

Minutes of the 21st Meeting of  
the Fourth-term Wong Tai Sin District Council  
of the HKSAR

Date: 17 March 2015 (Tuesday)  
Time: 2:30 p.m.  
Venue: Conference Room, Wong Tai Sin District Council  
6/F Lung Cheung Office Block  
138 Lung Cheung Road  
Wong Tai Sin, Kowloon

Present:

Chairman:

Mr. LI Tak-hong, MH, JP

Vice-chairman:

Dr. WONG Kam-chiu, MH

Wong Tai Sin District Council (WTSDC) Members:

Ms. CHAN Man-ki, Maggie, MH  
Mr. CHAN On-tai  
Mr. CHAN Wai-kwan, Andie  
Mr. CHAN Yim-kwong, Joe  
Hon. CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP  
Mr. HO Hon-man, MH  
Mr. HO Yin-fai  
Mr. HUI Kam-shing  
Mr. KAN Chi-ho, BBS, MH, JP  
Ms. KWOK Sau-ying  
Mr. LAI Wing-ho, Joe, MH  
Mr. LEE Tat-yan, BBS, MH  
Mr. MOK Chung-fai, Rex, MH, JP  
Mr. MOK Kin-wing  
Mr. SHUM Wan-wa, Dan  
Mr. SO Sik-kin  
Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy  
Ms. TAM Mei-po  
Mr. TING Chi-wai, Roy  
Mr. WONG Kam-chi, BBS, MH, JP  
Mr. WONG Kit-hin, Peter  
Mr. WONG Kwok-tung  
Dr. WONG Kwok-yan  
Mr. WONG Yat-yuk  
Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH  
Mr. YUEN Kwok-keung, Stephen

Absent with Apologies:

Mr. MOK Ying-fan WTSDC Member

In Attendance:

Mr. LAU Kong-wah, JP	Under Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs	CMAB	) Re.: ) Item III(i)
Miss LEUNG Wing-sum, Anna	Assistant Secretary (Constitutional and Mainland Affairs) 3C	CMAB	) )
Mr. CHOU Wing-ping, Frankie	Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-3	HyD	) Re.:
Mr. CHIN Ka-wai, Cameron	Senior Construction Engineer – Tunnels	MTRCL	) Item III(iii)
Mr. LI Wing-how, Francis	Senior Liaison Engineer	MTRCL	)
Ms. LAM Yuet-ching, Terry	Assistant Public Relations Manager –Projects and Property	MTRCL	) )
Mrs. CHOI MA On-ki, Angel, JP	District Officer (Wong Tai Sin)	WTSDO	
Mr. CHAU Cho-kei	District Commander (Wong Tai Sin)	HKPF	
Ms. Lily NG	District Social Welfare Officer (Wong Tai Sin/Sai Kung)	SWD	
Mr. WONG Hon-kit	Chief Manager/Management (Wong Tai Sin, Tsing Yi, Tsuen Wan and Islands)	HD	
Mr. YUNG Kin-man	Chief Engineer/Kowloon 4 (Kowloon)	CEDD	
Mr. CHOY Chik-sang, Mario	Chief Transport Officer/Kowloon	TD	
Ms. TANG Man-wah, Sylvia	Chief Leisure Manager (Kowloon)	LCSD	
Ms. CHEUNG Sui-chun, Syndia	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Wong Tai Sin)	FEHD	
Mr. LING Pak-ki, Ronald	Assistant District Officer (Wong Tai Sin)	WTSDO	
Mr. KWONG Wai-kin, Jimmy	Senior Executive Officer (District Management)	WTSDO	
Mr. TING Tin-sang	Senior Liaison Officer 1	WTSDO	
Ms. PANG Suk-wah, Phyllis	Senior Liaison Officer 2	WTSDO	
Ms. TANG Wai-lan, Cecilia	Executive Officer I (District Council)	WTSDO	

Secretary:

Miss LAM Wing-sze, Victoria Senior Executive Officer (District Council) WTSDO

## Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed all to the 21st meeting of WTSDC, in particular Mr. LAU Kong-wah, JP, Under Secretary and Miss LEUNG Wing-sum, Anna, Assistant Secretary of the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau (CMAB), to attend this meeting for agenda item III(i).

### I Confirmation of Minutes of the 20th Meeting of Wong Tai Sin District Council held on 6 January 2015

2. As there was no proposed amendment received before the meeting or raised by the Members present, the minutes were hereby confirmed without amendment.

### II Progress Report of the 20th Meeting of Wong Tai Sin District Council held on 6 January 2015 (WTSDC Paper No. 16/2015)

3. The Chairman drew Members' attention to paragraph 4 of the progress report regarding the follow-up on the inadequacy in medical services and facilities in Wong Tai Sin District, and pointed out that the Secretariat had received the reply made by the Food and Health Bureau (FHB) under the authorisation of the Chief Executive (CE) on 10 March 2015 and forwarded FHB's reply letter to all Members for perusal on the next day. The Chairman suggested Mr. YUEN Kwok-keung, Stephen, Chairman of the Task Force on Medical Facilities in Wong Tai Sin, continue to follow up on this issue and report to WTSDC after meeting FHB in mid-year. Members had no comment on the above suggestion and the content of the progress report. Mr. YUEN Kwok-keung, Stephen also agreed to follow up on this issue.

4. The Chairman asked the Secretary to report on the papers that had been distributed to Members by way of circulation for their reference after the last meeting. The Secretary indicated that two information papers had been circulated to Members as follows:

- (i) WTSDC Information Paper No. 14/2015 titled "Colorectal Cancer Screening Pilot Programme" submitted by the Department of Health; and
- (ii) WTSDC Information Paper No. 15/2015 titled "Proposed Increase in the Honorarium and New Provision for Duty Visits for District Council Members" submitted by the Home Affairs Department.

III(i) Consultation Document on the Method for Selecting the Chief Executive by Universal Suffrage  
(WTSDC Paper No. 17/2015)

5. The Chairman thanked Mr. LAU Kong-wah, JP, Under Secretary and Miss LEUNG Wing-sum, Anna, Assistant Secretary of the CMAB for exchanging views with WTSDC Members on constitutional reform.

6. The Chairman said that the Government had published the Consultation Document on the Method for Selecting the Chief Executive by Universal Suffrage on 7 January 2015. After receiving the document, the Secretariat had immediately forwarded it to all Members for reference, with a view to allowing sufficient time for them to study and submit their views to the Government by different means. Although the consultation period had ended on 7 March 2015, as what the Secretary for Justice had said earlier at the Kwai Tsing District Council meeting, different parties could still give their views on constitutional reform at any time after the end of the consultation period. He believed that Mr. LAU Kong-wah, JP attended this meeting for this purpose. He then invited Mr. LAU Kong-wah, JP to introduce the salient points of the captioned paper.

7. Mr. LAU Kong-wah, JP thanked WTSDC for providing him with an opportunity to exchange views with Members on the constitutional reform consultation document. First of all, he apologised for not visiting WTSDC to consult Members before the end of the consultation period, and explained that accommodations to the schedule had to be made since no meeting had been held in several District Councils (DCs) during the two-month consultation period. However, he emphasised that the Bureau would certainly collate and summarise the views collected at this meeting for inclusion in the report on the second round of consultation on constitutional reform. The resolution to be submitted to the Legislative Council (LegCo) soon was the third step of the constitutional development. Based on the experience from the previous two constitutional reforms, the success would hinge upon the stance of LegCo, i.e. the votes of 70 LegCo Members. In the meantime, the Government might not be able to secure enough votes in LegCo in support of the endorsement of the constitutional reform package. It would nevertheless race against time to continue working hard to promote constitutional reform. As DC Members maintained close contact with the community and members of the public, CMAB hoped that DC Members would work shoulder-to-shoulder with the Government to promote constitutional reform. As a matter of fact, CMAB had in the past listened to a lot of opinions and understood that there was much debate about universal suffrage in the society. He opined that it would currently be most important to put aside differences and disputes so that the aspiration of members of the public to “elect CE through one person, one vote” could be fulfilled.

(Mr. SHUM Wan-wa, Dan arrived at the meeting at 2:35 p.m.)

