

(Confirmed minutes)
(Translation)

Sai Kung District Council
Minutes of the First Meeting in 2020

Date: 2 January 2020 (Thursday)

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Venue: Conference Room of the Sai Kung District Council

<u>Present</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Mr CHUNG Kam-lun (Chairman)	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr CHAU Yin-ming, Francis, BBS, MH (Vice Chairman)	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Ms CHAN Ka-lam, Debby	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr CHAN Wai-lit	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr CHAN Yiu-chor, Andrew	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr CHENG Chung-man	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr CHEUNG Chin-pang, Edwin	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr CHEUNG Mei-hung, Chris	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr CHOI Ming-hei	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr CHUN Hoi-shing	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr FAN Kwok-wai, Gary	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Ms FONG Kwok-shan, Christine	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr FUNG Kwan-on	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr HO Wai-hong, Stanley	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr LAI Ming-chak	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr LAI Wai-tong	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr LAM Siu-chung, Frankie	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr LAU Kai-hong	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr LEE Ka-yui	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr LEE Yin-ho, Ryan	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Ms LEUNG Hin-yan	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr LEUNG Li	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr LUI Man-kwong	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr LUK Ping-choi	9:30 a.m.	12:35 p.m.
Mr OR Yiu-lam, Ricky	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr TSE Ching-fung	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.

Ms WONG Cheuk-nga, Valerie	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr WONG Shui-sang	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr YIP Brandon Kenneth	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Mr YU Tsun-ning	9:30 a.m.	2:05 p.m.
Miss LAU Tang, Moira (Secretary)	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Sai Kung District Office	

In Attendance

Mr CHIU Yin-wa, David, JP	District Officer (Sai Kung), Sai Kung District Office
Mr CHOW Tat-wing, Cyrus	Assistant District Officer (Sai Kung)1, Sai Kung District Office
Miss WONG Ching-hang, Joey	Assistant District Officer (Sai Kung)2, Sai Kung District Office
Miss MAK Wai-man, Sandy	Senior Liaison Officer (1), Sai Kung District Office
Ms LAM Yee-mang, Dawn	Senior Liaison Officer (2), Sai Kung District Office
Mr WU Wai-kwong, Wilson	Senior Liaison Officer (3), Sai Kung District Office
Mr LIU Chung-him, Michael	Executive Officer I (District Council), Sai Kung District Office

Mr David CHIU, District Officer (Sai Kung) (DO(SK)), Sai Kung District Office (SKDO), welcomed all Members of the new term of Sai Kung District Council (SKDC) to the first full council meeting of SKDC (full council meeting). He said a quorum was present and the meeting commenced officially.

2. Mr David CHIU, DO(SK), said in comparison with the last term, two more seats were added in the new term of SKDC, which comprised a total of 31 Members, including 29 elected members and 2 ex officio members. He also introduced to Members the principal staff of SKDO.

3. Mr David CHIU, DO(SK), said he would chair the first part of today's meeting, i.e. the election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of SKDC. According to Section 62(5) of the District Councils Ordinance (Cap. 547), "the Chairman and Vice Chairman are to hold office as long as they are members of the Council". In other words, the term of office of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman would commence after they were elected until the end of the tenure of the current-term SKDC. After the Chairman and Vice-Chairman were elected, he would pass the chairmanship of the meeting to the new Chairman.

I. Election of the Chairman of the Sai Kung District Council (SKDC)

4. Mr David CHIU, DO(SK), said as stipulated in Sections 62 and 65 of the District Councils Ordinance, a District Council is to elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from amongst its members at the first meeting of the Council held after each ordinary election in accordance with the voting procedure set out in Schedule 5 to the District Councils Ordinance.

Schedule 5 to the District Councils Ordinance and the election procedures of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of District Councils were attached in the email sent by the Secretariat to Members in mid-December.

5. Mr David CHIU, DO(SK), continued that the deadline for nomination of candidates contesting for the Chairman was 8:30 this morning. As at the end of the nomination period, the Secretariat only received one valid nomination paper:

- Nominee: Mr CHUNG Kam-lun. The nomination was made by Mr Francis CHAU and seconded by Messrs Gary FAN and LAI Wai-tong.

6. There being only one valid nomination, Mr David CHIU, DO(SK), declared that Mr CHUNG Kam-lun was elected uncontested as the Chairman of SKDC according to Section 5 of Schedule 5 to the District Councils Ordinance.

II. Election of the Vice-Chairman of SKDC

7. Mr David CHIU, DO(SK), said the deadline for nomination of candidates contesting for the Vice-Chairman was 8:30 this morning. As at the end of the nomination period, the Secretariat only received one valid nomination paper:

- Nominee: Mr Francis CHAU. The nomination was made by Mr CHUNG Kam-lun and seconded by Messrs Gary FAN and LAI Wai-tong.

8. There being only one valid nomination, Mr David CHIU, DO(SK), declared that Mr Francis CHAU was elected uncontested as the Vice-Chairman of SKDC according to Section 5 of Schedule 5 to the District Councils Ordinance.

9. Mr David CHIU, DO(SK), announced that part one of the meeting ended. The meeting would then be chaired by the Chairman of SKDC Mr CHUNG Kam-lun and the Vice-Chairman of SKDC Mr Francis CHAU.

III. Any Other Business

10. The Chairman thanked Members for their support. He said the voting rate of the District Council election just held in Hong Kong was record high. He believed that all Members had joined SKDC bearing the residents' expectations of the Council. He hoped that the new term of SKDC could have a closer communication with the residents and community to facilitate a more active involvement and participation of residents in the community.

11. The Vice-Chairman thanked Members for their support and the cooperation of government departments. He said Hong Kong was now experiencing unprecedented social rifts, political unrest and disputes in the society. It was heartbreaking that many people had been arrested yesterday, he believed that the public, just like himself, was very anxious about it. However, he believed that SKDC Members of the new term could maintain their original intention and preserve the core values of Hong Kong, cherish every generation and would not give up easily. He also believed that Members could help mending the rifts and rebuilding a caring and just society. He pointed out that apart from being trusted by the public, Members should also be confident in themselves, and continued to commit to their work, preserve humanitarian values, diversity and equality, social justice and protect rights and interests. While paying attention to the needs relating to the livelihood of residents in the community, Members should also try to gain the support of the public at the same time.

12. The Chairman said this was the first meeting of the current-term SKDC, to facilitate the earliest operation of SKDC, he suggested making the following special arrangements to discuss issues that needed to be handled urgently. He also suggested adding these issues to the agenda, with details as follows:

- (A) Appointment of Secretary of SKDC
- (B) Establishment of Committees under SKDC and determination of the dates of meetings
- (C) Setting up of Working Groups under SKDC and the election of Convenors and Vice-Convenors
- (D) Approval of two funding applications of the Community Involvement Programme under SKDC and brief examination of the funding applications to be submitted by the Secretariat on behalf of the applicant organisations next time
- (E) Nomination of SKDC representatives to the Eastern Harbour Tunnel User Liaison Group
- (F) Determination of the date of next meeting

13. The Chairman said Order 13(2) of the Sai Kung District Council Standing Orders (SKDC Standing Orders) provides that “Subject to the agreement of over half of the members of the Council present at the meeting, the Chairman may at the commencement or in the course of the meeting approve the inclusion of an item in the agenda or adjustment of the order of business on the agenda.” The Chairman asked whether Members agreed with the inclusion of the above items in the agenda.

14. Ms Christine FONG congratulated Messrs CHUNG Kam-lun and Francis CHAU on their being elected as the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of SKDC respectively. She said everyone understood the existing social unrest, SKDC had also undergone sweeping changes, with the

addition of a lot of young Members. She pointed out that as the Chairman had mentioned to Members of different groups earlier the establishment of seven Committees and two Working Groups under SKDC, she hoped that the Chairman could brief Members of the direction of discussion in SKDC before convening the special meeting.

15. The Chairman said the establishment of Committees and Working Groups under SKDC and the respective terms of reference (TOR) would be discussed in detail under the new items B and C proposed.

16. Ms Christine FONG would like to know, after the Chairman's being elected uncontested, whether the style of chairmanship and the Standing Orders would be changed, as compared with the Council dominated by Members of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong in the previous terms.

17. The Chairman said the Standing Orders of SKDC could be reviewed at the special meeting to be held later. As for the style of chairmanship, he would share the information he got with other Members as early as possible, focus on issues concerned by residents, enhance the efficiency of SKDC and urge the government departments to respond to issues raised by SKDC more quickly.

18. Ms Christine FONG considered that SKDC Chairman should not reject the motions of Members without careful consideration, and the motions should be passed to all Members for resolution. In the past, the Chairman had the final decision on whether a motion could be discussed, which she considered a privilege, for example, at the full council meeting of SKDC of the previous term, some Members hoped that the opposition to making legislative amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance could be discussed, but the motions were rejected by the ex-Chairman finally. She hoped that there could be a change in the exercise of such privilege by the new Chairman. In addition, she also pointed out that minutes of meetings of SKDC had been written without indicating the names of speakers and presented in the form of a summary, she suggested SKDC to adopt the practice of indicating the names of speakers and capturing what the speakers had said in full when preparing the minutes of meetings. Besides, she said she had used "Facebook Live" during SKDC meetings of the previous term but was stopped by other Members. She said she was also using "Facebook Live" at the moment. She considered that the Chairman, as a young Member, should reform and make change in the Council, and enhance the transparency of the Council. Moreover, she said she had been prohibited from entering the Conference Room by 22 Members of the then SKDC because of her opposition to issues related to the landfill together with other residents in 2014. She did not want to see the recurrence of similar incidents. She hoped that the Chairman could break with tradition, not to "move the goal posts", and not to prohibit other Members from speaking because of their factions.

19. The Chairman said the operation of DCs was subject to the provisions of the District Councils Ordinance. He believed that the legislative amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance just mentioned was also a matter of concerns to many residents in Sai Kung District, he would handle the issue in a relaxed approach. Besides, he said when the issues related to minutes of meetings were discussed four years ago, he also considered that for the minutes of meetings of Committees, the names of speakers should be indicated. As for the method of drafting SKDC's minutes of meeting in the new term, it might be discussed together in the special meeting to be held on 16 January. Given that today's meeting was a full council meeting, the minutes of meeting would be prepared with the names of speakers indicated as usual. The Chairman said he personally agreed that the use of "Facebook Live" could enhance the transparency of SKDC. He asked Members whether they found it acceptable if some Members used the "Facebook Live" application during the meeting.

20. The Vice-Chairman pointed out that Members were allowed to take photos during the meetings, but no video recording was allowed. The major reason being that Members' movements during the recording might affect the meeting. Members might further discuss whether video recording at the meeting was acceptable to them at the special meeting to be held on 16 January. In addition, given that a Member had arranged the assistant to make live coverage of the meeting from the public gallery today, he considered it not necessary to grant special permission for making live coverage at the meeting today.

21. The Chairman said he permitted Members to make video record in the Conference Room today, but he hoped that they would not leave their seats so as not to affect the meeting. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared the inclusion of the discussion items mentioned above in the agenda of today's meeting.

22. In addition, to facilitate SKDC meetings to proceed in an orderly manner, he suggested adopting the following arrangements as in the past:

- (1) Each Member might participate for a maximum of two times in the discussion of every single item and the time for each speaking was limited to two minutes;
- (2) Members should, when they arrived at and before they left the Conference Room, write down the respective time and signed, otherwise, the respective time as shown on the minutes of meeting would be based on the observation of the staff of the Secretariat.

23. There was no objection from Members.

(A) Appointment of Secretary of SKDC

24. The Chairman said Section 69(1) of the District Councils Ordinance stipulated that “For the purpose of carrying out its functions, a District Council may appoint a public officer to act as the secretary of that District Council.” Senior Executive Officer (District Council) of SKDO was proposed to be the Secretary of SKDC in accordance with the above provision.

25. Ms Christine FONG agreed with the need to appoint a Secretary. She pointed out that the Secretary of SKDC had been focusing on serving the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of SKDC for many terms of SKDC in the past. She considered that the Secretary of SKDC was appointed by all 31 Members present at the meeting and should not only provide services for the Chairman and Vice-Chairman. She understood that the Secretary needed to prepare the Chairman’s brief for the Chairman, but she still hoped that the Secretary could allocate her time fairly so as to handle the demands and work of all 31 Members.

26. Mr David CHIU, DO(SK), reiterated that the Chairman was talking about the appointment of Secretary of SKDC but not the Secretary of Chairman of SKDC. In other words, the SKDC Secretariat was serving the whole SKDC.

27. The Chairman said the Secretary would lead the whole Secretariat to assist in implementing district work. The target of service provision was each and every Member present at the meeting. The Secretary of SKDC did not belong to any particular Member.

28. The Vice-Chairman said he had been serving as SKDC Member for 29 years, during which he had taken up the post of Vice-Chairman for two terms, he did not consider that the Secretary only provided services for the Chairman. He believed that all staff of the Secretariat were conscientious civil servants. There was only one Member who considered that the Secretary only served the Chairman. For the 14 re-elected Members present at the meeting, if they agreed with what Ms Christine had said, they were welcome to air their views, if no one agreed with her, then what she said would be considered the views of individual Member.

29. Ms Christine FONG said the Secretary would invite the Chairman or Vice-Chairman to attend activity and serve as officiating guest by email or document from time to time. It was also mentioned in Members’ reference materials about the the entertainment provision for the Chairman. She pointed out that the Chairman was representing the whole SKDC when he attended or officiated at any activity. Given that in the past, Members did not know what activities the Chairman had attended, she suggested that the Secretary could collate and set out the information on the activities attended by the Chairman for Members’ reference. The activities that the Chairman attended in his personal capacity could be excluded. She considered that when the Chairman attended activities on behalf of SKDC, he would more or

less listen to the views of residents. She had never heard the Chairman reporting any information on the activities he had attended during the previous terms of SKDC.

30. The Chairman said the operation of SKDC should keep abreast of time, he had an open attitude on reporting the activities he attended.

31. Ms Christine FONG said the Chairman was given additional funding for the social activities of SKDC, she considered that the funding could only be used with the prior approval of all Members. She quoted an example that in the past, the Chairman had entertained developers with funding, she hoped that in the current term of SKDC, the Secretary could set out such expenditure in detail for monitoring by the public and Members.

32. The Chairman said the issue had deviated from the procedure for appointing the Secretary. He pointed out that Members could check the Chairman's expenditure on entertainment on their own. He also considered that Ms Christine FONG should make the request to SKDC Chairman but not the Secretariat.

33. The Vice-Chairman said he was speaking for the second time. As Members had just endorsed that each Member could only speak for two times on each item and the time for each speaking was limited to two minutes, he suggested the Chairman not to discuss the item with Members in an interactive manner, but to handle the discussion according to the number of speaking.

34. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared the endorsement of appointing Senior Executive Officer (District Council) as the Secretary of SKDC.

(B) Establishment of the Committees under SKDC and determination of the dates of meetings

35. The Chairman said, the following six Committees were established under SKDC of the previous term:

- (i) District Facilities Management Committee
- (ii) Finance & Administration Committee
- (iii) Housing & Environmental Hygiene Committee
- (iv) Social Services & Healthy and Safe City Committee
- (v) Traffic & Transport Committee
- (vi) Signature Project Scheme Committee

36. The Chairman continued that he had discussed with different Members before the meeting about the proposed Committees to be set up under the current term SKDC and their respective scope of work. He asked the Secretariat to distribute the information prepared by him to Members.

