

OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Wednesday, 3 December 2003

The Council met at half-past Two o'clock

MEMBERS PRESENT:

THE PRESIDENT

THE HONOURABLE MRS RITA FAN HSU LAI-TAI, G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE KENNETH TING WOO-SHOU, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE JAMES TIEN PEI-CHUN, G.B.S., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE DAVID CHU YU-LIN, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CYD HO SAU-LAN

THE HONOURABLE ALBERT HO CHUN-YAN

IR DR THE HONOURABLE RAYMOND HO CHUNG-TAI, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LEE CHEUK-YAN

THE HONOURABLE MARTIN LEE CHU-MING, S.C., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE ERIC LI KA-CHEUNG, G.B.S., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE DAVID LI KWOK-PO, G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE FRED LI WAH-MING, J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE LUI MING-WAH, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE NG LEUNG-SING, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MARGARET NG

THE HONOURABLE MRS SELINA CHOW LIANG SHUK-YEE, G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE JAMES TO KUN-SUN

THE HONOURABLE CHEUNG MAN-KWONG

THE HONOURABLE HUI CHEUNG-CHING, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHAN KWOK-KEUNG, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHAN KAM-LAM, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MRS SOPHIE LEUNG LAU YAU-FUN, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LEUNG YIU-CHUNG

THE HONOURABLE SIN CHUNG-KAI

THE HONOURABLE ANDREW WONG WANG-FAT, J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE PHILIP WONG YU-HONG, G.B.S.

THE HONOURABLE WONG YUNG-KAN

THE HONOURABLE JASPER TSANG YOK-SING, G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE HOWARD YOUNG, S.B.S., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE YEUNG SUM

THE HONOURABLE YEUNG YIU-CHUNG, B.B.S.

THE HONOURABLE LAU CHIN-SHEK, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LAU KONG-WAH, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LAU WONG-FAT, G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MIRIAM LAU KIN-YEE, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE AMBROSE LAU HON-CHUEN, G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE EMILY LAU WAI-HING, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHOY SO-YUK

THE HONOURABLE ANDREW CHENG KAR-FOO

THE HONOURABLE SZETO WAH

THE HONOURABLE TIMOTHY FOK TSUN-TING, S.B.S., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE LAW CHI-KWONG, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE TAM YIU-CHUNG, G.B.S., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE TANG SIU-TONG, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE ABRAHAM SHEK LAI-HIM, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LI FUNG-YING, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE HENRY WU KING-CHEONG, B.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE TOMMY CHEUNG YU-YAN, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MICHAEL MAK KWOK-FUNG

THE HONOURABLE ALBERT CHAN WAI-YIP

THE HONOURABLE LEUNG FU-WAH, M.H., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE LO WING-LOK, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE WONG SING-CHI

THE HONOURABLE FREDERICK FUNG KIN-KEE

THE HONOURABLE IP KWOK-HIM, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LAU PING-CHEUNG

THE HONOURABLE AUDREY EU YUET-MEE, S.C., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MA FUNG-KWOK, J.P.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

THE HONOURABLE CHAN YUEN-HAN, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE BERNARD CHAN, J.P.

PUBLIC OFFICERS ATTENDING:

THE HONOURABLE DONALD TSANG YAM-KUEN, G.B.M., J.P.
THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

THE HONOURABLE HENRY TANG YING-YEN, G.B.S., J.P.
THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY

THE HONOURABLE MICHAEL SUEN MING-YEUNG, G.B.S., J.P.
SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS

PROF THE HONOURABLE ARTHUR LI KWOK-CHEUNG, G.B.S., J.P.
SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION AND MANPOWER

THE HONOURABLE JOSEPH WONG WING-PING, G.B.S., J.P.
SECRETARY FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE

DR THE HONOURABLE PATRICK HO CHI-PING, J.P.
SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS

THE HONOURABLE STEPHEN IP SHU-KWAN, G.B.S., J.P.
SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOUR

THE HONOURABLE STEPHEN LAM SUI-LUNG, J.P.
SECRETARY FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

CLERKS IN ATTENDANCE:

MR RICKY FUNG CHOI-CHEUNG, J.P., SECRETARY GENERAL

MR LAW KAM-SANG, J.P., DEPUTY SECRETARY GENERAL

MS PAULINE NG MAN-WAH, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

MR RAY CHAN YUM-MOU, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

TABLING OF PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table pursuant to Rule 21(2) of the Rules of Procedure:

Subsidiary Legislation/Instruments	<i>L.N. No.</i>
------------------------------------	-----------------

Import and Export (General) Regulations (Amendment of Seventh Schedule) (No. 9) Notice 2003	254/2003
---	----------

Registration of Persons (Amendment) Regulation 2003 (L.N. 165 of 2003) (Commencement) Notice 2003.....	255/2003
--	----------

Matrimonial Causes (Amendment) Rules 2003 (L.N. 209 of 2003) (Commencement) Notice 2003	256/2003
---	----------

Other Papers

No. 32	—	Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation Annual Report 2002/2003
--------	---	--

No. 33	—	Hong Kong Productivity Council Annual Report 2002/2003
--------	---	--

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Questions. First question.

Appointment of Chairpersons and Members of Statutory and Advisory Bodies

1. **MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG** (in Cantonese): *Madam President, regarding the appointment of chairpersons and members of statutory and advisory bodies, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (a) *of the total number of members of the Chief Executive Election Committee (Election Committee) or political parties appointed as chairpersons or members of statutory or advisory bodies by the relevant authorities since the reunification, with a table listing the bodies and posts to which each such person has been appointed and by whom the appointments were made; and*
- (b) *whether the relevant authorities will consider appointing members of the Election Committee or political parties of different political views, professional expertise or backgrounds to sit on statutory or advisory bodies so that such bodies may take in different views in a more balanced manner?*

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): Madam President,

- (a) The Government's existing policy of appointing chairpersons and members to advisory and statutory bodies is primarily based on the merit principle. Our major considerations in making appointments are the candidates' expertise, experience and integrity, and so on. If a special need (such as requiring certain professional knowledge) arises, the Government will invite certain organizations to nominate representatives as members of advisory and statutory bodies so as to reflect the views of certain associations or professional sectors. In general, the Government will endeavour to ensure that the composition of each and every advisory and statutory body can fully reflect the views and opinions of people from different strata and sectors of the society.

At present, there are some 500 advisory and statutory bodies in Hong Kong. The whole system of advisory and statutory bodies is very complicated and multi-faceted, comprising various advisory committees, public bodies, appeal boards and public corporations, and so on. The authority of appointment does not rest solely with the Chief Executive. It is also to a great extent vested with the principal officials and heads of departments. Nevertheless, all of them will make the most suitable appointment in view of the functions and needs of the bodies. Regarding the appointments to statutory bodies, the Government will make appointments according

to the provisions set out in relevant legislation. For example, in appointing members of the Football Betting and Lotteries Commission, we appoint representatives from social welfare sector, education sector and religious sector. In making appointments, the Government will assess candidates' ability in all aspects, as well as his commitment to public service. We will listen to public views and anticipation of the work of advisory and statutory bodies, so as to ensure the committees' composition could reflect views from different sectors as far as practicable.

The political affiliation of a candidate or whether he is a member of the Election Committee is not an important factor for consideration. As we do not have the data concerning members of different political parties in Hong Kong, we are unable to identify the number of political party members sitting on advisory and statutory bodies. As for the number of Election Committee members appointed to advisory and statutory bodies, I would like to explain that, not all Election Committee members submit information to the Central Personality Index kept by the Home Affairs Bureau. With the data available, we can only make the following rough estimates:

Total number of Election Committee members	About 800
Number of Election Committee members appointed to advisory and statutory bodies	About 390 (48.8%) (including 40 members who only serve in district level committee.)

As it takes time to process so much information on so many people, we are at present unable to provide the details of each Election Committee member as requested.

- (b) As I have pointed out in part (a) above, it is clear that in appointing members of advisory and statutory bodies, the Government aims to select the most capable candidates only. In setting up a committee, the Government will look into its functions and enlist talents from the professional fields, people representing public opinions, the academia, business sector and people holding different views, so

that holistic and comprehensive views can be solicited through the committee. We hope that the appointees are selected on the basis of their ability and each one of them possesses specific expertise and plays a particular role. At present, the advisory and statutory bodies could generally involve representatives from different strata of society and the Government would be able to hear different voices. Also, in making the appointments, we will not discriminate against any candidate on the grounds of sex, age, religion, race and social background. On the whole, we hope that the existing policy and legislation can ensure the pluralistic composition of advisory and statutory bodies, and that by enlisting people of different background and experiences, advisory committees can give valuable advice to the Government and statutory bodies can operate smoothly. In view of the above, whether an individual is a member of the Election Committee or political party is not an important factor when we make an appointment.

Madam President, there has been an increasing interest in the public on the appointment of chairpersons and members of advisory and statutory bodies, and raised a number of issues that worth further examination. They include the appointment of chairpersons or members of advisory and statutory bodies, and ways to perfect the existing system to facilitate the collection of views by various advisory and statutory bodies. In view of this, we have to extend the scope of the current review of the system of advisory and statutory bodies in the light of the latest developments. We shall take into account the Honourable CHEUNG Man-kwong's suggestion in our review.

MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG (in Cantonese): *Madam President, the Secretary for Home Affairs was criticized of being a "flash mobber" in the Michael WONG incident for shirking responsibilities. However, in the disclosure on the appointment of Election Committee members as members of statutory and advisory bodies, he just ducked out and covered up the truth, acquitting himself worse than the crocodile in Shan Pui River; while the crocodile would come out and do some sunbathing occasionally, the Government's appointment of members of the Election Committee is shrouded in mystery*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Please raise your supplementary direct.

MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG (in Cantonese): *And a disclosure of the details is refused. My supplementary is: Does it not show that the Government has a devil in its heart and fears for a disclosure of information and fears that the public may find the fact that the Chief Executive only appoints his own cronies of identical political views and practises nepotism, instead of adhering to the merit principle as suggested in the main reply? In order to dispel worries, will the Government make enquiries with the 390 appointees one by one and then disclose the appointment record of each of them?*

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): Madam President, I have to reiterate that the Government's existing policy is primarily based on the merit principle. We will definitely seek the consent of the 390 appointees before providing Members with the relevant and detailed information in writing and disclosing them to Members as soon as possible. (Appendix I)

DR YEUNG SUM (in Cantonese): *Madam President, the Secretary pointed out in the main reply that a total of 390 Election Committee members had been appointed as chairpersons or members of advisory and statutory bodies. Can the Secretary provide further information to set out clearly how many of the posts of advisory and statutory bodies are taken by these 390 Election Committee members? Is anyone among them taking up duties in more than one advisory or statutory body? How many posts of these advisory or statutory bodies are taken up by Election Committee members?*

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): Madam President, please allow me to reply in writing later on. With regard to details in this respect, we would give the public a full account on that. (Appendix II)

MISS MARGARET NG (in Cantonese): *Madam President, can the Secretary clarify why he said in the main reply that details on Election Committee members taking up duties in advisory and statutory bodies were personal information and*

their prior consent must be sought? In fact, these appointments are open and the files are readily accessible, so our present request is to present it in a tabulated form only. May I ask the Secretary on what principle he has based his remark that the parties concerned should be informed before the information could be disclosed to this Council?

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): Madam President, according to our internal guidelines, we should inform the parties concerned before announcing who have been appointed to sit on which advisory and statutory bodies, in order to avoid the possible embarrassment caused to the parties concerned by unexpected press questions that they are not prepared to take. Therefore it is only a notice out of courtesy. We will definitely disclose the information, because when they submit information to the Central Personality Index, they have given us consent to disclose the information. However, we should inform them before the information is made public, this is the practice we have been observing.

MISS MARGARET NG (in Cantonese): *I was asking the Secretary what principle he adhered to, not the internal guidelines. The internal guidelines are just some documents, but my question was on what principle should their consent be sought? As a matter of fact, their appointments have been made public.*

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): Madam President, I wish to add that it is based on the principle of courtesy.

MR SIN CHUNG-KAI (in Cantonese): *Madam President, may I ask the Secretary whether he has considered amending the guidelines to state that once a person accepts the appointment, the Government would make public his information in this respect? In other words, the procedure has to be changed. As far as the existing practice is concerned, their consent should be sought before the information could be disclosed. Nevertheless, will you amend the procedure and state that the information shall be deemed to have been disclosed once they accept the appointment?*

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): Madam President, it is precisely like the case presented by Mr SIN Chung-kai, for while a number of committees or advisory bodies would disclose the information after their members have accepted the appointment, some will not make the information public. For that reason, different committees adopt different approaches. We will include the opinion in the impending review of advisory and statutory bodies, the scope of which has already been broadened. We will definitely look at the needs in this respect in detail.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr James TIEN. Mr TIEN, I am sorry, please wait a minute. Mr SIN Chung-kai, has your supplementary not been answered?

MR SIN CHUNG-KAI (in Cantonese): *My supplementary was about whether the procedure would be amended. You stated in your reply that it would be amended, because some committees have already adopted that practice. In that case, will those committees, which have not yet adopted the practice, change their practices and make this a uniform practice?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): *Secretary, do you have anything to add?*

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): I reiterate that we would consider and look into the need in this respect.

MR JAMES TIEN (in Cantonese): *Madam President, the Secretary emphasized that the Government aimed to select the most capable candidates only, which included talents from the professional fields, business sector and the academia, and said that the political affiliation of an individual was not an important factor when the Government was making an appointment. Some members of the democratic camp may also be representatives of the business sector or the academia. Will the Secretary be reluctant to appoint them because you know that they are members of the democratic camp?*

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): Madam President, our policy of appointing individuals to advisory and statutory bodies is primarily based on the merit principle. We will not give any specific consideration to any candidate on the grounds of sex, age, religion, race or political affiliation.

MR MARTIN LEE (in Cantonese): *Madam President, does the reply given by the Secretary just now imply that none of the members of the democratic camp have the capability? The Secretary also said that the political affiliation of an individual was not an important factor, that is, it is one of the factors, only that it is not important. Then, may I ask the Secretary, what is the connotation of someone's political affiliation?*

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): Madam President, under special circumstances, it is a factor for consideration. For example, if certain members of a political party are already sitting on an advisory committee, in order to prevent an imbalance as a result of too many members of that political party sitting on the committee, it is likely that we would avoid appointing members of the same political party to sit on the relevant advisory committee, or we may wish to have some independent and non-politically affiliated individuals to sit on certain committees; therefore, we may consider not appointing persons with political affiliation to sit on the relevant committees. Nevertheless, I must stress that the principle by and large remains to select the most capable candidates only.

MR MARTIN LEE (in Cantonese): *Just now I was trying to follow up Mr James TIEN's.....*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEE, which part of your supplementary has not been answered? Are you trying to follow up Mr James TIEN's supplementary?

MR MARTIN LEE (in Cantonese): *It was the first part. I wish to follow up the preceding supplementary, that is, will members of the democratic camp not be appointed since they are not capable enough?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Martin LEE, you may sit down. In fact, you can only raise one supplementary, but now you have raised two supplementaries. I would leave it to the Secretary to decide how he would reply and see whether the Secretary has anything to add.

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): Madam President, in fact we have noted that few members of the democratic camp or Democratic Party are sitting on advisory and statutory bodies. We would pay particular attention to this respect in the impending review.

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): *Miss Margaret NG has already raised the supplementary I wish to raise, but the Secretary's reply was not at all satisfactory. Will such principle infringe on the privacy of an individual? However, given all of these are public duties, what is the relevance of privacy to public duties?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WONG, we have a tight schedule.

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): *This is the question I wish to ask.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WONG, are you asking the relevance of privacy to public duties? Secretary.

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): Madam President, I have already given a reply. As I said just now, it is not a matter of privacy, but as a matter of courtesy, we should first notify the parties concerned before disclosure.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): We have spent more than 17 minutes on this question. The last supplementary.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): *Madam President, may I ask the Secretary, how many committees, be they advisory or statutory bodies, would not disclose their membership lists? Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong requested in the main question a table listing the relevant information. If we find most of the information on the list has been made public after cross-checking the list of the Election Committee and those advisory committees, can you inform the parties concerned that you would disclose the list at the meeting of the Legislative Council concurrently when you come to the Legislative Council to answer Members' oral questions? According to the Rules of Procedure, we have given you sufficient time to prepare an answer to an oral question of the Legislative Council.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr James TO, you have raised your supplementary, right?