8. The Chairman thanked Mr. LAU Kong-wah, JP for the introduction and said that a number of Members and groups had already submitted their petitions to Mr. LAU before the meeting, while the submission of the East Kowloon District Residents' Committee (EKDRC) (Annex 1) had been distributed on table by the Secretariat. He then invited Dr. WONG Kam-chiu, MH, the Vice-chairman to present the submission on behalf of the EKDRC.

9. The Vice-chairman indicated that the EKDRC spared no effort in striving for the implementation of universal suffrage for the selection of CE in 2017, since it was the expectation of Hong Kong people to elect the CE through "one person, one vote". The EKDRC opined that Hong Kong should uphold the rule of law and therefore arrangements for the selection of CE by universal suffrage in 2017 should be in strict compliance with the Basic Law and the decision of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress (NPCSC) on issues relating to universal suffrage in 2007. Moreover, Hong Kong's constitutional development should not come to a standstill. Hence, the EKDRC agreed to the "pocket-it-first" package whereby universal suffrage for the selection of CE would first be implemented in 2017 and gradual improvement to the method for selecting CE would follow. Only in this way could there be genuine compliance with the principle of "gradual and orderly progress" for taking forward universal suffrage as set out in the Basic Law. The EKDRC hoped that the democratic development in Hong Kong would not be halted. Besides, the Government would also need to review the method for forming the nominating committee (NC) for CE election in each term so as to balance the interests of all strata of the society, including taking care of the needs of the underprivileged groups. The first step should be taken at present to elect the next CE through "one person, one vote". He added that if the constitutional reform package was vetoed, Hong Kong society would be torn further apart and the Government would experience more difficulty in policy implementation. To sum up, the NC should be formed in accordance with Article 45 of the Basic Law and NPCSC's 2007 decision and in compliance with the principles of being broadly represented and balanced participation, and with reference to the current provisions regarding the composition of the Election Committee (EC).

(Mr. CHAN Wai-kwan, Andie arrived at the meeting at 2:40 p.m.)

10. Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy thanked Mr. LAU for visiting WTSDC to consult Members. She believed that given the number of Members present, it was certain that the motion to be discussed later would be passed, whereas the amended motion proposed by Members of the pro-democracy camp would be negated. Nonetheless, she wanted to take this opportunity to ask Mr. LAU to accept a small vertical banner bearing the words "genuine universal suffrage" which was what Hong Kong people needed.

(At this juncture, Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy walked towards Mr. LAU with an opened umbrella and handed to him a small vertical banner bearing the words “I want genuine universal suffrage”).

11. Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy thanked Mr. LAU for accepting the vertical banner and requested that he listen to what the general public wanted, i.e. “I want genuine universal suffrage without screening. I do not want a universal suffrage that does not comply with the international standards”.

12. The Hon. CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP indicated that she had enquired the Chairman why the Government had not visited WTSDC during the consultation period, and the Chairman had replied that the Bureau was busy and a visit could not be scheduled. However, she was of the view that the “constitutional reform trio” should have sought views from DCs during the consultation period, and requested Mr. LAU to explain why the Bureau had deferred his visit to the WTSDC. She continued that as indicated in the recent opinion polls, many Hong Kong people hoped that the constitutional reform package could be endorsed, while quite a number of Central Government officials had also expressed their hope for the endorsement of the constitutional reform package. However, there were only two months before the package was to be submitted to LegCo. She requested Mr. LAU to respond as to how the Government would secure support from LegCo Members for endorsing the package and solicit more support from members of the public.

13. Mr. KAN Chi-ho, BBS, MH, JP indicated that the Government had published the consultation document on the method for selecting CE in 2017, taking a further step towards the implementation of universal suffrage for CE election. He opined that the system for CE selection by universal suffrage must strictly comply with the Basic Law and the decision made by NPCSC on 31 August 2014 (i.e. “Decision of the Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress on Issues Relating to the Selection of the Chief Executive of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region by Universal Suffrage and on the Method for Forming the Legislative Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region in the Year 2016” adopted by NPCSC on 31 August 2014, hereinafter referred to as “831 Decision”). He expressed the views of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB) to Mr. LAU as follows:

- (i) On the composition of NC, Paragraph (1) of Article II of the “831 Decision” provided that “a broadly represented NC shall be formed. The provisions for the number of members, composition and formation method of the NC shall be made in accordance with the number of members, composition and formation method of the

EC for the Fourth Chief Executive”. DAB therefore held that the NC should follow the arrangements for the EC and be formed by 1 200 members from the existing 38 subsectors in the four major sectors;

- (ii) The nominating procedures for the NC should be fair, open and competitive. Persons who intended to run in CE election should obtain recommendation from not less than one-tenth of the NC members, and each NC member might recommend one person by open nomination. Besides, the NC should make its best endeavour to let the public know and understand each CE candidate, so that all candidates would have equal opportunity to explain their policy visions and manifestoes to the public while demonstrating their versatility. Regarding the specific arrangements under the nomination system, after understanding the policy visions and manifestoes of all persons seeking nomination and giving full consideration to public views, NC members should, by secret ballot, cast support votes for one to three persons seeking nomination. The two to three persons who obtained the endorsement of more than half of all the NC members and the highest numbers of votes would become CE candidates. If less than two persons could obtain the endorsement of more than half of all the NC members, the NC should conduct another round of voting for those who failed to secure majority endorsement until two to three CE candidates were returned; and
- (iii) This would be the first time in Hong Kong that CE was elected by universal suffrage on a “one person, one vote” basis, and there would be big differences from the existing election model. After taking into account the procedural arrangements, workload and tight timeframe of universal suffrage, DAB believed that the “first-past-the-post” voting system was the most realistic and should hence be adopted.

(Mr. WONG Kit-hin, Peter joined the meeting at 2:45 p.m.)

14. Mr. SHUM Wan-wa, Dan said that he would like to voice the opinions of Hong Kong people. He considered that the rule of law was a cornerstone for Hong Kong’s successful development. While President XI Jinping, Premier LI Keqiang and many other leaders of the Central Government had made remarks on the rule of law in the society, he believed that Hong Kong people did not see that the “831 Decision” of NPCSC respected the rule of law. From the constitutional perspective, Article 7 of

Annex I to the Basic Law stated that if there were any amendments to the method for selecting CEs for the terms subsequent to the year 2007, such amendments had to be made with the endorsement of two-thirds of all the LegCo Members, the consent of CE, and the approval of the NPCSC. As illustrated in this three-step process, the duty of the NPCSC was to approve or disapprove amendments rather than determining a detailed constitutional arrangement. Even though the NPCSC decided to change the three-step process to a five-step process in 2004, its role in the second step was merely to confirm CE's report on constitutional reform in the first step. But it seemed at present that the "831 Decision" made by the NPCSC was ultra vires as it required that a person had to secure the endorsement of half of the NC members before running in CE election. Moreover, Article 4 of Annex I to the Basic Law stated that each NC member could nominate one candidate only. However, it was surprisingly absurd that the "831 Decision" required a person to secure the nomination of more than half of the NC members before becoming a candidate but at the same time the number of CE candidates was limited to two to three. In the 1 200-strength NC, if 600, or half, of NC members nominated one candidate and the remaining 600 members nominated another candidate, it was impossible that the third candidate would be returned. Simply put, democracy, liberty and equality were the cornerstones for the success of the society. Those values were the aspirations of all people around the world.

15. Mr. MOK Kin-wing quoted the remarks of "resuming from where it left off" made earlier by LI Fei, Deputy Secretary-General of the NPCSC cum Basic Law Committee Chairman. He enquired whether any future constitutional reform would resume from the current stage if the current constitutional reform package failed to secure the endorsement of two-thirds of LegCo Members, whether the method for selecting CE in 2022 should still be devised within the framework of the NPCSC's decision in the next consultation on constitutional reform, and whether the NPCSC's decision would be applicable to the next constitutional reform. Regarding the views of a Member that the "831 Decision" of the NPCSC had imposed additional requirements on the universal suffrage for CE election, he opined that since its promulgation, the Basic Law had clearly provided that nomination should be made by the NC rather than individual NC members; therefore, the "more-than-half" requirement reflected the NC's decision. While some Members remarked that the "831 Decision" meant screening as opposed to "genuine universal suffrage", he opined that as the NC was yet to be formed, it was too early to presume at this stage that persons from certain camp would be screened out. As every person who wished to stand as a candidate in CE election could enlist the support of NC members from different camps, everyone had equal opportunity to become a candidate. He did not understand why some Members believed that persons from certain camp would likely be screened out. He wondered if the so-called "genuine universal suffrage" was meant to guarantee that a certain group of people could definitely become CE candidates.