37. The Chairman proposed that the District Facilities Management Committee (DFMC), Finance & Administration Committee (FAC) and Traffic & Transport Committee (TTC) would continue to be set up. The previous Housing & Environmental Hygiene Committee (HEHC) was proposed to be split into the Housing, Planning and Development Committee and the Environmental Hygiene, Climate Change, Agriculture and Fisheries Committee; the previous Social Services & Healthy and Safe City Committee (SSHSCC) would be renamed as Education, Health and Social Welfare Committee (EHSWC) to enable the public to better understand the policy scopes that the Committee involved; while the proposed new Community Building and Social Innovation Committee (CBSIC) aimed at strengthening the cooperation between SKDC and the local community. He suggested Members to discuss later the TOR of each Committee together with whether or not to adopt the established practices and endorsed that the tenure of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of each Committee would be two years, i.e. from the date of their being elected to 31 December 2021, and that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of each Committee could be re-elected to serve for another term upon the end of their tenures. He also added that Members were requested in the past to join at least three Committees so that Members could better understand in details various issues of the district. The Chairman invited Members to put forward their views on the number, names and TOR of the Committees.

38. Mr Edwin CHEUNG said working groups would be set up under Committees in the past, as no information on working groups was available, he considered the information provided not comprehensive. Besides, he considered that splitting the existing Committee into too many Committees would increase the workload of the Secretariat to a certain extent. He supported the handling of specific issues by dedicated committees, but it was also effective to handle the issues through working groups, he would like to understand the ideology behind splitting up the Committee.

39. Mr LAI Ming-chak pointed out that there were two types of SKDC working groups, to be established under SKDC and under different Committees respectively. The Chairman just mentioned that there would be agenda items at a later time of the meeting for discussing the Working Groups established under SKDC, the meeting should now discuss the setting up of Committees. The dates of electing the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of Committees would be decided later, and thereafter the respective Committees would discuss the setting up of their Working Groups. Besides, for SKDC, apart from the full council meeting, there would be one meeting for each of the seven Committees, which meant that a total of eight meetings would be

held for each cycle. If the established practice of convening meetings on Tuesdays and Thursdays of the odd months was adopted, he believed that there would be enough time to convene the eight meetings for each cycle. He also said given that the meeting time of certain Committees were rather long, and that half of the items being discussed were not related to the representatives of departments attending the meeting, it was difficult for them to sit through the whole meeting.

40. The Chairman said the Working Groups established under SKDC would be handled at today's meeting; while those under the Committees would be separately discussed by the respective Committees.

41. Ms Christine FONG agreed with the views of Mr Edwin CHEUNG. Given that no information on the Working Groups under Committees was available, it was difficult to make thorough discussion. Besides, she pointed out that the meeting time of TTC was from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., which was very long. On one occasion, the meeting had spent eight hours on discussing the traffic problems in Tseung Kwan O, as a result, the representatives of Transport Department responsible for handling the traffic issues in rural Sai Kung had to wait for at least eight hours before they could speak. She said although Members were hardworking, the setting up of additional Working Groups would increase the workload of the departments concerned. She pointed out that the TOR of Committees were very blurred. As the Chairman had discussed with other Members the Working Groups to be set up under Committees, she suggested discussing it together at today's meeting. She also said issues on housing and environmental hygiene and planning and climate changes were closely related, if two separate Committees were set up to discuss these issues, this would result in repetition of discussion. However, she also welcomed the discussion of climate changes and agricultural issues, and hoped that they could be discussed together to enhance efficiency. She also welcomed the establishment of CBSIC, but she would like to learn more about the mission of this newly established Committee.

42. Mr CHEUNG Mei-hung agreed with the functions and TOR of the Committees. He said based on the experience of last year, the meeting of TTC lasted from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.; but the meeting time of other Committees were very short. He understood that all Members were very busy and was worried that Members would not be able to attend a meeting if the meeting time was too long; if the Committee was split into too many Committees, the problem of the short meeting time of FAC, which ended in half an hour, would recur.

43. Mr Ricky OR said as the Working Groups established under SKDC were directly under SKDC, in theory, those Working Groups would only be established for important issues. Given that under the framework of SKDC, the power of Committees was greater than that of Working Groups, he asked, instead of setting up Working Groups established under SKDC, why

not setting up Committees directly. Besides, the Committees would hold a meeting once every two months in general, but for Working Groups, the number of meetings could be increased as necessary. He considered that the setting up of Working Groups must be supported by the cooperation of the departments concerned, if the departments were unable to deploy the necessary resources accordingly, Working Groups established under SKDC should not be set up hastily. He also worried that the government departments would not place as much importance to Working Groups as Committees.

44. Mr LUK Ping-choi said he agreed to a certain degree the views of Ms Christine FONG over the arrangement of Working Groups. In addition, as SSHSCC would be renamed as EHSWC, he enquired whether EHSWC would still discuss the issue of Healthy and Safe City, or the issue would be handled by Working Group. According to his knowledge, the status as a healthy and safe city needed to be validated by the World Health Organisation on a periodic basis.

45. Ms Debby CHAN enquired whether the establishment of Working Groups must be handled by Committees, and whether the views expressed by Members would be handled at today's meeting. She also asked whether the relevant Committee was split into two Committees because the meeting time was too long. Besides, she asked for controversial or major issues involving cooperation across different departments and committees, e.g. the rodent infestation problem that involved housing, transport and planning concurrently, whether the Working Group could handle the work across different departments or Committees, and whether the Working Group would be established directly under SKDC.

46. Mr LAI Ming-chak said during the last term of SKDC, many issues needed to be discussed across various Committees, for example, the project on construction of housing on five green belt sites involved HEHC and TTC; while the connection of cycle tracks involved DFMC and TTC. Given the difficulty in perfectly assigning all issues to the seven Committees, it was necessary to invite the representatives of departments to attend the full council meeting for discussing issues that could not be handled by one single Committee. It was the same for the setting up of Working Groups established under SKDC because an issue might not be only under the area of work of one particular Committee. Besides, there was greater flexibility in arrangement of meeting time of Working Groups. He suggested the Chairman to discuss the arrangement of Working Groups established under SKDC first; while Members could also express their views on the Working Groups under Committees, but the Committees should have the final decision.

47. The Chairman considered that each Committee had its own priorities, the Working Groups under Committees should be handled by the respective Committees. As for the issues to be handled across various Committees, for the time being, he did not foresee any chaotic

situation would arise from splitting of the Committee. For example, if any Members discovered any hygiene blackspot, they could request the representatives of the suitable departments to attend the respective meetings. Given that a maximum of only seven Committees could be established under SKDC, not every issue could be followed up by establishing a Committee, a Working Group established under SKDC could be set up to handle the issues if necessary. The Chairman emphasised that the long meeting time was not the reason for splitting the Committee into two Committees. He discovered during the discussion with Members earlier that it was the intention of all to split housing and environmental hygiene issues for dedicated following up. As for the concept of healthy and safe city mentioned by Mr LUK Ping-choi, the Chairman said the TOR of the Committee concerned had set out clearly that the issue would be followed up, which meant that the issue would not be affected by the renaming of the Committee.

48. Ms Christine FONG hoped that the Chairman could explain the mission of CBSIC.

49. The Chairman considered the relationship among residents in Tseung Kwan O new town relatively distant. He noted from the movement on the opposition to the proposed legislative amendment that there were many subjects of common concerns in the community and the young people growing up in Tseung Kwan O had a very strong sense of belonging to the place where they grew up. Taking into account that SKDC did not have very frequent contact with residents in the name of the Council in the past, the purposes of setting up CBSIC was to enhance the transparency of the Council and promote residents' participation in the community; through CBSIC, the Council could also listen to the views of different experts, academics and stakeholders, thus formulating policies more suitable for Sai Kung district.

50. Ms Christine FONG welcomed the new Committee's concern over issues like warming of climate, agricultural and social building, etc., which she considered could provide more opportunity for young people in the district to exchange views and understand the work of SKDC; but she was also worried that the meeting time would be too long. She also pointed out that the Vegetable Marketing Organisation in Sai Kung Town Centre had been deserted a long time ago, some residents suggested running business or holding activities there. Given that the site was managed by the District Lands Office, HPDC would be involved during the discussion process. Besides, given that a lot of land in Hong Kong was currently occupied by developers and consortia, including the space outside MTR stations, she considered that CBSIC would not be able to get the expected result if its area of work did not involve planning, for example, unable to provide space for young people to run business or to formulate social innovation options. She also pointed out that in SKDC of the last term, Chairmen of different Committees had tried to refer some motions moved by Members to other Committees, she enquired about the criteria on submission of motions by Members.

51. The Chairman said there must be some grey areas no matter how the areas of work of Committees were divided, he encouraged Members to negotiate with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the respective Committees actively.

52. Mr CHEUNG Mei-hung said as a full time DC Member, he had joined five Committees in SKDC of the last term. He pointed out that during the last term, the meetings of some Committees ended within half an hour. If seven Committees were set up in this term, he was worried that the above-mentioned situation would occur again. Anticipating that the meeting time of EHSWC and CBSIC would be shorter, he suggested handling the issues related to them in the form of Working Groups. He understood that some Members were not full time Members, as they would be relatively busier, he considered setting up seven Committees would seriously affect the efficiency of the Council. He also asked whether the decision on setting up the seven Committees mentioned above must be made today.

53. Mr LUK Ping-choi said he had been serving as a DC Member for 16 years. As he remembered, many issues would involve one or two Committees or even several government departments, and the established practice was that one Committee would coordinate and invite the government departments concerned, including those not in regular attendance of the meetings, to attend the meetings as necessary. He had joined only four Committees in the past, but he considered that the meeting time of individual Committee was relatively shorter because of the high efficiency of Members and that the items to be followed up was not complicated. He considered that there was room for discussion regarding the setting up of seven Committees.

54. The Chairman clarified that the meeting time of Signature Project Scheme Committee (SPSC) was occasionally rather short because the relevant projects had not made any specific progress, thus some meetings of SPSC were held on the same day with other Committees. The meeting of Committees would be held once every two months, given that some Working Groups did not convene meeting regularly after being established, he suggested following up issues of major concern to the public and residents in the form of Committees. He hoped that the TOR of Committees would be endorsed today, to be followed by the election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman of Committees at the meeting held on 16 January, with a view to following up on district work as soon as possible.

55. Mr Gary FAN agreed to convening a special meeting of SKDC on 16 January. According to established practice, a meeting would be convened in the first month after the commencement of SKDC of the new term for setting up Committees, which would not begin working until March. He considered the current term SKDC very special because Hong Kong was currently facing unprecedented political crisis, serious livelihood problems, abuse of power by Police, etc. Given that substantial number of residents in Sai Kung had been arrested, Members of the current term should speak for them. He also considered that the expectation

of members of the public could be handled together at the special meeting to be held on 16 January.

56. Ms Christine FONG said all 18 DCs were currently reviewing the \$100 million signature projects, although all project items in Tseung Kwan O had completed, but they were not yet opened for public use, which meant that they were still under public monitoring. The situations of 18 DCs were different, some DCs had overruled the projects already endorsed; for Sai Kung district, the \$100 million signature projects were included in the TOR of a new Committee, she enquired how the projects would be followed up in the future.

57. Mr Ricky OR said the Council had endorsed earlier that each Member could only participate for a maximum of two times for every agenda item, but it seemed that individual Member could speak as many time as he/she liked, he hoped that the Chairman could implement the Standing Orders strictly.

58. Mr CHOI Ming-hei agreed with the views of Mr Ricky OR, he hoped that the Chairman would implement the Standing Orders strictly and handle issues related to Members' speaking fairly.

59. Ms Debby CHAN said she spoke for less than two minutes for the first speaking and enquired whether the remaining time could be added to the speaking time of her second speaking. She agreed that the Chairman should implement the Standing Orders strictly.

60. The Chairman said the remaining time of the first speaking could not be accumulated to the speaking time of the second speaking. He said he would implement the Standing Orders strictly. He then invited Members to decide whether or not to endorse the TOR of the Committees.

61. Mr Edwin CHEUNG said Members' views over setting up additional Committees and Working Groups established under SKDC were divergent. In his view, many livelihood issues were interrelated, if too many Committees were set up, it would not be easy to reach a consensus among different Committees given the varied discussion results of different Committees; coupled with the fact that Members might not have joined all Committees, individual issues might have to be discussed again at the full council meeting, thus hindering the progress of the Council's work. He hoped that the Chairman could explain the criteria on setting up Committees and Working Groups. Given the greater flexibility and effectiveness of Working Groups, he enquired about the reasons for setting up additional Committees but not Working Groups. He understood the urgency of setting up Committees and suggested establishing four major Committees first today, and then discussed whether or not to establish other Committees at the special meeting to be held on 16 January to allow more time for discussion.

62. Mr LEUNG Li said the issues to be handled across different Committees, which worried some Members, would be submitted to the full council meeting for resolution in the end. He considered that it was the responsibility of Members to attend meetings. For Members who were concerned about the issues being followed up under a Committee, they might join the Committee; for Members who were interested in certain issues but had not joined the Committees concerned, they could seek approval from the respective Chairman for attending the meeting. As the operation of Committees had not officially begun, problems such as the number of issues and duration of discussion at the meeting did not exist. He pointed out that if Members agreed that the items to be followed up by the seven Committees in question were issues of concerns to the Council and residents, then those Committees should be established.

63. The Vice-Chairman agreed with the views of Mr LEUNG Li. He also apologised for not submitting the meeting paper to Members earlier. He said the Chairman had contacted and discussed the content of the meeting paper with individual Members earlier. Six out of the seven Committees were existing Committees. The TOR of all Committees were set out in the meeting paper. Regarding the new CBSIC, he expected that it could interact more with the community and listen to the views of experts and different stakeholders. CBSIC would also follow up on the signature projects, including the promotion and exploration on the opportunity to launch similar projects in the future. He also said, in the past, the meeting time of FAC was brief but highly effective because the Secretariat would send the relevant funding applications to Members via email in advance. The meeting time of SPSC was the shortest because two working groups had been set up under it to follow up on the works. Given the short meeting time, SPSC was arranged to be convened on the same day with FAC. He pointed out that if similar situation occurred this year, further discussion might be held. Under the existing practice of holding meetings on every Tuesday and Thursday of the odd months, the full council meeting and the meetings of the seven Committees could be held; but the establishment of seven committees had already exhausted the resources of the Secretariat. He understood that individual Members might not be able to attend all meetings because of other commitments, he emphasised that the Progress Report of all Committees would be submitted to the full council meeting. There used to be five Working Groups established under SKDC, now that two of them were cut, the work of the Council would be more flexible and the issues of great concern to the Council would be highlighted. At the same time, a new Committee was added. Members' suggestions on the Working Groups under the Committees, if any, might be discussed at the Special Meeting to be held on 16 January. He suggested endorsing the establishment of seven Committees and that there would be no co-opted member. As for the Working Group under Committees, the Age-Friendly City Working Group had included elderly in the district as members in the past, the details of which could be determined by the respective Committees directly.

64. Mr LUI Man-kwong said the length of the meeting time was arranged by individual Committees. The Committees could set up ad hoc working groups to handle issues already discussed to avoid having the issues discussed at the meetings of Committees repeatedly. Some Members mentioned that the meeting time of a particular Committee was particularly long, he suggested the respective Committee could be assigned to explore whether ad hoc working groups could be established to follow up on certain issues, so that the meeting time could be used more efficiently. Regarding Members' worries that some issues might involve two to three Committees, he pointed out that there were many similar occasions in the past. He considered that today's meeting mainly aimed at exploring whether Members agreed with the work direction of the seven Committees, as for the details, the respective Committees could be assigned to make arrangements on their own.

65. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan agreed with setting up two new Committees. She considered that Committees should be classified according to the TOR rather than the length of meeting time; elected Members had the responsibilities to attend meeting, the length of meeting time should not be the factor for Members to determine whether or not to attend a meeting or to comment on the efficiency of meeting. She considered that Members could decide on their own whether to serve as a full time or part time DC Members, there was no need for others to bother. She pointed out that it was meaningless to discuss at this meeting whether the Committees would overlap, because an issue might involve the views of many stakeholders and could only be solved with the coordination of different departments. She agreed with splitting up HEHC, because in the past, many people considered that environmental hygiene was a problem of hardware, but actually, instead of merely improving the facilities, the matching of suitable mentality and environmental protection knowledge were crucial to the solving of environmental hygiene problem. She also agreed with setting up CBSIC. She considered that many policies of SKDC did not benefit the middle-aged or young people, CBSIC could handle the relevant issues more effectively. In addition, she had no comment on whether six or seven Committees should be set up.

66. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared the endorsement of the following:

- (A) the proposal for establishing seven Committees and their respective TOR.
- (B) adopting the established practice, and endorsed that the tenure of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of each Committee would be two years, i.e. from the date of their being elected to 31 December 2021, and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of each Committee could be re-elected to serve for another term upon the end of their tenures.
- (C) Each Member should join at least three Committees.

- (D) There would be no co-opted Member for all Committees under SKDC of the current-term. The Vice-Chairman's concern was expressed having regard to the need of an individual Working Group, and the respective Committees should be entrusted to decide whether the Working Group(s) under Committees could have other members.

67. Ms Christine FONG said she had served as a DC Member for 12 years. She pointed out that co-opted members were appointed under the appointment system. She supported the Government's abolishment of the appointment system eight years ago, but the invitation of stakeholders in the community to participate in discussion and express their views would be an exception. She considered the bringing up of appointment system again by the Council would give rise to another problem. She did not support the idea of having co-opted members, no matter the Committees or Working Groups, there should not be any co-opted members. If members of the public would like to participate in community affairs, they might attend the meeting for discussion and sharing.

68. The Chairman explained that the Council would adopt different arrangements when setting up Working Groups under Committees. For example, a certain proportion of members of the Age-Friendly City Working Group of SKDC of the last term was representatives of elderly, they were not co-opted members, but were called members of the Working Group in general. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman reiterated SKDC's endorsement that there would be no co-opted members in this term, and the Working Groups could decide the arrangements for members on their own. He also suggested all Committees to hold the first meeting on the same day, i.e. 16 January, for electing the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

69. Mr Ricky OR said he had no comment on holding a Special Meeting on 16 January, but he declared that he would have a scheduled overseas duty visit on 15 January and was worried that he would not be able to attend the meeting on 16 January.

70. The Chairman asked the Member concerned to submit an application for absence from meeting by then. Besides, the Chairman asked the Secretariat to prepare the timetable of meetings of SKDC and its Committees in 2020 for Members' consideration and endorsement at the next meeting.

71. The Chairman said, according to Order 33(2) of SKDC Standing Orders, "The Council shall determine the membership of its committees"; while Order 35(1) of SKDC Standing Orders stipulates that "A committee of a District Council shall elect a member of the committee who is also a member of that Council, as the chairman of the committee". In other words, the Council should decide the Members of the Committees first, and then the Members would elect

among themselves the Chairman of the respective Committees. Given that the Committees would hold the first meetings on 16 January, the Chairman invited Members to reply the Secretariat the Committees they would like to join before 8 January. On 9 January, the Secretariat would, through circulation of paper, invite Members to decide on or before 14 January whether they endorse the membership lists of the Committees.

72. Ms Christine FONG welcomed new Members to serve as the Chairman of Committees, or take up the principal posts of SKDC. She said some members of the Legislative Council (LegCo) or DCs had resigned after being elected as the Chairman of a Committee in the past, she hoped that this would not happen in SKDC.

73. The Chairman said similar situation had never happened in SKDC. He reminded Members that only Members whose membership in a Committee were endorsed by the full council meeting were eligible for electing the Chairman and Vice-Chairman at the meetings of the respective Committees to be held on 16 January. All Members must reply to the Secretariat before 8 January the Committees they would like to join. As for the dates of meeting, the established practice of holding meeting on Tuesdays and Thursdays would be adopted. In the past, the full council meeting would be held on the first Tuesday of the odd months, while no meeting would be held on the first Thursday. With the establishment of one more Committee, he proposed holding the meeting of Committee on the first Thursday as well.

74. Mr Ricky OR asked whether the proposed meeting dates of SKDC of the new term in the odd months had been discussed with the government departments concerned because those departments had to attend the meeting of four DCs in New Territories East at the same time.

75. Mr David CHIU, DO (SK), responded that there were similar occasions in SKDC of the last term, the departments concerned would coordinate on attending meetings of different DCs. Even though there was one more Committee in SKDC of the new term, it was believed that the impact would be limited. As it was stipulated in the relevant legislation that the full council meeting must be convened once every two months, and that one full council meeting must be convened within 30 days after the commencement of DCs of the new term, the full council meeting would be arranged in the odd months basically, and the meetings of all other Committees would be held in the same odd month.

76. Mr LUK Ping-choi worried that the convening of Committee meeting only two days after the full council meeting would increase the workload of the Secretariat. In the past, there were also seven Committees in SKDC, the first Committee meeting was held seven days after the full council meeting, and the operation was smooth. The existing workload of the Secretariat was much heavier than that of ten years ago.

77. The Secretary responded that the Secretariat would make the arrangements as far as practicable.

78. The Chairman said, for SKDC of the last term, the election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman of all Committees was conducted through a raise of hands on the spot, i.e. one Member making a nomination, another Member seconded it, then the Members elected among themselves the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of Committees by a show of hands. The Chairman invited Members to consider whether the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of Committees for the current-term SKDC should be nominated, seconded and elected by a raise of hands as in the past. Moreover, the Chairman invited Members to consider whether a simple majority vote (i.e. a higher number of valid votes cast excluding abstentions but obtaining more than half of the votes is not required) or an absolute majority of votes (i.e. more than half of the valid votes cast excluding abstentions) was necessary for the candidates to be elected as the Chairman or Vice-Chairman. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the established practices of electing the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of Committees through a raise of hands and a simple majority vote would be adopted.

(C) Setting up of Working Groups established under SKDC and the election of Convenor and Vice-Convenor

79. The Chairman said, there were five Working Groups established under SKDC when the tenure of last-term SKDC ended, including:

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

80. The Chairman hoped to simplify the Working Groups established under SKDC in the current term. Where the ambit of a particular Committee already covered the responsibility of a Working Group established under SKDC, such Working Group should be merged into the Working Group under the respective Committee. The Chairman referred Members to the paper tabled at the meeting, which set out the Working Groups proposed to be established and their TOR. Among them, the Working Group on Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, the Cross Bay Link, New Government Buildings was proposed to be a standing working group; while the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative

Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, which was established in response to the recent social incident would be a non-standing working group.

81. Mr Stanley HO pointed out that the Chairman had omitted one Working Group established under SKDC, i.e. the Working Group on Hiram's Highway Improvement Project.

82. Ms Christine FONG agreed that the Working Group on Hiram's Highway Improvement Project should not be omitted. The cost of the Hiram's Highway Improvement Stage 1 Project was \$1.7 billion; while the cost of the Stage 2 project, to be gazetted soon, was still unknown. She considered the Hiram's Highway Improvement projects highly controversial, including whether the tunnel proposal or dual 2-lane carriageway scheme should be adopted. The Friends of Sai Kung hoped that the tunnel proposal would be adopted. In the last term, the Working Group on Hiram's Highway Improvement Project had not convened any meeting for 12 months, she expressed resentment about it and hoped that different stakeholders would be invited to attend the meetings of the Working Group in the future. Besides, she considered that as the Hiram's Highway Improvement Stage 1 Project was handled part by part, many Members were unable to participate. She also suggested the departments to contact more with the residents in rural areas. When carrying out the Hiram's Highway Improvement Stage 1 Project, the contractor did not conduct any environmental impact assessment, as a result, the problem of muddy water had seriously affected the living of the residents in the vicinity of Pak Sha Wan during the course of the project. Given that residents in Sai Kung were deeply troubled by the traffic congestion problem, she hoped that the Chairman could set up the Working Group on Hiram's Highway Improvement Project for continuous attention to the Hiram's Highway Improvement Stage 2 project.

83. The Chairman said Members could see the TOR of the Working Groups on the paper. The TOR of the Working Group on Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, the Cross Bay Link, New Government Buildings and the Working Group on Hiram's Highway Improvement Project were drawn up based on those of the last term. Members' views were welcomed.

84. Mr Ricky OR said he hoped that for future meetings, the paper would not be tabled after the meeting commenced because Members might not be able to collect data and understand the content of the paper. However, he understood that it was the first meeting and there might not be enough time for preparation. He would like to understand the definitions and time limits of standing and non-standing working groups.

85. Mr Gary FAN said he very much agreed with setting up the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance. He emphasised that it was against the background of the movement of opposition to the proposed legislative amendments during the past six odd months that the

current-term SKDC had come to its current composition and formation; and it was the responsibility and mission of Members to set up the Working Group as a platform to follow up the issues. In particular, the issues arising from the movement of opposition to the proposed legislative amendments, including whether Hong Kong was becoming a “Police Society”; the Police’s abuse of power during law enforcement; the Police’s hitting the head of some residents during the procession in Tseung Kwan O participated by 150,000 people on 5 August last year; a female reporter’s being chopped inside the “lennon tunnel” in King Lam Estate; the death of CHAN Yin-lam, a student of Hong Kong Design Institute (HKDI); the falling from height and death of CHOW Tsz-lok, a student of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, which had triggered the “all-in-strike” subsequently; the entering of anti-riot squad into Hong Kong Chinese University and Hong Kong Polytechnic University for dispersing, were all matters of concern to Members and the problems that the public wished the Council to follow up. He continued that as he understood, Tseung Kwan O was the place where the number of people being arrested was the highest among the 18 districts, and the Police had used tear gas and entered some primary schools, secondary schools, public housing estates, Home Ownership Scheme estates and podium of private sector housing. Given that Members needed to hold the Police accountable for its law enforcement standards, and that lots of collaboration, investigation and public hearing at district level were also needed, he agreed with setting up the Working Group.

86. Mr Stanley HO said he agreed with setting up the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance and considered that the Working Group should commence its work as soon as possible because the public expected Members to discuss the issues arising from the movement of opposition to the proposed legislative amendments in the Council, in addition to doing more about issues of livelihood. He agreed with Mr Gary FAN that more people in Sai Kung and Tseung Kwan O should participate in the discussion of the Council, and that consideration should be given to hold public hearing in the future so that different stakeholders of the movement could express their views. Besides, he would like to revise the TOR of the Working Group on Hiram’s Highway Improvement Project. Given that the Stage 1 improvement works were progressing smoothly and expected to be completed in the 3rd quarter of next year, he suggested that the words “Stage 1 and” should be deleted from the second point of the TOR: “To offer suggestions on the design of Hiram’s Highway Improvement Stage 1 and Stage 2 Projects”. For the third point of the TOR, “To foster communication between government departments and different stakeholders”, he also hoped that the stakeholders would be emphasised as “different stakeholders in the district, including villagers, owners and tenants” to ensure that their voices could be brought into the Council. He also agreed that the Working Group should be a standing working group.

87. Mr TSE Ching-fung supported setting up the three working groups set out in the paper, including the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, which was a concern of all. He considered that Hong Kong was overwhelmingly concerned about the incidents relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments. He would like to understand the work direction of the Working Group after it was established; he also hoped that government departments could attend the meeting for response. Apart from the Tseung Kwan O Police Station, the Working Group could also contact the Security Bureau and request it to respond and to follow up Police brutality. He also suggested inviting different people, for example those who were injured or affected in the incident, etc., to attend the meeting for discussion, just like the Age-Friendly City Working Group, which he considered could enhance the public's participation. He said many Members had mentioned the incident relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments in their election manifesto, they could follow up on the incident in a more proactive manner after being elected as Members.

88. Mr LUI Man-kwong agreed with the arrangements for the three working groups mentioned in the paper. The Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance should make reference to the practice adopted by the Age-Friendly City Working Group and allow other people to attend its meetings, which could enable the relevant parties to express their views over the incidents relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments on one hand, and facilitate the Council to follow up on the incidents more easily and comprehensively on the other. He even considered that consideration could be given to arranging public hearing to enable others to consider and explore how to follow up on the incidents related to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments from different perspectives. He continued that several hundreds of people were arrested yesterday, which indicated that the problem of Police brutality was very serious, and it might even be necessary to cooperate and explore with other districts on how to handle the incident.

89. Mr LUK Ping-choi said the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance must be set up. For the incidents happened in Tseung Kwan O in the past, Members had tried their best to understand more from the Police, but they did not get any positive response. The Police brutality problem was most serious in the vicinity of Tong Chun Street, including Sheung Tak Estate, Kwong Ming Court, Beverly Garden and Tseung Kwan O Plaza, among which was his constituency. Some anti-riot squad had entered the Beverly Garden and Kwong Ming Court in the past, the Police had used over 100 pieces of tear gas in one night, it had also used more than 32 pieces of tear gas at the entrance of the carpark of Beverly Garden, he considered it extremely wrong. The anti-riot squads even rushed into Beverly Garden. He tried to mediate, but the Police ignored him, and even used pepper spray on him. He doubted why the Police

had become so brutal. He believed that the above examples could be found in many housing estates, shopping centres all over Hong Kong. There were even passers-by who were sprayed with pepper spray when they just walked passed the street. Up to now, the Police had not provided any explanation on those incidents, he considered that the Working Group in question must be formed to safeguard the well-being of the public.

90. Mr Edwin CHEUNG said, regarding the third point of the TOR of the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance: “To co-ordinate the services of different social service agencies in the district to safeguard the well-being of residents”, he would like to learn more about the actual work objectives and planning.

91. Mr LAI Ming-chak agreed with setting up the three proposed working groups and he also believed that for the following few months, the priority of the Council would be the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance. He said quick arrangement of meetings was a characteristic of working groups, and he hoped that the above Working Group could hold more meetings to facilitate Members to have in-depth and more follow-up on the incidents. He also agreed that even though the persons related to the incidents might not be able to attend the meeting of the Working Group as its members, consideration might be given to hold public hearing so that members of the public could have more opportunities to express their views on the incidents or the Police brutality problem during the course of the incidents, or to disclose their suffering. He continued that different departments (e.g. Sai Kung District Office (SKDO)) had attended today’s meeting, he hoped that all departments could follow the example of SKDO, respecting the Council and public opinions by attending the meetings of the above mentioned Working Group to respond to the public’s queries and doubts about them. Furthermore, regarding the Member’s question about co-ordinating the services of different social service agencies, he quoted an example that some persons with disabilities might face the problem that the opening hours of rehabilitation centres were affected by the use of tear gas by the Police, and said this issue also needed to be handled. Lastly, given that 75% of the public requested for setting up an independent commission of inquiry, even if the Government would not investigate the incident independently, he still hoped that the Working Group would try its best to compile and release the report for fulfilling the public’s expectation.

92. Ms Valerie WONG agreed with the setting up of the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance. Despite the fact that the Police was a very important stakeholder in this aspect, as she understood, for other DCs, the Police Public Relations Branch had not responded positively to whether it would attend the meeting of the respective dedicated committee. She would like to know if the Police would attend the meeting of the Working Group to give an account of

indiscriminate arrest and violent behavior. She also hoped that the Police could respect Members for their being the representatives of public opinions.

93. Mr FUNG Kwan-on agreed with setting up the three working groups, in particular the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance because many conflicts between police and public took place in New Territory East, particularly Tseung Kwan O. He pointed out that many incumbent Members were at the scene of confrontation, they saw the Police behaved violently, speaking foul language and even scolded and intimidated the reporters and members of the public present when dispersing the crowd. He considered this not an operation for dispersion. He hoped that a review could be conducted through the Working Group to see whether the Police had made suitable dispersion in each operation, or that it had injected other personal emotions in the operation. Besides, he pointed out that the Police had entered private places or public spaces many times, he considered this involving abuse of power, indiscriminate arrest and even arbitrary use of force. He also pointed out that in the past, even though conflicts between police and public occurred during the procession, the Police would choose, among a wide variety, which weapons to use; nowadays, however, the Police would use tear gas and pepper spray under all circumstances. For example, at the scene of conflict on Hong Kong Island yesterday, a lot of reporters were sprayed with pepper spray, the Police even used tear gas at the reporters and the crowd without giving any warning. Being aware that other public activities might be held in Tseung Kwan O in the future, he considered it necessary to conduct a review on the problem mentioned above, otherwise, the residents and all people in Hong Kong would be affected.

