sai Kung by LCSD in 2016/17". The amount of funding recommended for approval was \$645,000, from which an expenditure of \$52,000 would have to be paid in the 2017/18 financial year.

287. Mr. WAN Yuet-cheung suggested endorsing the funding application.

288. There being no objections, the Chairman declared that the above funding application was endorsed.

289. The Secretary reported that the third application was "Promotion Activities in Public Libraries of Sai Kung District Between April 2016 and March 2017". The amount of funding recommended for approval was \$241,140, from which an expenditure of \$3,180 would have to be paid in the 2017/18 financial year.

290. Mr. Francis CHAU suggested endorsing the funding application. He said that he had made an enquiry to the LCSD and learnt that a dedicated fund would soon be provided for the LCSD to promote elderly-friendly work as mentioned in the Policy Address.

291. There being no objections, the Chairman declared that the above funding application was endorsed.

IX. Any Other Business

(1) CPCE's Cooperation Scheme with District Councils 2016/2017 by the Committee on the Promotion of Civic Education
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 12/16)

292. Members noted the contents of the captioned paper.

293. There being no objections, the Chairman declared that just as in the past, the Committee on the Promotion of Civic Education (CPCE) of Sai Kung District would invite district organisations to submit applications, and the SKDC would recommend suitable activity applications to the CPCE for its consideration.

294. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to contact the CPCE of Sai Kung District.

(2) Selection of Representative to Become a Member of the Regional Advisory Committee of the Hospital Authority
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 13/16)

295. Members noted the contents of the paper. The Chairman said that the Hospital Authority (HA) had invited the SKDC to nominate a SKDC Member to be considered by the HA for appointment as a Member of Kowloon Regional Advisory Committee (KRAC) from 1 April 2016 in personal capacity. Mr. Stanley TAM was currently a Member of the KRAC and his term of office would end on 31 March 2016. The Chairman proposed nominating the Chairman of Social Services & Healthy and Safe City Committee (SSHSCC).

296. Mr. CHONG Yuen-tung and Mr. CHAN Kai-wai suggested adopting the usual practice of appointing the Chairman of the SSHSCC to join the KRAC.

297. There being no objections, the Chairman declared that Mr. Stanley TAM, the Chairman of the SSHSCC, was appointed as a Member of the KRAC.

(3) HULU Culture
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 14/16)

298. Members noted the contents of the captioned paper. The Chairman said that HULU Culture would organise the Hong Kong Jockey Club Heritage x Arts x Design Walk Exhibition in Sha Tin and Sai Kung from 30 April 2016 to 29 May 2016. The organisation had written to invite the SKDC to be a partner of the activity. HULU Culture stated that it had promoted the history and culture of communities in many areas, including Central, Sheung Wan, Sham Shui Po, Tsuen Wan, Kwai Tsing, Tai Po, Fanling, Wong Tai Sin and Kowloon City through arts and design over the past five years. The theme of the 6th project would be Sha Tin District and Sai Kung District. The history and unique cultures of the two districts would be explored comprehensively through exhibitions, workshops, guided tours and talks. HULU Culture also hoped to print the SKDC's logo on its publications and publicity items.

299. There being no objections, the Chairman declared that the SKDC would be a partner of the project and permitted HULU Culture to print the SKDC's logo on its publications and publicity items.

(4) Representatives in Attending the Customer Liaison Group of Hongkong Post
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 15/16)

300. Members noted the contents of the paper. The Chairman said that Hongkong Post invited the SKDC to nominate a representative to join the new-term Customer Liaison Group (CLG). The term of office was from 1 April 2016 to 31 December 2017. The Chairman said that the representative of the last term was Mr. CHAN Kai-wai and invited nominations from Members.

301. Mr. Francis CHAU nominated Mr. Raymond HO since Hongkong Post had expressed its wish in the letter to have a different representative from the SKDC to join the new-term CLG. Mr. CHUNG Kam-lun seconded the nomination.

302. Mr. Raymond HO accepted the nomination.

303. There being no objections, the Chairman declared that the appointment of Mr. Raymond HO as a representative of the new-term CLG was endorsed.

X. Date of Next Meeting

304. The Chairman announced that the next meeting would be held at 9:30 a.m. on 8 March 2016 (Tuesday).

305. There being no other business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 2:25 p.m.

Sai Kung District Council Secretariat
February 2016