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): *The final part of.....*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr James TO, have you finished your supplementary?

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): *The final part of my supplementary is, such being the case, why did you not have enough time to inform them?*

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): Madam President, I will definitely give Members a written reply later. (Appendix III)

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): *Is it that difficult to give us a single example concerning which committee would not disclose its membership list? I am not sure if it is what the Government really means. I have no idea, but I hope that at least the Government can give us an example.*

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): Madam President, indeed, if it is a committee, it would be made public. Just now I mentioned the name list, therefore, I have to inform the relevant members, and we can disclose that after seeking their consent.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Second question.

Large Real Estate Developers Expanding Business Areas

2. **MR FRED LI** (in Cantonese): *Madam President, at present, some large real estate developers in Hong Kong concurrently run other businesses such as estate management, retail and telecommunications, and make use of the housing estates they developed as platforms for expanding these businesses. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council whether:*

- (a) *the Competition Policy Advisory Group or government departments have received complaints against large real estate developers using the above practice to run other businesses; if so, of the number of such complaints received in each of the past three years and the follow-up actions taken;*
- (b) *it has examined the impact of the above business practice on other competitors, and whether such a practice violates the principle of fair competition; and*
- (c) *it knows if regulations and restrictions on business practices of cross-sector enterprises are in place in overseas countries; if so, of the details, and whether the authorities will put in place similar regulations and restrictions?*

SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOUR (in Cantonese): Madam President,

- (a) Neither the Competition Policy Advisory Group nor any government department has received complaints against large real estate developers engaging concurrently in other businesses such as

estate management, retail and telecommunications, and making use of their housing developments as platforms for expanding these businesses.

- (b) Mr Fred LI Wah-ming wrote to the Financial Secretary on 13 November this year requesting the Competition Policy Advisory Group to look into the above-mentioned business practice. As a result, the Government is now looking into the matter. We will examine the impact of such practice on other competitors, and consider whether such practice violates the fair competition principle. As we have just commenced the investigation, we are not in a position to draw any conclusion yet.

Exploring new business opportunities, developing new markets and diversifying into other business areas are common commercial practices. To the economy and society, these can be drivers for economic development and market competition. To the business operations, they can be logical progressions in business development. To the consumers, such activities may offer opportunities for them to benefit from economic efficiency and economy of scale. Real estate developers operating other businesses such as estate management, retail and telecommunications in the housing development is one form of business diversification. Whether this business practice violates the principle of fair competition will hinge on whether the developers have, in operating individual businesses, acted in a manner that has limited market accessibility or market contestability, impaired economic efficiency or free trade to the detriment of the overall interest of Hong Kong. Another consideration is whether such acts have adversely affected the interest of the consumer. We must therefore conduct thorough investigation, and consider the actual circumstances of each case. We should not take things at their face value and jump to conclusion.

Mr Fred LI's question also covers issues such as estate management. On estate management, there is an established mechanism regulating the procurement of various services in housing estates and replacing under-performing management companies.

According to the guidelines promulgated by the Lands Department, to facilitate planning and property development by developers, particularly those projects involving multi-phase development with different completion and occupation dates, the developer may appoint the first estate management company for an initial period not exceeding two years. The Deed of Mutual Covenant provides that the owners may, on expiry of the two-year period, employ another company to manage their property by a resolution of the owners holding not less than 50% of the shares.

The Building Management Ordinance further provides that, any services with a value exceeding or likely to exceed the sum of \$100,000 or 20% of an owners' corporation's annual budget, whichever is the less, shall be procured by tender.

- (c) Information in hand indicates that developed economies or places at a level of economic development similar to that of Hong Kong do not have any regulations or restrictions on the operation of cross-sector enterprises. These places, including the United States, the European Union (EU) and Australia, only have provisions in their competition laws against anti-competitive practices or agreements that would seriously affect the operation of the relevant sector or market. Whether the enterprises have cross-sector business is not a factor for consideration.

In the case of the EU, its competition law prohibits anti-competitive agreements and abuse of dominant market position. Notwithstanding, the provisions prohibiting anti-competitive agreements do not apply to intra-group agreements (such as leases between a subsidiary and its parent company). And in determining whether a company with dominant market position has abused its position, the company's engagement in cross-sector business activities is not a factor for consideration.

MR FRED LI (in Cantonese): *Madam President, recently, many residents of private housing estates have pointed out that in the estates where they live, the estate management company, which is owned by the developer, chose to use the*

telephone network or fixed telecommunications network services (FTNS) provided by operators belonging to the same group, thus depriving them of their right to choose and securing interest for the telecommunications company under the same group. May I ask the Government if such a practice has deprived consumers of the right to choose and violates the principle of fair competition?

SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOUR (in Cantonese): I wish to thank Mr LI for this supplementary. Residents of housing estates certainly have the right to choose their FTNS operator. Mr LI mentioned the situation in some housing estates. As far as I know, the practice of including the telephone service charge in the management fee is adopted in these housing estates, however, it is claimed that the service is provided free-of-charge. In other words, the households can still use the telephone services provided by other FTNS operators, but the management fee cannot be reduced accordingly. Should such a situation occur, residents can lodge a complaint with the Office of the Telecommunications Authority (OFTA) and the Consumer Council. In fact, the OFTA has received complaints from the households concerned and is investigating the complaints according to the Telecommunication Ordinance. The Consumer Council has also received relevant complaints and is following them up in conjunction with the OFTA.

MR FRED LI (in Cantonese): *The Secretary has not answered my question. Does such a practice violate the principle of fair competition?*

SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOUR (in Cantonese): I believe we have to collect more information to understand the actual circumstances. As I have said, it depends on the actual circumstances of each case, because residents still have the right to opt for the telephone service provided by other FTNS operators. It is not the case that they can only use the service provided by a designated FTNS operator to the exclusion of others. I believe we have to look at the actual circumstances. The OFTA is now also conducting investigations according to the Telecommunication Ordinance. After the investigations have yielded results, I will report to Members.

MR SIN CHUNG-KAI (in Cantonese): *Madam President, the guidelines are not legally binding. May I ask the Government what measures it can take against organizations that do not adhere to the guidelines?*

SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOUR (in Cantonese): Mr SIN did not specify which guidelines. Do you mean the guidelines issued recently by the Bureau, or some other guidelines?

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr SIN, can you please explain.

MR SIN CHUNG-KAI (in Cantonese): *Yes. I mean the guidelines on fair competition compiled recently after consultations with the trade associations.*

SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOUR (in Cantonese): Thank you, Mr SIN. In fact, these guidelines are not legislation, however, we have also consulted many trade associations and the industry on these guidelines. We now hope that the trade associations of various industries can formulate objective benchmarks according to the guidelines to serve as their codes of conduct, and so on. Various industries should then adhere to them voluntarily and take the initiative to formulate codes of conduct tailored for their own trade. We hope that through the guidelines and the codes of conduct tailored for individual industries, and the voluntary adherence and spontaneous formulation of the same, anti-competitive behaviour can be pre-empted. Of course, we will monitor the implementation of the codes and determine if it will bring improvements to the competition situation and then examine what actions have to be taken.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr SIN, has the Secretary not answered your supplementary?

MR SIN CHUNG-KAI (in Cantonese): *The Secretary has not answered my supplementary. To take the initiative is of course to do so out of one's volition, the point is that they do not.....*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Which part of your supplementary has not been answered? You do not have to expound on his answer. You only need to point out which part of your supplementary has not been answered.

MR SIN CHUNG-KAI (in Cantonese): *The Secretary has not yet answered it. After hearing his answer, I find that there is nothing the Government can do. May I ask the Secretary if, according to my understanding, this is his answer?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I am sorry, this is not a supplementary.

MR SIN CHUNG-KAI (in Cantonese): *If this is not his answer, then is there anything that the Government can do, or is there not? The supplementary I have asked was: Is there anything that the Government can do? I want him to simply answer if there is, or there is not.*

SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOUR (in Cantonese): The answer is definitely in the positive. That means although the guidelines are not legally binding, we have actively followed up these voluntary guidelines with the industry and consulted many of its members. What we have to do now is to let the industry formulate the codes of conduct mentioned by me on a self-disciplined basis. I believe Members will also agree that we do not have to implement everything by way of legislation. If the codes of conduct prove to be effective, I hope Members will also agree that this is a feasible approach. What we are talking about is to implement the requirements of the codes of conduct through self-regulation. We will monitor their effectiveness. If necessary, we will not rule out taking action against anti-competitive behaviour by means of legislation. That is to say, if it is found that the codes of conduct are not effective, certainly I will not rule out pursuing the legislative approach.

MR HENRY WU (in Cantonese): *Madam President, in part (b) of the Secretary's main reply, in the paragraph about the guidelines promulgated by the Lands Department, it is mentioned that "the owners may, on expiry of the two-*

year period, employ another company to manage their property by a resolution of the owners holding not less than 50% of the shares". I believe the Government is well aware that in fact not many owners holding shares will come forward to vote. May I ask the Government why it did not adopt as the requirement the support of 50% of those present, that is, the majority of the owners present, instead of the requirement that the support of owners holding 50% of all shares?

SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOUR (in Cantonese): The simple answer is that this is stipulated in existing legislation. This is the answer. It seems the issue raised by Mr Henry WU is whether, since the people present usually hold less than 50% of the shares, it is necessary to change the requirement to 50% of those present. I believe this issue can be referred to the department concerned for consideration.

MR FRED LI (in Cantonese): *Madam President, I wish to follow up the supplementary concerning 50% of the shares. In a housing development, often the shopping mall accounts for a very large proportion of the shares and the shopping mall also belongs to the developer. It is totally impossible to secure the support of owners holding the other 50% of shares so that minor property owners can attempt to hire another management company. Is the Government aware of such an unfair situation? If yes, what improvements should be made?*

SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOUR (in Cantonese): Madam President, I do not quite understand Mr LI's supplementary. I know that in housing estates, a large proportion of the shares is owned by minor property owners. I do not understand why major property owners will always hold more than 50% of the shares.

MR FRED LI (in Cantonese): *Madam President, as far as I understand it, shopping malls are incorporated into some privately-developed housing estates and they account for a certain proportion of the shares of the entire lot. To hire another estate management company, it is necessary for the parties to discuss together. By proportion, the shares held by the shopping mall are even greater than those held by minor property owners. Under these circumstances, it is*

impossible for minor property owners to secure the support from owners holding 50% of shares in the residential part to overturn the practice of hiring the management company owned by the developer.

SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOUR (in Cantonese): Madam President, I am not an expert on this, but I believe the management fee for the shopping mall and that for residents are two separate matters. Since I am not an expert and since Mr LI has raised this issue, I am happy to refer Mr LI's suggestion — that is, whether the shares held by shopping malls should be separated so that residents can exercise their rights and make decisions — to the Policy Bureau concerned for consideration.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Third question.

Litigations Arising From Acquisition of Private Land by Government

3. **MR LAU WONG-FAT** (in Cantonese): *Madam President, regarding litigations arising from the acquisition of private land by the Government, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (a) *of the number of litigations instituted in the past five years as a result of the Government's failure to reach an agreement with owners of private land on compensation for the resumption or lease of private land, as well as the respective numbers of those cases in which the Government lost and lodged an appeal;*
- (b) *of the total amount of litigation fees paid from public money for such cases in the past five years; and*
- (c) *whether it has required the departments concerned to review if the cases in which judgement was given against the Government involved any mistakes on the part of government officials, and if such officials have to be held responsible; if the departments concerned have been required to do so, of the details of the review results; if not, the reasons for that?*

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Cantonese):

Madam President, my reply to the three parts of the question is as follows:

- (a) If the Government needs to resume private land or to create rights of temporary occupation over private land for public projects, compensation is payable to affected persons who are entitled to compensation in accordance with the provisions of the relevant ordinances. If the affected persons are not satisfied with the Government's offer of compensation, they can refer their cases to the Lands Tribunal for determination. In the past five years, the claimants accept the Government's offer in the majority of cases.

During that period, about 8 000 private lots were resumed and rights of temporary occupations created over 270 private lots. Among these, only 245 cases had been referred to the Lands Tribunal for determination. Of these 245 cases, 107 were either settled or discontinued prior to the commencement of the Lands Tribunal hearing, and 38 cases had been heard with judgements delivered. The remaining 100 cases are awaiting hearing.

Of the 38 cases mentioned above where Lands Tribunal judgements have been delivered, 14 cases were in favour of the Government and 24 cases in favour of the claimants.

Among these 24 cases, the Government appealed in nine cases. Out of these, one case was dismissed by consent and the Government ultimately won two cases in the Court of Final Appeal. The other six appeals are pending determination.

- (b) The total amount of litigation fees paid from public money for such cases in the past five years amounts to \$20.3 million.
- (c) In handling compensation claims, government officers concerned act with due diligence and in accordance with the provisions of the relevant ordinances, the established procedures and their professional/technical knowledge. They have the duty to safeguarding the proper use of public monies. There is no reason to doubt individual officers' integrity and conduct in handling such claims. Hence, we do not think that they should be held responsible for any discrepancies in the claim cases.

Notwithstanding the above, the judgements handed down by the Lands Tribunal and higher courts are followed up by the Administration. Where appropriate, the fairness and adequacy of the relevant policy, procedures and practices are reviewed in the light of the court judgements.

MR LAU WONG-FAT (in Cantonese): *Madam President, may I ask whether the department concerned has any internal guidelines and under what circumstances litigation can be initiated by officers who are in charge of the case; and whether the criteria adopted by a certain responsible officer in vetting and approving the litigation proposal can be made known to members of the public?*

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Cantonese): Madam President, it may be necessary for me to give an explanation. As I explained earlier, our officers are mainly responsible for offering compensations in land resumption. If the private landowners are satisfied with the compensation offered by the Government, they will certainly accept it. From my main reply, Members can see that the majority of owners have agreed to and accepted the compensation arrangements of the Government and a small number of owners have objected. Therefore, the initiative to seek a judgement from the Court or Lands Tribunal rests with the claimant, and the initiative is taken by them and not us. Of course, I have also said that there are some cases in which judgements were made in favour of the claimants. Over the past five years, we have dealt with 8 000 cases, and only 38 cases were ruled by the Lands Tribunal after hearings, with only 24 cases being ruled in favour of the claimants. As regards these 24 cases, the Government will consider whether there is a need to appeal against the judgement of the Lands Tribunal. Of course, there are different reasons for appeal, some being legal, some being technical, some being over the amount of compensation, and so on. The Government has appealed only on nine of those cases and we do have guidelines for doing so. As I said earlier, the Government will determine whether it is necessary to appeal in accordance with the guidelines in the light of different circumstances. It can be seen from the main reply that the number of such cases is minimal and those are exceptional cases.

MR NG LEUNG-SING (in Cantonese): *Madam President, according to the main reply, among those litigations, 14 cases were ruled in favour of the Government and 24 in favour of the claimants. In other words, the number of cases ruled in favour of the claimants is more than the number of cases ruled in favour of the Government. The Government said in part (c) of the main reply that there is no reason to doubt individual officers' integrity and conduct in handling such claims, and there is no reason to believe that they should be held responsible because the Government has lost a case. Under such circumstances, is there a need for investigations to be conducted by independent officers outside the department so as to determine whether there are reasons to believe whether the relevant officers should be held responsible?*

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Cantonese): *Madam President, as I explained earlier, we are only talking about a minimal number of cases. Very often, this has nothing to do with the officers who handled the cases but rather the legal basis for handling the relevant cases or the amount of compensations offered in accordance with the law. These should be the point of our contention and the personal wish of officers who handled the cases are not involved because this is not a factor. In dealing with all such matters, firstly, we must act in accordance with the relevant legislation and this is most important; secondly, we have to follow our professional judgement; and thirdly, we must act in accordance with the guidelines and other procedures. As such, though there is only a very small number of such cases, I have also said in the main reply that if the Court ruled that we had interpreted the law differently, after a judgement is passed by the Court, we will certainly act in accordance with the judgement. Or, if the Court pointed out in its statement that there were inadequacies in our work procedures, we should certainly endeavour to perfect our own procedures in accordance with the judgement made by the Court. In this regard, though we have taken follow-up actions, we do not think that this has anything to do with personal integrity but rather we have interpreted the law differently in the whole process.*

MR WONG SING-CHI (in Cantonese): *Madam President, can the Government tell us, of the litigations arising from land resumption, how many involved confrontations; and during this process, what measures has the Government taken to prevent confrontations arising from the acquisition of land?*

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Cantonese): Madam President, I do not have such information at hand and I am also not sure whether we have detailed information in this regard. We do have spasmodic reports on certain confrontations, but I am not sure whether such reports are comprehensive. However, I would try my best to provide a written reply that can meet with Mr WONG's request when I am back in the office. (Appendix IV)

MR WONG SING-CHI (in Cantonese): *What measures does the Government have to prevent confrontations arising from land resumption? Apart from the figures I enquired about earlier, what measures does the Government have to actually prevent confrontations arising from such land resumption?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WONG, as the Secretary said earlier he did not know whether there were such situations, I think you can follow up after he has given his reply in writing.