94. Mr Chris CHEUNG said the Professional Power supported setting up the three working groups. Given that over 75% of people in Hong Kong agreed with establishing the independent commission of inquiry, he considered the TOR of the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance could specify the discussion on views in the community on establishing an independent commission of inquiry, which he thought could highlight the direction of SKDC and the expectation of the public. He continued that the incidents relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments of Fugitive Offenders Ordinance had resulted in great dissension in the community, the public were divided into “yellow”, “blue” or other colours. He considered SKDC should take the lead in resolving the dissension in the community, and suggested adding “to resolve the dissension within the community” into the TOR: “To promote the emotional health of residents and the mutual understanding and respects among people with different views in the community”.

95. Ms Debby CHAN supported setting up the three working groups, but she considered the TOR of the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed

Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance not clear enough. A Member had just asked what social service agencies represented. She said, apart from the Police's indiscriminate arrest, the incidents happened in the last few months also included the suspension of services by MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) for different reasons with the details not disclosed to the public; and the suspension of green minibus services owing to the suspension of services of MTR with the issue never being followed up. Besides, in response to the Police's using tear gas in Tseung Kwan O, she inquired whether problems like what protective equipment the cleaning workers had been provided, how the institutions would respond, etc., were included in the point: "To co-ordinate the services of different social service agencies in the district to safeguard the well-being of residents". She also suggested having a clearer expression of the point.

96. Mr CHAN Wai-lit agreed with the setting up of the three working groups, particularly the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance. He suggested including the words "government departments" in "To co-ordinate the services of different social service agencies in the district to safeguard the well-being of residents"; as for "to safeguard the well-being of residents", taking into account that the incident related to HKDI and the use of tear gas would worry the public, he considered that the relevant sponsoring body and the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) could handle the issue to remove public worries. He also suggested instead of "to safeguard the well-being of residents" only, the above views should also be included in the TOR.

97. Mr CHENG Chung-man very much agreed with setting up three working groups. He said the large-scale Hiram's Highway Improvement Project had seriously affected the villages nearby. For example, bus stops were moved forward for over 100 metres or 50 metres, causing the residents to walk a longer distance before they could have a ride on public transport. He supported establishing the Working Group on Hiram's Highway Improvement Project. Besides, he strongly agreed with establishing the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance. He also hoped that the Working Group could commence its work as soon as possible. The Police brutality problem affected the whole society. When participating in the legal proceeding organised by the Civil Human Rights Front yesterday, he tried to mediate and provided legal assistance to those who were arrested, but the Police sprayed him with pepper spray without any warning. Up to now, he could still feel the discomfort caused to his throat and eyes. He hoped that the Working Group could keep discussing the issue in question and requested the Police to explain the brutality incidents. He continued that Members were representatives of public opinions, he did not understand why the Police could disperse Members, the public and residents unreasonably, which had caused worries and fear to many residents. In the past, when seeing policemen, the public considered them as those who upheld

justice; however, nowadays, the public considered them as those who were masked as if going to rob a bank.

98. Mr CHOI Ming-hei strongly agreed with establishing the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance. He said 400 people were arrested yesterday. He witnessed in the procession yesterday that the policemen could hardly control themselves. Although the passers-by might be rather agitated, the policemen also could not control themselves and have engaged in a war of words with the passers-by, they even attempted to attack the passers-by. He really hoped that the Police could attend the meeting of the Working Group. He also agreed that the Working Group should submit a work report for public information in the end. He also said he would like to fulfill his election pledges and submit to the Chairman later a letter petitioning for opposition to Police brutality, and requesting for independent investigation, severe punishment and re-organisation of the Police.

99. Mr CHUN Hoi-shing agreed with setting up three working groups established under SKDC and also considered the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance very important. He hoped that the establishment of the Working Group could reflect SKDC's attaching importance to Hong Kong people. He also hoped that the public could join the Working Group to express their views. Given that the invitation of those who had experienced police brutality to attend the meeting might involve the protection of privacy, he hoped that Members could work out the specific arrangement. As the incidents involved many parties, including the arrangement of MTR and shopping malls, he hoped that the representatives concerned could attend the meetings to listen to the voices of Members and the public.

100. Mr LAI Wai-tong agreed with setting up three working groups established under SKDC, especially the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance. Many incidents related to police brutality had occurred in Tseung Kwan O, other mishaps and arrestment of the minors had also taken place there. Given that SKDC was an organisation for reflecting public opinions, Members had the responsibility to request the Police and the departments concerned to give an account on the follow-up to different issues of the incidents relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments and to provide relevant explanations.

101. Mr Ryan LEE strongly agreed with establishing the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance. He particularly agreed to the second point of the TOR: "To advise on the operations carried out by the Police and the subsequent follow-up work regarding the incident relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments of Fugitive Offenders

Ordinance in the district”. He considered that SKDC should invite representatives of the Police to attend the meeting to explain the things that had happened when the Police performed its duties in Sai Kung district. He also considered that Hong Kong people had paid salaries to the Police in the capacity as taxpayers, however, the Police had pointed the guns and shot at the public arbitrarily like the terrorists. Therefore, the Police must attend the meeting, which to a certain extent, could provide an extra channel for the public to air their views.

102. Mr LEE Ka-yui supported setting up the three working groups established under SKDC. He considered that many tragedies occurred in the last six months were stemmed from the operations of the Police. He also queried why the policemen could wear a mask when they carried out law enforcement actions. Given that the Independent Police Complaints Council was not functioning properly, the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance could provide another channel for following up the problems relating to the law enforcement and brutality of the Police, thus reducing the opportunity of recurrence of the tragedies. Besides, he said when Members communicated or argued with the Police face-to face at the scene of the demonstration, even if they had showed their DC Members’ identity card, the Police still considered them as pretenders, he considered that the Police did not respect Members’ identity as representatives of public opinions and hindered Members from performing their functions.

103. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan agreed that the TOR of the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance should also include the concern over the service arrangement of different public utilities. As for the TOR of the Working Group on Hiram’s Highway Improvement Project, she disagreed with the proposal of Mr Stanley HO that the words “Stage 1” should be deleted from “To offer suggestions on the design of Hiram’s Highway Improvement Stage 1 and Stage 2 Projects” because SKDC of the last term had been following up the relevant project and the new term should also continue making suggestions for improving the Stage 1 project. On the other hand, she supported Mr Stanley HO’s proposal that the stakeholders mentioned in the third point: “To foster communication between government departments and different stakeholders”, should be emphasised as the stakeholders in Sai Kung district.

104. Mr Brandon Kenneth YIP agreed with setting up the three working groups. Concerning the Working Group on Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, Cross Bay Link, New Government Buildings, the contractor was found to have breached the relevant regulations in different aspects earlier, including carrying out noise works without the Construction Noise Permit (CNP), and left some abandoned aluminium cans for blasting at the site. The Council needed to closely monitor and follow up on whether the contractor had breached the relevant ordinance(s). As for the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, he considered that

police brutality had become a norm. Apart from using violence frequently, the Police had also forced into residential areas; used torches to shine strong light into flats of residents at midnight; honked the horn of the police vehicle that was driving in high speed without proper reason. There was also the yelling of a large group of anti-riot squad who got off from the vehicle at places with no conflict. These problems, which affected the livelihood of residents, needed to be monitored and followed-up.

105. Mr Ricky OR said the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance would be a non-standing working group. He asked the Chairman again the definitions of standing and non-standing working groups. Besides, he would like to add one more point in the TOR of the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, which was: “Request the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government to respond to the five demands raised by the public”. In view that the Government had not given any response up to now, he hoped that the Working Group could make the Government respond to them. He also requested the Chairman to state clearly, if the Police or other government departments refused the request(s) of the Working Group, e.g. refused to provide information or data or attend meeting, how would the Working Group respond.

106. Mr TSE Ching-fung said regarding Members’ views that the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance should request the Government to respond to the request for establishing an independent commission of inquiry, he hoped the Members concerned would understand that the majority of public opinions was “five demands, not one less”, instead of merely establishing an independent commission of inquiry. He would absolutely disagree with it if the Members concerned considered that the incidents relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments had been followed up after the request for establishing an independent commission of inquiry was raised. He continued that if the Members concerned really wanted to follow up on the incidents relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments, he hoped that the Members would pursue “five demands, not one less” just like the other Members after joining the Working Group. Besides, some Members proposed including “resolving the dissension in the community” in the TOR, he considered that the dissension in the community and many social movements were stemmed from many members of the public’s strong dissatisfaction with the Government and the fact that the police brutality problem was still not solved. The Government’s responding to “five demands, not one less” was the way to resolve dissension in the community. He hoped that the Members who put forward the proposal and the Members of the same organisation would join the Working Group and pursue “five demands, not one less” together with other Members of the Working Group.

107. Mr Andrew CHAN agreed that the Government must respond to “five demands, not one less” and establish the independent commission of inquiry. Apart from requesting the Government and the Police to be responsible for the things they had done badly over the last six months, which was negative to a certain extent, what the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance could do positively and quickly, might be to restore the relationship in the community. He said many residents, including those who were neutral, the “yellow ribbon” and the “blue ribbon”, cried when they talked to him. He was so touched that he also shed tears. Witnessing the dissension in the community and the family relationship problems, he hoped that the Working Group could focus on doing something to restore the relationship in the community, i.e. to do something substantive for the community shortly.

108. Mr LAI Ming-chak believed that most Members agreed with the proposals raised by other Members on requesting the Government to respond to “five demands, not one less”. He hoped that the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance could release the relevant report. Given that “to reflect residents’ concerns” was mentioned in the first point of the TOR, the report should clearly reflect the support of “five demands, not one less” by many residents. He said the Working Group did not simply request for establishing an independent commission of inquiry, it also requested for holding public hearing so that the public could attend and voice their opinions; and to request the government departments and Police to attend the meetings to give explanation on different operations and arrangements. Through releasing the report, the world and the society would know that the Council had investigated the things happened in Hong Kong over the last six months. As for the third point of the TOR, he suggested revising it as: “To co-ordinate the services of different government departments, public utilities and social service agencies in the district to safeguard the health and well-being of residents and remove their worries”. Regarding the second point of the TOR of the Working Group on Hiram’s Highway Improvement Project, he proposed revising it as: “To offer suggestions on the design of Hiram’s Highway Improvement Project” so as to cover the views on the Stage 1, Stage 2 projects or other new ideas, for inclusion of the new ideas of the new Members of this term.

109. The Chairman asked the Secretary to respond to Mr Ricky OR’s enquiry on non-standing working groups.

110. The Secretary said the tenure of a non-standing working group should not exceed eight months, it could be extended when the Council considered it necessary.

111. Mr Ricky OR considered that the incidents relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments could not be settled within eight months. He asked the Chairman

whether the Working Group could be set up as a standing working group until the Government responded to the “five demands, not one less” or established an independent commission of inquiry. After that, a review might be conducted to decide whether or not to change the Working Group into a non-standing working group.

112. The Chairman said it was not the District Council, but the Chief Executive (CE) that could decide whether the disturbance arising from the incidents relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments could be settled within eight months. He asked the Secretary to give explanation on the number of Working Groups.

113. The Secretary said according to Order 40(1) of the SKDC Standing Orders, the number of standing working groups under the Council and each of its committee should not exceed three at any one time.

114. The Chairman said the tenure of the Working Group could be extended if the disturbance was not settled or the work of the Working Group was not completed within eight months. He said he would adopt an open attitude on the nature of the Working Group and asked Members to express their views on it.

115. Mr Ricky OR said the setting up of the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance as a standing working group could make known to the public at large or the government departments the determination of the Council to continue following up on the item.

116. Mr Chris CHEUNG said as the Government was unwilling to set up an independent commission of inquiry, SKDC could set a precedent by renaming the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance as “Sai Kung District Independent Commission of Inquiry”. By so doing, he hoped that the Government would face up to the opinions of the majority of the public.

117. Mr LEE Ka-yui shared Mr Ricky OR’s worry over the length of the tenure of the Working Group. Given that the persons who were sentenced to jail might be still in prison when the tenure of the current-term Council ended, he queried whether the Working Group could complete its work within eight months. He continued that the truth was very obvious, but the Government was unwilling to admit it and suppressed the people in Hong Kong with force. Therefore, today, for Members who entered the Council through election, there was the opportunity to set up the Working Group, the function they perform should not come to an end after they had requested for setting up an independent commission of inquiry or condemning the Police. The Government that refused to admit the truth was the tyranny that we saw today. The fact that a number of Members had entered the Council as representatives of public

opinions meant that the people in Hong Kong expected Members to give the Government a blow on the head. Even though the incidents relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments could be handled within eight months, in the long-run, Members still had to unite the community for long-term resistance to the tyranny.

118. Ms Valerie WONG considered the proposal of Mr Chris CHEUNG on renaming the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance as “Sai Kung District Independent Commission of Inquiry” a downright deception. The reason being that “Sai Kung District Independent Commission of Inquiry” was not the type of independent commission of inquiry requested in the “five demands”. She absolutely opposed the proposal and expressed her worry over whether the Police would attend the meeting of the Working Group and respond to the queries again.

119. Mr FUNG Kwan-on considered that there was no need to rename the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance as “Sai Kung District Independent Commission of Inquiry” because the Working Group would hold public hearings, try to invite the Police to attend meetings and release reports. The Working Group would not only request the Government to respond to the “five demands”, the Working Group was set up to lay a solid foundation for the “five demands”, to investigate the causes and course of the incident, to judge who should be responsible for the incident, and then to request the Government to set up an independent commission of inquiry. Given that the Working Group already had these objectives, there was no need to change the name of the Working Group or to add “the five demands, not one less” into the TOR.

120. Ms Christine FONG provided supplementary information on Members’ mentioning that each Member might participate for two times and the time for each speaking was limited to two minutes. She quoted Order 28 of the SKDC Standing Orders, which stated that unless otherwise agreed by the Chairman, a member could only ask up to three supplementary questions at a meeting, and such questions must be relevant to the original question. She said the discussion was relevant to Committees and focused on the same question. She also hoped that the Chairman could lead the new Members to comprehend the SKDC Standing Orders. She thanked the Chairman for allowing the discussion on Hiram’s Highway Improvement Project proposed by her. She also agreed with the views of Ms LEUNG Hin-yun that the words “Stage 1” should be kept in the second point of the TOR. As for the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, she said she had no special comment on discussing the setting up of the Working Group. The Professional Power had requested CE to withdraw the Ordinance on 9 June, it did not hope that the rift between “yellow” and “blue” would occur. The dissention among people in Hong Kong should not have appeared, she also hoped that the

first meeting of SKDC could help restore and mend the community as soon as possible. Moreover, she agreed that the setting up of an independent commission of inquiry was reasonable and not a false proposition. She continued that the Council should be tolerant, it should accept the statements expressed by Members of different political views instead of permitting only one viewpoint. She asked Members of the pro-democratic camp in return why they did not set up a Committee to follow up on the incident more bravely, because government departments should have greater responsibilities in attending meetings of Committees. She considered that the level of Committees was higher than Working Groups and queried whether it was appropriate to choose the working group option. She pointed out that the independent commission of inquiry would not only target at the Police. The incidents relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments had also triggered disputes in the community, which had hurt the public and broke their hearts, the incident also involved “settling privately” or triads. All these problems were not targeted at a particular group of people. She hoped that the Members could be fair, and reiterated that she agreed with setting up the Working Group and even upgrade it into a Committee.

