

**Sha Tin District Council**  
**Minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting of**  
**the Education and Welfare Committee in 2020**

**Date** : 10 September 2020 (Thursday)  
**Time** : 2:30 pm  
**Venue** : Sha Tin District Council Conference Room  
 4/F, Sha Tin Government Offices

<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Time of joining the meeting</u></b>	<b><u>Time of leaving the meeting</u></b>
Mr MAK Yun-pui, Chris (Chairman)	DC Member	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr LO Tak-ming (Vice-Chairman)	"	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH	DC Chairman	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr WONG Hok-lai, George	DC Vice-Chairman	2:45 pm	4:05 pm
Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	DC Member	2:30 pm	3:43 pm
Mr CHAN Nok-hang	"	2:47pm	4:40 pm
Mr CHAN Pui-ming	"	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr CHAN Wan-tung	"	3:27 pm	4:40 pm
Mr CHENG Chung-hang	"	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa	"	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr CHIU Chu-pong	"	2:30 pm	3:45 pm
Mr CHOW Hiu-laam, Felix	"	2:30 pm	4:30 pm
Mr CHUNG Lai-him, Johnny	"	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr HUI Lap-san	"	2:45 pm	4:40 pm
Mr HUI Yui-yu	"	2:47 pm	3:30 pm
Mr LAI Tsz-yan	"	4:28 pm	4:40 pm
Dr LAM Kong-kwan	"	2:42 pm	4:27 pm
Mr LI Chi-wang, Raymond	"	2:36 pm	4:40 pm
Mr LI Sai-hung	"	2:30 pm	3:00 pm
Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson	"	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr LIAO Pak-hong, Ricardo	"	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr LO Yuet-chau	"	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Ms LUK Tsz-tung	"	2:32 pm	4:40 pm
Mr MAK Tsz-kin	"	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS	"	2:45 pm	3:30 pm
Mr NG Kam-hung	"	2:42 pm	3:30 pm
Ms NG Ting-lam	"	2:54 pm	4:40 pm
Mr SHAM Tsz-kit, Jimmy	"	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr SHEK William	"	2:50 pm	4:40 pm
Mr SIN Cheuk-nam	"	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	"	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr WONG Ho-fung	"	2:45 pm	4:05 pm
Ms WONG Man-huen	"	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr YAU Man-chun	"	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr YIP Wing	"	2:37 pm	3:30 pm
Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael	"	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Ms YU Wai-ting, Amy (Secretary)	Executive Officer (District Council) 1, Sha Tin District Office		

**In Attendance**

Mr LIU Hon-wah, Andy  
 Ms LAI Wai-man, Irene  
 Ms YEW Suet-yi, Mary  
 Ms CHAN Yee-chi, Elaine  
 Ms CHIANG lam  
 Ms WONG Yee-wah, Eva  
 Ms NG Suk-min  
 Ms CHENG Siu-ling  
 Mr YUEN Chun-kit, Derek

**Title**

Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1,  
 Social Welfare Department  
 Senior Executive Officer (Planning) Management,  
 Social Welfare Department  
 Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Shatin)3,  
 Social Welfare Department  
 Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Shatin)2,  
 Social Welfare Department  
 Senior School Development Officer (Shatin)5,  
 Education Bureau  
 Housing Manager (Tai Po, North and Shatin 11),  
 Housing Department  
 Senior Liaison Officer (East),  
 Sha Tin District Office  
 Chief Liaison Officer,  
 Sha Tin District Office  
 Senior Executive Officer (District Council),  
 Sha Tin District Office

**Absent**

Mr CHENG Tsuk-man  
 Mr TING Tsz-yuen  
 Mr LUI Kai-wing  
 Mr TSANG Kit  
 Mr YEUNG Sze-kin

**Title**

DC Member (Application for leave of absence received)  
 ” ( ” )  
 ” ( ” )  
 ” (No application for leave of absence received)  
 ” ( ” )

**Action****Welcome Message**

The Chairman welcomed Members and representatives of government departments to the fifth meeting of the Education and Welfare Committee this year. He congratulated Mr HUI Lap-san on his birthday, as well as Mr CHIU Chu-pong on obtaining the professional qualification for social worker.