MR WONG SING-CHI (in Cantonese): *Madam President, I was asking what measures there were. Even if the Government does not have the relevant figures, it should have some measures. Even if the Government said it does not have such figures or measures, it does not matter.*

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Cantonese): Madam President, as regards land resumption, many people perceive this as mandatory and something that they do not have any option. Of course, if we just handle such issues strictly in accordance with the law, it will often lead to certain confrontations. In dealing with the issue of land resumption, we have actually allowed sufficient time for the affected persons to learn about it. We will certainly publish a notice in the Gazette to let affected persons learn about this matter and make necessary preparations. In effecting land resumption, we also offer different kinds of *ex gratia* allowance to the affected persons in addition to statutory compensations. For example, we offer *ex gratia* allowance to people who are not landowners themselves but have leased land for farming purposes and such tenants will be offered a special allowance. Therefore, we have often managed to deal with issues like demolition of agricultural structures

and the housing problem of affected persons. Certainly, due to certain restrictions in policy, for example, the affected persons do not meet the requirements of our policy, then even if such *ex gratia* compensation is in place, it cannot be offered to the affected persons. So, such circumstances may sometimes lead to confrontations.

As regards compensation on land resumption, what I have talked about earlier is statutory compensation. In fact, apart from statutory compensation, we have still got certain *ex gratia* zonal compensation and the amount of this compensation is actually higher than that of the statutory compensation. If the affected persons accept this offer, they will have to give up their right to petition the Lands Tribunal. Therefore, we have a series of more flexible ways to deal with the problems we face, and to reduce the possibility of confrontation.

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): *Madam President, first of all, I would like to point out that the Secretary did not answer Mr LAU Wong-fat's question on whether guidelines could be made public. I hope the Secretary can also answer this question.*

From the figures, it seems that the Government is very reasonable, but I would like very much to know how the whole resumption process is conducted. According to the resumption procedure, a notice is first published in the Gazette and the land can then resumed. If the land is occupied on a temporary basis, and that is, it is illegally occupied on a temporary basis, then ex gratia allowance will be provided as compensation; if the land is leased on a temporary basis, then unless litigation is initiated after the lease comes into effect, nothing can be done and there is no such thing as ex gratia compensation. If the affected person does not accept the ex gratia compensation, I would like to know, after the land is resumed.....

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WONG, please come directly to your supplementary question direct.

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): *This is my supplementary question.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Andrew WONG, instead of explaining the procedure, please ask your supplementary question, will you? This is because many Members are still waiting to ask their supplementary questions.

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): *This procedure requires great changes. From the process of gazettal to resuming the land and from resuming the land to referring the case to the Lands Tribunal, how much time is required?*

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Cantonese): Madam President, the whole land resumption process from gazettal to resumption is a legal process that has to be conducted in accordance with the relevant legislation. For example, after we have gazetted a notice, a period of three months will usually be given and notices will also be posted. If no one raise objections or put forward other requests within three months, then upon the expiry of this period, the land in question will be resumed by the Government. Of course, if someone raise objections, he will petition the Lands Tribunal for a judgement and undergo the relevant procedures. Appointments have to be made to take the case to the Lands Tribunal, so the time required will depend on the waiting time and this is not something we can control for this will be affected by many other factors. Therefore, as regards the time required in this area, I admit it has to depend on how much work the Lands Tribunal needs to do in the process. As regards other *ex gratia* compensations, we will usually award those compensations speedily and the time required only hinges on whether they are accepted by the affected person. If it is accepted by him, then the matter can be resolved, otherwise, negotiations will be held and it will then depend on the duration of the negotiations and whether an agreement can be reached. Therefore, the time required may fluctuate.

As regards Mr WONG's question on whether our guidelines can be made public, since our guidelines are very long in a thick volume, I am not sure whether there is a need to do so. If Mr LAU Wong-fat considers it necessary, I can invite him to our office and explain the guidelines to him in detail.

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): *Madam President, my specific supplementary question is the length of the waiting time for hearing. Of course,*

this is not within the control of the Secretary. However, since the Secretary has the figures for five years, he can tell us how long it will take for such cases to be referred to the Lands Tribunal. And, if appeals have to be lodged, how long is the waiting time and how long will the hearing take? Such figures must definitely be available and I hope the Secretary can give us a reply in writing.

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Cantonese): Madam President, they fall outside the scope of today's question, but since Mr WONG has asked a question on them, I can give him a reply in writing. (Appendix V)

MR IP KWOK-HIM (in Cantonese): *Madam President, may I ask the Secretary, in the course of the whole land resumption process, in addition to the Lands Department, will other departments such as the Home Affairs Department or the Housing Department be required to help? Under such circumstances, how can the expenses incurred be calculated and is it connected with government expenditure in any way?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, you may also think that this supplementary question is not related to the question scope today, but will you please answer it.

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Cantonese): I would like to thank the President for her sympathy.

I do not have such information at hand and I am also unable to grasp what Mr IP means by other expenditure. Is he referring to expenses incurred by other departments in relation to other work arising from this issue? I do not have such information at hand. Perhaps I can go back and ask my colleagues to examine if they can provide me with such information. If they can do so, I will give a reply in writing; if not, I will see whether they have other relevant information, so that I can give Mr IP a reply in writing. (Appendix VI)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): We have spent 18 minutes on this question. Last supplementary question.

MR JAMES TIEN (in Cantonese): *Madam President, the Secretary said in part (a) of the main reply that over the past five years, 245 cases had been referred to the Lands Tribunal for determination and 100 of such cases are awaiting hearing. The Secretary is also aware that the people involved may not necessarily be major real estate developers for many of them may be small landlords but their time and money are of great importance. May I ask the Secretary the average waiting time of the 100 cases that are still awaiting hearing?*

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Cantonese): *Madam President, I believe I would give Mr James TIEN a written reply on this question. (Appendix VII)*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): *Fourth Question.*

Work Pressure of Civil Servants

4. **MR MICHAEL MAK** (in Cantonese): *Madam President, regarding civil servants' work pressure, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (a) *of the total number of civil servants who sought help or guidance over the past three years from the Civil Service Bureau (CSB) or their own departments because of work pressure, together with a breakdown by their ranks;*
- (b) *whether it will take the initiative to study the work pressure experienced by the management and front-line staff of various departments and consider ways to alleviate their pressure; if it will, of the details of the study and consideration; if not, the reasons for that; and*
- (c) *whether the departments concerned will assess the psychological conditions of the candidates when considering promoting civil servants to management posts in order to ensure that they can cope with the work pressure after promotion?*

SECRETARY FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE (in Cantonese): Madam President, civil servants, like employees in other sectors, have to face rising expectations of their clients and changing service demands. In this process, they would inevitably have to come to terms with some degree of stress at work.

Under the management system of the Civil Service, the departmental management, down to each supervisor, has the responsibility to help their staff to deal with problems encountered in their work, including the management of stress at the workplace. When necessary, the management will try to alleviate the work stress felt by staff through reorganization and streamlining of work procedures, provide counselling, or arrange reposting for staff under stress.

Various government departments have already established departmental Safety Management Committees or similar set-ups, which comprise both management and staff representatives, to promote occupational health and perform related tasks, such as working out improvement measures to ensure a healthy working environment. We also encourage departments to organize activities that promote healthy mindset and healthy lifestyle, and enhance knowledge of health issues such as stress management.

During the past two years, the Administration organized about 140 courses per year on stress management for civil servants at all levels. While most of these courses were conducted by Training Officers of the Civil Service Training and Development Institute (CSTDI), guest speakers were also invited from private consultant agencies or government departments. Over 10 000 staff members have received this training. Besides, the subject of stress management is covered in training courses organized by the CSTDI on personal effectiveness, and in management training courses for Directorate staff as well as senior/middle managers.

Apart from classroom training, the Cyber Learning Centre Plus launched by the CSTDI also provides online courses and information on stress management and emotional intelligence.

In addition, the CSTDI conducts seminars on stress management. Guest speakers at these seminars include psychiatrists and clinical psychologists. They help participants understand the sources of stress and their impact, introduce stress management skills as well as encourage participants to cultivate a positive attitude towards life. Since 2000, some 7 300 civil servants have

attended these seminars. The majority of the participants consider the seminars useful in meeting their needs.

Apart from helping civil servants to better cope with work pressure and maintain a healthy living through the above preventive measures and training sessions, we also provide counselling services for individual civil servants in need.

At present, 11 departments (that is, Hong Kong Police Force, Correctional Services Department, Fire Services Department, Electrical and Mechanical Services Department, Social Welfare Department, Customs and Excise Department, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department, Department of Health, Post Office, Housing Department and Transport Department) provide in-house professional counselling services, including hotline counselling services and clinical psychology services, for some 100 000 civil servants.

As for other departments, the CSB has since 1999 commissioned professional counselling agencies to provide hotline counselling service for staff. Face-to-face counselling and clinical psychology services are provided to staff in need. About 70 000 civil servants from 63 bureaux and departments are presently covered by this scheme.

My answers to the questions raised by Mr Michael MAK are as follows:

- (a) According to the records kept by the CSB and various departments, for the past three years, that is, from January 2001 to October 2003, a total of 2 428 civil servants with stress problem at workplace sought professional assistance or counselling through the hotline service provided by the CSB or the in-house counselling offered by individual departments. A breakdown by grades reveals that 1 380 (or 57%) are technical/operational, assistant or front-line staff; 563 (or 23%) clerical and secretarial staff, workmen or drivers; 481 (or 20%) professional, managerial or supervisory staff.
- (b) As I have mentioned earlier, in our daily working environment, it is incumbent upon each supervisor at the management level to help their staff in dealing with problems encountered in their work, including the work pressure they face, and be alert to the need for any follow-up action or assistance.

In monitoring the overall situation, we also assess the utilization of the counselling services. For instance, the CSB collects and analyses monthly statistical data on users of the counselling service. In case of need, such data will be referred to the relevant departments to consider whether follow-up action should be taken.

The statistics available reveal that for the past three years, the number of civil servants who sought government counselling services on grounds of work pressure remained fairly stable (at about 800 to 900 cases per year). Take the counselling service provided by the CSB as an example, according to the survey questionnaires returned by service users, over 90% consider the hotline counselling service on stress management useful in solving their problems partly or entirely.

- (c) When completing the performance appraisal report, the appraising officer is usually required to assess the appraisee's performance while working under pressure. As and when officers advance, on the basis of performance and potential, up the promotion ladder, the management provides suitable training to meet the development needs of individual officers at different stages to enhance their capabilities, including the ability to manage stress. An officer's performance under pressure, including his reliability and resilience, is regarded by the management as a core competence for the purpose of training, assessment and selection for promotion.

In selecting officers for promotion, we would consider the qualified candidates' character, ability, experience and performance, as well as any qualifications prescribed for the higher rank. This would include an assessment, on the basis of the officer's past performance under work pressure, of the officer's ability to cope with the work pressure expected of the higher rank on a sustained basis.

MR MICHAEL MAK (in Cantonese): *Madam President, I forgot to declare an interest. I have conducted stress management courses for certain government departments, and provided free individual counselling services to some civil servants.*

In the last part of the main reply, the Secretary mentioned that in selecting officers for promotion, the ability of an eligible officer to cope with work pressure would be considered. Has the Secretary assessed how their performance is examined? Will civil servants worried about their promotion prospects choose not to approach the CSB or their department for professional assistance even when they come under pressure at work? For officers trying to hide their stress, how can the authorities reach out to help them?

SECRETARY FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE (in Cantonese): Madam President, as I have said in the main reply, under the existing management system, all departmental management and supervisors are required to pay attention to and be concerned about the performance of their subordinates. This includes understanding their problems and the need for counselling. We do have professional counselling services in place. If civil servants manage to have their stress problems well hidden from their supervisors, and do not call the hotline for professional counselling services (which all information is treated with strict confidence), it is absolutely difficult for us to deal with these cases. However, frankly speaking, in the management of stress of any kind, I think employers can only assist to a certain extent, and every serving officer has his part to play. He has the responsibility to manage stress that comes not only from work but also from personal, family and financial affairs.

MR LEUNG FU-WAH (in Cantonese): *Madam President, under the classification in part (a) of the main reply, figures for the disciplined services are not listed separately, so we do not know the figures for the disciplined services. Madam President, my supplementary question is on the types of stress faced by these 2 428 civil servants, for example, was it due to interpersonal relationship, complaints from the public or heavy workload. The Secretary only said that the pressure came from work. What are the types of pressure?*

SECRETARY FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE (in Cantonese): Madam President, the stress problems mentioned in part (a) of the main reply were all workplace related. These include strained relationship with supervisors at work, increased workload, or inability to deal with problems arising at work. We are not able to provide a further breakdown, for very often the information collected is general

in nature. Besides, on the principle of confidentiality, we can hardly provide a further breakdown. Anyway, these problems are related to stress from work or work related, which are separated from stress coming from family or other personal reasons.

MR LEUNG FU-WAH (in Cantonese): *The Secretary has not provided the figures on the disciplined services.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Fu-wah, you did not ask for the figures on disciplined services. You just commented that figures on the disciplined services had not been listed.

MS LI FUNG-YING (in Cantonese): *Madam President, in the main reply, the Secretary stressed very strongly the management system of the Civil Service, pointing out that the management and every supervisor have the responsibility to assist their front-line staff. May I ask the Secretary if the Bureau has put in place any specific measures to provide counselling services to supervisors and management?*

SECRETARY FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE (in Cantonese): Madam President, I have mentioned in the main reply that the CSB has arranged many courses and seminars on stress management. These courses have been attended by more than 10 000 officers, with a substantial number of them being supervisors in general who must know how to handle the stress problems encountered by their subordinates at work.

MS LI FUNG-YING (in Cantonese): *Madam President, the Secretary has not answered whether there are specific measures to relieve stress faced by managerial staff.*

SECRETARY FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE (in Cantonese): Madam President, regarding work pressure, we can note from the information that every rank and

every grade are subject to different pressure, and they have to come under pressure at work in all manners. We should not say that managerial staff must feel greater pressure than junior staff. Therefore, we do not restrict the participation in most training courses to any specific rank. However, we have the impression that officers at management level are more interested in attending training conducted in the form of seminars, for they can exchange their experience in stress management with officers from other departments or organizations.

MR CHAN KWOK-KEUNG (in Cantonese): *Madam President, may I ask the Secretary if there are any civil servants who suffer from psychosis because of work pressure? If yes, how assistance is provided to them? How many such cases are there?*

SECRETARY FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE (in Cantonese): Madam President, I have said that under the counselling services provided by the CSB and departments, civil servants in need are offered face-to-face counselling services and clinical psychology services as well. According to my understanding, some cases have been referred to the Hospital Authority or hospitals for follow-up after the officers have received clinical psychology services. However, for confidentiality consideration, we do not have the information on these cases.

MR HUI CHEUNG-CHING (in Cantonese): *Madam President, it is stated in the main reply that the Government provides training to civil servants to strengthen their ability in stress management. May I ask the Secretary whether the Government will provide courses, workshops or counselling services to civil servants promoted to the management level to facilitate their coping with greater pressure in future?*

SECRETARY FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE (in Cantonese): Madam President, just as I have said in my main reply, stress management courses in all manners are offered every year by the CSTDI. These courses will continue to be offered to ensure that civil servants at all levels and different stages of their career will have the opportunity to receive such training.