121. Mr Gary FAN said many Members had offered a lot of valuable views regarding the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance. The views, including inclusion of independent commission of inquiry and the wordings “five demands” to the TOR, holding public hearings, preparing report, etc., were good suggestions. He considered tolerance as achieving the broadest consensus, which was the work of the Council and he did not object to it. However, for the proposal on renaming the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance as “Sai Kung District Independent Commission of Inquiry” put forward by Mr Chris CHEUNG and Ms Christine FONG of the Professional Power, he considered that it should be handled carefully. The setting up of an independent commission of inquiry as requested in the “five demands” of the movement protesting authoritarianism over the last six months, was based on the establishment of a statutory framework set out in the Commission of Inquiry Ordinance (Cap. 86) to follow up on the police brutality problem. Given that the independent commission of inquiry fell outside the purview of District Councils, it was not proper to mislead the public or the media by changing the name. The name should not be changed. He continued that there could be discussion over the setting up of Working Group or Committee, but what Ms Christine FONG of Professional Power said about her having moved a motion in May 2019 to oppose the proposed legislative amendment was untrue. He pointed out that the motion moved by Ms Christine FONG at that time was just about suspension and that the timing was not suitable. He requested the Chairman to ask Members to speak the truth in their statement, not to speak anything misleading, and not to attack the original intention and motivation of the Members who requested for setting up the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders

Ordinance.

122. Ms Christine FONG hoped to invite the Secretary to respond on Order 28 of the SKDC Standing Orders through the Chairman.

123. The Chairman said it was the District Council Ordinance that had been just quoted. He also pointed out that there was no opportunity to review whether there was any difference between the District Council Ordinance and the SKDC Standing Orders for the time being. He would like to go on discussing the agenda items.

124. The Vice-Chairman added that Order 28 of the SKDC Standing Orders was under the part on Statements and Questions, it was not about Members could continue delivering follow up speaking after they had spoken for two minutes as Ms Christine FONG had said. The Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretariat also had to keep a close watch on this to ensure that the departments concerned could respond to the questions. He asked the Secretary to give supplementary information.

125. The Secretary said the Vice-Chairman was correct. The stipulation that a member might ask up to three supplementary questions at a meeting under Order 28 of the SKDC Standing Orders referred to the supplementary questions raised in respect of the questions raised under Order 27. In accordance with Order 27, if a member of the Council wished to ask any question at a meeting, he or she was required to send his or her question to the Secretary at least ten clear working days before the meeting.

126. Mr LUK Ping-choi responded to the suggestion on renaming the Working Group as “Sai Kung District Independent Commission of Inquiry”. He said it was not proper to have the word “independent” in the name of a Committee. Given that some DCs had proposed setting up the “Police Brutality Committee”, he suggested the Council to consider whether or not to set up a “Police Brutality Committee” and to make the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance a Working Group under the Committee. He believed that the Committee could follow up on the incident better and could invite the Police to attend the meeting. Besides, the independency of the “Sai Kung District Independent Commission of Inquiry” was in doubt, it was not feasible in terms of its name.

127. The Chairman said SKDC already intended to set up the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance. Given that the Council could only set up three standing working groups directly under the Council, the change in the nature of this Working Group from a non-standing working group to a standing working group as suggested by some Members would make it impossible

to set up other standing working groups. As it was decided that seven Committees would be set up under the Council, the number of Committees had reached the upper limit according to the SKDC Standing Orders. He hoped that Members could consider the option of setting up a working group, while the TOR could be further discussed and revised. He invited the Secretary to provide supplementary information on the number of standing working groups.

128. The Secretary said generally, the number of standing working groups under the Council and each of its committee should not exceed three; subject to the approval of the Council, the Council and a committee might appoint more than three standing working groups, but the total number of standing working groups set up under the Council and its committees should not exceed three times the number of its committees. For example, there were seven Committees in the Council of this term, the maximum number of standing working groups of the Council could only be 21.

129. Mr Frankie LAM supported the establishment of the three working groups under SKDC, in particular the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance. He said the incidents relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments, which began in May, had lasted for seven to eight months. The number of people participated in the procession was over 1 million on 9 June, and 1.03 million yesterday. Given that one “brother” passed away in mid-June, and there were other cases of homicide cases during this period of time, he would like to observe a moment of silence for them at the meeting.

130. The Chairman said he would like to handle the procedure on setting up Working Groups first. The Chairman invited Members to decide whether they endorse the setting up of the Working Group on Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, Cross Bay Link, New Government Buildings, which would be a standing working group established under SKDC.

131. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the establishment of the Working Group on Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, Cross Bay Link, New Government Buildings under SKDC (a standing working group) was endorsed.

132. The Chairman invited Members to decide whether they endorse the TOR of the Working Group.

133. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the following TOR of the Working Group on Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, Cross Bay Link, New Government Buildings were endorsed:

- To follow up on the works progress and planning of the Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin

Tunnel (TKO-LTT), the Cross Bay Link (CBL) and New Government Buildings in Area 67 of Tseung Kwan O;

- To make recommendations on improvement of the design and ancillary facilities of TKO – LTT, CBL and New Government Buildings in Area 67 of Tseung Kwan O to match with the development of Tseung Kwan O and to meet the needs of the public.

134. The Chairman invited Members to decide whether they endorse the setting up of the Working Group on Hiram’s Highway Improvement Project, which would be a standing working group established under SKDC.

135. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the establishment of the Working Group on Hiram’s Highway Improvement Project under SKDC (a standing working group) was endorsed.

136. The Chairman invited Members to decide whether they endorse the TOR of the Working Group, and the amendment of the third point as: “To foster communication between government departments and stakeholders in the district to ensure that the projects can meet the needs of stakeholders and minimise the impact on stakeholders during construction and after completion.”

137. Ms Debbie CHAN said the use of “stakeholders in the district” was not clear enough, she considered it necessary to emphasise that stakeholders in the district included residents of the district.

138. The Chairman suggested revising the wording as: “To foster communication between government departments and stakeholders in the district (including residents) to ensure that the projects can meet the needs of stakeholders and minimise the impact on stakeholders during construction and after completion.”

139. Ms Christine FONG said given that problems related to hiking existed in rural area of Sai Kung, the town centre and Pak Tam Chung, instead of limited to local residents, stakeholders should also include other relevant parties, including tourists, etc. She agreed that it was necessary to consult local residents, but as there were also many people from other areas in Sai Kung, the consultation would not be comprehensive if only a particular group of residents were consulted. She said the coaches, which could reduce traffic congestion through the ways they parked, were also a stakeholder. She continued that it would be too hasty if all TOR were to be decided at today’s meeting. She considered that they should be discussed at the Special Meeting.

140. The Vice-Chairman suggested revising the third point as: “To foster communication between government departments and stakeholders in the district (including local residents) to ensure that the projects can meet the needs of stakeholders and minimise the impact on stakeholders during construction and after completion.”

141. Mr WONG Shui-sang said the communication between government departments and local residents was most important. All residents in Hong Kong could be stakeholders, but what they thought might be different from the local residents. The project would occupy the private land of indigenous residents, it also involved resumption of land. If Ms Christine FONG’s views were adopted, all people in Hong Kong would have to be consulted, then the consultation might not be completed after 20 years. Therefore, the views of local residents were most important.

142. Mr CHOI Ming-hei suggested revising the third point as: “To foster communication between government departments and different stakeholders (especially local residents) to ensure that the projects can meet the needs of stakeholders and minimise the impact on stakeholders during construction and after completion”, which could meet the requirements of all.

143. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the following TOR of the Working Group on Hiram’s Highway Improvement Project were endorsed:

- To follow up on the progress of Hiram’s Highway Improvement Stage 1 and Stage 2 Projects;
- To offer suggestions on the design of Hiram’s Highway Improvement Stage 1 and Stage 2 Projects;
- To foster communication between government departments and different stakeholders (especially local residents) to ensure that the projects can meet the needs of stakeholders and minimise the impact on stakeholders during construction and after completion.

144. The Chairman invited Members to decide whether they endorse the establishment of the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, and whether it should be a standing or non-standing working group.

145. Mr Ricky OR suggested that it should be established as a standing working group.

146. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared the endorsement of setting up the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed

Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, which was a Working Group established under SKDC (a standing working group).

147. The Chairman said given that the TOR of the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance were relatively controversial, they would be discussed one by one. In response to Mr Edwin CHEUNG's enquiry on the third point, he pointed out that the social dimensions involved in the incident in question was huge, including friends fell out and became enemies, members of families argued because of different political views which had affected the family relationships, schools provided support to arrested students, etc. The social service agencies mentioned in the third point included the social dimensions just mentioned.

148. The Chairman invited Members to discuss the first point of the TOR: "To reflect residents' concerns over the major incidents related to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance that occurred in the district".

149. No view was put forward by Members.

150. The Chairman invited Member to discuss the second point of the TOR: "To advise on the operations carried out by the Police and the subsequent follow-up work regarding incidents related to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments of Fugitive Offenders Ordinance in the district". He added that the subsequent follow-up work after operations already covered the cleaning work after the use of tear gas by the Police. He asked Members whether it was necessary to specify the cleaning work.

151. No view was put forward by Members.

152. The Chairman invited Member to discuss the third point of the TOR: "To co-ordinate the services of different government departments, public utilities and social service agencies in the district to safeguard the well-being of residents and remove their worries".

153. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan said she had mentioned the problems related to cleaners and cleaning work earlier. She suggested specifying "to safeguard the health and well-being of residents" in the TOR.

154. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman said the third point would be revised as: "To co-ordinate the services of different government departments, public utilities and social service agencies in the district to safeguard the health and well-being of residents and remove their worries". Then, he invited Members to discuss the fourth point: "To promote the emotional health of residents and the mutual understanding and respects among people with

different views in the community to resolve the dissension within the community.”

155. Mr Ricky OR said his suggestion was very clear and the amendment was: “Request the Special Administrative Region Government to respond to the five demands raised by the public”, or even adding “not one less”. He reiterated that the words “five demands, not one less” must not be missed to avoid obscurity of the aims.

156. Mr TSE Ching-fung suggested revising the wording more clearly as: “Request the Government to respond to the five demands not one less as soon as possible so as to resolve the dissention within the community”. He also considered the Government’s failure to respond to the five demands in the community the source of the dissention within community.

157. Mr WONG Shui-sang asked the Chairman whether the issues under discussion would be endorsed by taking a vote by open ballot.

158. The Chairman said the TOR would be put to vote after the presentation of them was discussed.

159. Mr WONG Shui-sang said he did not support including the “five demands” in the TOR because he had more than five demands and he believed that DC could not affect the administration of the Government.

160. Mr Chris CHEUNG said if there was more flexibility in the content of the TOR, the follow-up work would be relatively easier, it could also facilitate the Police and different departments to attend the meeting.

161. Mr LAI Ming-chak responded to Members’ worries over whether government departments would attend the meeting. He believed that the crucial factor was not the presentation of the TOR, nor whether the incident would be discussed in Working Group, Committee or full council meeting, but the general public, who could make the Government or particular departments to cooperate. The 17 DCs might even follow up the incident together. He said the public had to clearly indicate their opinions and aspirations in the future processions or elections; to pressurize; or to create a result in the Legislative Council Election to be held soon, so that government departments could not ignore the incidents, thus pressing the Government to give response. That said, regardless of the content of the TOR, crisis would still appear. If some government departments were unwilling to cooperate, he hoped that the public could make a choice and let the government departments concerned to understand the anger of the public and that the public were not to be bullied or ignored easily.

162. Mr Edwin CHEUNG agreed with the fourth point of the TOR of the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance and the revision. He said he was “peaceful, rational and non-violent”, and he supported the setting up of an independent commission of inquiry. The last point of the TOR was about promoting relationship and mending the rift. Under this premises, if the “five demands” or “pursuing of police brutality” were added to the TOR, there would be conflict between the first and the fourth points because the first point had already covered those demands. Therefore, he considered it not necessary to add those demands in the fourth point. At the same time, he considered the original intention of the Working Group in question, i.e. restoring the relationship instead of pursuing the problems of the Police or the Government, more positive. He suggested setting up a separate non-standing working group to discuss the “five demands” rather than adding the demands mentioned above to the TOR, which could be separated from the TOR of the Working Group in question and facilitate more focused discussion.

163. The Chairman invited Members to vote on including the “five demands” in the fourth point of the TOR.

164. Mr CHOI Ming-hei said all Members understood the content of the “five demands”. If the “five demands” were to be included in the TOR, he asked whether it was necessary to specify what these five demands were.

165. The Chairman considered that as all Members understood clearly the content of the “five demands”, the use of “five demands” would suffice. He invited Members who supported inclusion of the “five demands” in the TOR to raise their hands to indicate their intention preliminarily. A vote on the TOR as a whole would be conducted later, and the record would be made when the votes were casted.

166. The Chairman said Members might put down their hands first. He would not announce the result for the time being.

167. Mr Chris CHEUNG said he supported requesting the Government to respond to which demand(s) under the “five demands” that it would/would not accept, and he described it as a more practical approach. He agreed that the Government’s responding to the “five demands” was necessary for mending the rift. He said it was easy to speak the words “not one less”, but he was very realistic and did not want to deceive others. He also considered that, in order to bear fruit and to be practical, the wording “not one less” should not be added. This approach was more flexible.

168. Ms Christine FONG said she did not agree with Mr Gary FAN's view that the setting up of "Sai Kung District Independent Commission of Inquiry" would only attract more attention to what one want to conceal. She suggested renaming the Working Group in question as "Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance and Independent Commission of Inquiry", or even upgraded it to a Committee. She hoped that the Chairman could put the name to the vote. The "five demands" included the immediate release of those who were arrested. She said she was charged for opposing the extension of landfill in LegCo, and she had lodged an appeal to the Court of Final Appeal. She considered that Hong Kong was governed by the rule of law and procedures. Given that there were many causes to the incidents, the independent inquiry should be comprehensive rather than only targeting at the Police. The incident also involved the problems of "settling privately" and problems of the general public. Regarding the Government's response to the "five demands", she said Members should discuss about it, otherwise it would be considered as being determined in advance. Everyone in Hong Kong attached great importance to the independent commission of inquiry, therefore the name of the Working Group in question could include "and Independent Commission of Inquiry" in addition to "the Incident relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance".

169. Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu said if the "five demands" were to be added, "not one less" must be added too. It was because the Government or CE had all along been saying that it/she had responded to the "five demands" and would not respond to them anymore. He considered that the public should let the Government know that they were not requesting for the Government to respond to the "five demands", but wanted the Government to know the meaning of "five demands, not one less", and why they requested for "not one less". Besides, he did not agree with adding "Independent Commission of Inquiry" in the name of the Working Group in question because, in terms of authority and the power of the Council, it was different from the independent commission of inquiry requested by the public. The over-interpretation of the public on the Working Group in question should be avoided.

170. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan said she had not raised her hand to support the inclusion of the "five demands" in the TOR. She hoped that Members could think clearly whether the inclusion of the "five demands" in the TOR was just an indication of political stance in the form of slogan, or that they had clearly considered that it was something that could be achieved given the function of the District Council. She was highly doubtful about how the Council could implement the TOR concerning the "five demands". Besides, it was not possible for the Council to request for genuine universal suffrage or the cancellation of functional constituency under the TOR of the Council. She did support the "five demands", but she hoped that Members could think clearly how the Council could strive for them through its function. She continued that the inclusion of "five demands, not one less" in the TOR would make the Police

unwilling to attend the meeting of the Working Group in question. Now that the Police had ignored, not stating its position or even responded to the issue in a stern way, she knew that many people, including herself, were angry at the behavior of the Police, and had a very strong feeling on police brutality. However, as Members, what one should consider was how to strive for more communication with different departments. That said, instead of adding the “five demands”, one should consider how to implement the “five demands”, which could be considered as including the “five demands” in the TOR in another way. She considered that the existing TOR could already perform the function of striving for the “five demands”.