**Application for Leave of Absence**

2. The Chairman said that applications for leave of absence in writing had been received from the following members:

Mr CHENG Tsuk-man	Sickness
Mr TING Tsz-yuen	”
Mr LUI Kai-wing	”

3. Members unanimously approved the applications for leave of absence submitted by the members above.

**Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 9 July 2020**  
(EWC Minutes 5/2020)

4. Members unanimously confirmed the minutes of the meeting above.

**Discussion Items**

Membership Lists of the Working Groups under the Committee  
(Paper No. EW 14/2020)

5. Members unanimously endorsed the above paper.

Purchase of Premises for the Provision of Welfare Facilities  
(Paper No. EW 15/2020)

6. Mr Andy LIU, Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 1 of the Social Welfare Department (SWD) introduced the contents of the paper.

7. The views of Mr Michael YUNG were summarised below:

- (a) he opined that the Paper failed to let Members understand the problems of different areas of Sha Tin. The Department needed to consider the needs of different areas when setting up welfare facilities such as Integrated Family Services Centre (IFSC), Child Care Centre (CCC). He hoped that the Department would provide after the meeting the information on the locations of the future IFSCs and CCCs in the district, the standard area of such facilities and of which IFSCs the areas were currently below standard;
- (b) he asked which area lacked Day Care Centres for the Elderly (DEs) and the area of the DEs. Moreover, he wanted to know the locations of the new DEs and Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Services Centres (IVRSCs) set up by the Department under the premises purchase programme;
- (c) he asked the Department, Youth Outreaching Social Work Team (YOTs) of which area they would purchase premises for and whether they would consider purchasing a car parking space. He also asked about the location of the District Support Centre for Persons with Disabilities (DSC) set up under the programme; and
- (d) the Department should timely conduct local consultation on the purchase of premises for welfare facilities to avoid public opposition.

8. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

- (a) the Paper stated that the Department was going to purchase 14 premises for the provision of welfare facilities in Sha Tin District. He asked how this figure was come up with and whether it was based on current or future needs;
- (b) a Complex would be set up in Tai Wai and tenants of Chun Yeung Estate and Yan On Estate Phase 2 were gradually moving in. He asked whether the Department considered using government land to provide more welfare facilities;
- (c) he asked why the Department planned an IFSC with a below-standard area and whether the service area would be reallocated in future; and

- (d) he cited 23 Hang Tai Road, Ma On Shan as an example, saying that a number of pieces of government land were under short-term lease but such land was not fully utilised. He suggested resuming those land for welfare use.

9. The views of Mr SIN Cheuk-nam were summarised below:

- (a) he believed that the Department would refuse to tell the locations of the welfare facilities as the Department was afraid of affecting property prices, but he hoped that the Department could fully consult residents and stakeholders nearby before establishing the welfare facilities; and
- (b) he asked at what stage the Department would commence consultation on the welfare facilities.

10. The views of Mr Wilson LI were summarised below:

- (a) regarding the 200 places of CCC services under the premises purchase programme, he asked about the age group of the service targets. Moreover, he urged the Department to allocate more resources to provide nursing home places for elderly in need; and
- (b) the Support Centre for Persons with Autism in Wo Che Estate was not the permanent site of the organisation and he asked when the lease would expire. Apart from a permanent site, he hoped that the Department could enhance support to organisations which provided services for persons with autism and increase the ratio of care workers.

11. The responses of Mr Andy LIU were summarised as follows:

- (a) in view of the ever-changing property market, if the information was disclosed and consultation was conducted before purchase of the premises, this might affect the prices and the premises might be bought by other buyers;
- (b) the areas of welfare facilities were based on the respective “Schedules of Accommodation”. The required internal floor areas of CCC, DE and IFSC were 689, 537 and 589 square metres respectively. If the “Schedules of Accommodation” were amended later, the Department would ensure that the areas of the planned welfare facilities would comply with the latest standards;
- (c) the proposed welfare facilities under the premises purchase programme were highly needed. It was believed that not much opposition would arise. The Department would be more careful in purchase of premises. For example, they would try to purchase premises on ground floor as far as practicable; and
- (d) the SWD planned to provide about 200 full-time places for infants aged 3 or below in the two proposed CCCs in the district. On the other hand, as Residential Care Homes for the Elderly (RCHE) required a larger area with more stringent technical and layout requirements, the SWD would, through mid- and long-term strategy, adopt a multi-pronged approach to include the RCHE as purpose-built premises in different development projects, such as Government,

Institution or Community sites, Public Rental Housing (PRH) Estates, private developments, Urban Renewal programme, Land Sale Programme, “Special Scheme on Privately Owned Sites for Welfare Uses”, etc.