MR LAU CHIN-SHEK (in Cantonese): *Madam President, in his earlier reply to Mr LEUNG Fu-wah's question, the Secretary said that the stress was related to work but not family. The Secretary explained that information was not available because individual officers might be involved. I find it strange. Even if those cases have to be classified in terms of the cause of stress, such as heavy workload or poor working relationship, the information on individual officers would not have to be revealed. Why information on a further breakdown is not available? Then, if heavy workload is identified as the cause of stress, the holding of seminars cannot help the officers concerned to solve the problem. For stress caused by workload, that is increased workload, will the reduction or adjustment of workload to a more reasonable level be a better solution?*

SECRETARY FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE (in Cantonese): Two issues are involved here. Firstly, as I have said, we can only make a broad classification now, such as stress arising from work, including relationship with supervisors, increased workload, and so on. Perhaps I can check it out with the relevant departments and my Bureau after this meeting and see whether there are further breakdowns. They may not necessarily have more detailed information indeed, but anyway I will check it again after the meeting.

Regarding the increase in workload, as I have said in my main reply, information would be referred to the relevant departments where necessary, so that the departments concerned could give advice to the officers after understanding the case. For instance, it may be indicated that many officers in departments have approached us for assistance owing to the increase in workload, then the department concerned will have to look into their cases. We do not have to provide names of the officers concerned, but the relevant departments have to examine whether there are any problems with a particular grade, and see whether follow-up action can be taken. I hope this can be of practical assistance to the civil servants concerned.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): We have spent more than 17 minutes on this question. Last supplementary question.

MR LAU KONG-WAH (in Cantonese): *Madam President, the relevant figures show that quite a number of managerial staff have to receive counselling. The*

Secretary stated in the main reply that the competence of an officer in coping with stress would be assessed during the promotion exercise, but people simply may not know the actual situation before taking up the posts. If the officer concerned found himself incapable of fulfilling his duties or coping with the stress, what measures will the Bureau or senior management take? For instance, will the officer concerned be offered a demotion to his previous rank? Were there any such cases? Will the Government use the above measures to reduce the pressure encountered by the officer concerned?

SECRETARY FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE (in Cantonese): Madam President, if colleagues found themselves under pressure after promotion, they could of course seek assistance from our counselling services. In extreme cases like an officer requesting for demotion to the original rank, we will consider each case on its merits. There were exceptional cases in the past, but only one or two apparently. In response to the request of the relevant officers, and after considering all related factors, those civil servants were allowed to return to their original posts.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Fifth question.

Proposal to Convert HOS Blocks Into Guesthouses

5. **MR ABRAHAM SHEK:** *The Housing Authority (HA) is exploring the feasibility of converting the two surplus Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) blocks into guesthouses or for similar uses, and has invited expression of interest from the public in such a proposal so as to gauge the interest of the market in providing a different category of visitor accommodation. In addition, if the HA decides to pursue the guesthouse proposal, the flats will only be leased or sold on a block basis. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (a) *of the reasons for the HA's inclusion of the option of selling the flats on a block basis in the proposal, and whether the HA intends to permanently change the functions and uses of the blocks concerned;*
- (b) *whether the Administration or the HA has sought in-house or outside legal advice to assist it in deciding whether the proposal to lease or*

sell the HOS blocks on a block basis for guesthouse use would exceed the HA's functions and authority, depart from the HA's principle of focusing on providing public housing for the public and is inconsistent with the Housing Ordinance (Cap. 283) and other relevant legislation; and

- (c) if legal advice has been sought, whether different legal opinions have been received; if so, of the details of and rationale for the opinions and why, despite the legal opinions, the HA has decided to proceed to invite expression of interest from the public?

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Cantonese):

Madam President, before answering the main question, I would like to set out the background to the Housing Authority (HA)'s proposal to convert Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) blocks into guesthouses. In November last year and October this year, I delivered at this Council statements on the Government's housing policy to reposition the housing policy of the SAR Government. I also clearly stated that the Government was determined to withdraw from the property market by ceasing the production and sale of subsidized home ownership flats, so as to minimize government intervention in the market and facilitate its free and smooth operation and resume its vitality. This general direction is on the whole widely supported and accepted by the community.

As a result of cessation of HOS sales, some 10 000-odd surplus unsold HOS flats need to be disposed of through other means. In March this year, we consulted the Legislative Council Panel on Housing on various disposal options. We put forward a few options, including sale to the Hong Kong Housing Society for rehousing purposes, use as government departmental quarters, use as guesthouses and conversion to public rental housing.

The Housing Department has been exploring, examining and evaluating the feasibility and implications of these options. From 17 October to 14 November 2003, we invited expression of interest from the public on the feasibility of the proposal to convert some of the surplus HOS flats into guesthouses or similar uses.

My reply to the three-part question raised by the Honourable Abraham SHEK is as follows:

- (a) In inviting expression of interest from the public, the HA has not made any commitment. The aim of the exercise is to explore the feasibility of converting two surplus HOS blocks into guesthouses and to evaluate market responses. The invitation was couched in open terms so as to allow maximum scope for interested parties to put forward innovative and commercially viable proposals. The Housing Authority has not made any decision, including whether to change the use of the HOS blocks concerned, or the means of their sale or lease.
- (b) The HA has sought in-house and external legal advice on the feasibility of the proposal to convert surplus HOS blocks into guesthouses, including whether the proposal is within the powers and functions of the HA, whether the proposal would depart from the HA's objective of providing public housing, and whether the proposal is consistent with the Housing Ordinance (Cap. 283) and other relevant legislation.
- (c) The advice we have so far obtained is that the proposal is generally feasible. As the legal advice is for the HA's internal reference, it is inappropriate to disclose the details. I assure Members that the HA will address all the concerns arising from the proposal prudently. A decision will only be made after confirmation of its feasibility and legality.

MR ABRAHAM SHEK (in Cantonese): *I do not have any follow-up questions.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Fine.

MR NG LEUNG-SING (in Cantonese): *Madam President, the Secretary said in part (a) of the main reply that in inviting expression of interest from the public, the HA has not made any commitment. However, the main question asks whether the proposal is supported by legal advice or not. In this connection, before the Government obtains any legal advice, can members of the public ask the Government to provide information on its rationale and reference materials in relation to this issue for those who would submit expression of interest?*

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Cantonese): Madam President, I said earlier that we have sought legal advice and the advice we have got so far is that it is feasible to sell the HOS flats and convert them into guesthouses, and the answer is positive. However, as legal points and issues that need to be solved actually depend on the details of the proposal itself, we really need to know whether anyone is interested. If some people are interested, then we have to find out the general direction of their preliminary proposals so as to make reasonable assessments. As I said earlier, our main motive is to explore firstly, whether anyone is interested; secondly, if so, to study whether there are any contradictions between the proposals submitted and the mode adopted in accordance with the legal advice. Therefore, at this stage, we are considering the submissions received and also doing two jobs in parallel: firstly, we will study such proposals in detail; secondly, we will further discuss the relevant legal issue with our legal adviser in respect of the details of the submissions.

MRS SELINA CHOW (in Cantonese): *Madam President, I believe members of the community are generally very concerned about this policy because such HOS flats are, after all, public resources. Has the Secretary tried to consult as many members of the community as possible, to find out how far they accept this policy direction, in particular how far this policy is acceptable to public housing residents?*

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Cantonese): Madam President, we have certainly made preliminary contact with the relevant sectors, for example, the hotel industry to find out their response. We have also notified residents, for example, the relevant District Councils before their re-election to explain our ideas on this issue. Of course, apart from this, as I said in my main reply, we explained to the Legislative Council Panel on Housing at the beginning of this year our views on solving the problem of surplus HOS flats and our ideas on this issue.

On the whole, the general response is, it mainly depends on the option we eventually adopt, therefore we will deal with this matter in a cautious manner. This is because apart from legal considerations, we also have to consider whether the option is acceptable to members of the public.

MR LAU KONG-WAH (in Cantonese): *Madam President, the Secretary mentioned several options in the second paragraph of his main reply. However, we have learned from the media that mainland developers have proposed converting the HOS flats into the so-called "time-sharing holiday flats", but the Secretary has not mentioned this in his main reply. In this connection, may I ask the Secretary whether such applications have really been made? What is the relevant situation and response of the Government?*

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Cantonese): *Madam President, during the period from 17 October to 14 November, we invited expression of interest from the public on the feasibility of this proposal. We eventually received eight submissions on the expression of interest. I can say that one of these submissions comes from the organization mentioned by Mr LAU Kong-wah earlier. Its proposal is on the mode of operation to which Mr LAU Kong-wah referred. Under the existing procedures, the views and interests expressed by the relevant organization in response to our invitation will be handled together with other submissions on the expression of interests.*

MR LAU KONG-WAH (in Cantonese): *Madam President, I do not have any further question on this. Madam President, I would like to ask another follow-up. The Secretary said in the part (b) of the fourth paragraph of his main reply that as regards the criteria on the feasibility of the proposal, there are three considerations, namely: whether the proposal is within the powers and functions of the HA, whether the proposal will depart from the principle of providing public housing, and whether the proposal is consistent with the relevant legislation. The Secretary then said in the next paragraph that having considered all factors, it is considered generally feasible. In other words, if these two HOS blocks were used as guesthouses, does this mean that it has not departed from the principle of providing public housing to the public? If yes, why will it not depart from the principle, if such flats that are originally intended for housing members of the public are now used as guesthouses? Moreover, in terms of law, is it stated in the deed of mutual covenant that such housing blocks should be used as HOS flats, and if they were used as guesthouses, does it really mean that it has not violated any of such requirements?*

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Cantonese): Madam President, as this involves rather detailed legal analysis and opinions, I do not know whether today is a suitable occasion for me to share our views with Members on such details. However, the several significant considerations that Mr LAU Kong-wah has talked about are issues we must deal with and we are now in the process of doing so. The general situation is, let me explain this in a general manner, since we have already made a policy to stop the sale of such HOS flats, we must have an appropriate method to dispose of those flats if they are not to be sold. The original method of disposal is certainly not feasible and we think that if we sell the HOS flats for other purposes, we can still have financial proceeds. This can enable the HA to use the money to do what it is required to do under its terms of reference, and that is, to use the money to build other public rental housing for the benefit of the people concerned. Such are finer legal points that cannot be expressed clearly in layman terms. However, all these have to be taken into consideration. We also have to consider certain wordings of the Housing Ordinance, for example, what we are authorized to do, reasonable needs, and so on, and we have to deal with all these issues. Therefore, the problems we are considering internally are such views. For all these issues in different areas, we will exercise caution to ensure that the result and the final decision must be legally justifiable and not subject to challenge in law.

MR LAU KONG-WAH (in Cantonese): *Madam President, the Secretary has not answered my follow-up question. In fact, I only need a very simple answer. The Secretary said in part (c) of the main reply that it is generally feasible and that means, he has already drawn a conclusion. As such, can he simply reply that the proposal has not departed from the principle, has not exceeded the functions of the HA and has not violated the relevant legislation?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Cantonese): Madam President, to put it simply, I can give a positive answer. However, we also have to look at the specific conditions, for example, as regards the sale price, is it not much better if a higher price can be fetched by selling the HOS flats in another manner? Therefore, we also have to consider the specific conditions.

However, generally speaking, if all the other manners of sale yield the same return, the answer is positive.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Oral question time ends here.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Traffic Accident Occuring at Signal-controlled Junction

6. **MR LAU KONG-WAH** (in Chinese): *Madam President, on the 10th of last month, a serious traffic accident occurred at a signal-controlled junction at Sau Mau Ping Road in Kwun Tong. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council whether:*

- (a) *it has completed the investigation of the accident; if so, of the causes of the accident; and*
- (b) *there is information indicating that the road layout or traffic signal arrangement has some bearing on this accident; if so, of the improvement measures it will take, and whether it will assess if similar improvement measures are needed for the road layouts or traffic signal arrangements at other junctions; if no such assessment will be made, of the reasons for that?*

SECRETARY FOR HEALTH, WELFARE AND FOOD (in the absence of Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works) (in Chinese): Madam President, the police's investigation into the traffic accident which took place on 10 November 2003 at the junction of Sau Mau Ping Road and Sau Ming Road is currently in progress. We are therefore not in a position to provide information on the causes of the accident.

The standards we adopt for the design of road layout and traffic signals at road junctions are in line with international practices. For Sau Mau Ping Road, a right-turn pocket is currently available for vehicles waiting to turn right onto Sau Ming Road. These vehicles may turn right during the green phase of the traffic lights when there is a gap in the opposite stream of traffic. Such arrangement is intended to maximize the handling capacity of the road junction

and is adopted at similar junctions in the territory. Upon analysis of the traffic accidents at this junction in the past years, it is noted that the major contributory factors have always been drivers' negligence and inappropriate driving behaviour. Nevertheless, to further minimize the risk of traffic accidents at this junction, the Transport Department (TD) has already adjusted the traffic lights so as to provide a separate time phase exclusively for the right-turn movement.

Road layouts and traffic signal arrangements at major road junctions are kept under regular review and where necessary we will implement measures to enhance road safety. The TD will review road junctions with conditions similar to those at Sau Mau Ping Road/Sau Ming Road and examine if any improvement measures are required.

Provision of Isolation Facilities for Infectious Diseases in Private Sector Institutions

7. **DR DAVID CHU** (in Chinese): *Madam President, regarding the provision of isolation facilities for infectious diseases in private sector institutions, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (a) *of the reasons for giving funding support for installing additional isolation facilities in subvented residential care homes for the elderly (RCHEs) only, but not all such homes; and*
- (b) *whether it has assessed if various private hospitals have installed adequate isolation facilities; if so, of the details of the assessment?*

SECRETARY FOR HEALTH, WELFARE AND FOOD (in Chinese):
Madam President,

- (a) In line with the recommendations in the Report of the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) Expert Committee issued in October 2003, the Social Welfare Department (SWD) has obtained a grant of \$20.1 million from the Lotteries Fund to assist RCHEs as well as residential care homes for persons with disabilities (RCHDs) to improve their infection control facilities. All RCHEs in Hong Kong, including 103 subvented and 639 non-subvented RCHEs; the

latter comprising 599 private RCHEs, 34 self-financing RCHEs and six contract RCHEs can apply for the one-off subsidy. The subsidy is provided on a reimbursement basis and will cover basic material and installation cost of a prescribed set of building/building services installation fittings/items covering toileting/bathing facilities, partitions, exhaust fan and emergency call bell. The SWD issued letters to all RCHEs and RCHDs in mid-November to invite applications. The improvement works have to be completed within three months as from 17 November 2003, the commencement date of the scheme.

- (b) Private hospitals and nursing homes have already made appropriate arrangements for isolation facilities and providing nursing care.

The Department of Health has conducted inspection on 12 private hospitals from September to November 2003 and examined their isolation facilities for managing infectious diseases. Depending on the practical situation of individual hospitals, arrangements such as renovating a whole wing with automatic doors and negative pressure rooms, or designating a floor to house patients with fever of unknown origin, or assigning some rooms as isolation rooms with exhaust fans or stand-alone room coolers have been made in these hospitals. In addition, all private hospitals have implemented appropriate infection control measures, such as adopting standard precautions and limiting the number of visitors, to prevent the spread of infectious diseases. Private hospitals have also set out the policy to transfer SARS patients to public hospitals for further treatment.

Post Office Robberies

8. **MR MA FUNG-KWOK** (in Chinese): *Madam President, regarding the recent spate of post office robberies, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (a) *of the details of the enhanced security measures adopted by the authorities in the wake of these robberies; whether the authorities will consider changing the existing layouts of post offices by separating fee collection areas from operation areas, so as to make*

it more difficult for post offices to be robbed and prevent robbers from jumping over the counters to grab the cash;

- (b) whether the authorities have issued guidelines and conducted drills to teach staff of post offices how to react in the event of a robbery in order to safeguard their safety; and*
- (c) whether, in the light of these post office robberies, the authorities have reviewed the security measures for fee-collection counters of other government departments; if so, of the results; if not, the reasons for that?*

SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOUR (in Chinese): Madam President,

- (a) Since the launch of the PayThruPost service in April 2000, the Post Office has, after consultation with the Crime Prevention Bureau of the Hong Kong Police Force, enhanced security arrangements in post offices. These include installing glass screens at all "PayThruPost" counters, partitioning off the "PayThruPost" counters into separate cashier cubicles and installing CCTV at selected post offices that handle large amount of cash.