171. Mr LEE Ka-yui responded to the view of Ms LEUNG Hin-yan and pointed out that it was not the District Council, but the Government that could respond to the “five demands”. Regarding the views of the Professional Power, he responded that the “five demands” must come together with “not one less”. Facing a tyranny that ignored the truth, someone could still say loudly in the Council that the “five demands” and “not one less” were not complementary to each other. They were no different from the accomplices of the totalitarian government and the tyranny, and a shield of the totalitarian government. That said, the inclusion of “five demands” in the TOR must be complemented with the wording “not one less”, otherwise, the face-to-face confrontation with the tyranny would be impossible. He said he did not expect the Police to attend the meeting, it was because no matter whether the “five demands” were included in the TOR or not, as long as the Police saw the wording “incident relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments”, it would refuse to attend the meeting on the ground that it involved politics and the political neutrality of civil service, etc. Instead of worrying about whether the Police would attend the meeting, it was better to consider how to resist such problems in times of conflicts or police brutality. In addition, the Working Group just wanted to tell everyone that the violence of the protesters stemmed from the tyranny of the totalitarian government and its suppressing the freedom of the public with force.

172. Mr CHOI Ming-hei agreed with insisting on the “five demands, not one less”. He also hoped that the Chairman could put the TOR to a vote by open ballot.

173. Mr Ricky OR opined that it was not necessary for the Council to consider whether some wording would affect the decision of the Government or departments concerned to attend a meeting or respond to the requests of the Council or not. Given that the Council had no control in this aspect, there was no need to relax the bottom line or the stance. He insisted on including the “five demands, not one less” in the TOR. Besides, some Members mentioned that consideration should be given to the function of the Council before deciding whether certain issues should be raised in the meeting. However, it could be seen from the history of SKDC that many issues were political issues. If some issues were not raised taking into account the function of the Council, then it would be impossible to discuss all issues related to politics in the future meetings. He considered this chopping off one’s limbs and forfeiting one’s right to

express opinions and the basic speaking right. He hoped that Members could think clearly whether this was a proper way to handle the matter.

174. Ms Valerie WONG considered that “five demands, not one less” must be included in the TOR. She believed that Members would have mentioned “five demands, not one less” during the election period. The formulation of TOR was within the purview of Members and it could urge the Government to respond to Members’ pledges to their voters, which was also the expectation of Hong Kong people. Regarding Ms Christine FONG’s proposal for renaming the Working Group in question as “Working Group on Incident relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments and Independent Commission of Inquiry”, she considered it misleading because the Working Group was not the independent commission of inquiry expected by the public, nor did it have the power of the independent commission of inquiry. She absolutely opposed to the renaming proposal.

175. The Chairman said Members had already voted on the revision to the fourth point of the TOR by a show of hands. He asked if Members had any new point of views, if not, he would announce the result.

176. Mr CHUN Hoi-shing said given that the Council was an advisory body, he suggested adding to the fourth point: “to convey the mainstream public opinion of five demands, not one less to the Government continually”. He considered this presentation more practical and a demonstration that the Council would continue to convey this request to the Government.

177. Mr TSE Ching-fung responded to some Members’ views that “five demands” and “not one less” were not complementary. He asked if those Members were supporters of police brutality.

178. The Chairman said the speaking of Mr TSE Ching-fung was not a new viewpoint.

179. Ms Christine FONG said to put it simple, the Professional Power supported setting up the Working Group in question and it just hoped to add “Independent Commission of Inquiry” to its name.

180. The Chairman said the discussion on the fourth point of the TOR would be handled first, then the name and TOR of the Working Group as a whole would be put to the vote.

181. Mr CHENG Chung-man agreed with the views of Mr CHUN Hoi-shing. As for the wording, he suggested using “facilitate” or “strongly request” to demonstrate the conveying of this political view to the Government on a continuous basis. He also hoped to remind Members that the Council of this term was highly political, if “five demands, not one less” was

not clearly written, it would leave a blurred image to the public, who might think that someone who were politically neutral and did not know what they were doing were pretending as supporters of opposition to the proposed legislative amendments and requested for setting up the independent committee. He did not hope that the Council would give the public such an impression because of the presentation of TOR.

182. Mr LUK Ping-choi said the public had generally voted for the candidates of DCs to request Members to strive for the fulfilment of “five demands, not one less”. The Council should press the Government for this instead of merely expressing the views. Besides, it should not only request for the setting up of an independent commission of inquiry and ignore other demands. It did not match with the expectation of the public. He suggested revising the wording as “to strive for the fulfilment of five demands, not one less”. He pointed out that up to now, only the withdrawal of Fugitive Offenders Ordinance had been fulfilled, while the other demands were still not yet fulfilled.

183. Ms Valerie WONG said CE said she had responded to the five demands, but this did not meet the expectation of the public, therefore, she supported the use of the wording “to strive for the fulfilment of five demands, not one less”.

184. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan said if Members agreed that the inclusion of “five demands, not one less” in the TOR was merely an indication of political stance, there was no need to consider the actual operation, and they had a firm intention to let the public and the Government know the political stance of the Council, she would absolutely support it.

185. Mr LUI Man-kwong said “five demands, not one less” should be included in the TOR. In the past, motions about the incident relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments had been moved and put to the vote in DC meeting, the representatives of the Police left the conference room at that time. If Members’ consideration on whether or not to include “five demands, not one less” in the TOR was based on whether it would deter the departments from attending the meetings, he would like to point out that in fact, as long as there were the words “opposing to the proposed legislative amendments”, the departments would not attend the meeting.

186. Mr LAI Ming-chak said the reason for mentioning “five demands, not one less” was that some Members stated that the Government’s response to the “five demands, not one less” was the way to heal the rift in the society. He proposed presenting the fourth point of the TOR as follows: “To promote the emotional health of residents and the mutual understanding and respects among people with different views in the community; to strive for the fulfilment of “five demands, not one less” and to resolve the dissension within the community.”

187. The Chairman suggested maintaining the option of a TOR with four points, and voting on the setting up and TOR of the Working Group. He asked Ms Christine FONG again if she had any comment on the name of the Working Group.

188. Ms Christine FONG said she agreed with setting up the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance. Given that the setting up of the independent commission of inquiry was a matter of major concern to everyone, she suggested renaming the Working Group as “Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance and Independent Commission of Inquiry”. She also considered that the name of a Working Group under SKDC would not mislead the public. She hoped that her proposal on the name of the Working Group would be voted by show of hands.

189. Mr Edwin CHEUNG suggested discussing the TOR of the Working Group first. Given that the name of the Working Group would be determined by its TOR, if the name was determined before the TOR, the voting result might be affected. He said the residents in his constituency and he himself found the five demands totally unacceptable, these concerns must be reflected in the meeting. He considered that it was a must to straddle “blue” and “yellow” and have rational discussion. He also found the first and fourth points of the TOR contradictory and unacceptable. He hoped that Members could respect different views in the community with a view to performing the function of the Council.

190. The Chairman said the Council had already discussed the TOR of the Working Group in detail. If Members had different views, it was necessary to put the issue to the vote.

191. Ms Christine FONG requested the Chairman to handle the proposal of Mr Edwin CHEUNG first. She said she agreed with three demands, including withdrawal of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, setting up of the independent commission of inquiry and striving for dual universal suffrage. She suggested including those demands in the TOR of the Working Group.

192. The Chairman said the Secretariat would record the speaking of Mr Edwin CHEUNG and Ms Christine FONG. However, the Council had endorsed keeping the five demands earlier.

193. Ms Christine FONG considered that the Council still had not discussed the TOR sufficiently.

194. Mr LAI Ming-chak said the Council might take a vote on “five demands, not one less” by open ballot if necessary. The Chairman had just read out the fourth point of the TOR, if Members had any doubt, they might ask the Secretariat to read out the proposed TOR, and then

voted on them. The other details of the Working Group could be discussed afterwards.

195. The Chairman suggested voting on whether or not to set up a working group to follow up on the opposition to the proposed legislative amendment by show of hands first.

196. Ms Christine FONG suggested putting her proposal on revising the name of the Working Group to the vote first in accordance with the established practice to avoid misleading the public on the voting procedure. If necessary, the Secretary might be asked to explain on it.

197. Mr TSE Ching-fung responded that what Ms Christine FONG had mentioned was just the procedure for handling motions.

198. The Chairman said given that the Council was not handling motions now, he would handle the issue in his own way. He said 27 Members had voted for setting up a Working Group to follow up on the incident relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments earlier.

199. Mr WONG Shui-sang said he did not support taking a vote by show of hands. He considered a vote by open ballot should be conducted through the voting system.

200. Ms Christine FONG said the Chairman should handle the revision proposal that she raised first. She also considered there was a problem with the procedure.

201. The Chairman said he was now asking Members to choose one from the two options.

202. Ms Christine FONG said the Chairman claimed that the Council was not discussing about motions currently, which was in fact not allowing Members to discuss. She considered it unfair.

203. The Vice-Chairman said the Chairman's logic had all along been discussing whether or not to set up the Working Group concerned first, to be followed by deciding the name of the Working Group, and then endorsing the TOR lastly. If there was no objection from Members, the issues could be put to the vote according to the above sequence. In fact, the Chairman had just invited Members to take a vote on whether or not to set up a working group to follow up on the incident relating to the proposed legislative amendments by show of hands and some Members had already voted for it. He suggested the Chairman to continue handling the remaining parts.

204. Mr Edwin CHEUNG said the paper on Members' table had set out the name and TOR of all Working Groups. However, he strongly disagreed with the TOR of the Working Group on

the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, and it was impossible for him to make a decision. He considered that the vote on the name and TOR should not be separated but should be casted in one go to facilitate Members to express their views clearly.

205. Mr LEUNG Li said he agreed with including “five demands, not one less” in the TOR. Besides, although Mr Edwin CHEUNG said Members had not discussed the TOR, yet, the Council had already endorsed including “five demands, not one less” in the TOR in a vote by show of hands. At the time of voting, Mr Edwin CHEUNG and Ms Christine FONG had not raised their hands, he would like to know the reason for that. In addition, regarding the name of the Working Group, he opposed the proposal raised by Ms Christine FONG. It was because the mainstream public opinion was that the independent commission of inquiry was a commission of inquiry appointed by CE of Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Executive Council under the Commission of Inquiry Ordinance (Cap. 86), but not one that was named independent commission of inquiry but did not have the authority to summon. The Council could not guarantee that such commission would be recognised by the Government. He pointed out that as Ms Christine FONG did not agree with all the contents of the five demands, her request for setting up an independent commission of inquiry would cast doubt on whether the function of the independent commission of inquiry she requested was the same as that requested by the general public. He also pointed out that Ms Christine FONG raised her hand to support the setting up of the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance on one hand, but also supported the independent commission of inquiry she proposed on the other, he regarded her as a person who considered herself neither “blue” nor “yellow”.

206. Mr Chris CHEUNG said he fully supported the setting up of the above-mentioned Working Group. However, he considered some Members had problems with their logic because they opposed including the wording of “Independent Commission of Inquiry” in the name of the Working Group on the ground that the Hong Kong Government did not allow it, or that it was meaningless to change only the name of the Working Group. If the Council followed this logic, based on the existing response of the Hong Kong Government, he queried if the “five demands” could not be included in the TOR too. He highly agreed with “To promote the emotional health of residents and the mutual understanding and respects among people with different views in the community” in the TOR, yet, he was worried that the room for discussion would be narrowed with such pre-set conditions. Secondly, he had reservation over “do not prosecute but release the protestors” under the “five demands”. If the additional content of the TOR was in the form of a slogan, the room for discussion might be narrowed. Moreover, if the Council merely wanted to push the Government to take action in the new term, its Members could move motions in the special meeting of SKDC to be held on 16 January, or have discussion on problems related to the Police, rather than referring the issue to a Working

Group with pre-set conditions for following up. He considered that Members should be practical.

207. Mr Edwin CHEUNG requested the Chairman to announce the voting result because Mr LEUNG Li had misunderstood his meaning. He pointed out that the Council had taken a vote on whether or not to include “five demands” in the TOR of the Working Group, but the Chairman had not announced the voting result yet. There would be evidence that the option was endorsed only after the Chairman had announced the result. Then, he could decide whether or not to set up the Working Group in question.

208. The Chairman announced that the Council had taken a vote on whether or not to include “five demands, not one less” in the TOR of the Working Group, and the proposal was endorsed by 21 votes for it.

209. The Chairman suggested separating the vote into three parts, all of which would be casted by open ballot. The first part was whether or not to set up a working group on the incidents relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance; the second part was to decide the name of the Working Group; the third part was to decide the TOR of the Working Group. Concerning the part on TOR, the Council would vote on the options derived after detailed discussion together.

210. Ms Christine FONG said to avoid Members’ misunderstanding of what the vote was about, the item already endorsed in the vote by show of hands should be voted again by open ballot. The items that followed should also be voted by open ballot.

211. The Chairman invited Members to decide whether or not to set up a standing working group on the incidents relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments.

212. Mr Gary FAN told the Chairman before the end of the vote that he was unable to press the button and cast his vote because of system failure. He said he had casted an affirmative vote.

213. Mr WONG Shui-sang said after the vote was ended that he himself had casted an abstention vote.

214. The voting result was as follows: 27 votes for it (including 1 vote from Mr Gary FAN), 0 vote against it and 2 abstentions (including 1 vote from Mr WONG Shui-sang). SKDC endorsed setting up a standing working group on the incidents relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments.

215. The Chairman invited Members to decide if they agreed to name the Working Group as “Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance and Independent Commission of Inquiry” He added that if the name mentioned above was not endorsed, the Council would take a vote on the name “Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance”.

216. Mr Gary FAN said he would cast a negative vote on naming the Working Group as “Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance and Independent Commission of Inquiry”; and cast an affirmative vote on the name “Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance”. He pointed out that as Ms Christine FONG had quoted out of the context and misinterpreted the intention of other Members as opposing to a working group that already included “five demands, not one less” and the setting up of an independent commission of inquiry as its function, he would like to make himself clear in advance for record in the minutes of the meeting.

217. Ms Christine FONG considered what Mr Gary FAN said had misinterpreted her speaking and quoted out of context. She highly agreed with taking a vote on the name she proposed first, to be followed by a vote on the original name.

218. The Chairman announced the voting result as follows: 3 votes for it, 24 votes against it, and 2 abstentions. The naming of the Working Group as “Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance and Independent Commission of Inquiry” was not endorsed.

219. Ms Christine FONG said although Messrs Chris CHEUNG and Edwin CHEUNG and she herself had voted for the name “Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance and Independent Commission of Inquiry”, they also supported using the name “Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance”. But its TOR would be the topic of another discussion.

220. The Chairman invited Members to decide whether they agreed to name the Working Group as “Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance”.

221. The Chairman announced the voting result as follows: 27 votes for it, 0 vote against it and 2 abstentions. The naming of the Working Group as “Working Group on the Incident

Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance”.

222. Ms Christine FONG said, regarding the “three demands” raised by Mr Edwin CHEUNG, including withdrawal of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, setting up of the independent commission of inquiry and striving for dual universal suffrage, she hoped that the Council could take a vote on them. The Council should only vote on the suggestions put forward by other Members if this proposal was not endorsed.

223. The Chairman said given that the Council had already spent a very long time discussing every item of the TOR one by one, the Council would not vote on them again; the Council had also taken a vote on whether or not to include “five demands, not one less” in the TOR, it would handle the TOR in a bundle.

224. The Chairman said the TOR to be put to the vote were as follows:

- To reflect residents’ concerns over the major incidents related to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance that occurred in the district;
- To advise on the operations carried out by the Police and the subsequent follow-up work regarding the incident related to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance in the district;
- To co-ordinate the services of different government departments, public utilities and social service agencies in the district to safeguard the health and well-being of residents and remove their worries;
- To promote the emotional health of residents and the mutual understanding and respects among people with different views in the community; to strive for the fulfilment of “five demands, not one less” by the Government and to resolve the dissension within the community.