16. Mr. HO Yin-fai said that the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions had made a submission on constitutional reform to the Government during the consultation period, and forwarded the same submission to Mr. LAU before the meeting. He also made a submission in his personal capacity and hoped that the Government would consider their views and put forward the reform package that was supported by the public under the condition that the Basic Law was not contravened. He also looked forward to the selection of CE by universal suffrage in 2017 and asked whether the “831 Decision” would still be valid if the package was vetoed due to the lack of support of two-thirds of LegCo Members. In addition, since the Bureau would consolidate and publish the views from public consultation later, he asked the Government how to balance the interests of all parties and what criteria would be adopted to come up with the best constitutional reform package.

17. Mr. WONG Kwok-tung said that the Government had repeatedly emphasised in this round of consultation that “You have choices. Why don’t you make your choice?”. He opined that the word “choice” was simple, which meant that people could select from a variety. He would not comment on the candidates selected under the “831” package because different values were involved. However, when referring to “selection” and “choices”, he held the view that there would not be a variety of candidates under the “831” package for public selection. He said that the dissension between the Government and members of the public could be concluded with the word “sincerity”, that was, the lack of sincerity from the Government. As the saying went, “Gentlemen treat people with sincerity”, the lack of genuine sincerity from the Government to Hong Kong people was reflected in various aspects. On the basis of the lack of sincerity and mutual trust, communication was not possible. He also said that even if WTSDC convened a special meeting, all WTSDC Members would attend the meeting without boycotting. However, Mr. LAU only visited WTSDC after the consultation period, which showed the lack of sincerity from the Government. The Government also played with words to deceive the public, it was impossible for Hong Kong people to trust the Government. The Government should state explicitly that the discussion would be based on sincerity in order to communicate with Hong Kong people. The Hong Kong society was torn apart and constitutional reform remained stagnant because the Government neither showed full sincerity nor was it willing to have candid discussion with the public.

18. Ms. CHAN Man-ki, Maggie, MH opined that universal suffrage meant “election” without the distinction between genuine and fake universal suffrage. If a distinction had to be made between them, it would be “fake universal suffrage” when slogans were chanted in pursuit of “genuine universal suffrage” but election opportunity was denied. She also considered that “genuine universal suffrage” meant seizing the opportunity to elect CE by “one person, one vote” in 2017. She said that Mr. LAU did not need to be afraid of receiving the vertical banner “I want genuine universal

suffrage”, because “genuine universal suffrage” meant the election of CE by “one person, one vote” in 2017. She also wished to tell the political parties that were prepared to vote against the constitutional reform package that their opposing votes would deprive five million eligible voters of their voting rights and queried why the fate of five million people had to be controlled by the people who were against the package. She urged those people who were prepared to cast opposing votes to hand over their right back to the five million electors for making their own decision. She opined that the rule of law was the cornerstone of Hong Kong. It was not an arbitrary non-compliance when the legislation was not welcomed. The Preamble of the Basic Law had conveyed the legislative intent. Hong Kong people had a historical mission. After the Opium War in 1840, there was no need for Hong Kong people to get into the war. However, how to uphold national sovereignty and take a step forward for history rested on the election of CE by “one person, one vote” in 2017. She said that the Preamble, Articles 1, 2, 15, and 45 of, as well as Annex I to the Basic Law clearly set out the power of the NPCSC and that the power of the Central Government to appoint CE was a substantive one. Other people should not make sweeping generalisations and disseminate wrong information to the public.

19. Mr. LAI Wing-ho, Joe, MH supported the Government’s package for CE election by universal suffrage in 2017. The current discussion in the society was what constituted “genuine universal suffrage”. He opined that it was most problematic to spend time to illustrate what was genuine or fake, which was somewhat deceptive in nature. He drew an analogy between universal suffrage and goldware by saying that the goldware bought with money in hard cash was 99.99% pure gold only. There were different features for different constitutional systems and differences were inevitable. If the pro-democratic camp considered it unfair, they could suggest improvements to the package. Nevertheless, they would deceive the public if they vetoed the package when the labelling of “genuine universal suffrage” or “fake universal suffrage” went on but turned out to be slogans without substance, nor a package in compliance with the established framework was put forth. He and Ms. CHAN Man-ki, Maggie, MH had visited the United States to study its congressional and presidential election systems. The candidates of both camps, be they from the pro-democratic camp or the republican camp, had to undergo internal competition and screening to gain support through building of consensus. He was of the view that “genuine universal suffrage” did not mean that everyone could stand for election. There was no “free lunch” in the world. If the people seeking nomination did not make effort to solicit support for becoming CE candidates, the risks to Hong Kong people were too huge. In this regard, he opined that the views expressed by Mr. KAN Chi-ho, BBS, MH, JP on behalf of DBA was practical. The problems of constitutional reform could not be solved by chanting some slogans. He hoped that Members could be more practical and study how to improve the package as it was of utmost importance to implement universal suffrage in 2017.

20. Mr. HUI Kam-shing took the view that whether universal suffrage was genuine or fake could be determined with regard to the element of screening by one's common knowledge. The NC composed 1 200 members who were elected by 200 000-odd people by ballot. In other words, the candidates for the office of CE would be determined by that group of 200 000-odd people. He doubted if screening was involved in such mechanism. He continued that one also had to judge whether unreasonable screening was involved. To put it in a simple way, the group of 200 000-odd people would decide whether five million voters had the right to choose. He said that the Hong Kong Association for Democracy and People's Livelihood belonged to the "democratic reunification camp" which wished to practise democracy in Hong Kong after reunification. Hong Kong witnessed the gradual development of a democratic system and the application of the principles of "Hong Kong people administering Hong Kong" and "a high degree of autonomy" in the signing of the Sino-British Joint Declaration, the introduction of "One Country, Two Systems" by Mr. DENG Xiaoping, and the implementation of "One Country, Two Systems" by Mr. ZHAO Ziyang. Universal suffrage seemed to be around the corner but actually there was still a long way to go. The key to the implementation of universal suffrage was to introduce an election system generally acceptable to Hong Kong people. He agreed that there were different systems and methods of election in other parts of the world, for example, presidential system and prime ministerial system. However, one could still judge by common knowledge if screening was involved in the system. What the Government was trying to do was to push through a universal suffrage with screening and persuade the public to accept it without addressing the issue of genuineness. He found the practice unacceptable. He enquired how the Government was going to address the differences and conflicts caused by the proposed universal suffrage, and to solve the problems of split in the society and credibility of governance.

21. Mr. HO Hon-man, MH stated that although many people hoped that the selection of CE by universal suffrage could be implemented in 2017, they had different views about the nomination method. As suggested in the name of the so-called "pocket-it-first" package, there would be something in the "pocket". The third point put forward by the EKDRC was to urge the Government to review the composition of the NC in each term to safeguard the interests of different strata of the society and to broaden the representativeness of the NC. He hoped that the Government could provide supplementary information about what else the public would have in their pockets in the future in order to solicit their support.

22. The Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH took the view that the "pocket-it-first" package had provoked divergent views because it only involved the right to vote in which the principles of universal and equal suffrage were embodied. The public was denied the right to make nominations and the right to run in elections because of the three restrictions imposed by the "831 Decision". If merely considering the right to vote as

well as universal and equal suffrage, voters would become voting machines and could not have a genuine right to choose. He considered that in designing a political system, consideration should be given to whether the system could support government policies to solve problems in the society. The current split in the society and governance crisis were the direct results of insufficient public mandate in the election of CE who was nominated and elected by a few hundred voters only. If screening and other constraints were imposed on the nominating procedures, the current split in the society could neither be mitigated nor come to an end even if the package with screening was passed. He doubted if the Government simply aimed at endorsing the package. Many people showing concern to Hong Kong society were steadfast in the principles of “Hong Kong people administering Hong Kong” and “a high degree of autonomy” laid down in the Basic Law and in the rights granted to Hong Kong people and the government system allowed in the Sino-British Joint Declaration. If the package was endorsed, he was worried that universal suffrage in the future was tantamount to a system with screening in which voters were given only the universal and equal right to vote. He wondered if Hong Kong people would again be requested to “pocket” any package first in the universal suffrage for LegCo in 2020. The request of “pocket-it-first” might be everlasting, but the Government had never responded to that concern. He had put a question to Mr TAM Chi-yuen, Raymond, GBS, JP at the LegCo earlier as to whether the Government would clearly state that the public had to accept the “pocket-it-first” package as a condition in consideration of the rights to vote, to nominate candidates and to run in elections in the universal suffrage for LegCo election in 2020 based on a universal and equal principle. If the reply was negative, the “pocket-it-first” package would simply be a “fraud”.