In the aftermath of the recent robbery cases, the Post Office has in consultation with the Hong Kong Police Force, reviewed and enhanced the security arrangements in all post offices. These include:

- (i) in post offices with "open-counter" design, installing glass screens at the upper portion of all service counters, including "PayThruPost" counters;
- (ii) in post offices with conventional counter design, retrofitting glass screens at the Speedpost, LocalCourierPost and parcels counters to prevent robbers from gaining access to the back of the service counters which handle cash; and
- (iii) installing separate cashier cubicles for "PayThruPost" counters at more post offices that handle large amount of cash.

- (b) For the safety of staff and clients, the Post Office provides regular classroom training and briefing sessions for all counter staff on robbery prevention measures and contingency arrangements in the event of a robbery. The Post Office has also issued guidelines on these issues to all counter staff.
- (c) After consultation with the Security Bureau, the Treasury has promulgated guidelines to relevant bureaux and departments engaged in fee collection on the security requirements in the design and construction of offices with collection facilities and custody of cash, and the procedures for handling of cash. Bureaux and departments will follow these guidelines in developing and reviewing their security measures.

Bureaux and departments also review periodically security arrangements at their fee-collection counters, taking into account, *inter alia*, location of the counters, characteristics of the locality, frequency of cash receipt, amount of cash handled and latest information on recent crimes. Furthermore, the Crime Prevention Bureau of the Hong Kong Police Force proactively offers advice on security arrangements to individual departments, having regard to their particular circumstances.

Statistics on Salaries Tax Payment

9. **MR BERNARD CHAN:** *Madam President, in his statement on Hong Kong's economy and management of public finances made at the Council meeting on 22 October 2003, the Financial Secretary said that "only slightly over one third of the working population need to pay any tax on their salaries. Only 100 000, which is 3% of the working population, will contribute 59% of the salaries tax". In this connection, will the Government inform this Council of the total number of taxpayers paying salaries tax only in each of the past three financial years and, among them, the respective numbers of taxpayers whose salaries tax payment represents only 5%, 10% and 15% of their annual total assessable income less total deductions?*

SECRETARY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND THE TREASURY:

Madam President, the numbers of taxpayers liable to salaries tax were 1 215 131 in 2000-01, 1 208 336 in 2001-02 and 1 097 036 in 2002-03^{Note 1}.

Depending on the year in question, for 70.8% to 75.8% of salaries taxpayers, their effective tax rate (tax amount divided by the assessable income) was below 5%. For 15.5% to 18.8% of taxpayers, their effective tax rate was 5% to 9.99%. For 8.7% to 10.1% of taxpayers, their effective tax rate was 10% to 14.99%. For 0% to 0.4% of taxpayers, their effective tax rate was 15%.

If the basis for calculation is changed from assessable income to assessable income less deductions, the respective percentages were 69.3% to 74.4%, 15.8% to 19.1%, 9.8% to 10.6% and 0% to 1.1% respectively.

Details are set out in the following tables.

<i>Effective tax rate (amount of salaries tax divided by total assessable income)</i>	<i>No. of taxpayers (% of all salaries taxpayers)</i>					
	<i>2000-01</i>		<i>2001-02^{Note 2}</i>		<i>2002-03^{Note 1}</i>	
Below 5%	879 803	(72.4%)	915 537	(75.8%)	776 758	(70.8%)
5%-9.99%	215 336	(17.7%)	188 073	(15.5%)	206 656	(18.8%)
10%-14.99%	115 512	(9.5%)	104 726	(8.7%)	110 361	(10.1%)
15%	4 480	(0.4%)	0	(0.0%)	3 261	(0.3%)
Total	1 215 131	(100%)	1 208 336	(100%)	1 097 036	(100%)

<i>Amount of salaries tax over assessable income less deductions</i>	<i>No. of taxpayers (% of all salaries taxpayers)</i>					
	<i>2000-01</i>		<i>2001-02^{Note 2}</i>		<i>2002-03^{Note 1}</i>	
Below 5%	862 738	(71.0%)	899 123	(74.4%)	760 533	(69.3%)
5%-9.99%	217 788	(17.9%)	190 464	(15.8%)	208 905	(19.1%)
10%-14.99%	121 206	(10.0%)	118 749	(9.8%)	116 448	(10.6%)
15%	13 399	(1.1%)	0	(0.0%)	11 150	(1.0%)
Total	1 215 131	(100%)	1 208 336	(100%)	1 097 036	(100%)

Note 1 Income earned in a year is principally assessed in the following year. As at 2 December 2003, the assessing program for the year of assessment 2002-03 has not been completed. It is expected that the number of taxpayers in 2002-03 will be higher than 1 097 036 and very much the same as in 2001-02.

Note 2 Due to the 50% salaries tax rebate (subject to a cap of \$3,000 per case) which formed part of the SARS relief package, a larger proportion of taxpayers pay at lower effective rates for 2001-02. Salaries tax charged is subject to a cap at the standard rate (15% for 2001-02) on the assessable income less deductions. As a result of the tax rebate pursuant to SARS relief package, taxpayers' effective tax rates all fell below the standard rate of 15% in 2001-02.

Measures to Improve Tram Safety and Service

10. **DR TANG SIU-TONG** (in Chinese): *Madam President, as the Hongkong Tramways Limited (the Company) undertook to implement a number of safety and service improvement measures when it applied for a fare increase in 1998, will the Government inform this Council whether it has assessed if the company has implemented these measures as scheduled; if so, of the results of the assessment?*

SECRETARY FOR HEALTH, WELFARE AND FOOD (in the absence of Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works) (in Chinese): Madam President, in connection with the last fare increase of the Company in 1998, the Company committed to implement the following safety and service improvement measures:

- (i) install a drivers' vigilance device in each tram car to enable trams to brake automatically during emergencies;
- (ii) upgrade the electrical and wiring system of all tram cars to reduce fire hazards;
- (iii) install a fully automatic track-switching system at all critical junctions and complete the track conversion programme;
- (iv) organize a series of safety and courtesy training as well as a refresher course on defensive driving for motormen; and
- (v) implement full-scale meal break arrangements whereby meal breaks for motormen would be of not less than 30 minutes.

The Transport Department and the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department have been closely monitoring the progress of the implementation of these measures. All the proposed measures were fully implemented by June 2001. As for item (iv) above, refresher courses for motormen are organized annually by the Company as a continuous enhancement initiative.

Reclamation Projects in Progress

11. **MR LEUNG FU-WAH** (in Chinese): *Madam President, regarding the reclamation projects in progress, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (a) of the details and progress of the projects;*
- (b) whether the projects involve the disposal of carcinogenic substances; if so, of the project names and the routes along which carcinogenic substances are transported; and*
- (c) of the authorities' control measures to ensure that carcinogenic substances are properly disposed of?*

SECRETARY FOR HEALTH, WELFARE AND FOOD (in the absence of Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works) (in Chinese): Madam President,

- (a) The ongoing projects in Hong Kong involving reclamation works are shown in the attached Annex.
- (b) Except for the projects "Central Reclamation Phase III" and "Reclamation Works in North Tsing Yi", all other projects listed in the Annex do not involve handling and transportation of carcinogenic substances.

For the project "Central Reclamation Phase III", there are carcinogenic substances (for example, some heavy metals and organic polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAH)) identified in the dredged materials. Since these substances exist in a form that cannot be released in open air unless being exposed to an environment over 700 degree Celsius, the contaminated sediments are dredged and disposed of at East Sha Chau contaminated mud pit in the usual manner.

For the project "Reclamation Works in North Tsing Yi", some of the contaminants found within the site are classified as carcinogenic, for example, some heavy metals, PAH and polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB).

Decontamination works for heavy metals and PAH are carried out on site. After treatment, all the soil will be used as backfilling materials for land formation in this project and there will be no transportation of treated materials off site. For PCB, only a relatively small amount of the contaminated soil handled in this project (about 800 cu m out of the total of 90 000 cu m) has been found contaminated with this substance and the concentration of it is very low (2.3 mg/kg). Pursuant to the United States Toxic Substances Control Act, additional disposal requirements will only be required for soils contaminated with PCB at a concentration greater than 50 mg/kg. Therefore, according to the findings and recommendations in the Environmental Impact Assessment Study for the project, the PCB contaminated soil in this project has been disposed of at the Southeast New Territories landfill. The soil was properly covered during the course of transportation by dump trucks via major road network.

- (c) For the project "Reclamation Works in North Tsing Yi", the Government implements the following monitoring measures for all on-site treatments of contaminants:
 - (i) An independent environmental monitoring and audit contractor is employed to implement the Environmental Monitoring and Audit Programme approved by the Environmental Protection Department to ensure that there is no adverse impact to the environment due to the treatment processes carried out on site.
 - (ii) An independent specialist laboratory is employed to ensure that the decontamination works carried out by the contractor were up to the required standards.
 - (iii) A specialist consultant is employed to help site supervision and to give advice to the Government for the decontamination works.

For the project "Central Reclamation Phase III", the contaminated mud is disposed of at the East Sha Chau contaminated mud dump site. At this contaminated mud dump site, the Government has a

very comprehensive environmental monitoring programme to detect the possible impacts arising from the disposal of contaminated mud. The monitoring programme includes the monitoring of sediment, water quality, ecological community structure, fishery resources and biotic tissue contamination. Based on the information collected, the Government conducts ecotoxicology and risk assessments for both human beings and dolphins. The risk assessment conducted in early 2003 concluded that the risk of the general population and fisherman in acquiring cancer or non-cancer chronic diseases due to eating seafood from the East Sha Chau area is low and within the acceptability guidelines. The assessment also found that the health risks of eating seafood from the East Sha Chau area were similar to those from other areas in Hong Kong.

Annex

<i>Title</i>	<i>Details</i>	<i>Progress</i>	<i>Involve carcinogenic substances?</i>
Castle Peak Road Improvement between Area 2 and Sham Tseng, Tsuen Wan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reclamation of about 0.3 hectare of land at Sham Tseng East - Roadworks and associated drainage works 	Reclamation is under way and will be completed in mid 2004.	No
Tseung Kwan O Development Phase 3 Remaining Reclamation in the Town Centre Extension, Stage 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reclamation of about 20 hectare of seabed south of the Tseung Kwan O Town Centre - Construction of associated seawall and box culverts 	Reclamation just completed.	No
Tseung Kwan O Port Development at Area 137, Stage 2 – Construction of Seawalls and Reclamation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reclamation of about 29 hectare of land - Construction of associated seawall and drainage works 	The Works are anticipated to be completed by end December 2003.	No
Reclamation for Ma Liu Shui Interchange and Reprovisioning of Existing Pier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reclamation of about 3.5 hectare of land using public fill - Construction of associated seawall with sheltered public landing steps - Construction of associated drainage works 	The Works will be completed in January 2005.	No

<i>Title</i>	<i>Details</i>	<i>Progress</i>	<i>Involve carcinogenic substances?</i>
Tai O Development - Sheltered Boat Anchorage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reclamation for a new bus terminus - Construction of 4 hectare of boat anchorage area, marine access channels, a promenade, restoration of a historical seawall 	Ground investigation works, dredging of marine access channels and boat anchorage area are in progress. The Works are scheduled for completion by August 2005.	No
Penny's Bay Reclamation Stage 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reclamation of about 60 hectare of land - Construction of associated seawall and drainage system - Installation and operation of public fill sorting facilities at Tseung Kwan O Area 137 and Tuen Mun Area 38 to produce sorted public fill material for reclamation works 	Construction of sloping seawall and associated dredging works are in progress. The Works is scheduled for completion by 2008.	No
Central Reclamation Phase III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reclamation of about 18 hectare of seabed in front of Star Ferry Pier - Construction of associated seawall and culverts - Construction of roads and provision of infrastructure and other services 	Mud dredging and filling back with rockfill are in progress on a restricted scale. Marine piling works have been temporarily suspended due to the controversy on the reclamation in Central.	Yes
Reclamation Works in North Tsing Yi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reclamation of about 3.5 hectare of foreshore and seabed - Site formation of 3.5 hectare of land adjoining the reclamation - Construction of associated seawall and drainage works - Decontamination works for about 90 000 cu m of contaminated soil 	Reclamation and seawall construction have been substantially completed while decontamination works are in progress. The Works are scheduled for completion by May 2006.	Yes

On-street Begging

12. **MR WONG SING-CHI** (in Chinese): *Madam President, regarding the problem of begging in the streets, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (a) *whether there are beggars in Hong Kong who come from foreign places; if so, of the number of such beggars as well as the number of local beggars;*
- (b) *whether the beggars are controlled by syndicates and, if so, of the scale of these syndicates and the number of beggars controlled by them, and how the authorities tackle this problem; and*
- (c) *of the number of persons who beg in the streets because of financial hardship and how the authorities assist them?*

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Chinese): Madam President,

- (a) The Administration does not maintain comprehensive statistics on begging activities in Hong Kong. According to information from the police, between 1 September and 23 November 2003, the number of cases of mainland visitors (two-way permit holders) and local residents involved in mendicancy which surfaced during police actions were 91 and 13 respectively. We do not have information on the number of beggars in Hong Kong who come from other places.
- (b) According to the experience of the police, there is so far no evidence to point to the involvement of syndicates in begging activities.
- (c) We do not have information on the number of persons who beg in the streets because of financial hardship. According to the Street Sleepers Registry maintained by the Social Welfare Department (SWD), there are currently about 500 street sleepers in Hong Kong. About 50% of them rely on Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) for a living. From the experience of front-line social workers serving the street sleepers, a very small number of them would intermittently turn to begging for a living.

The Administration has all along been committed to helping people in need and those with financial hardship. If persons begging in the streets have genuine financial needs, they can apply for CSSA, which aims to provide a safety net for individuals or families who are unable to support themselves financially because of age,

disability, illness, low earnings, unemployment or family circumstances. If persons begging in the streets are street sleepers, a range of welfare services are also in place to assist them to live off the street. Family Services Centres/Integrated Family Service Centres of the SWD will offer outreaching and counselling services to street sleepers while the three Street Sleepers Outreaching Teams are responsible for handling the more complicated cases, including the suspected mentally ill. On the other hand, non-governmental organizations, especially the three Midnight Outreaching Teams, provide various assistance to the street sleepers, such as counselling, personal care service, employment guidance, emergency fund, referral for financial assistance as well as medical and accommodation services. They also operate temporary shelters and urban hostels for single persons in districts with high concentration of street sleepers to provide them with accommodation and short-term placement.

Students Committing Suicide

13. **MR FREDERICK FUNG** (in Chinese): *Madam President, regarding the problem of Hong Kong students committing suicide, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (a) *of the respective numbers of students who attempted suicide and who died of suicide in each of the past five years, broken down by grades in school; and*
- (b) *whether measures and means are in place to identify suicide-prone students and to help them give up the thought of suicide; if so, of the details and effectiveness of such measures and means; if not, the reasons for that?*

SECRETARY FOR HEALTH, WELFARE AND FOOD (in Chinese):
Madam President,

- (a) According to the information reported by schools to the Education and Manpower Bureau (the Bureau), the numbers of students involved in attempted suicide and fatal suicide (mutually exclusive)

in the five school years from 1998-99 to 2002-03 are set out in the tables below.

Table 1: Number of attempted student suicide cases as reported by schools to the Bureau
(as at 31 August 2003)

<i>Class</i> <i>Year</i>	<i>P1</i>	<i>P2</i>	<i>P3</i>	<i>P4</i>	<i>P5</i>	<i>P6</i>	<i>S1</i>	<i>S2</i>	<i>S3</i>	<i>S4</i>	<i>S5</i>	<i>S6</i>	<i>S7</i>	<i>Total</i>
1998-99	-	-	-	-	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	-	-	10
1999-2000	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	1	-	-	-	5
2000-01	-	-	-	-	2	3	1	5	3	3	1	-	-	18
2001-02	-	-	-	1	4	1	3	3	-	1	1	-	-	14
2002-03	-	-	1	-	2	4	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	11
Total:	-	-	1	1	10	10	6	10	10	7	3	-	-	58

Table 2: Number of fatal student suicide cases as reported by schools to the Bureau
(as at 31 August 2003)

<i>Class</i> <i>Year</i>	<i>P1</i>	<i>P2</i>	<i>P3</i>	<i>P4</i>	<i>P5</i>	<i>P6</i>	<i>S1</i>	<i>S2</i>	<i>S3</i>	<i>S4</i>	<i>S5</i>	<i>S6</i>	<i>S7</i>	<i>Total</i>
1998-99				1			2	1	2	1	6	1	1	15
1999-2000					2	2	2	5	2	1	4	1		19
2000-01						2	3	2	4	1	5		2	19
2001-02			1	1	1	2		4		1			4	14
2002-03		1				2		1	2		4	1	1	12
Total:		1	1	2	3	8	7	13	10	4	19	3	8	79

- (b) Tackling the student suicide problem requires the concerted efforts of the Government and the community. Under a working group chaired by the Health, Welfare and Food Bureau, a multi-pronged strategy through a multi-disciplinary and cross-sectoral approach has been adopted, including:

- (i) enhancing our understanding of the problem;
- (ii) providing a range of preventive, supportive and remedial measures to facilitate early identification, timely intervention and effective support;

- (iii) promoting public education and publicity; and
- (iv) strengthening the training of front-line professionals and workers.