225. Ms Christine FONG said if the TOR of the Working Group was simply “to strive for the fulfilment of “five demands, not one less” by the Government”, it would be acceptable to Messrs Chris CHEUNG and Edwin CHEUNG and herself. She requested the Chairman to consider adopting the option of “three demands” under the premise of social harmony and resolving dissention within the community.

226. Mr Gary FAN requested the Chairman to strictly implement the requirement on the maximum number of speaking because Ms Christine FONG had spoken time and again without permission.

227. Mr TSE Ching-fung said, if Members had different views, they could cast the negative votes, they should also avoid speaking continuously which would hinder the progress of the meeting.

228. The Chairman invited Members to decide whether they agreed with the TOR just read out by him.

229. The Chairman announced the voting result as follows: 25 votes for it, 1 vote against it and 3 abstentions. The TOR of the above Working Group were endorsed.

230. The Chairman concluded that the Council endorsed the setting up of the three Working Groups established under SKDC.

231. Mr LEUNG Li said Mr Chris CHEUNG stated that other Members disagreed with naming the Working Group as “Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance and Independent Commission of Inquiry” because they were afraid of going against the Government; but in fact, the independent commission of inquiry that everyone strived for was one that had the authority to summon witness and to arrest those who refused to be summoned. On the contrary, the suggestion proposed by Mr Chris CHEUNG, etc., was just the same as the independent review committee proposed by CE, which he considered a disguise.

232. Mr Chris CHEUNG said he had reservation over requesting the Government to release all those who were arrested.

233. The Chairman asked Members to avoid repeating their words. The Chairman said SKDC had implemented an “Appreciation of Local Personalities Scheme”. A Working Group established under SKDC titled “Working Group on Appreciation of Local Personalities” was set up in the last-term SKDC to make preparation for the scheme. The Selection Committee on Appreciation of Local Personalities had made selection on the nominees of the certificates whose nomination were made by Members of the last-term SKDC. As proposed by the Working Group of the last-term SKDC, the certificate presentation ceremony was tentatively scheduled for 14 March 2020 (Saturday) at Hang Hau Community Hall. The Chairman asked if Members agreed to continue implementing this scheme in the new-term SKDC.

234. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that SKDC would continue implementing the above scheme. He suggested that there was no need to set up a working group on the scheme, the Vice-Chairman, he himself and the Secretariat would follow up on the relevant arrangements, including the submission of funding application to SKDC. When the scheme was discussed at the last-term SKDC, \$140,000 had been earmarked for

organising the presentation ceremony, the major expenditure items included decoration of venue, catering service, design and production of certificates, provision of photo printing and distributing services to the awardees on the spot, etc. He considered that lesser public money should be spent when the scheme was implemented and he would follow up on the details of the scheme.

[Post-meeting note: Taking into account the development of the COVID-19 epidemic, it was decided, after consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, that the presentation ceremony would be cancelled to reduce social contact and the risk of spreading the virus in the community. The Secretariat would send the certificate to the awardees by post.]

235. The Chairman said the Convenor and Vice-Convenor of the Working Group would be elected one by one now. He suggested holding the election by a raise of hands just like the Committees. The candidates who got the simple majority vote (i.e. a higher number of valid votes cast excluding abstentions but obtaining more than half of the votes was not required) would be elected as the Convenor. The Chairman also suggested following the practice of the last term, i.e. the tenure of the standing Working Groups would be two years from the date of their being elected until 31 December 2021, and that the Convenor and Vice-Convenor of the Working Groups could be re-elected to serve for another term upon the expiry of the tenure. There being no objection from Member, the Chairman declared that the suggestion was accepted.

236. The Chairman declared that the election of the Convenor of the Working Group on Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, the Cross Bay Link, New Government Buildings commenced. He invited Members to make nomination.

237. Mr YU Tsun-ning nominated Mr Brandon Kenneth YIP. The nomination was seconded by Mr Frankie LAM.

238. Mr Brandon Kenneth YIP accepted the nomination.

239. There being no other nomination, the Chairman declared that Mr Brandon Kenneth YIP was elected uncontested as the Convenor of the Working Group on Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, the Cross Bay Link, New Government Buildings.

240. The Chairman declared that the election of the Vice-Convenor of the Working Group on Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, the Cross Bay Link, New Government Buildings commenced. He invited Members to make nomination.

241. Mr CHUN Hoi-shing nominated Mr LAI Wai-tong. The nomination was seconded by Mr LEUNG Li.

242. Mr LAI Wai-tong accepted the nomination.

243. Mr Edwin CHEUNG nominated Ms Christine FONG, because the areas most affected by Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel and the Cross Bay Link included Ocean Shores and LOHAS Park.

244. Ms Christine FONG accepted the nomination.

245. Mr Chris CHEUNG seconded the nomination. He also said there was no Vice-Convenor for the Working Group in SKDC of the last term, he enquired whether all Working Groups in the current-term SKDC would have Vice-Convenor.

246. The Chairman said for the Council of the current-term, the Working Groups established under SKDC would have Vice-Convenor.

247. Ms Christine FONG said Mr Chris CHEUNG had made the enquiry because the Chairman said already that the practice of the last-term SKDC would be followed. She did not really care whether she could be elected as the Vice-Convenor. Yet she considered herself being more familiar with the community and its planning, in particular, she had rich experience in civil engineering and infrastructures. Since the cost of the project was as high as \$20 billion, she hoped that all Members would attach importance to it no matter whether she was elected or not.

248. The Chairman invited Members to elect the Vice-Convenor of the Working Group on Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, the Cross Bay Link, New Government Buildings by show of hands.

249. The Chairman declared the voting result as follows: 23 votes for Mr LAI Wai-tong and 4 votes for Ms Christine FONG. Mr LAI Wai-tong was elected the Vice-Convenor of the Working Group on Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, the Cross Bay Link, New Government Buildings.

250. The Chairman declared that the election of the Convenor of the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance commenced. He invited Members to make nomination.

251. Mr CHAN Wai-lit nominated Mr FUNG Kwan-on. The nomination was seconded by Mr LAI Ming-chak.

252. Mr FUNG Kwan-on accepted the nomination.

253. There being no other nomination, the Chairman declared that Mr FUNG Kwan-on was elected uncontested as the Convenor of the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance.

254. The Chairman declared that the election of the Vice-Convenor of the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance commenced. He invited Members to make nomination.

255. Ms Debby CHAN nominated Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu. The nomination was seconded by Mr Brandon Kenneth YIP.

256. Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu accepted the nomination.

257. There being no other nomination, the Chairman declared that Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu was elected uncontested as the Vice-Convenor of the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance.

258. Mr FUNG Kwan-on suggested all Members to observe a one-minute silence at the meeting in memory of the Hong Kong people sacrificed in the incident relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance.

259. The Chairman said he himself also felt sad about the sacrifice of lives in the incidents relating to the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, especially the pass away of residents because of the incidents in Sai Kung district. He agreed with observing a one-minute silence in memory of them.

260. Ms Christine FONG considered that apart from those who passed away, got injured or fell sick in the incident, the moment of silence should also be observed for those who were affected by the incident.

(Some Members stood in silence for one minute)

261. The Chairman declared that the election of the Convenor of the Working Group on Hiram's Highway Improvement Project commenced. He invited Members to make nomination.

262. Mr Gary FAN nominated Mr Stanley HO. The nomination was seconded by Ms Christine FONG.

263. Mr Stanley HO accepted the nomination.

264. There being no other nomination, the Chairman declared that Mr Stanley HO was elected uncontested as the Convenor the Working Group on Hiram's Highway Improvement Project.

265. The Chairman declared that the election of the Vice-Convenor of the Working Group on Hiram's Highway Improvement Project commenced. He invited Members to make nomination.

266. Mr Francis CHAU nominated Mr WONG Shui-sang. Mr WONG Shui-sang did not accept the nomination.

267. Ms Christine FONG nominated Ms LEUNG Hin-yan. The nomination was seconded by Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu and Mr WONG Shui-sang.

268. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan accepted the nomination.

269. There being no other nomination, the Chairman declared that Ms LEUNG Hin-yan was elected uncontested as the Vice-Convenor of the Working Group on Hiram's Highway Improvement Project.

270. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to invite Members to join the Working Groups established under SKDC by e-mail after the meeting. Just like the arrangement of Committees, Members should return the reply slip on joining the Working Group established under SKDC to the Secretariat before 8 January (Wednesday) to facilitate the Secretariat to request Members to decide whether or not to endorse the Membership List of the Committees and Working Groups together by circulation on 9 January (Thursday).

(D) Approval of Funding Applications for the Community Involvement Projects under SKDC (Paper on table (1))

271. The Chairman said the current financial year would end on 31 March and he asked Members to consider and approve the funding applications of two activities to be held soon. The Secretariat had sent the relevant information to Members by email on 30 December 2019.

272. The Chairman continued that the paper had set out the information on declaration of interest made by Members. He asked Members to read the part on declaration of interest carefully. The information on declaration of interest set out in the paper was prepared by the Secretariat based on the information it obtained. If Members found any incorrect or missing information on the paper, they were requested to make a declaration immediately, and then complete and return the declaration of interest forms to the Secretariat after the meeting for record purpose. Besides, Members should declare their interests or update their information before the meeting to facilitate the Secretariat to send the updated information provided by the relevant Members by emails to all SKDC Members for noting before the meeting. If any person present at the meeting had any doubts about the information or the relationship with an organisation as declared by a Member, he/she should raise it immediately at the meeting for discussion and resolution.

273. Mr Ricky OR considered the size of letters on the paper on table too small. He suggested enlarging the letters in the future.

274. The Chairman said SKDC was becoming a paperless office. As the issue in question was not included in the agenda before the meeting, the Secretariat was unable to upload the information onto the website in advance. However, Members could still read the relevant paper in the emails of the Secretariat.

275. The Vice-Chairman added that the Secretariat had sent the relevant information to all Members by email on 30 December 2019.

276. The Chairman said the funding applications submitted to SKDC for consideration had been vetted by the Secretariat based on the Guidelines/Procedures on the Use of Sai Kung District Council Funds for Community Involvement Project (the Guidelines) before they were recommended to SKDC for approval. If there was no provision under the existing items listed in the Guidelines for a particular funding item under request, the item would be regarded as “non-standard item”. Members could decide whether funding should be granted for such “non-standard item”. He asked Members to vet the funding applications in detail for more efficient utilisation of resources. According to Order 48 (11) of the SKDC Standing Orders, “The Chairman of the Council shall decide whether a member of the Council (other than the Chairman of the Council) disclosing an interest in a matter may speak or vote on the matter, may remain in the meeting as an observer, or should withdraw from the meeting.” He would make decision on the declaration of interest made by Members when the relevant application was discussed later.

277. The Chairman continued that two funding applications for 2019-20 were shown in the paper, with a total amount of \$585,666.80 recommended for approval. Members might

discuss on the funding applications. The Chairman asked the Secretary to introduce the funding application one by one.

278. The Secretary said there was one funding application for Lunar New Year Programme of Rural Nature, with a total amount of \$286,000 recommended for approval. The activity was a district-wide Chinese New Year Celebration recognised by SKDC. According to paragraphs 5 to 6 of the Guidelines, “The maximum subsidy for each NGO eligible for applying DC Fund is \$30,000 each year. The maximum subsidy for organisations which are exempt from tax under Section 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance can be increased to \$40,000 each year.” Organisations recommended by SKDC were not subject to the maximum amount of subsidy. The amount of funding sought under the application exceeded the maximum subsidy to be accumulated by organisations eligible for applying CI Fund for co-organising activities. If Members recommended the activity, the amount of funding sought could exceed the subsidy ceiling. Members were asked to decide whether they recommend the activity.

279. Mr WONG Shui-sang declared that he was the Chairman of the Sai Kung Rural Committee.

280. The Chairman decided that Mr WONG Shui-sang should withdraw from the meeting.

281. Mr LAI Ming-chak said although the Secretariat had sent the paper to Members by email, part of the content of the paper was still not readable even when being enlarged on the monitor of the computer. He suggested the Secretariat to pay attention to the font size on the funding application form in the future, and to ask the applicant organisation to enlarge the font size on the forms where necessary. Besides, the Council was becoming a paperless office, yet he found that there was a huge difference in terms of requirements of pamphlets and posters between the two activities. For the “Lunar New Year Lion Dance Gala at Sai Kung 2020” (“Lunar New Year Lion Dance Gala”), only 300 posters of A2 size would be printed; but for “Sai Kung Chiu Chow Cultural Festival” under “Sai Kung District Arts and Cultural Festival 2019-2020 - Passing on Arts and Cultural Heritage in Sai Kung”, 900 posters of A2 size and 600 posters of A3 size would be printed. He hoped that the Secretariat would explain, based on experience, whether the organiser would be able to put up all the posters. If not, he suggested the organiser to reduce the quantity of poster to avoid wastage.

282. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan said she welcomed the organisation of “Sai Kung Chiu Chow Cultural Festival” in Sai Kung Town. However, given that it was listed in the application form that the anticipated total number of participants was 6 500, she hoped that the organiser could explain how the figure was derived. Moreover, she was also concerned about the number of posters. She considered it not environmentally friendly to put up 900 posters of A2 size for an activity of half a day.

283. The Chairman invited Members to express their views on “Lunar New Year Lion Dance Gala” first.

284. Ms Debby CHAN would like to understand the type of the souvenir and the details of the expenditure on resources involved in organising the activity. She considered the meaning of some expenditure items rather vague, but they involved substantial amount of funding. For Item 9 “Performance”, given that the same performance would be staged every year, she enquired whether it was necessary to purchase new apparatus, and the way the expenditure was calculated. Moreover, although both the “Lunar New Year Lion Dance Gala” and the “Sai Kung Chiu Chow Cultural Festival” would be held in Sai Kung Town, the items under them were not identical. She was also concerned whether the applicant organisation would consider including an item on cleaning up of venue. It was because in the past, staff of FEHD would be responsible for cleaning up the venues after some activities were held. She considered such practice would add burden to the department and suggested that the applicant organisation should be responsible for cleaning up the venue after the activity on its own initiative.

285. The Secretary added that Item 9 under the funding application of “Lunar New Year Lion Dance Gala” was “Dragon/Lion Performance (involving a total of 28 golden dragons, unicorns and lions)”.

286. The Chairman said in the past, when vetting funding applications, the Council could revise some details of the funding applications; reduce the amount of subsidy; or when there were problems relating to principles where Members would like to understand more, the Council could choose to handle the funding application by circulation after the meeting. However, before a decision was reached on handling the funding application by circulation, the Council must give due consideration as to whether the organiser would still have sufficient time to organise the activity. As for the details of an activity, Members’ views could be reflected in the approval letter issued by the Council to the applicant organisation, which would also request the applicant to meet the requirement set out by the Council, including the amount of paper to be used and the cleaning up of venue, etc., as far as possible.

287. Ms Debby CHAN considered that some contents of the funding application were not clear, including the difference between Central Administrative Overheads and programme assistant expenses; the details of souvenir and other resources involved were not set out. She considered that as the Council was vetting the application of an activity organised with public money, she hoped that the applicant organisation could give explanation on them.

288. The Chairman said his response was not only applicable to the funding application in question. In the past, some applicant organisations mainly paid the necessary expenses of the

activities with Central Administrative Overheads; while the programme assistant expenses mainly involved the staff cost for organising the activities.

289. Mr Stanley HO enquired about the difference between Item 18 “Temporary Staff” and Item 24 “Programme Assistant Expenses”.

290. The Chairman said temporary staff cost usually referred to the staff cost incurred when an activity was held, it was different from the cost for programme assistants who were responsible for coordinating the activity. The Chairman said if Members did not understand the details of individual items, e.g. souvenir, they might consider not giving approval to such items.