23. The Hon. CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP made additional remarks. She drew an analogy between the discussion at the meeting and the divergent views in the society. It was natural for different people to hold different views. The issue was how to collate these views and come up with an optimal package with a view to securing the endorsement of two-thirds of LegCo Members. She said that it was easy to adhere to one’s own views, but the cost was a standstill in Hong Kong’s constitutional development. Hong Kong people would question what the Members from the two camps (pan-democratic camp and pro-establishment camp) had done. She reminded all Members, especially elected Members, that they had to be accountable to the public. She would like to know if the Government would allow some flexibilities, including a promise to fine-tune the next election or other concrete proposals under the “831 Decision framework” and the local legislature after collecting different views. During the recent meeting with Central Government officials to exchange views about constitutional reform, she had talked about the sharp divisions in LegCo as well as in the society. The LegCo was in constant conflict and was unable to function properly because some Members filibustered and even initiated “uncooperative” movement. According to the Basic Law, Hong Kong should adopt an executive-led system and

establish a legislature to monitor the work of the administration. There should be mutual trust between the two. She therefore shared a Member's view on mutual trust. She took the view that not only should Members do their part, the Government should take also a step further by fine-tuning the package under the "831 Decision framework" laid down by the NPCSC so as to resolve the conflict. Lastly, she added that her views were similar to the third point of the EKDRC's submission.

24. The Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH added that many organisations and the Government had stressed that the society would continue to be torn apart should constitutional development come to a standstill. However, he opined that pushing through a political system under which various political forces could not have fair and reasonable access would not end the split in the society. Thus, he agreed with the remarks of the Hon. CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP to a certain extent that endorsing for the sake of endorsement would not help solve social problems through changes in political system. Moreover, the message conveyed by the massive publicity of the Government was that the "831 Decision" was made for the sake of national security. It was understandable that the decision of the Central Government was made in the interest of national security. As a country, it certainly put emphasis on national security. However, in Hong Kong, emphasis was put on the improvement of governance through political system. Other than through the method for selecting CE, governance could also be improved through the method for LegCo election. During the discussion of constitutional reform, the Government quickly ruled out the possibility of discussion of LegCo election. From a macro point of view, the views of the public could be brought to LegCo to ensure checks and balances on executive authorities through improvement of the system of LegCo. Thus he suggested the Government consider from this perspective and think out of the box, i.e. the Central Government emphasised national security while the HKSAR Government emphasised governance issues. From the perspective of improving governance, he asked whether the Government had room for reiterating its position on the basis of the "831 Decision" for the constitutional development of Hong Kong to take a step forward.

25. Ms. CHAN Man-ki, Maggie, MH added that there were currently two types of views in the society. One type supported the selection of CE by universal suffrage in 2017 and the gradual improvement in the election system. The other type objected to the package for fear that it would be the "ultimate package" and people requested some government officials to make promises of not ending at this "ultimate package". She opined that a society upholding the rule of law could not rely on the promise of an individual. The pace of constitutional reform should be reflected in the Basic Law and the spirit of the rule of law. She also said that Article 45 of the Basic Law provided that the method for selecting the CE shall be specified "in accordance with the principle of gradual and orderly progress" "in the light of the actual situation". The pace of constitutional reform was clearly set out in the law. She opined that democracy was

not overbearing and everyone had a chance to speak. Under the principle of “gradual and orderly progress” “in the light of the actual situation” provided in the Basic Law, she suggested the Government explore from a macro perspective how the political system would continue to improve upon the implementation of CE election by “one person, one vote” in 2017. The mission was not completed upon endorsement of the package on the selection of CE by universal suffrage. The Government had to look ahead to future constitutional development of Hong Kong.

26. Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy agreed to the views raised by the Hon. CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP. The Government would encounter difficulty in governance if there was no “genuine universal suffrage”. The veto of the constitutional reform package by LegCo in 2005 showed that a standstill was not necessarily a disaster as the Central Government extended an olive branch soon afterwards and came up with the package for “genuine universal suffrage” in 2017. She hoped that Mr. LAU could bring to the Bureau public aspiration for “genuine universal suffrage”. She stressed that the public demanded a universal suffrage system without screening and in line with the international standards.

27. The Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH reiterated that the Central Government emphasised national security while Hong Kong people emphasised social governance. Both issues were based on the Basic Law and the principles of “One Country, Two Systems”, “Hong Kong people administering Hong Kong” and “a high degree of autonomy” as guaranteed in the Sino-British Joint Declaration. They were also consistent with the NPCSC’s decision. In this regard, he hoped that Mr. LAU, the HKSAR Government or the Central Government could consider from this perspective and fine-tune the “831 Decision” for setting the direction for CE election and LegCo election in 2020. On constitutional issues, the society had never relied on the promise of an individual. Reference must be made to the NPCSC’s decision such that the decision acceptable to the public could be implemented further at the constitutional level.

28. Mr. LAU Kong-wah, JP thanked Members for their keen responses as well as enquiries and views. He would collate the views and give a consolidated response. First of all, he responded to Dr. WONG Kam-chiu, MH, Mr. KAN Chi-ho, BBS, MH, JP, Ms. CHAN Man-ki, Maggie, MH, Mr. LAI Wing-ho, Joe, MH and Mr. HO Hon-man, MH who agreed that the Government should implement universal suffrage for CE in accordance with the law. In fact, universal suffrage originated from the Basic Law and the timetable of universal suffrage was set based on the NPCSC’s decision. The “831 Decision” showed the strong determination of the Central Government to allow Hong Kong people to elect CE by “one person, one vote” two years later. This was the first time the country allowed the people in a city to elect their head. This opportunity should be seized and he hoped that people would appreciate and treasure the opportunity. The above Members also expressed their hope

for a step forward in constitutional development and this would be better than a standstill in any event. He opined that this package was not simply a step forward, but a great step forward. On an overview of Hong Kong's history of more than a century since its founding from the appointment of governors, the indirect election of CE to universal suffrage of CE two years later, this was a huge leap in the history. He wished to seize the opportunity and believed that this was the wish of many people. As to whether the political system, once implemented, could be improved in the future, he quoted Article 7 of Annex I to the Basic Law that amendments might be made when there was a need, which was also indicated by a Member just then. This article would not be repealed because of the "831 Decision". He also pointed out that the Government had experience in improving the election system. Since the handover, the size of the EC had increased from 400 to 800, and then to 1 200. Improvement was made step by step and he hoped that there would be a process of gradual improvement in the future. It was the most important that "CE election through one person, one vote" would not be changed. He hoped that this package could be endorsed without backtracking in the future.

29. Mr. LAU moved on to respond to the concerns of Mr. SHUM Wan-wa, Dan, Mr. MOK Kin-wing and Mr. HO Yin-fai about the future applicability of the "831 Decision" if the constitutional reform package was voted down by the LegCo. He believed that the answer was self-explanatory from the title of the "831 Decision", namely "Decision of the NPCSC on Issues Relating to the Selection of the CE of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region by Universal Suffrage and on the Method for Forming the LegCo of the HKSAR in the Year 2016". It was stated clearly that the Decision would apply to the method for forming LegCo in 2016, but the year for the selection of CE by universal suffrage was not specified. In other words, the "831 Decision" would apply to the selection of CE by universal suffrage in 2017 and all future CE selections as well even if the constitutional reform package was not endorsed unless the NPCSC amended the Decision. The Bureau certainly did not want to see the veto of the constitutional reform package, so he would continue to solicit support from people from all walks of life. He asked those who were against the package on the grounds of inadequacy or imperfection to chew over a question: Although they wanted to look for a better package in the future, was the means they adopted worthwhile or were they wasting Hong Kong people's time and passing up the readily available opportunity of electing CE through "one person, one vote" after two years?