12. Ms Elaine CHAN, Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Shatin)<sup>2</sup> of the SWD said that the Department had re-delineated the service area of IFSCs in view of the completion of new PRH estates. The Department would continue to review the services and flexibly deploy manpower to cope with the local needs for various services.

13. The Vice-Chairman repeated the question of Mr Michael YUNG on which IFSCs and Neighborhood Elderly Centres (NEC) had an area below standard. Besides, he asked whether the current IFSCs would continue to provide services after new offices started operation.

14. The Chairman asked which non-governmental organisations (NGOs) lacked spaces in their premises.

15. Mr Andy LIU said that the Department would identify suitable premises for two local NECs run by NGOs with an area below standard for setting up new branches. The Department would timely inform the NGOs of the arrangements. The locations would be set up as close as possible to their current locations. If the locations of the two centers were disclosed before purchase, this might affect purchase prices.

16. The Chairman said that many NGOs providing welfare services in the district were facing the problem of a lack of space. He hoped that the Department could provide the information on which NGOs required expansion after the meeting, so that members could help identify suitable locations for them and communicate with the Department.

17. Mr Michael YUNG said that he might submit a question if the Department did not answer his question.

18. The views of Ms WONG Man-huen were summarised below:

- (a) the Department did not mention in the Paper the reason for purchasing 14 welfare facilities under the premises purchase programme, as well as the figures on the waiting lists of elderly and child care services. She hoped that the Department could provide more information;
- (b) she asked about the respective number of new service centres of NGOs and new offices among the 14 new welfare facilities;
- (c) the Paper pointed out that the Government would purchase three elderly services facilities and two CCCs. She asked whether the new facilities could cope with local social welfare needs and whether the Department would re-delineate the service areas of different types of social welfare services; and
- (d) she asked why a premise needed to be purchased for a Cyber Youth Support Team (CYST) to set up a permanent site.

19. The views of Mr Ricardo LIAO were summarised below:

- (a) the population of his Kwong Hong constituency was ageing and many residents required social welfare assistance. He pointed out that residents of Kwong Hong needed to seek help from the IFSC in Heng On Estate, Ma On Shan which was distant and time-consuming. He asked whether the Department would re-delineate service areas of IFSCs or consider provision of outreach assistance; and
- (b) he suggested that the Department should provide new social welfare facilities such as IFSCs, etc. in Siu Lek Yuen to cope with the community and population development of Shing Mun River East, Sha Tin.

20. The views of Mr Johnny CHUNG were summarised below:

- (a) he asked the department about the number of beneficiaries of each social welfare services unit in the district and the increase in total beneficiaries after the welfare facilities purchased commenced services. He also asked how many years the welfare facilities could cater the need of the district; and
- (b) he said that a CYST required premises to provide counselling services and organise group activities. He asked whether the new location purchased for outreach services would also provide services to other districts such as North District, Tai Po, etc. Moreover, he asked the Department whether they had asked the service units if a bigger proportion of their cases had to be followed up in the centre.

21. Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa said that the Government would spend \$20 billion on purchasing 158 welfare facilities in 3 years. He asked how much funding was involved in the 14 facilities in Sha Tin. He asked whether owners would raise the prices as the buyer was the Government and whether the Government set up an upper limit of purchase prices. Moreover, he opined that the Department should adjust the amount of subsidies to social welfare organisations so that they could employ more manpower and help more persons in need.

22. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) if a YOT could contact youngsters in need online, they should encourage the youngsters to go to the centre in person to communicate with social workers. Moreover, the Lump Sum Grant Subvention System (LSGSS) of the SWD made the subsidised organisations spending much effort on “meeting quota” or deploying outreach staff to take care of other work;
- (b) he said that a number of NGOs set up their service centres in industrial buildings. He suggested that the Department should avoid choosing industrial buildings or remote commercial buildings as locations of welfare facilities; and
- (c) residents of Ma On Shan needed to go to the Social Security Field Unit in Yu Chui Shopping Centre which was inconvenient. He suggested that the Department could modify a vacant local school into welfare facilities.