291. Mr Chris CHEUNG suggested handling the application by circulation after the meeting if Members needed time to consider about it.

292. The Chairman said he had no objection to handling the application by circulation, but consideration needed to be given to whether Members would put forward any further views. Given that the applicant organisation hoped that SKDC would give it a reply as soon as possible, the Chairman asked the Secretariat to contact the applicant organisation and enquire about the details of the souvenir, whether the performance fee could be reduced, and whether the unicorns could be reused.

293. Mr LAU Kai-hong said although he was not speaking on behalf of the applicant organisation, based on the experience of Hang Hau Rural Committee, the unicorn dance team usually had its own unicorns. When the activity was over, it would get back its unicorns for use in other activities. For the “Dragon/Lion Performance” which involved \$70,000, he pointed out that it actually involved 28 performing teams each consisting of over ten persons, in other words, each team only had \$2,500 for light meals and travelling expenses, which was actually not expensive. He continued that the estimated expenditure of the activity as a whole was some \$200,000. The activity, which was a relatively large-scale territory-wide lion and unicorn dance activity for promoting the unicorn dance culture in Sai Kung and Hang Hau, had been granted funding in the past. He also pointed out that for funding applications to be handled by the Council in the future, there might be some items that appeared to be ordinary, such as chairs and lighting, but would involve a substantial amount of money.

294. The Chairman said regarding the question just raised by Members, including whether there was room for reducing the performance fee, etc., the applicant organisation would be asked to give a response as soon as possible. Then, the funding application would be vetted and approved by circulation as quickly as possible.

295. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan enquired about the maximum number of people covered under Item 19 “Public Liability Insurance”.

296. The Chairman said for territory-wide activity, “Public Liability Insurance” depended on whether the number of participants in the activity was sufficient, but it was not calculated by the number of people.

297. The Chairman asked the Secretary to introduce the next funding application.

298. The Secretary said there was a funding application for Arts and Cultural Activities with a total amount of \$299,666.80 recommended for approval. The activity was recommended by the last-term FAC for approval by the current-term SKDC. According to paragraph 16 of the Guidelines, except for the cross-year projects, lunar new year activities, Flower Show or other activities approved at the discretion of FAC, all activities under the funding applications should not be held or completed after 15 February. As the activity would be held on 23 February 2020, Members were asked to decide whether to exercise their discretion to approve the application.

299. In response to the enquiry raised by Ms LEUNG Hin-yan earlier, the Secretary said the estimated number of participants of “Chiu Chow Cultural Festival” was 6 500. Based on the information of the Secretariat, the applicant organisation had also organised a similar activity last year. As shown in the report submitted by it to the Secretariat, the number of participants was about 5 000.

300. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan said as the estimated number of participants of the activity was 6 500, the influx of participants, even only 5 000 just like last year, into Sai Kung Town would surely affect the traffic; coupled with the fact that the activity would be held in the weekend, she was concerned about the traffic arrangements. Besides, given that the venues of the activity would be Tin Hau Temple Square and Man Yee Playground in Sai Kung, she would like to know whether road closure would be implemented on the day of the activity, and whether the organiser would provide the floor plan of the venues. Moreover, she considered that the printing of 900 A2-sized posters for the activity was not in line with the paperless trend. She was also doubtful whether all posters could be put up and hoped that the organiser could further explain. She continued enquiring that for such a large-scale activity, whether the volunteers included first-aiders. Besides, as 50 flags with flag poles would be used in the activity, she would like to know whether those items would be reused. She also wanted to know whether the organiser would practise waste separation and recycling at the activity. Finally, she was also concerned about the cleaning of venues after the activity.

301. The Chairman said the Secretariat would ask the applicant organisation for the details

after the meeting. He asked Members whether they needed to be informed of the arrangements of all issues mentioned above before vetting the funding application. The Council could also approve the application by circulation, or choose to allocate the funding first with certain conditions imposed, such as requesting for reducing the number of posters for the activity, requesting for reusing the flag poles in the future and requiring for the presence of first-aiders at the venues.

302. Mr Stanley HO said Gongfu Tea (功夫茶 in Chinese) was a very important part of the Chinese tea culture, however, it was written as “工夫茶” in the paper, he hoped that the relevant unit would pay attention to their own traditional culture. Secondly, he asked the organiser to clearly explain why the activity was scheduled for February because the last activity was held in November 2018, and one of the most important activities in the Chiu Chow culture was the Yu Lan Festival which was usually held in the seventh lunar month. Therefore, he considered it more appropriate to promote the Chiu Chow culture during that period of time. Thirdly, he would like to know the groups and units included in Item 23 “Subsidies for Performing Groups”. According to his understanding, the Chiu Chow culture consisted of many activities, he enquired whether there were other performances relevant to the Chiu Chow culture in addition to bamboo pipes.

303. Mr WONG Shui-sang said “Chiu Chow Cultural Festival” was not equivalent to Yu Lan Festival. “Chiu Chow Cultural Festival” was held at the beginning of each year at the temple entrance, the contents included lions and Pixiu, etc., of Chiu Chow, to demonstrate the festive atmosphere of the ethnic group; while Yu Lan Festival focused on ritual performances of Chinese Opera.

304. Mr Stanley HO said he only suggested holding “Chiu Chow Cultural Festival” in the seventh lunar month. Besides, he would like to know why the organiser had chosen to hold the activity in February.

305. Mr WONG Shui-sang reiterated that “Chiu Chow Cultural Festival” was not equivalent to Yu Lan Festival. Yu Lan Festival was held at the end of the year and the major content was ritual performances of Chinese Opera; while “Chiu Chow Cultural Festival” mainly showcased the traditional culture of the Chiu Chow population, including dragon/lion dance and performance on fish catching, etc.

306. Ms Debby CHAN said she had no strong view on the date of activity, her concern was whether resources were used appropriately. After comparing the two funding applications, she discovered that even for the same item, the amount of subsidy applied under “Chiu Chow Cultural Festival” was higher than that of “Lunar New Year Lion Dance Gala”. For example, the total amount of rental fee of the stage and the production and design of the cover and

backdrop of the stage nearly doubled that of “Lunar New Year Lion Dance Gala”, the price of the public liability insurance was also higher. She hoped that the organiser could provide an explanation on this. Besides, she asked how the amount of \$70,000 was calculated given that the number of persons to be subsidised under the subsidies for performing groups was yet to be confirmed. Furthermore, she considered that the activity should be held in a more environmentally friendly way, for example, by reducing the use of paper, etc. She also noted that mineral water was included in the funding application. Since the promotion on stop purchasing bottled water had all along been carrying out in the community, she considered it unreasonable if SKDC approved funding for purchasing bottled water. Coupled with the fact that the Conservancy Association was one of the co-organisers, she suggested reducing the amount of funding allocated to bottled water and paper; for other items, further explanation was required. Finally, she would like to know what materials were used for producing the banners.

307. The Chairman clarified that the applicant organisation had not applied for DC Fund to purchase bottled water; however, the Council would still suggest them not to use bottled water. The Secretariat would consolidate the questions raised by Members and asked the applicant organisation to provide information, in particular whether there was room for reducing the amount of subsidy it applied. After that, the Secretariat would seek the views of Members by circulation.

308. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan would like to know the sizes of the easy-mount frames under Item 20 and the boards for introducing the culture concerned under Item 21. Given that the cost of making one easy-mount frame in the market was about \$200, if the easy-mount frames of the organiser were of normal size, she considered the price too expensive.

309. The Vice-Chairman said the circumstances of “Chiu Chow Cultural Festival” was different from that of “Lunar New Year Lion Dance Gala”. “Chiu Chow Cultural Festival” was recommended by the Working Group on Arts and Cultural Activities under the last-term FAC. It was an activity similar to an arts and cultural festival consisting of different items, some of which would invite district groups to be the co-hosts. Other co-organisers included SKDC and SKDO. Given that most Members of the Working Group of the last-term were not present at the meeting, the Council might have more queries on the issue. The Secretariat would invite the organisation to provide more information for circulation.

310. Mr CHAN Wai-lit enquired whether the expenses on producing the easy-mount frames and boards for introducing the culture included the design fees.

311. The Chairman said, in his experience, the design fees would usually be included in such expenses. He suggested vetting and approving the funding by circulation after the unit concerned had provided the relevant information.

312. The Chairman invited Members to decide whether to use their discretion to approve holding of the “Chiu Chow Cultural Festival” on 23 February first.

313. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the Council had no in principle objection to the holding of the activity on 23 February, but this did not represent that the funding application was approved.

314. The Chairman continued that as the current financial year would end soon, at the special meeting to be held on 16 January, the funding applications for other activities would also be vetted. Among which were the funding applications of several DC activities, including “Updating of SKDC Copper Name Plates”, “Photo-shooting for Members”, “Green Stall at the Hong Kong Flower Show 2020”, “Web Hosting and Maintenance of Travel in Sai Kung”, “Appreciation of Local Personalities Scheme” and “District Councils Challenge Cup of Standard Chartered Hong Kong Marathon 2020”. The Chairman asked the Secretary to prepare the relevant funding applications.

315. The Chairman said in the past, only a list that summarised all funding applications would be uploaded onto the webpage of SKDC before the meeting. He invited Members to decide whether or not to upload the funding application forms, with all personal particular of the applicant covered, onto the webpage at the same time. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the suggestion was endorsed. The funding application forms needed not be attached to the email any more in the future.

III. Any Other Business

(A) Eastern Harbour Tunnel User Liaison Group

316. The Chairman said the operator of the Eastern Harbour Tunnel had always been enhancing communication with users through the Eastern Harbour Tunnel User Liaison Group. The operator now invited the Council to nominate a representative to serve as a member of the new-term Liaison Group with tenure until 6 August 2022. The Chairman invited Members to make nominations.

317. Mr LAI Ming-chak nominated Mr Frankie LAM, and the nomination was seconded by Mr Gary FAN.

318. Mr Frankie LAM accepted the nomination.

319. The Chairman hoped that the elected Member could take relevant information back to SKDC for other Members' reference, especially about Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, which would be commissioned during the tenure of the current-term SKDC.

320. There being no other nomination, the Chairman declared that Mr Frankie LAM would represent SKDC to serve as a member of the Eastern Harbour Tunnel User Liaison Group. He asked Mr Frankie LAM to reserve time to attend the meeting of the Liaison Group to be held on 10 January 2020 at 3:00 p.m. The Secretariat would provide detailed information after the meeting.

321. Mr Frankie LAM said as he would be outside Hong Kong on 10 January, he was unable to attend the meeting.

322. The Chairman suggested asking the Liaison Group whether another Member could attend the above meeting on behalf of Mr Frankie LAM. If not, Members would have to elect another candidate.

323. Ms Christine FONG said as TKO-LTT would be toll-free and would connect with the Eastern Harbour Tunnel, she suggested that Mr Chris CHEUNG should attend the meeting on behalf of Mr Frankie LAM. She pointed out that the meeting of the Liaison Group would only be held once a year, no matter who would represent the Council to attend the meeting, the Member must report the matters discussed at the meeting to the Council.

324. Mr Chris CHEUNG said he was able to attend the above meeting.

325. Mr LAI Ming-chak said the Council first needed to consider whether the Liaison Group allowed another Member to attend the meeting on 10 January on behalf of Mr Frankie LAM. Otherwise, he would like to nominate Mr Brandon Kenneth YIP to serve as a member of the Liaison Group on behalf of SKDC because he was the Convenor of the Working Group on Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, the Cross Bay Link, New Government Buildings.

326. Mr Chris CHEUNG said in response to the suggestion of Mr LAI Ming-chak, he would withdraw from the election. However, as the meeting would follow up closely on the issues of the last term, he would like to remind the Member who would attend the meeting to understand more about those issues before attending the meeting. He also pointed out that the connection point of the works was also very important.

327. The Vice-Chairman said he could further exchange views with the Member who would attend the meeting of the Liaison Group after the present meeting, it was because members of the Liaison Group needed to take the initiative to raise issues for discussion in general.

328. The Chairman said the Member could also take the opportunity to meet other members of the Liaison Group. He also reminded the Member to provide the contact details to the Secretariat as it might be necessary to contact them in the future.

329. Mr Brandon Kenneth YIP said he needed more time for further consideration.

330. The Chairman suggested Mr Chris CHEUNG to represent SKDC to serve as a member of the Liaison Group if Mr Brandon Kenneth YIP needed more time for consideration. There being no objection from Members, the suggestion was endorsed. He asked the Secretariat to follow up.

IV. Date of Next Meeting

331. The Chairman said the Council just endorsed that the first meetings of Committees would be convened on 16 January to elect the respective Chairman and Vice-Chairman. He suggested convening the first special meeting of SKDC in 2020 immediate after the meetings of Committees on that day. The Secretariat would send the agenda of the special meeting to Members later. The items to be discussed included discussion and endorsement of the proposed time-table of full council and Committee meetings of SKDC for 2020, review of the SKDC Standing Orders and the operation of SKDC, approval of funding applications, etc.

332. The Chairman continued that as the next meeting would be a special meeting and many items were to be discussed, he suggested no discussion item put forward by other government departments would be discussed in that meeting.

333. Mr Gary FAN said at the meeting on 16 January, although it was necessary to elect the Chairman of Committees and there were a lot of issues to be handled, as SKDC had not convened any meeting since the District Council Ordinary Election last year, he still hoped that arrangement could be made for the government departments concerned to send representatives to attend the special meeting to give a verbal report on the issues of concerns to SKDC, including the progress of the major infrastructure projects in the district, e.g. Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel and the Cross Bay Link, the Hiram’s Highway Improvement Project, and the bus-bus interchange at Tseung Kwan O Tunnel, etc., for Members’ information. Secondly, he also hoped that there would be discussion on the police brutality problem highly concerned by the city. As he was unable to know how the Police could infringe on human rights without limit during law enforcement, and that not all Members would join the Working Group on the Incident Relating to the Opposition to the Proposed Legislative Amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, he hoped that SKDC could invite the Police to send representative to explain the problem of law enforcement operations in the past. Thirdly, given that Tuen Mun

Hospital had admitted patients who came from Wuhan and suspected to be infected with COVID-19, and there were also suspected cases in Tseung Kwan O Hospital, in consideration of the public hygiene in the district, he hoped that the Hospital Authority (HA) and the Food and Health Bureau would send representatives to give an account of the latest situation.

334. The Chairman said Mr Gary FAN had put forward three issues which he hoped could be discussed at the special meeting to be held on 16 January. Given that SKDC had suspended its operation since October 2019, if the above issues would not be discussed until March, it would mean that there would be no update on the progress of such issues for half a year. If Members agreed, he suggested inviting the departments concerned to attend the special meeting to give explanation on the above-mentioned issues that needed to be handled urgently. At the special meeting, he would ask the departments that accepted the invitation and attended the meeting to give an account of the relevant issues first, and then handle other agenda items, including the meeting time-table, SKDC Standing Orders and the operation of the Council, etc.

335. Ms Christine FONG said in addition to the three infrastructure projects mentioned by Members, the progress of the Town Park in Tseung Kwan O South was also a pressing issue. She hoped that the departments concerned could give an oral report on it at the special meeting. Secondly, she considered that apart from the spreading of virus detected in the Mainland, the University of Hong Kong also pointed out that infectious disease would also be transmitted via urinal bowls and toilet seats in public toilets. Given that there were many public toilets in the district, she hoped that discussion with HA on infectious disease could be held.

336. The Chairman said he considered it worthwhile to include the two items mentioned by Ms Christine FONG in the agenda of the special meeting, but as he understood, the prevention of infectious disease should be coordinated by the Department of Health. Moreover, although he agreed with including the above items in the meeting agenda, he also asked the Members who raised the items to submit the relevant meeting papers to the Secretariat before 7 January so that the items could be included in the agenda officially.

337. The Chairman asked Members to reserve time to attend the meeting to be held on 16 January. The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Sai Kung District Council Secretariat
February 2020