30. In response to the issue of "sincerity" raised by the Hon. CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP and Mr. WONG Kwok-tung, Mr. LAU reiterated that Mr. TAM Chi-yuen, Raymond, GBS, JP had visited 18 DCs to present the constitutional reform package in person in the five-month first round consultation period. Nevertheless, the second round consultation lasted only for two months, during which there were the Chinese New Year holidays. Although the DC visit was shared among the "constitutional

reform trio” and himself in the second round consultation, they could not visit all 18 DCs within the consultation period. He apologised for this and thanked the Chairman for arranging representatives of the Bureau to attend this meeting. He also assured the Members present that their views expressed in this meeting would be incorporated in the second round consultation report. He then explained that he stood in for Mr. TAM to attend the meeting because Mr. TAM had other commitments.

31. Mr. LAU went on to respond to Mr. HUI Kam-shing’s concern over the genuineness of universal suffrage and strictness of electoral system, and Mr. WONG Kwok-tung’s suspicion that persons with different political views and background might be excluded from candidacy under the proposed political system. As a matter of fact, a person would have to reach the threshold by seeking recommendation and to cross the threshold by seeking nomination to formally become a candidate according to the “831 Decision”. The Bureau wished to build a platform for such activities as debate and canvassing so that all potential candidates could face the general public, not just the 1 200-member NC, during their competition in the nomination stage. Persons with certain political views would not be denied candidacy, nor would persons from certain parties be guaranteed candidacy. The candidates nominated would compete again for the votes of five million eligible voters. The nominating procedures actually involved dual competition.

32. In response to Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy and the Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH’s call for the Bureau to relay the divergent views in the community, Mr. LAU agreed that there were both supporting and opposing views on the package, the division of which had to be addressed by the Government. He concurred with the Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH that not only were there disagreements over the package, but also problems with government administration. Given the grave internal conflicts around universal suffrage in Hong Kong for over a decade, the Bureau hoped to solve the problem of governance by implementing the package. Despite the extensive discussion on whether the universal suffrage was genuine or bogus, the proposed election by five million eligible voters was, beyond doubt, better than an election by 1 200 people. The Bureau hoped that with the implementation of the package, members of the public could let go of their arguments. Of course, the Government did not believe that all difficulties would be resolved after the selection of CE by universal suffrage, but at least this perennial issue for over a decade could be brought to an end. More importantly, the decision of the NPCSC aimed at dealing with the selection of CE first before the formation of the LegCo by universal suffrage. Therefore, Members who opposed the proposals on the method for selecting CE by universal suffrage but intended to strive for dual universal suffrage were indeed acting against what they had been seeking. He sincerely hoped that constitutional development could be taken forward with the selection of CE by universal suffrage first, followed by the formation of the LegCo by universal suffrage. The chance of attaining dual universal suffrage would be slim and

the time to restart the constitutional development would be uncertain if the constitutional development came to a standstill. Caught in such a quandary and faced with the Occupy Movement, the HKSAR Government had remained relentless in taking forward constitutional development. In response to the Hon. CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP's enquiry about how the Government would solicit support, he said that all parties, including the Government and Members, had their constitutional role to play. The "831 Decision" was a national policy and a national decision. The Government hoped to take forward constitutional development on a legal basis. He believed that some of the Members present who had witnessed the previous constitutional reforms could recall that the decision of the NPCSC had never been amended. However, Members who opposed the current package had requested the revocation of the NPCSC's decision. The Central Government had expressly stated that the decision would not be revoked because it was final. He opined that Members should not dwell on this point. In fact, consensus in the community could still be forged within the framework laid down by the NPCSC. Over the past few months, the Government had been responsive to address the areas for improvement raised by the opposing Members in their exchange of views and it was willing to enhance communication with them. Therefore, he hoped to keep working on this in the coming months. Stressing the importance of public opinion, he encouraged members of the public to keep expressing their views so as to take forward constitutional development.

33. Mr. LAU concluded that although there were disputes in the community, the package, if fully implemented, would provide an opportunity for Hong Kong's social development as well as constitutional advancement.

34. The Chairman thanked Mr. LAU for his responses.

III(ii) Motion: "The Council supports the implementation of universal suffrage for the Chief Executive Election in 2017 in accordance with the Basic Law and Decision of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, so that over five million eligible voters in Hong Kong could elect the next CE through "one person, one vote"; in this connection, the Council calls for active participation from the community in the second round consultation on constitutional reform and urges the Legislative Council to pass the constitutional reform package, thereby taking an important step forward in the constitutional development of Hong Kong."

(WTSDC Paper No. 26/2015)

35. The Chairman said that a motion moved by Mr. KAN Chi-ho, BBS, MH, JP and seconded by 18 Members (Paper No. 26/2015 with the signature of the Hon. CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP – Annex 2) was tabled. He then invited Mr. KAN Chi-ho, BBS, MH, JP to introduce the motion.

36. Mr. KAN Chi-ho, BBS, MH, JP said that the motion was prepared according to the consultation document. The details were set out in the motion and he had nothing to add. Nineteen Members had signified their support for the motion and he hoped that it would be passed by the Council.

37. Dr. WONG Kam-chiu, MH said that it was the common aspiration of Hong Kong people to have universal suffrage for CE by “one person, one vote”. Opinion polls conducted by various organisations in recent months showed that most of the people hoped for the passage of the 2017 constitutional reform package, generally accepted the “831 Decision” of the NPCSC and hoped that the package would be further improved in the future. However, the political reality was that universal suffrage could hardly be implemented because a two-thirds majority support of LegCo Members was needed. Some members of the public might believe that the constitutional reform process would start all over again if the constitutional reform package was negated by the LegCo in June 2015. However, Mr. ZHANG Dejiang, the Chairman of the NPCSC, had indicated at the conference with local NPC deputies held in Beijing that the opportunity for universal suffrage in 2017 should be seized as it was “now or never”. Dr. WONG was of the view that Hong Kong would not have universal suffrage in a long period of time if the proposal for universal suffrage was negated. Although the pan-democrats claimed that they would take the historical responsibility for negating the constitutional reform, he doubted whether they were really able to take such responsibility. He could imagine that some people would continue to oppose government administration with the excuse that CE was not returned by “one person, one vote” election. Disputes in the society would continue and many economic and livelihood initiatives would be put off due to filibusters at LegCo meetings. He continued that if some people were so stubborn as to put the interest of a handful of people over the overall well-being of 7 million people in Hong Kong, not only would universal suffrage be beyond reach, the economic development and improvement in people’s livelihood would also be impeded. Therefore, he hoped that the pan-democrats would change their mind and support the constitutional reform package in accordance with the wishes of the public.

38. Mr. CHAN On-tai pointed out that Hong Kong was a city rather than a country. Hong Kong’s gross domestic product (GDP), an important economic indicator, accounted for around 25% of the GDP of China in 1997 but dropped to only around 2.5% in 2015. In view of this, Hong Kong people should awake, stop the internal conflicts and plan for the future generations, or Hong Kong’s future would be gloomy.

39. The Chairman said that a revised motion (Annex 3) moved by the Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH and seconded by seven Members was also tabled. He then invited the Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH to introduce the motion.