The various measures and means in place at the various settings are summarized below:

(1) *School setting*

- (i) For early identification of suicide risks, the following tools are available to all local schools to raise teachers' alertness to students who may be at risk of emotional disturbance and suicidal ideation:
 - Checklist for Youth Suicidal Risk Factors (2003) published by the Centre for Suicide Research and Prevention of the University of Hong Kong with web version;
 - Assessment Programme for Affective and Social Outcomes (APASO 2002) to measure students' affective and social performance; and
 - Resource package on "Student Suicide" (1997) developed by the then Education Department.

The Child Psychiatric Teams of the Hospital Authority (HA) also provide training for school teachers and social workers on detecting and assessing children with suicide risks. Support in various forms is given to students at risk. In addition to counselling and emotional support, support from families and schools will be mobilized. Multi-disciplinary support (involving education psychologists, clinical psychologists, and so on), emergency psychiatric consultation and hospitalization will be arranged as appropriate.

(ii) Other measures to mitigate the risk factors of student suicide and to strengthen the protective factors include:

- the provision of at least one student guidance professional for each school (school social workers for secondary schools and student guidance personnel for primary schools) to support students and assess their need for clinical intervention by psychologists and/or psychiatrists;
- the Understanding the Adolescent Project for early identification of the developmental needs of Secondary One students and addressing those needs through tailor-made primary preventive programmes;
- enhancement of the service of school-based education psychologists to cover 45 primary schools in 2003-04 (increased to 200 primary schools by 2007-08);
- the Comprehensive Student Guidance Services launched in primary schools and the new Integrated Humanities curriculum introduced in secondary schools to foster students' understanding of their personal growth and self-worth; and
- regular training programmes for teachers on enhancing students' self-esteem and helping them cope with stress, as well as parent education training packages and training programmes for parent educators.

(2) *Health setting*

(i) All students who attend the Student Health Service of the Department of Health (DH) will be interviewed by

the medical and nursing staff to identify their health problems. The centres also use a locally validated health assessment questionnaire, which contains specific questions on suicide, with secondary students. Through the interviews and questionnaires, students at risk of suicide will be identified. According to the level of suicide risks, referrals to clinical psychologists, school social workers, the Social Welfare Department (SWD), the Suicide Crisis Intervention Centre or other non-governmental organizations, the HA's Child Psychiatric Teams and/or Accident and Emergency Units will be made for further assessment and follow-up.

- (ii) The Central Health Education Unit of the DH has published a fact sheet on suicide prevention on its website, the Health Zone. The 24-hour Health Education Hotline also has a recording on adolescent depression. As mental illness is a risk factor for suicide, the HA has been running the Early Assessment Service for Young People with Psychosis, which includes screening service and public education, to identify and treat adolescent psychosis at an early stage.

(3) *Welfare setting*

- (i) The SWD and non-governmental organizations offer a range of services to those in emotional distress or at risk of suicide. These include:
 - the Suicide Crisis Intervention Centre run by the Samaritan Befrienders Hong Kong (SBHK) to provide round-the-clock crisis intervention to persons with high/moderate suicide risk;
 - a Life Education Centre run by the SBHK to enhance public education and promote positive life values, especially targeting at the youth and students;

- a Family Crisis Support Centre run by Caritas Hong Kong to provide time-out facilities and crisis support to vulnerable individuals/families in distress;
 - a Youthline operated by the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups to provide hotline services for young people with emotional and other problems; and
 - focused training to front-line social workers provided by the SWD, and research by the Centre for Suicide Research and Prevention of the University of Hong Kong.
- (ii) Core welfare services for young people also play an important role in supporting the youth at risk. These include 131 Integrated Children and Youth Services Centres, 34 Children and Youth Centres, 16 District Youth Outreaching Social Work Teams, and so on. These service units provide a full spectrum of preventive, supportive and remedial services for young people and their families, including identifying the developmental needs of young people and assisting them to overcome crises such as emotional distress or suicide risk.

In the past three school years, the number of suicidal cases referred by schools for the Bureau's education psychologist service was 78. Subsequently, there was no completed suicide among the cases given intervention. During the same period, the Student Health Service of DH identified a total of 507 students with suicidal ideation or attempts. The detection rate (that is, proportion of students with suicidal risk identified) ranged from 0.3% to 0.4%. According to the information available, none of these students have completed suicide following referral and intervention. In addition, in-built evaluative studies for certain pilot projects, where appropriate (like the Suicide Crisis Intervention Centre), will be undertaken.

Also, literature reviews show that the media have an important role to play in the prevention of suicide, for example, reducing imitated suicides (or called "copycat" suicide), in particular amongst young people. The Government has briefed the media and encouraged the media to adopt the World Health Organization's guidelines on reporting suicide cases. In 2002, members of the Board of Education, the Commission on Youth, the Committee on the Promotion of Civic Education and the Social Welfare Advisory Committee issued a public statement on the need for responsible reporting of suicide cases by the media.

Structural Safety and Maintenance of Tai Tam Reservoir Dam

14. **MR JAMES TIEN** (in Chinese): *Madam President, members of the public have told me that the volume of vehicular traffic on the Tai Tam Reservoir dam is very high every day. They are concerned that the aged dam may thus be overloaded and collapse. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council of:*

- (a) *the date of completion of the dam, its design life and allowable vehicular traffic load;*
- (b) *the daily average vehicular traffic on the dam; whether it has assessed the impact of such vehicular traffic on the structure of the dam; if it has, of the details of the assessment; if not, the reasons for that; and*
- (c) *the frequency of inspection on the structural safety of and maintenance works for the dam?*

SECRETARY FOR HEALTH, WELFARE AND FOOD (in the absence of Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works) (in Chinese): Madam President,

- (a) Construction of the Tai Tam Tuk Reservoir dam was completed in 1918. In view of the long history of the dam, it is unable to locate the relevant design calculations and therefore it cannot tell exactly

what the design life and the allowable load were when the dam was designed. However, it should be noted that the existing road on top of the dam was part of the original design.

- (b) The current traffic flow along the road on the dam is about 550 passenger car units/hour (two-way total) during busy periods. The structural safety of the dam under vehicle loading condition was reviewed in 1999 by a reservoir expert engaged by the Water Supplies Department (WSD). The reservoir expert conducted an analysis on the impact of traffic loadings on the dam and concluded that the dam was structurally adequate under the prevailing traffic loadings. As part of the regular safety inspection of the dam, the reservoir expert reconfirmed in 2002 that the dam was structurally safe under the current Hong Kong highway vehicle loading conditions of the road along the dam. The physical width of the road is however too narrow to permit two heavy vehicles from passing each other. Appropriate warning signs are erected at both ends to advise drivers on the narrowness of the road and to give way to buses.
- (c) To maintain the reservoir dam in good condition, WSD staff carries out monthly safety inspections. Furthermore, inspections will continue to be conducted by independent reservoir experts at not more than 10-year intervals and maintenance works will be carried out as appropriate. On top of these, more frequent inspections will be conducted when necessary.

Renovation of Dilapidated Industrial Buildings

15. **MR KENNETH TING** (in Chinese): *Madam President, it has been reported that most industrial buildings in Hong Kong are dilapidated as the owners are reluctant to pay for their maintenance and the number of tenants is decreasing. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council whether it will relax the user restrictions on industrial buildings, provide regrant premium concessions to the industries and adopt other relevant measures to encourage owners of industrial building to renovate the buildings and improve their facilities; if it will, of the authorities' specific plans; if not, whether the authorities will expeditiously formulate the relevant policy?*

SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND LANDS (in Chinese): Madam President, to facilitate the industrial restructuring of Hong Kong, the Town Planning Board (TPB) has in recent years gradually relaxed the restrictions on the use of industrial buildings. For example, in July 2001, uses for the information technology and telecommunications industries, offices related to industrial purposes, and trading companies requiring large storage space and frequently engaged in loading/unloading of goods are included by the TPB as uses which are always permitted in "Industrial" zones, thus allowing more flexibility in the uses of industrial buildings. In addition, in September the same year, the TPB further agreed to allow, subject to applications to the TPB, the use of industrial-office buildings or fully converted industrial buildings in "Industrial" zones as educational institutions or as places of public entertainment.

Meanwhile, the TPB has also encouraged owners to redevelop or renovate their industrial buildings by rezoning industrial land for other uses. Among other things, the TPB introduced in October 2000 the new land use zone of "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" ("Business" zone). This new "Business" zone provides considerable flexibility by allowing clean industrial, general office and commercial uses to co-locate at the same building through a new development or whole conversion of the building. Since the introduction of the new zoning in late 2000, the TPB has rezoned over 190 hectares of industrial land for "Business" use.

Apart from relaxing the restrictions on the uses of industrial buildings and rezoning industrial land for "Business" or other uses, the Lands Department has also introduced a simplified procedure for the grant of temporary waivers^{Note} to facilitate the owners of industrial buildings to convert their buildings into other uses. However, to maintain a level playing field for all, we do not consider it appropriate to offer premium concession in the modification of land leases.

Note: Owners of industrial buildings may change their industrial buildings into other permissible economic uses through modification of land leases or application for temporary waivers.

Renting of Soccer Pitches in Victoria Park

16. **MR FRED LI** (in Chinese): *Madam President, it has been reported that the Hong Kong Eastern District Community Association, whose Honorary Chairman is a Legislative Council Member, rented several soccer pitches in*

Victoria Park for organizing the Hong Kong Thrives carnival held from September 26 to November 17 this year, with venue fee waived by the authorities. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the criteria adopted by the Government for approving community organizations' applications to rent the soccer pitches in Victoria Park for a lengthy period for organizing activities; and whether the criteria include "the person in charge of the activity is a Legislative Council Member" and "the activity is recommended by a Legislative Council Member";*
- (b) whether, before approving the application, it has assessed if renting the venue to a single organization for a lengthy period is fair to other persons and groups who intend to use the venue and how they are thus affected; if it has, of the assessment results; if not, the reasons for that; and*
- (c) as it has been reported that the promotional leaflets of Hong Kong Thrives have claimed that the activity was supported by several bodies including the Home Affairs Bureau, the Hong Kong Sports Development Board and the Hong Kong Tourism Board (HKTb), of the reasons for these government departments and statutory bodies supporting this commercial activity?*

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Chinese): Madam President,

- (a) The Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) processes all applications from community organizations for use of venues managed by the LCSD in accordance with a set of established criteria, procedures and rules. While the leisure venues of the LCSD are primarily intended for sports and recreational purposes, the LCSD will, after considering the individual applications, accept applications for non-designated use of these venues so as to optimize the use of these well facilities. In processing such applications, the LCSD would consider factors including the reputation and track record of the applicants/organizations, the objectives and nature of the proposed activities, the benefits to the public and implications to

other users, the duration of the booking period, and so on. As regards whether the responsible person of the organization applying is a Legislative Council Member or whether the application is recommended by a Legislative Council Member, these are not the relevant considerations when processing the application. The LCSD has charged the organizer for the Hong Kong Thrives a rent in accordance with our established procedures and rules, that is, a rent of \$290,000 in advance and no exemption has been given.

- (b) Prior to approving the application, the LCSD has fully assessed the implications of holding the event to other users of the soccer pitches. Staged by the Hong Kong Eastern District Community Association, the Hong Kong Thrives aimed to help revitalizing the local economy after the SARS epidemic. The event aimed to provide not only diversified leisure and recreational activities to visitors, but also help promote local tourism and create business and job opportunities. Having regard to the above considerations, we approved the application for non-designated use of the venue for holding the Hong Kong Thrives.
- (c) According to the publicity poster of Hong Kong Thrives, the supporting organizations of the event include the Home Affairs Department (HAD), the HKTb and The Federation of Hong Kong Hotel Owners.

As far as government department is concerned, the HAD has been working closely with various district organizations to foster community involvement and participation. The Hong Kong Eastern District Community Association is a long-established *bona fide* organization in the Eastern District. At the invitation of the Association, the HAD has agreed to be one of the supporting organizations of the Hong Kong Thrives event, the objective of which was to promote local economy and tourism.

As regards the HKTb, it has not given approval to the organizer to publicize the event as fully supported by the HKTb. The HKTb has already written to the organizer reiterating that the HKTb was not a co-organizer, sponsor or promoter of the event.

Vacancy Rates of Student Hostel Places at UGC-Funded Institutions

17. **DR RAYMOND HO** (in Chinese): *Madam President, it has been reported that the vacancy rates of student hostel places at the University Grants Committee (UGC)-funded institutions are on the high side, resulting in wastage. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council whether it knows:*

- (a) the number of students admitted to the hostels of the above institutions and its percentage in the total number of students of all institutions in the past year, and the year of study of the majority of these student residents;*
- (b) the respective average vacancy rates of student hostel places at the above institutions during the summer vacation and the other period in each of the past two years; and*
- (c) the total amount of rental income forgone between October last year and May this year as a result of the student hostel places at the above institutions being left vacant?*

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION AND MANPOWER (in Chinese): Madam President,

- (a) The number of undergraduate and postgraduate students admitted to the student hostels of UGC-funded institutions during the term period of the 2002-03 academic year was about 19 340, which constituted 30% of the total number of undergraduate and postgraduate students of all institutions. The majority of these residents were undergraduate students in their senior years.
- (b) The average vacancy rates of student hostel places at UGC-funded institutions during term period and summer vacation in 2001-02 and 2002-03 academic years are at Annex.
- (c) It is impossible for all student hostels to be fully occupied every day of the year. Any estimates of the rental income forgone is only notional and should be so qualified. Against this background, it is estimated that vacant student hostel places during the specified

period could have attracted a total notional rental income of about \$18 million.

It should be noted that the provision of student hostels is a relatively new initiative for some institutions. The institutions are making an effort to foster a culture of hostel life and to enhance students' understanding of its educational objective. Indeed, the occupancy rate during term period has increased in the 2002-03 academic year.

Annex

Average vacancy rates of student hostel places at UGC-funded institutions during term period and summer vacation in 2001-02 and 2002-03 academic years

<i>Academic year</i> <i>Period</i>	2001-02	2002-03
Term period	10.0%	8.7%
Summer vacation	53.6%	61.8%

Public Funding for National Sports Associations

18. **MR ALBERT CHAN** (in Chinese): *Madam President, many national sports associations (NSAs) rely on public funding for operation and hosting sports events. However, some members of the public query some NSAs for their failure to make effective use of the funding to promote and develop sports events, resulting in a waste of public money. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (a) *of the amount of public funding provided to each NSA in each of the past three years;*
- (b) *of the principles and criteria adopted by the relevant authorities in deciding whether or not to provide funding to a NSA;*
- (c) *whether it has formulated measures to ensure that NSAs make the best use of their funding and spend their money in a cost-effective manner; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and*

- (d) *whether new measures will be devised to enhance supervision on NSAs in the use of their funding so as to promote and develop sports events more effectively; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?*

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Chinese): Madam President,

- (a) NSAs mainly receive subvention from the Hong Kong Sports Development Board (SDB) to promote and develop sports events. Please refer to the Annex for the SDB's funding allocation for NSAs for the past three years.
- (b) In providing subvention to the non-profit-making NSAs, the SDB will consider whether the NSAs could meet the following criteria:
- (i) registered under the Societies Ordinance or Companies Ordinance with a proper constitution;
 - (ii) operational for at least three years;
 - (iii) adhering to the Code of Practice drawn up by the SDB; and
 - (iv) working within a Four-Year Development Plan accepted by the SDB.
- (c) All NSAs in receipt of the SDB funding will need to observe the Code of Practice established by the Board. A set of application and accounting procedures has also been established for compliance by all subvented NSAs. These requirements are published in the Handbook for NSAs. If any NSA is found in violation of these policies and procedures, funding will be suspended until the NSA rectifies the anomaly. The system of monitoring has been inspected by various bodies such as the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) and the Audit Commission, and has found to be satisfactory.
- (d) Upon the dissolution of the SDB, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) will take over the responsibility of funding

allocation to NSAs. The LCSD plans to provide one-stop service for funding allocation to NSAs and monitoring the subvention process. The LCSD and the SDB are now working closely with NSAs to draw up their business plan for the coming year as well as to refine future subvention procedures. The LCSD have followed government subvention guidelines, with special emphasis on administration, accounting, sponsorship and code of conduct, and have consulted the ICAC, Department of Justice and Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau to refine the subvention procedures. The LCSD will set out the responsibilities of the subvented NSAs and the code of conduct they have to strictly observe. The LCSD staff will attend NSAs' meetings and pay irregular visit to their sports programmes so as to evaluate the effectiveness of the programmes. Furthermore, NSAs are required to furnish the LCSD with quarterly reports on their accounting and programme operation and annual audited accounts. Through the above arrangements, the supervision of NSAs in the use of subvention is expected to improve, which in turn will lead to more effective promotion of sports in Hong Kong.