23. The responses of Mr Andy LIU were summarised as follows:

- (a) the CYST required a suitable location so that social workers could contact their service targets in person to provide support and counselling;
- (b) among the 14 welfare facilities under the premises purchase programme, six were new service units, including two CCCs, one DE, one Special Child Care Centre (SCCC), one DSC and one IVRSC, while the remaining eight were offices or permanent locations of current service units;
- (c) a committee formed by professional surveyors of different grades of the Government Property Agency determined the maximum acceptable prices for suitable premises each year based on prevailing mechanism. The premises to be purchased must not exceed the maximum acceptable prices at that time to ensure the property prices were reasonable and in line with market prices. Therefore, if an owner proposed a price which was higher than the maximum acceptable price, the Government would not purchase that premises;
- (d) the Planning Department reviewed vacant school lots based on a central allocation mechanism. If there was a suitable vacant school lot which would serve government, institutional or community use in the long run, the SWD would proactively review whether the lot was suitable for use as welfare facilities, subject to the Government's priority in land use. The factors of consideration included location, accessibility, available floor area and compatibility with the needs of the proposed welfare facilities; and
- (e) the SWD was currently modifying 3 vacant schools in Tuen Mun, Sai Kung and Tai Po into welfare facilities. According to relevant experience, the modification works took five years or even longer. The premises purchase programme was a short-term measure and the first batch of premises were expected to be purchased in the first quarter of 2021 for prompt provision to cope with the pressing needs of welfare facilities.

24. The Chairman stressed that the Department not only had to increase the number of welfare facilities, they also had to ensure the social welfare organisations providing the services engaged sufficient manpower to cope with service needs.

25. The Vice-Chairman opined that the re-delineation of service areas of IFSCs were not satisfactory. Those residing in Shui Chuen O Estate needed to go to Shatin (North) Integrated Family Service Centre in Wo Che Estate, while those residing in Kwong Yuen Estate and Shek Mun Estate had to go to the IFSC at Hang Hong Street, Ma On Shan. Considering that the Department would set up another IFSC, he hoped that the Department would update the service areas in the district.

26. Mr CHING Cheung-ying agreed that the Government should make use of vacant school lots by modifying them into welfare facilities to cope with the problem of insufficient space. He opined that it was too long to spend at least 5 years on modifying a school and wanted to know the reasons. Moreover, he supported that the Department purchased premises so that space could be promptly provided for the pressing need for social welfare services. He opined that this should be prioritised over the office use or backup use. He also hoped that the welfare policy of

the Government could be more forward-looking and arrange the necessary social welfare units before the intake of new residential buildings and subsidised housing.

27. The views of Mr Jimmy SHAM were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that the committee on the Government's premises purchase programme did not include civil servants, the oversight function was limited, while property prices in Hong Kong were unreasonably high. As what Mr CHING Cheung-ying said, the Department lacked vision in their policy and should plan in advance the welfare facilities to be provided before establishing a community;
- (b) the Department mentioned in the Paper that a SCCC premises would be purchased in the district. He asked for the specific type of needs of the children and whether accommodation facilities were available;
- (c) residents had varied views on the establishment of different welfare facilities. He hoped that the Department could promptly inform Members of the respective constituencies after confirming the locations of the welfare facilities, including the SCCC, etc.;
- (d) in view of insufficient space of some social welfare organisations, the Department should seek comment from them before identifying a location of new office. He opined that it was not necessary to set up a branch near to the existing centre; and
- (e) he pointed out that a number of welfare facilities required extra storage space for hygienic and anti-epidemic gear and for their staff to put on the related gear, such as a changing room for protective clothing. He suggested that the Department should reserve a larger space for welfare facilities in need when purchasing the premises.

28. Mr LO Yuet-chau opined that the Government did not provide sufficient support on inclusive education. Apart from autism, many students suffered from attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and dyslexia, but the Government only provided assistance at schools, but not in communities. He continued that as teaching materials of schools in the district were not shared, he suggested that the Department set up an educational support centre for inclusive education to centrally manage the resources and help the students in need of the district.

29. The Chairman pointed out that the Secretariat expected the meeting to end within two hours.

30. Mr CHENG Chung-hang opined that the information in the Paper was not detailed and asked the Department when the premises purchase programme was targeted to be completed and in which year the 14 new welfare facilities in the district could commence services. Besides, he asked what figures were based on in deciding the number of premises to be purchased and whether such programme could alleviate the pressure on social welfare services.