40. The Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH said that the revised motion moved by pan-democratic Members of WTSDC was basically a summary of the previous discussion. They hoped to introduce a political system under which genuine universal suffrage of CE without screening could be implemented and that a constitutional reform package conforming to the international standards would be passed by LegCo. Since the second round of consultation period was over, he deleted the content on “calls for active participation from the community in the second round consultation on constitutional reform”. Although Members including Dr. WONG Kam-chiu, MH, just said that the passage of the “pocket-it-first” package could minimise social disputes, he held that two political realities should not to be neglected: the first was the relationship between the Central Government and the HKSAR Government; the second was the internal conflicts in the society of Hong Kong. A political system should be developed through an effective method to resolve the disputes caused by the two political realities. Otherwise the disputes in the society would not be resolved even if the right of “one person, one vote” was granted or the “pocket-it-first” package was implemented. Therefore, if the HKSAR Government and the Central Government did not consider the two political realities and strike a balance between them during the discussion on the universal suffrage of CE in 2017 and the constitutional reform package, the disputes in the society could not be settled even if the changes in political system were bulldozed through the constitutional reform package. He went on to explain that the public’s preference definitely had to be considered in the next LegCo election if the constitutional reform package was negated. Given the existing situation, various opinion polls seemed to indicate that the community would prefer the “pocket-it-first” package, which suggested that the constitutional reform package would be passed by the next term of LegCo at the choice of the entire society. The pan-democrats proposed that the Government arrange a referendum in the form of a dual meet between the pan-democrats and pro-establishment camps as a solution to the dispute over the political reform to enable the public to indicate their preference in order to obtain a widely recognised result. If not, the decision would have to be left to the public in the LegCo election in 2016. Politicians had responsibility for accepting the wish of the public and make revisions to their political commitments accordingly, or else the passage of the constitutional reform package would be in vain when the atmosphere of grievance continued to permeate the community.

41. The Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH moved on to respond to the enquiry of Mr. CHAN On-tai. He said that there was not a clear definition of the international standards of a political system, but it had to be a platform to resolve political disputes no matter in a country, a region or a society. Generally speaking, a political system up to the international standards was defined by whether the rights to nominate, to run in elections and to vote were exercised on a universal and equal basis so that different political forces could participate in elections. He asked everyone to reflect on whether Hong Kong needed such a platform to resolve social disputes.

(Mr. LEE Tat-yan, BBS, MH arrived at the meeting at 3:40 p.m.)

42. Ms. CHAN Man-ki, Maggie, MH agreed with the Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH that there were no international standards of the electoral system. She opined that international standards could refer to the ones adopted for the electoral system in the United States, the United Kingdom, the Philippines, Thailand or other regions or countries. For instance, the Super-delegate system adopted in the United States was different from the civic nomination or other similar system referred to by the general public, but was more similar to the universal suffrage for CE in 2017 set out in the current proposal. She said that the wording of the revised motion was of paramount importance. As there were no international standard of the electoral system, she could not agree to the revised motion moved by the Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH.

43. Mr. SHUM Wan-wa, Dan suggested referring to an international standard, namely the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). It was indicated in ICCPR that elections should be universal and equal. He said that ICCPR was an international covenant and China was one of the signatories as a sovereign state. The Basic Law also provided that Hong Kong should implement ICCPR. Apart from universal and equal elections, the ICCPR also stated that the voters' right to nominate should not be subject to unreasonable restrictions. It was the international standard that Hong Kong could refer to.

44. The Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH thanked Mr. SHUM Wan-wa, Dan for his supplementary information. He emphasised that although there was no single international standard at the current stage, ICCPR could serve as a framework. Any political system aimed primarily at seeking a platform to resolve social disputes, and that platform should not impose unreasonable limitations on any political forces as stated in the ICCPR. He called on everyone to reconsider and review the issue.

45. The Chairman said that according to the Standing Orders, Members should first vote on the revised motion moved by the Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH. The Chairman confirmed that no Member had received the written proxy vote from Mr. MOK Ying-fan. As Members present agreed to vote by show of hands, the Chairman then invited Members to vote on the revised motion moved by the Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH. The voting result was as follows:

Affirmative vote	:	8
Negative vote	:	17
Abstention vote	:	1
Total	:	<u>26</u>

46. The Chairman declared that as the number of negative votes exceeded half of the total number of valid votes, the revised motion was not carried.

47. The Chairman then invited Members to vote on the original motion moved by Mr. KAN Chi-ho, BBS, MH, JP by show of hands. The voting result was as follows:

Affirmative vote	:	19
Negative vote	:	8
Abstention vote	:	0
Total	:	<u>27</u>

48. The Chairman declared that the original motion was carried and thanked Mr. LAU Kong-wah, JP again for attending the meeting.

(Mr. CHAN Yim-kwong, Joe, the Hon. CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP, Ms. KWOK Sau-ying, Mr. WONG Kit-hin, Peter, Mr. WONG Yat-yuk and the Hon. WU Chi-wai, MH left the meeting at 3:50 p.m.)

III(iii) Latest Development of Shatin to Central Link (Wong Tai Sin Section)  
(WTSDC Paper No. 27/2015)

49. The Chairman welcomed Mr. CHOU Wing-ping, Frankie, Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-3 of the Highways Department (HyD), Mr. CHIN Ka-wai, Cameron, Senior Construction Engineer – Tunnels, Mr. LI Wing-how, Francis, Senior Liaison Engineer and Ms. LAM Yuet-ching, Terry, Assistant Public Relations Manager – Projects and Property of the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL), to attend the meeting for this agenda item, and invited the representatives of the MTRCL to present the paper.

50. Mr. LI Wing-how, Francis of the MTRCL presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint. He pointed out that the MTRCL, together with the Transport Department (TD), the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) and other relevant government departments, had earlier explored the feasibility of implementing temporary traffic management schemes by phases at a number of road sections in Tsz Wan Shan. The MTRCL had also explained to the DC Members of the constituencies concerned the relevant schemes and listened to their views. Lift foundation works were being carried out at the footbridge at the junction of Po Kong Village Road and Fung Tak Road near Fung Tak Shopping Centre. As the staircase of the footbridge was very close to the location of the pile driver at the works site, the MTRCL proposed closing the staircase concerned temporarily for safety's sake. After the closure of the staircase concerned, pedestrians could use the escalator in Fung Tak Shopping Centre or the existing ramp of the footbridge to go to Fung Tak Road. The MTRCL would put up sufficient directional signs in the vicinity of the works site. He added that he had earlier conducted an on-site inspection with Mr. KAN Chi-ho, BBS, MH, JP, the DC Member of the constituency concerned, and welcomed Members to raise their views on the proposal.

51. Mr. LI Wing-how, Francis of the MTRCL moved on to present the paper about the adjustment on works procedure for the railway tunnels between Hin Keng in Sha Tin and Ma Chai Hang in Wong Tai Sin. He pointed out that the tunnel from Diamond Hill to Hin Keng was divided into the Diamond Hill to Ma Chai Hang section and the Ma Chai Hang to Hin Keng section. The section from Diamond Hill to Ma Chai Hang was constructed by tunnel boring. The boring machine was currently proceeding from Diamond Hill towards Ma Chai Hang and had passed underneath the Wong Tai Sin Temple. It was expected that it would reach Ma Chai Hang within two months. The Ma Chai Hang to Hin Keng tunnel section was constructed by the drill and blast method. The drill and blast works were in progress from Hin Keng of Sha Tin towards the underneath of Lion Rock at a depth of more than 600 metres. There might be mixed ground underneath the Lion Rock and hence delays in the works, as past experience showed that boring in mixed ground required the disposal of infiltrated groundwater and the erection of additional props while mechanical boring method had to be used instead. There had been works in foreign countries being confronted with the same challenge and thus delayed for several months. To avoid the overall works being delayed by the above problem, the MTRCL proposed a backup plan be implemented if necessary. Under the plan, after the completion of the boring works for the Diamond Hill to Ma Chai Hang tunnel section, a blasting works front would be added at the Ma Chai Hang construction site where drill and blast works would be conducted 30 metres below ground towards the Lion Rock, so that construction works could be carried out simultaneously at both ends of the Ma Chai Hang to Hin Keng tunnel section. He explained that as a usual practice, the explosives and detonators used for the drill and blast works would be transported separately to ensure safety. On the transportation front, the explosives would be delivered via the originally designated route to the Ma Chai Hang construction site but the route would be truncated at the site of emergency access point next to Wong Tai Sin Road. The explosives would be delivered to the completed tunnel (about 30 metres below ground) through shafts at the site of emergency access point for conveyance to the Ma Chai Hang construction site. The excavated spoil produced by the blasts would then be delivered from the Ma Chai Hang construction site to the site of emergency access point next to Wong Tai Sin Road via the same tunnel for removal by dump trucks. During the implementation of the backup plan, the number of dump truck trips would be more or less the same as that for the present excavation works for the emergency access shafts, with a frequency of about 10 trucks per hour. Overall speaking, the transport arrangements for explosive and spoil delivery would basically remain unchanged, while there would be less vehicles delivering explosives to the Ma Chai Hang construction site via Shatin Pass Road. The MTRCL would also conduct a risk assessment and a traffic impact assessment for the proposed backup plan. The reports of the assessments would be submitted to the relevant government departments for examination and approval. The MTRCL hoped that the boring works for the entire Ma Chai Hang to Hin Keng tunnel could be completed in late 2015 or early 2016. Therefore, the above backup plan was expected to be implemented from the third quarter of 2015 to the first quarter of 2016, if necessary.

52. Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy thanked Mr. LI Wing-how, Francis of the MTRCL for joining the residents of the district in a site visit one week before the meeting to observe vehicles turning from the carparks of Lung Poon Court and Bel Air Heights into Lung Poon Street. She voiced the opinions of some residents, saying that as the MTRCL was carrying out lift retrofitting works at the footbridge spanning Lung Poon Street near Lung Poon Court, some lanes of Lung Poon Street near Lung Poon Court had to be narrowed temporarily. As a result, vehicles departing from the carpark of Bel Air Heights had to wait longer. She was grateful to Mr. LI and his colleagues for explaining the arrangements on pavement narrowing and traffic improvement measures to residents on the spot. However, it was not until the site visit that the residents learnt the MTRCL's plan to provide a signalised pedestrian crossing outside the main entrance of Bel Air Heights. The residents of Bel Air Heights or Galaxia had never been consulted about the plan. As the arrangement would directly affect residents' daily life, she requested the MTRCL or the relevant government departments to formally inform the residents of Bel Air Heights, Galaxia and Lung Poon Court of the arrangement and to collect their opinions. As she had not had the opportunity to consult the residents about the new arrangement concerning the pedestrian crossing, she could not make any comments at the moment.

(Mr. CHAN Wai-kwan, Andie and Mr. MOK Chung-fai, Rex, MH, JP left the meeting at 4:05 p.m.)

53. Mr. HO Hon-man, MH asked the MTRCL about the routing of the 10 dump trucks departing from the Wong Tai Sin Road construction site every hour as mentioned in the backup plan.

54. Mr. SO Sik-kin was also very concerned about the change of routing of construction dump trucks. He had earlier learnt about the delay in the works for the Wong Tai Sin section of the Shatin to Central Link (SCL), so he did not oppose the MTRCL's newly proposed measures to expedite the progress of works but he hoped that the MTRCL would review the measures regularly. He opined that if the frequency of dump trucks increased, traffic flow and road condition would be affected. Although workers would wash the wheels before the dump trucks left the construction site, spoil might still fall on roads and affect other vehicles if the dump trucks were overloaded. He hoped that the MTRCL would pay more attention to this, and requested the MTRCL to report to the DC Members of the constituencies concerned should any road sections were affected.

55. Mr. CHAN On-tai believed that the backup plan adopted by the MTRCL could help expedite the progress of the project. He enquired how much time could be saved for the project and how the blasting works would affect the surroundings (especially the vicinity of Ma Chai Hang Recreation Ground). Besides, he enquired about the blasting procedures and the scope and power of each blast.

(Mr. LEE Tat-yan, BBS, MH left the meeting at 4:10 p.m.)

56. Mr. HUI Kam-shing said that he shared the concerns of other Members over the potential impact of the backup plan on safety, traffic and environment, such as the number of dump trucks, blasting works at the site, etc. In addition, he enquired about the extent of delay in the entire SCL project (especially Wong Tai Sin section). He was particularly concerned about whether the target date of re-opening of the Ma Chai Hang Recreation Ground upon re-provisioning in 2017 would be deferred, and whether there was any preliminary estimate as to how long it would be deferred.

57. Mr. LI Wing-how, Francis of the MTRCL said that upon completion of retrofitting of lifts and staircase at the footbridge across Lung Poon Street near Lung Poon Court, the existing pedestrian crossing across Lung Poon Street would be relocated to the junction of Lung Poon Street and Fung Tak Road and would be controlled by traffic lights. The MTRCL noted Members' views and would inform the stakeholders of the arrangement by distributing a notice to the DC Members of the constituencies concerned and residents. The MTRCL would collect their views and then discuss the proposal with TD and take follow-up action. Currently, there were around 10 dump trucks carrying spoil from the shaft at Wong Tai Sin Road heading for Kai Tak Barging Point every hour. If there was a need for implementing the backup plan in the future, the transportation route of the dump trucks would largely be similar to the current route, that was, from the works site of the emergency access next to Wong Tai Sin Road to Kai Tak via Shatin Pass Road, Wong Tai Sin Road, Fei Fung Street, Po Kong Village Road and Choi Hung Road. After the implementation of the backup plan, the spoil at Ma Chai Hang works site would be transported to the ground level of the works site of the emergency access next to Wong Tai Sin Road via the completed railway tunnel for onward transportation by dump trucks. In addition, the spoil at Ma Chai Hang works site would mainly come from the shaft works and the excavation works of the some 100-metre tunnel for the ventilation building. There would not be too much spoil generated from the works. Accordingly, the implementation of the backup plan would not have any impacts on the traffic near Ma Chai Hang works site. The MTRCL would only adopt the backup plan when the overall project progress of the Ma Chai Hang to Hin Keng of Sha Tin section was so seriously hindered by the excavation works towards the Lion Rock that the problem could not be solved in the short term. During the implementation of the backup plan, the early stage blasting works at Ma Chai Hang to the Lion Rock would mainly be carried out underground in the daytime. Blasting works would be conducted around the clock only when the works had proceeded to the underneath of the Lion Rock. The MTRCL would then arrange a site inspection of the blasting works for Members. The MTRCL expected to complete the drill and blast works of the entire tunnel between Ma Chai Hang and Hin Keng of Sha Tin in early 2016. The MTRCL was in discussion with the Leisure and Cultural Services Department on the arrangements for re-provisioning Ma Chai Hang Recreation Ground, including the re-provisioning of the gymnasium at the northeast of the recreation ground and the multi-purpose activity room cum rooftop tennis court at the

southwest of the recreation ground. The construction works for the two facilities were expected to commence in late 2016. The reprovisioning of the football pitch within the recreation ground would then follow. The MTRCL would discuss with the Chairman of WTSDC, the Chairman of District Facilities Management Committee under WTSDC and Members of the constituencies concerned the details and time schedule of the proposal. The preliminary estimate was that the works would take place between 2017 and 2018 and the entire project was expected to complete in 2018.

58. Mr. KAN Chi-ho, BBS, MH, JP thanked Mr. LI for conducting a site inspection with him earlier of the lift foundation works at the footbridge at the junction of Po Kong Village Road and Fung Tak Road near Fung Tak Shopping Centre. He said the residents nearby also agreed that it was necessary to close the staircase of the footbridge on a temporary basis for safety's sake. He hoped that the MTRCL would provide clear directional signs during the closure of staircase and properly enclose the site so that pedestrians would not stray into the works site. In addition, he agreed that it was necessary for local residents to clearly understand the proposed relocation of the pedestrian crossing across Lung Poon Street to the junction of Lung Poon Street and Fung Tak Road and the changing of the pedestrian crossing to a signalised one. He reiterated that he had expressed his views to the MTRCL and government departments on different occasions regarding the vehicular green time of traffic lights at Fung Tak Road and the road sections nearby. He requested the MTRCL to take note of the views and explain any future changes that might give rise to traffic congestion at Fung Tak Road and the roads nearby. He also expressed concern over the safety issues regarding the backup plan for tunnel excavation works and the potential impacts on local traffic. He requested the MTRCL to give prior notice to WTSDC of the implementation of the backup plan.

(Mr. WONG Kwok-tung left the meeting at 4:15 pm.)

59. Mr. LAI Wing-ho, Joe, MH said he understood that the item was put to WTSDC for discussion because the progress of the entire SCL project (Wong Tai Sin section) was involved. Since the paper included the temporary traffic management schemes in the district, he was worried that the MTRCL might implement the schemes when Members did not have comprehensive knowledge. The latter might be embarrassed if local residents asked them about the schemes. While it was not necessary to consult the Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) under WTSDC, he suggested the MTRCL report to TTC the temporary traffic management schemes and district consultation result for Members' information in order to rationalise the operation of WTSDC.