Annex

Direct Funding to NSAs

<i>NSA \ Year</i>	<i>2001-02</i> (\$)	<i>2002-03</i> (\$)	<i>2003-04</i> (\$)
ARC	1,515,260	713,130	731,600
ATH	2,128,090	2,230,690	2,117,590
BBA	1,662,400	1,278,030	1,252,090
BBG	209,510	169,110	373,710
BBL	1,998,520	2,448,580	2,592,360
BDM	3,568,720	3,877,450	3,302,950
BOX	172,410	180,270	175,170
CAN	969,560	800,160	805,200
CMA	814,050	1,207,750	656,250
CRT	1,122,950	1,203,050	1,288,420
CYC	3,232,350	3,315,800	3,277,300
DBA	1,161,570	1,143,610	876,610
FBL	2,032,510	2,396,820	2,347,266
FEN	2,470,480	2,512,580	2,342,180
GBL	281,600	253,500	259,560

<i>NSA \ Year</i>	<i>2001-02</i> (\$)	<i>2002-03</i> (\$)	<i>2003-04</i> (\$)
GLF	1,331,360	971,030	882,830
GYM	2,069,320	1,791,920	1,762,220
HBL	1,154,850	1,076,290	1,018,738
HOC	1,048,360	1,013,380	931,230
HOR	1,141,530	1,005,030	880,230
ICE	45,600	225,400	93,300
JDO	958,400	1,062,690	1,025,970
KDO	193,400	255,820	312,100
KRG	381,000	291,300	153,100
KRO	400,680	452,880	433,600
LBS	710,590	727,690	629,620
LSG	197,300	769,690	679,990
MTG	557,940	682,240	684,740
NBL	511,170	628,470	252,740
ORG	1,000,560	1,301,660	1,010,960
ROS	786,560	805,630	818,930
ROW	2,976,200	3,090,170	3,144,590
RUG	1,575,350	1,633,970	1,834,910
SBL	716,220	738,020	577,780
SHG	1,283,360	1,515,170	1,342,390
SKG	247,700	480,310	429,210
SNK	435,840	546,240	586,340
SQU	3,261,890	3,294,060	3,257,590
STK	42,500	130,100	155,100
SWM	4,997,240	3,914,520	3,754,980
TAE	612,300	997,722	647,700
TBG	2,190,650	2,868,378	2,274,578
TNS	3,502,800	3,034,800	2,820,220
TRI	1,947,490	2,261,490	1,998,490
TTS	3,423,160	3,389,560	3,193,908
UWR	373,540	486,540	373,940
VLB	1,128,340	1,498,570	1,001,570
WLG	39,750	52,650	60,300
WSF	3,891,750	3,491,690	3,563,400
WSK	200,000	267,600	279,000
WUS	2,106,220	1,700,670	1,834,470
YAG	397,940	429,140	515,690
SAD	355,970	198,410	187,310
SAM	1,707,630	1,927,930	2,145,230
SAP	2,002,270	1,946,570	1,932,470
TOTAL	75,244,710	76,685,930	71,879,720

Abbreviations of NSAs

ARC	Hong Kong Archery Association
ATH	Hong Kong Amateur Athletic Association
BBA	Hong Kong Baseball Association
BBG	Hong Kong China Bodybuilding Association
BBL	Hong Kong Basketball Association
BDM	Hong Kong Badminton Association
BOX	Hong Kong Boxing Association
CAN	Hong Kong Canoe Union
CMA	Hong Kong Chinese Martial Arts Association
CRT	Hong Kong Cricket Association
CYC	Hong Kong Cycling Association
DBA	Hong Kong Dragon Boat Association
FBL	Hong Kong Football Association
FEN	Hong Kong Amateur Fencing Association
GBL	Hong Kong Gateball Association
GLF	Hong Kong Golf Association
GYM	Gymnastic Association of Hong Kong, China
HBL	Handball Association of Hong Kong, China
HOC	Hong Kong Hockey Association
HOR	Hong Kong Equestrian Federation
ICE	Hong Kong Ice Hockey Association
JDO	Judo Association of Hong Kong, China
KDO	Hong Kong Kendo Association
KRG	Hong Kong Kart Club
KRO	Hong Kong Karatedo Federation
LBS	Hong Kong Lawn Bowls Association
LSG	Hong Kong Life Saving Society
MTG	Hong Kong Mountaineering Union
NBL	Hong Kong Netball Association
ORG	Orienteering Association of Hong Kong
ROS	Hong Kong Federation of Roller Sports
ROW	Hong Kong, China Rowing Association
RUG	Hong Kong Rugby Football Union
SBL	Hong Kong Softball Association
SHG	Hong Kong Shooting Association

SKG	Hong Kong Skating Union
SNK	Hong Kong Billiards & Snooker Control Council
SQU	Hong Kong Squash
STK	Hong Kong Shuttlecock Association
SWM	Hong Kong Amateur Swimming Association
TAE	Hong Kong Taekwondo Association
TBG	Hong Kong Tenpin Bowling Congress
TNS	Hong Kong Tennis Association
TRI	Hong Kong Triathlon Association
TTS	Hong Kong Table Tennis Association
UWR	Hong Kong Underwater Association
VBL	Volleyball Association of Hong Kong, China
WLG	Hong Kong Amateur Weightlifting and Powerlifting Association
WSF	Windsurfing Association of Hong Kong
WSK	Hong Kong Water Ski Association
WUS	Hong Kong Wushu Union
YAG	Hong Kong Yachting Association
SAD	Hong Kong Sports Association of the Deaf
SAM	Hong Kong Sports Association for the Mentally Handicapped
SAP	Hong Kong Sports Association for the Physically Disabled

Shelving of Tamar Development Project

19. **MS EMILY LAU** (in Chinese): *Madam President, on 26 May this year, the Government announced that it would temporarily put the Tamar development project on hold in order to review its spending priorities. It also indicated that it would complete the review within six months and would announce the outcome. The development project included the construction of a new Legislative Council Complex. On 19 November, the Government announced its decision to defer the project following its review. In this connection, will the executive authorities inform this Council:*

- (a) *given that the relevant authorities completed late last year a prequalification exercise and selected five syndicates to participate in the tender, whether the relevant authorities have to pay compensation to these syndicates; if so, of the amount of compensation; if not, the justifications for that;*

- (b) *given that the Government has made several different decisions concerning whether or not to take the project forward since September 2001, whether they have assessed the damage done to the business environment and the Government's credibility by its indecisiveness; if so, of the assessment results; and*
- (c) *whether they will provide another piece of land for the construction of a new Legislative Council Complex; if not, of the reasons for that?*

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION (in Chinese): Madam President,

- (a) The Government has reserved in the prequalification document for the design-and-build contract of the Tamar development project the right not to conduct the tender for any reason and the document also states that the Government shall not be liable for any costs, expenses and damages in the event of cancellation of the tender exercise.
- (b) Before arriving at any major decision concerning the Tamar project, the Government had carefully assessed the justifications and considered the implications pertaining to the decision. As a responsible Government, we consider it appropriate to review our plans in the light of changed circumstances. The Government's decision to defer the Tamar project was made following a review of the Government's fiscal position, particularly amidst the aggravated fiscal deficit following the outbreak of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome. We believe that it would not be in the public interest to proceed with the Tamar project now.
- (c) The Government accepts the case for proceeding with the Tamar project, including the new Legislative Council Complex and Central Government Complex, at a later stage. Notwithstanding (b), therefore, we remain of the view that we should reserve the Tamar site for this purpose.

BILLS**First Reading of Bills**

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Bill: First Reading.

EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION ASSISTANCE (MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS) BILL 2003

CLERK (in Cantonese): Employees Compensation Assistance (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2003.

Bill read the First time and ordered to be set down for Second Reading pursuant to Rule 53(3) of the Rules of Procedure.

Second Reading of Bills

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Bill: Second Reading.

EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION ASSISTANCE (MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS) BILL 2003

SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOUR (in Cantonese): Madam President, I move the Second Reading of the Employees Compensation Assistance (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2003.

The Bill introduces two technical amendments to clarify certain ambiguities in the existing Employees Compensation Assistance Ordinance (ECAO).

The first amendment makes clear that the Employees Compensation Assistance Fund Board (the Board) may, in the event of insurer insolvency, assist employers in meeting the costs incurred in legal proceedings in relation to claims for compensation from their employees.

Legal advisers of the Board consider that the "costs in making the application" under section 23(7) of the ECAO may be interpreted to exclude costs incurred in the course of court proceedings brought by injured employees against their employers. The Department of Justice (DoJ) also holds that the existing Ordinance does not confer power on the Board to assist employers in relation to the costs of such legal proceedings. In other words, the existing provisions only allow the Board to assist employers in relation to legal costs in claims made to the Board, but not legal costs relating to employers' defence against employees' claims for compensation in the Court, as well as the legal costs payable by the employers as ordered by the Court.

As a common practice in the insurance industry, an employees' compensation (EC) insurance policy normally indemnifies an employer for the legal costs that he has incurred or is liable to pay in proceedings relating to a claim that arose from work injuries, provided that the employer has paid the statutory levy to the Board and has been assisted by the Board in paying compensation or damages to the injured employee. We think that in the event of insurer insolvency, the Board should provide assistance to the employer in paying the legal costs. If the Board does not assist employers in relation to the legal costs, employers will have little incentive to defend the claims in Court diligently even though they may dispute the claims. This will result in the Board having to join in the legal proceedings to contest the claims or paying the uncontested claims as awarded by the Court.

Injured employees would also be affected if their employers defaulted on payment of the legal costs as ordered by the Court. In these circumstances, the injured employees would have to pay legal fees to their lawyers on their own account. This would reduce the amount of compensation that the employees could actually receive eventually. We, therefore, propose to amend the relevant provisions so that the Board may assist employers on legal costs in relation to compensation proceedings brought by their employees.

The second amendment is to clarify the transitional arrangement for the excision of the protection of insurer insolvency. The Employees Compensation Insurer Insolvency Scheme (ECIIS) operated by the insurance industry is expected to provide protection to employers in the event of their insurer's insolvency from 1 April next year onwards, when the similar protection provided by the ECAO will be excised on the same date. In order to protect the interests of employers whose insurers may have become insolvent before 1 April 2004, we hope to enable these employers to continue to receive assistance from the Board on or after 1 April 2004.

In 2001, when the HIH Group of insurance companies in Australia collapsed, three of its insurance companies in Hong Kong were declared insolvent, and among which, two operated businesses in EC insurance. According to the legal advice from the DoJ, the ambiguity in section 46A(8) would have the unintended effect of excluding those employers who have been affected by the HIH insolvency from the protection of the ECAO if their liability for compensation of damages is determined on or after 1 April 2004. These employers would also not be entitled to seeking assistance under the ECIIS. To truly reflect the policy intent, it is necessary to amend the relevant provisions.

Madam President, the amendments concerned can protect the interests of employers and employees injured at work, while extra costs would not be brought to employers. In order that those employers affected by insurer insolvency can obtain speedier assistance on legal costs, and that the ECIIS can start operation on 1 April next year as scheduled, I hope Members can support and pass the Bill as soon as possible.

Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the Employees Compensation Assistance (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2003 be read the Second time.

In accordance with the Rules of Procedure, the debate is now adjourned and the Bill is referred to the House Committee.

MEMBERS' MOTIONS

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Members' motions. Three motions with no legislative effect. I have accepted the recommendations of the House Committee on the time limits for Members' speeches. As Members are already very familiar with the time limits, I shall make no repetition here. I only wish to point out to Members that I am obliged to direct any Member speaking in excess of the specified time to discontinue.

First motion: Education policy.

EDUCATION POLICY

MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG (in Cantonese): Madam President, I rise to move this motion to oppose the Government's reduction in spending on education, and to urge the Government to implement small-class teaching in primary and secondary schools by phases, adopt the four-year normative undergraduate structure as early as possible, and provide funding support for existing associate degree programmes run by universities, so as to provide students with quality education and nurture future talents for Hong Kong.

Madam President, my purpose of moving this motion is to urge the Chief Executive, TUNG Chee-hwa, to honour his pledge in the policy address of 2001: "Regardless of Hong Kong's economic situation, you can rest assured that in the next five to ten years spending on education will continue to increase year after year." I also hope that Financial Secretary Henry TANG will not axe education funding under the pretext of eliminating the fiscal deficit, lest the resultant disruption to education services may render the education reform fruitless. As for kindergarten education, the resources allocated to it are already very scarce, so no further reduction should be possible. That said, I must add that there is still room for savings in education. But the savings must be ploughed back to education for improvement, for developing the three "Projects Hope", namely, small-class teaching, the four-year normative undergraduate structure and associate degree programmes.

I also hope that the Secretary for Education and Manpower can be present not only physically but also mentally today; he must not play electronic games anymore. Education gives hope to countless parents, and quality education can foster social cohesion. Had the Secretary for Education and Manpower listened at all carefully to the 40 or so representatives of various educational organizations and bodies at the Legislative Council hearing held the day before yesterday, he would have known that they oppose any reduction in education funding. Their views are very clear. The Government must attach the greatest importance to the views of these organizations, because they represent the various segments of the education system — universities, secondary and primary schools, kindergartens and special education schools. All these people were willing to wait several hours just for a chance to speak for three minutes, to state the adverse consequences of reducing education funding, in the hope that the Government can provide quality education to students and thus nurture the talents required by Hong Kong in the future.

Madam President, the first Project Hope is small-class teaching. The aim of the Government's education reform is to cultivate students' multiple-intelligence and creativity, but then it also refuses to administer the proper remedy and provide the resources required for implementation of small-class teaching. Even today, a classroom is still crammed with 40 students, or even 45 students. In such an overcrowded learning environment, where there is little teacher-student interaction, the teacher can only focus on the imparting of knowledge, having no time for consolidating the foundation of students and enhancing the performance of high achievers. If we look around us, we will see that places such as Shanghai, Singapore, Japan and Taiwan, where the student population is diminishing, have all sought to capitalize on this golden opportunity and develop teaching in small classes. The success experience of these places is by no means any coincidence, because small-class teaching is essential to quality education and also an irresistible trend. In contrast, back in Hong Kong, although the British Hong Kong Administration already started a gradual reduction of the average class size in 1992, there has still been a good deal of vacillation on the policy of small-class teaching. We have lost the first 10 years, and we can ill-afford losing another 10 years or even more. The student population is now steadily declining, leading to an ever-increasing number of vacancies in both secondary and primary schools. The Government must grasp this opportunity and introduce small-class teaching step by step: district by district for primary schools, according priority to those with a shrinking population; school by school for secondary schools, giving priority to Band 3 ones. In this way, the ideal of small-class teaching can be realized in 10 years without having to spending any huge additional resources.

Madam President, at a time when people are still fighting for small-class teaching in secondary and primary schools, the class size in our universities has instead started to increase due to funding reduction. This is indeed absurd. The worst-hit of all is the Institute of Education, the funding of which is reduced by 20% in 2004-05, and it may well be forced to raise its teacher-to-student ratio by 10% in the future. In a public hearing of the Legislative Council, staff of the Institute of Education remarked helplessly that even the purchase of reference books and the subscription of periodicals for their library had been reduced. The Institute of Education is being "sapped", so there are no more books in its library, so to speak. This is a great misery to the education sector.