31. The responses of Mr Andy LIU were summarised as follows:

- (a) the SWD had been maintaining close communication with the Housing Department (HD) to comprehensively look into the feasibility of providing suitable welfare facilities in development projects at the early planning stage of public housing developments or redevelopment. For example, welfare facilities were provided in Shek Mun Estate Phase II;
- (b) planning work of modification of vacant schools was more difficult than expected. For example, multiple rounds of discussion with owners' corporations and multiple changes to design were required to obtain support from owners' corporations. The planning and implementation easily took five years or longer. Compared to the time required for purchasing premises, the SWD expected that the first batch of properties would be purchased in the first quarter of 2021 at the earliest;
- (c) the new SCCC would not provide accommodation services. He thanked Mr Jimmy SHAM for his views and would relay his views to related personnel;
- (d) paragraph 9 of the Paper mentioned that the Government would purchase the first batch of properties in the first quarter of 2021 at the earliest. Considering the time required for transaction and interior renovation, the Department estimated that the first batch and the last batch of purchased premises could provide services in the year 2021/22 and year 2024/25 at the earliest respectively; and
- (e) the SWD considered various factors when planning welfare facilities in different districts, including new day services urgently needed, existing welfare facilities that did not have enough space or had to be relocated, situation in various districts, preliminary assessment of premises suitable for use, number of planned welfare facilities in the designated area, etc. As these factors varied among different districts, the proposed welfare facilities were different. In order to solve the problem of insufficient welfare facilities, apart from prompt provision through the premises purchase programme, the SWD also added appropriate welfare facilities in different types of developments in a multi-pronged approach in long- and mid-term strategies.

32. The views of Mr Johnny CHUNG were summarised below:

- (a) he hoped that the Department could provide information on the increase on beneficiaries after the completion of welfare facilities for comparison after the meeting; and
- (b) he asked how to delineate service areas of CYSTs. If cases mostly concentrated in areas like Sheung Shui or Fanling, setting up a physical office in Sha Tin might not be the best choice.

33. Mr SIN Cheuk-nam said that the SWD should not expect residents to welcome new welfare facilities. When Day Activity Centres were set up in the community, residents also had misunderstanding. If the SWD failed in preliminary lobbying and consultation, it might "do bad deeds out of good intentions". He pointed out that apart from the Members of the respective

constituencies, the Department should also attend residents' meetings to listen to residents' views.

34. The views of Mr Michael YUNG were summarised below:

- (a) he considered that the role of the SWD was passive. Although the HD provided the space for welfare facilities, the funding application on construction, etc. was made by the SWD to the relevant committees of the Legislative Council. Also, a public housing development had to be large enough to provide space for SWD to establish welfare facilities; and
- (b) he hoped that the Department could promptly communicate with the Sha Tin District Council when they were aware of a new housing development. The SWD should inform of which welfare facilities in the district the area was below standards or service had to be extended, so that Members could raise relevant suggestions to the HD.

35. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

- (a) he asked whether the Government would purchase more premises for welfare use if there was remaining balance of the \$20 billion fund after purchasing 158 welfare facilities under the premises purchase programme;
- (b) if facilities or fittings of the properties to be purchased, such as ventilation system and barrier-free facilities, were inadequate, he asked whether the Department required to undertake the costs of installation and maintenance of such facilities; and
- (c) as the current economy worsened, he asked whether the Government would consider buying back properties of the Link REIT such as shopping centers and modifying them into welfare facilities.

36. Mr LO Yuet-chau said that the formal name of the educational support centre for inclusive education he mentioned just now should be Special Education Resource Centre and pointed out that the Department had not answered his question.

37. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) many members considered the premises purchase programme as a remedial measure and the Government should roll out a forward-looking plan to cope with the demand for social welfare services brought by the increase in population in the district. He opined that the SWD should review its social welfare planning and increase the number of welfare facility and practitioner of the sector;
- (b) he stressed that LSGSS of the Department caused much pressure on the frontline staff of welfare organisations. Apart from the services originally provided by the organisations, they needed to also provide services of the Department to the public; and

- (c) the Department should “visit districts” more to understand public views on welfare services. Moreover, he opined that the geographical locations of many vacant schools were good and hoped that the Department could proactively consider modifying them into welfare facilities.