60. The Chairman said that there were a number of Co-opted Members in TTC, so he agreed to the suggestion of Mr. LAI Wing-ho, Joe, MH.

61. Mr. HO Hon-man, MH said he only knew before the meeting that the location for installing explosives for the tunnel excavation works had changed but did not know about the backup plan mentioned by the MTRCL. Although the MTRCL pointed out that there were only about 10 dump trucks per hour accessing the Wong Tai Sin Road works site at present, he noted that there had been queuing of dump trucks near the entrance of the works site. Furthermore, given the large number of coaches travelling to Wong Tai Sin Temple via Wong Tai Sin Road, he worried that the route diversion of dump trucks to the works site of the emergency access point near Wong Tai Sin Road after the implementation of the backup plan would hinder the movement of coaches in and out of the carpark and their picking up/dropping off of passengers at Wong Tai Sin Road. In addition, although there would be only an additional movement of about 10 vehicles per hour under the backup plan, the increase would still put more load on the already bustling traffic at the intersection of Po Kong Village Road and Fung Tak Road. Indicating that the board of directors of Sik Sik Yuen had not yet been informed of the backup plan, he proposed that explanation should be given to them by the MTRCL.

62. Mr. CHAN On-tai was concerned about the inadequacy of parking spaces near the Wong Tai Sin Temple and enquired whether the MTRCL could add a storey above or under the ground to the proposed Wong Tai Sin Public Transport Terminus to meet the demand for parking spaces in the district.

(Mr. MOK Kin-wing and Mr. TING Chi-wai, Roy left the meeting at 4:20 p.m.)

63. The Chairman explained that as the MTRCL had finalised the project of Wong Tai Sin Public Transport Terminus already, it could not amend the project simply to accede to WTSDC's proposals. He hoped that Mr. CHAN On-tai would understand the difficulties involved. He added that WTSDC could examine and review how to optimise the piece of government land beside Wong Tai Sin Public Transport Terminus to cope with the demand for parking spaces in the future.

64. Mr. LI Wing-how, Francis of the MTRCL said that the MTRCL would put up sufficient notices regarding the temporary closure arrangement for the staircase of the footbridge at the junction of Po Kong Village Road and Fung Tak Road near Fung Tak Shopping Mall in the vicinity. As regards the proposal of providing a signalised pedestrian crossing across Lung Poon Street near the junction of Lung Poon Street and Fung Tak Road, the MTRCL would brief DC Members of the constituencies concerned on the arrangements and further study with TD to ensure that the traffic nearby would not be affected. While the MTRCL would notify WTSDC of the implementation of the backup plan in advance, it reiterated that the plan was prepared only to make up for the delay. If the boring works in Sha Tin went smoothly, the backup plan would not be implemented. In addition, the MTRCL would communicate with the DC Member of the constituency concerned on the local temporary traffic management schemes and

would not implement the schemes unless the DC Members of the constituency concerned had given their consent. He also agreed to provide TTC Members with the details of the schemes for information. Lastly, he clarified that under the backup plan, dump trucks would go from the emergency access point next to Wong Tai Sin Road to Kai Tak via Wong Tai Sin Road, Ma Chai Hang Road roundabout, Lung Cheung Road and Choi Hung Road.

65. Mr. CHIN Ka-wai, Cameron of the MTRCL added that the transport route and the frequency of dump truck trips in the backup plan were the same as those of the shaft excavation for the emergency access point next to Wong Tai Sin Road. As the shaft excavation was completed, the frequency of dump trucks travelling along the road section concerned would also be about 10 per hour under the backup plan. Nevertheless, given that the time taken by the dump trucks to travel along the road section concerned would be different, the MTRCL would reassess the traffic impact and submit the assessment report to TD and HKPF for approval before implementing the backup plan.

66. Mr. HO Hon-man, MH requested the MTRCL to consult the Community Liaison Group (CLG) before implementing the backup plan.

67. The Chairman said Members understood that there was no choice but to implement the temporary traffic management schemes and the adjustment on works procedure proposed in the paper, especially when the works progress in Tsz Wan Shan was behind schedule. It was therefore necessary to extend the relevant temporary traffic management schemes. He concluded that WTSDC agreed to the temporary traffic management schemes implemented by the MTRCL in Diamond Hill and Tsz Wan Shan set out in paragraphs 3 and 4, and the adjustment on works procedure set out in paragraphs 5 and 6 (i.e. the introduction of an additional blasting work front at Ma Chai Hang works site to allow blasting into the Lion Rock). Although the number of dump trucks accessing the works site of the emergency access point near Wong Tai Sin Road would remain unchanged, their travelling time along Wong Tai Sin Road would become longer. WTSDC hoped that the MTRCL and HyD would closely monitor the actual situation, conduct timely reviews as and when necessary and follow up the matter at the meeting of TTC.

68. Mr. LI Wing-how, Francis of the MTRCL added that the MTRCL had briefed Sik Sik Yuen on the backup plan in February 2015 and it accepted the arrangements.

69. Mr. HUI Kam-shing made an additional remark. He proposed the MTRCL consult the relevant local organisations, including owners' corporations, mutual aid committees and concern groups, on the proposed reprovisioning and timetable of Ma Chai Hang Recreation Ground through CLG. He opined that the views of the relevant local organisations on the details of the reprovisioning project were of reference value.

(Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy left the meeting at 4:30 p.m.)

70. Mr. SO Sik-kin said that to avoid complicating the consultation exercise, he suggested the MTRCL discuss with the Members concerned first and give an account on the issue to district organisations at the CLG after reaching a consensus.

71. The Chairman agreed with Mr. SO Sik-kin. As he would also attend meetings of the CLG, he opined that the best way was that district organisations raised their views after understanding the works progress. He extended his gratitude again to the representatives of HyD and the MTRCL for attending the meeting.

#### IV Progress Reports

72. Members noted the following papers:

- (i) Progress Report of the 20th Meeting of the Community Building and Social Services Committee held on 13 January 2015  
(WTSDC Paper No. 18/2015)
- (ii) Progress Report of the 20th Meeting of the District Facilities Management Committee held on 20 January 2015  
(WTSDC Paper No. 19/2015)
- (iii) Progress Report of the 20th Meeting of the Traffic and Transport Committee held on 27 January 2015  
(WTSDC Paper No. 20/2015)
- (iv) Progress Report of the 20th Meeting of the Housing Committee held on 3 February 2015  
(WTSDC Paper No. 21/2015)
- (v) Progress Report of the 20th Meeting of the Finance, General and Economic Affairs Committee held on 10 February 2015  
(WTSDC Paper No. 22/2015)
- (vi) Progress Report of the 20th Meeting of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Committee held on 10 March 2015  
(WTSDC Paper No. 23/2015)
- (vii) Progress Report of the Wong Tai Sin District Management Committee Meeting held on 13 February 2015  
(WTSDC Paper No. 24/2015)

- (viii) Progress of and Follow-ups on the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals' Holistic Centre for Youth Development Project  
(WTSDC Paper No. 25/2015)

73. The Chairman informed Members that the Secretariat had arranged the representatives of the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals, the Planning Department and the Lands Department to attend the meeting of the Community Building and Social Services Committee (CBSSC) on 24 March 2015 and explain to Members the latest design of the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Holistic Centre for Youth Development Project (WTSDC Paper No. 25/2015) and the difference of the latest design as compared with the one agreed by WTSDC, if any. Interested non-CBSSC Members could contact the Secretariat for arrangement to attend the meeting for the agenda item concerned.

V Date of the Next Meeting

74. The 22nd WTSDC Meeting would be held at 2:30 p.m. on 19 May 2015 (Tuesday).

75. The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Wong Tai Sin District Council Secretariat  
May 2015

Ref: HAD WTSDC 13-5/5/53 Pt. 39

# Chinese Version Only

(Please refer to:

[http://www.districtcouncils.gov.hk/wts/doc/2012\\_2015/tc/dc\\_meetings\\_minutes/DC\\_M21\\_M.pdf](http://www.districtcouncils.gov.hk/wts/doc/2012_2015/tc/dc_meetings_minutes/DC_M21_M.pdf))