38. The responses of Mr Andy LIU were summarised as follows:

- (a) regarding setting up welfare facilities in public housing developments of the Housing Authority (HA), expenditure on each works project not exceeding \$30 million would be settled by Capital Works Reserve Fund Block Allocation;
- (b) based on his understanding, the HD would generally consult the District Councils on new PRH developments. When considering whether to include proposed community facilities (including welfare facilities) in new PRH developments, the HD considered a number of factors including restrictions on individual lots, demand for different community facilities, etc. The SWD had been maintaining good communication with the HD to comprehensively look into the feasibility of providing suitable welfare facilities in developments at preliminary planning stage;
- (c) the SWD made good use of funds to purchase as many premises as possible to provide more welfare facilities. The 158 welfare facilities would be purchased first. When identifying suitable properties for welfare facilities, the Government would avoid aged and poorly-maintained properties;
- (d) based on his understanding, if Link REIT sold the retail properties divested by the HA, the sale was subject to the restriction of the transaction agreement, under which the Link REIT could not divest the stores separately. Therefore, the chance of purchasing premises from the Link REIT was rather small; and
- (e) he noted the views of the Chairman. The SWD reviewed from time to time the vacant school lots in the district. If there was a suitable vacant school lot which would serve government, institution or community use in the long run, the SWD would proactively look into whether the lot could be modified into welfare facilities, subject to priority of government use.

39. Ms Mary YEW, Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Shatin)<sup>3</sup> of the SWD noted the views of Mr LO Yuet-chau and the Department understood that children with special education needs and their parents faced different challenges. The Department would provide them with required support.

### **Information Paper**

Number of Children Referred to Public Sector Primary and Secondary Schools in Sha Tin District Provided by the Education Bureau  
(Paper No. EW 16/2020)

40. Mr CHAN Pui-ming said that the Immigration Department gradually allowed single-way permit holders to return to Hong Kong since 8 June this year. In view of COVID-19, cross-boundary students (CBS) unavoidably met some learning difficulties. He asked what support

the Sha Tin District Office (STDO) and the Education Bureau (EDB) would provide.

41. Mr Ricardo LIAO quoted from the Paper that 10 newly-arrived children from mainland were enrolled at the secondary or primary schools in the district, while 36 returned or moved into Sha Tin in July this year. He asked whether the EDB could provide figures on CBS in the district. Moreover, he quoted from newspapers that teachers were forced by schools to undergo COVID-19 testing.

42. The responses of Ms CHIANG lam, Senior School Development Officer (Shatin)<sup>5</sup> of the EDB were summarised as follows:

- (a) the figures on the Paper were up to July this year and the Bureau had been receiving enquiries and applications of children transferring to school in the district from August till now. The Bureau would update the figures in the next meeting;
- (b) the Paper mentioned that newly-arrived children applied for a school place after they arrived Hong Kong and then the Bureau arranged them to enroll at secondary or primary schools in the district. Besides, the Government arranged CBS to resume classes in Hong Kong as early as June this year. The Bureau would announce the latest arrangements later; and
- (c) regarding the articles mentioned by Mr Ricardo LIAO, she said she needed further information as the Bureau did not force teaching staff to undergo COVID-19 test.

43. The Chairman asked the EDB to provide the information of August related to the Paper for Members' reference as soon as possible.

(Post-meeting note: EDB provided the number of children referred to public sector primary and secondary schools in Sha Tin District in August 2020 via email on 29 September this year.)

44. Ms CHENG Siu-ling, Chief Liaison Officer of the STDO replied that the SWD and social welfare organisations in the district had been providing services for newly-arrived persons while STDO organised community engagement activities and encouraged them to join to help them integrate into the community.

45. Mr Ricardo LIAO said that a kindergarten teacher sought help from him that his school requested teachers to undergo COVID-19 testing. He opined that the request of the school was unreasonable and violated others' rights. Even the test result was negative, this did not mean that the person would not get infected. He hoped that the Bureau would follow up.

46. The Chairman asked the EDB to learn about the situation and follow up with the organisation of school principals when necessary.

**Date of Next Meeting**

47. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 2:30 pm on 5 November 2020 (Thursday).
48. The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 pm.

Sha Tin District Council Secretariat  
STDC 13/15/35

November 2020