TUNG Chee-hwa once set down a grand objective of achieving a 60% university participation rate in 10 years. But this grand objective is not backed

up by any financial support; instead, funding is reduced. In this way, the grand objective is reduced to a hollow promise and the Education and Manpower Bureau to a "shell" company having issued a cheque that cannot be honoured. In order to achieve the "85 000" manner goal in education, the Government is trying to make associate degree programmes self-financing, thus endangering the very survival of The Hong Kong Polytechnic University and the City University of Hong Kong. The quality of associate degree programmes will thus drop due to costs considerations, resulting in a tragic knocking out of good institutions by bad ones. According to the Education and Manpower Bureau, the resources thus saved will be expended on providing funding support to associate degree programmes, but the kind of support referred to is nothing but the provision of student loans. Associate degree students have to pay higher tuition fees when compared with degree students, but they will only be awarded an inferior qualification. It will be difficult for them to find a job or further their studies after graduation; worse still, they will become heavily indebted. This is really absurd. Education can indeed facilitate social mobility, but the Government has sought to rank students and discriminate against associate degree students. This runs counter to the principle of equity in education. I therefore demand the Government to provide funding support to all existing associate degree programmes, stop all discrimination and reverse this totally unjust funding policy.

Madam President, the adoption of the four-year normative undergraduate structure is the consensus of society. The heads of the universities have said that the Government must at least maintain the existing levels of funding before the four-year normative undergraduate structure can be implemented by phases. However, according to the funding reduction approach adopted by Henry TANG, the Government will go on reducing university funding for 10 years, which means that it will not be possible to implement the four-year normative undergraduate structure within the foreseeable future. When one segment is affected, the whole system will suffer. With the abortive implementation of the four-year normative undergraduate structure, the plan to introduce a three-year secondary school curriculum will be upset. In this way, the academic system and curriculum reforms in Hong Kong will continue to face chaos and uncertainties. Students will face increased examination pressure, having to sit for two public examinations in three years before they can enter university. And, the universities will be unable to implement the four-year normative undergraduate structure to upgrade the quality of their graduates. The reduction of university funding has not only created anxieties in the universities, but will also impede the progress of the education reform, victimizing students

ultimately. Financial Secretary Henry TANG's funding policy has failed to carry out TUNG Chee-hwa's policy commitment. The people of Hong Kong have been criticizing the Government for reversing its education policy much too often and abruptly. And, the worst reversal is evident in the Financial Secretary's education funding policy; sometimes, he gives lots of money, but then, suddenly, he wants to give less. In brief, this is similar to growing trees for 10 years and then trying to burn them all up in the next 10 years. Education is always so devoid of any direction, always in such a mess. Students will meet the same fate as the Director of Bureau playing electronic games — "Game Over" sooner or later.

Money cannot always work, but education can never work if there is no money. The Government is now faced with a fiscal deficit of some \$80 billion, so where can we get the money for the three Projects Hope? Dr YEUNG Sum and Mr SIN Chung-kai of the Democratic Party will offer a recommendation to the Financial Secretary on making a more active use of the Exchange Fund during the times of fiscal deficit. Hong Kong now possesses an Exchange Fund of some \$900 billion, which is seven times the total amount of Hong Kong Dollar notes in circulation. The net return of the Exchange Fund in the first three quarters of this year is even as much as \$52.1 billion, so our foreign exchange reserves, the fifth largest in the world, are in fact extremely stable. Dr YEUNG Sum and Mr SIN Chung-kai of the Democratic Party will later on submit a Budget proposal to the Government. The proposal will contain a three-win approach to deal with the fiscal deficit and education investments. The Government is advised to allocate part of the Exchange Fund's investment return to ease its financial situation during the times of fiscal deficit. In the case of this year, for example, when there is a return of \$52.1 billion, a maximum of \$10 billion may be allocated to the Government on top of its normal share of the return. The Government may get a maximum of \$10 billion in additional funding to meet the expenditure on education, health care and social welfare. The merit of this proposal is that during these times of fiscal deficit, education funding can be maintained at its present level. But this will neither affect the Government's determination to eliminate the fiscal deficit nor weaken the ability of the \$900 billion Exchange Fund to maintain the stability of the Hong Kong Dollar, because we are just talking about a very small portion of the returns. But then, we can continue to provide extra services to various fields, including the education sector — quality education, small-class teaching, funding support for associate degree programmes and the implementation of the four-year normative undergraduate structure.

There is also another possibility. We may consider the possibility of allocating funds from the Quality Education Fund, which has by now accumulated to almost \$4 billion, to subsidize new services under the education reform. This will not violate the spirit of the Quality Education Fund, and at the same time, the Fund can be flexibly used to upgrade our education services, thus serving a two-fold purpose. On the basis of the existing population size and assuming that there is no need to construct new schools, the implementation of small-class teaching will only require \$500 million to \$600 million a year. After 10 years, there will be a chance of implementing small-class teaching in all Hong Kong schools. To make use of a portion of the Exchange Fund's returns is one possibility; to make use of the Quality Education Fund is another. Both these two methods can provide timely assistance to the education reform. They can both put out the raging fire and grow trees for the future.

Madam President, in its recent report, the Audit Commission criticized the education sector for wasting resources in some aspects, urging the sector to spend less. I agree entirely that public money must not be wasted, and that where possible, less money should be spent in public interest. But I hope the money thus saved can be ploughed back to education, to improve education quality, to meet the aspirations of society and parents. I am of the view that we should grasp the opportunity provided by surplus places in secondary and primary schools. Specifically, the demands for school places in various districts should be mapped out again, and instead of setting the class size rigidly at 40 or even rigidly filling each class with 40 students, Band 3 students or students from under-performing schools should be admitted, so that they can benefit from small-class teaching as early as possible. But of all government education projects, the one that wastes the greatest amount of public money is the construction of new schools by the Education and Manpower Bureau even when there are surplus school places. Assuming that the construction cost of a millenium school is \$110 million, then the costs of constructing the new schools will be billions of dollars, which is a serious waste of public money. Therefore, I solemnly demand that unless it is for the implementation of whole-day schooling for primary schools, and unless it is for the reconstruction of old schools, the Government should construct new schools only when actual demands are noticed on the basis of demographic projections. The Education and Manpower Bureau should revise and reduce its expenditure estimate of school construction and save resources for the implementation of small-class teaching in secondary and primary schools.

Madam President, education is a project of hope, a significant social investment. Chinese people have always regarded education as a matter of important and paramount concern. Even if they have to skimp on food and clothes, they still want their children to receive good education and become achievers. The attempt by the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR) to reduce education funding is tantamount to taking away the hope of tens of thousands of families and parents. This is nothing but a wrongful policy that destroys the Government's own support and alienates the people. The students' strike earlier on was just a warning, and this warning was only the beginning. If the SAR Government remains so opinionated and insists on wielding its axe at students and education, it will meet the wider and fiercer resistance of society. I hope the Government can stop before it is too late and be merciful to education and students.

With these remarks, Madam President, I beg to move.

Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong moved the following motion: (Translation)

"That this Council opposes the Government's reduction in spending on education, and urges the Government to implement small-class teaching in primary and secondary schools by phases, adopt the four-year normative undergraduate structure as early as possible, and provide funding support for existing associate degree programmes run by universities, so as to provide students with quality education and nurture future talents for Hong Kong."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong be passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung and Mr Tommy CHEUNG will move amendments to this motion respectively. Their amendments have been printed on the Agenda. The motion and the two amendments will now be debated together in a joint debate.

I now call upon Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung to speak first.

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): Madam President, I believe education involves much more than the imparting of knowledge. More importantly, it also involves personality formation, that is, helping a youngster to form a good personality. According to traditional wisdom, teaching by one's example is far more effective than any other approaches. It is a pity that our SAR Government does not realize this point, does not understand what should be the best example to students. What Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said a moment ago is not the only example. If we play electronic games in a meeting, apart from making others feel that they are not being respected, we will also show other students how much we respect others. If government officials and the Government always do not honour their pledges, how can our youngsters be educated to keep their promises? The Mainland of the 1960s and 1970s was plagued with all sorts of empty talks and lies. What were the results? The results were chaos in society and incessant sufferings of the people. We do not want the SAR Government and SAR officials to drag our youngsters into such an abyss.

Madam President, Mr TUNG has been the Chief Executive for six years, and education is invariably accorded lengthy treatment in the policy address every year. Unfortunately, so many, many promises of his have failed to stand the test of time. Two to three years at most, or as soon as one year, he will break his promises.

I can remember that in 1997, in his first policy address, Mr TUNG said that he would increase basic education funding to 7.6% of the recurrent expenditure. Admittedly, in 1997-98 and 2001-2002, the amounts of education investments were really higher than this percentage, but then subsequently, the Government failed to carry it through at all. In 2002-03, when secondary and primary schools were all expecting the Government to make huge investments in basic education as it did in the past, the Government instead started to reduce the block grant for operating expenditure by 3.3% according to the deflation rate. We must realize that the block grant for operating expenditure is the major income source of a school. Although prices in general have dropped, some expenses accounting for the biggest proportion of a school's expenditure, such as electricity charges, have never gone down. As a result, many schools now face the problem of inadequate resources. How then can they improve students' learning environment? In the end, the quality of learning and teaching will both suffer. These schools are just like a person who used to be well-fed, but who now have to make do with very little food. The only result is malnutrition.

We do not wish to see basic education in Hong Kong suffer from ill health. If that happens, how can we build up a knowledge-based society?

In the policy address of 1998, Mr TUNG advocated lifelong learning, but unfortunately, several years have passed, and with the exception of the establishment of a Continuing Education Fund under which a person is eligible to apply only once in his whole lifetime for a \$10,000 studies grant, nothing else has been offered. We can see that tuition fees in the market are increasing incessantly, and a degree will cost at least some \$100,000, so a mere \$10,000 will not solve the problem at all. What is more enraging is that despite its advocacy of lifelong learning, since the beginning of this year, the Government has been closing down or outsourcing its adult secondary and primary education services, which provide the very basis of lifelong learning for adults. And, the tuition fees after outsourcing are nine or 10 times those in the past, totally beyond the means of those low-income earners with few qualifications who wish to further their studies. To these people, lifelong learning is just a dream, not something they can truly enjoy or receive.

Besides, in 1999, Mr TUNG said that it was the shared duty of all in society to ensure quality education, that the Government would fulfil its duty of providing resources to education, and that it would do the best it could to ensure more effective deployment of resources. And, in the policy address of 2000, he also pointed out that investment in education was the most important long-term social investment, so the SAR Government would be firmly committed to the provision of education resources. Then, in 2001, he even avowed that despite the pressure exerted by the current economic difficulties on public finances, the Government would remain committed to education investment; in the next five to 10 years, regardless of the prevailing economic situation, the Government's investment in education would still increase year after year. In the policy address this year, it was again stressed that despite the fiscal deficit problem which must be tackled, the Government would still invest in education.

However, Madam President, it is such a great pity that all these pledges of Mr TUNG have not made the people feel any more confident that the Government will invest in education. Instead, these pledges have pushed Mr TUNG's credibility to the brink of bankruptcy. In fact, the funding for tertiary education alone can already show us clearly what is going on. In the policy address of 2000, Mr TUNG proposed to increase the tertiary education age participation rate from 30% to 60% in 10 years. But the Government's

recurrent expenditure on this started to decrease in 2000-01. In the triennium of 1998-99 to 2000-01, the Government requested the universities to lower their unit cost per student by 2.5%; in the triennium of 2001-02 to 2003-04, the universities were further requested to lower their unit cost per student by 10%, and the total funding for them were also cut by \$2 billion. The number of students is increasing all the time, but the resources available are diminishing, so how can the tertiary education sector possibly withstand such a double impact? Can such a policy be described as a firm commitment to education investment? In fact, the Government has already reached the acme of perfection in breaking its promises and reversing its policies overnight. For instance, a couple of days ago, when the Panel on Education discussed tertiary education funding in 2004-05, that is, before the announcement by the Government, the relevant government officials still stressed that the rate of reduction would be roughly the same as that of the past triennium, that is, about 10%, but eventually, the rate turned out to be 12.9%. In other words, the rate of reduction was increased by 3% within just one single day. For the "main targets" of Secretary Prof Arthur LI, such as the Institute of Education and the Lingnan University, the rate of reduction even ranges from 13% to 15%. The Government has been talking so irresponsibly, so how can it command any credibility?

Secretary Prof Arthur LI, with all his wisdom, may well come up with an alternative interpretation of "increasing investment in education year after year". As Prof Arthur LI explained to students earlier on, "growth" may well refer to the proportion occupied by education in the total expenditure of the Government, not any real increase in money terms. This means that as long as education receives a smaller cut than those of other areas, people should say "yes". But is such an interpretation also the interpretation of students and members of the public? Generally, people think that vigorous investment in education should be linked to the amount of investments and the relevant targets. This is only as it should be. If Mr TUNG thinks that an increase of just one undergraduate place and an increase of \$1 million in funding can already be called vigorous investment, we would of course agree. But Mr TUNG's goal is to double the number of tertiary students in 10 years. That being the case, how many more resources are required before this goal can be attained, before one can say that there is vigorous investment? However, the Government has not offered any explanation to us. Therefore, what we have in mind and what we wish to ask is this question: "The Government talks about vigorous investment, but what exactly does that mean?" How is the Government going to show that to us in real terms?

Actually, many education objects were laid down by the Government, but it has invariably failed to provide adequate resources. This has led to many morbid phenomena in our education system. For instance, in 1997, when Mr TUNG assumed office, he immediately said that the whole-day schooling system should be implemented in primary schools as soon as possible, in 2002. Because of this, the objective of reducing the average class size had to be suspended for the time being, and this explains what is happening now. The Secretary may well say that the Government has really invested vigorously in education, and he may probably say that the total expenditure on education has increased from some \$40 billion to some \$60 billion this year. But I must say that a good part of the increase has been spent on the construction of new schools, which is just a non-recurrent expenditure. There has been no genuine investment in the long-term development of education. The increase can offer a superficial explanation to people, but it cannot be of any concrete help to education as a whole.

Another morbid phenomenon we notice is found in the university sector. For fear of increasing expenditure, the Government has tried to delay the adoption of the four-year normative undergraduate structure. But at the same time, it has come up with a scheme on the early admission of outstanding secondary school-leavers, asking the universities to increase their respective intake by 10% without any additional funding. The universities are of course willing to admit outstanding students, but this practice will do no good to the universities, schools and students. The increased workload of university staff will naturally affect education quality. In order to produce more outstanding students for early admission, schools will start to push their students as early as Secondary Three. So, students will face academic pressure much earlier. That being the case, it is simply impossible to achieve the learning objective of "happiness, benevolence, bravery and courage".

If the Government remains so opinionated and looks at education from the sole perspective of money, many more morbid phenomena are bound to emerge, and society will have to suffer more damage. Therefore, since the Government has made so many promises, I hope that it will not continue to break them. Instead, it must pluck up its courage and spend more money on education. It must not back away anymore. Madam President, I so submit.

MR TOMMY CHEUNG (in Cantonese): Madam President, the economy of Hong Kong has been in a very poor shape ever since the reunification, but the

SAR Government has still increased its annual expenditure on education year after year. Since the first financial year after the reunification, there has been a cumulative increase of 35%, totalling \$200 billion, in the Government's expenditure on education. This shows that the SAR Government has attached very great importance to education.

However, as pointed out by the Financial Secretary earlier on, the Government is now somewhat like a housewife having to cook a meal without any rice. Hong Kong is faced with an acute fiscal deficit, and because of the sudden onslaught of SARS, the Government's fiscal reserves have kept shrinking. It is estimated that by 2008, the fiscal reserves will be reduced to some \$100 billion, which is hardly sufficient for half a year of government expenditure. All in society must now share the burden of eliminating the fiscal deficit by all means. If not, the stability of our linked exchange rate system, or even the financial system may be affected.

The Liberal Party is of the view that under the principle of shared responsibility, no matter how important education is, it should not be exempted, and it must also contribute to the elimination of the fiscal deficit. This is not to speak of the fact that in line with the Chief Executive's principle that education is an investment but not an item of expenditure, the Financial Secretary has already been exceptionally "lenient" with the Education and Manpower Bureau, and Secretary Prof Arthur LI is not rigidly required to meet the "operating expenditure envelope" requirement, which sets down a 21% reduction in the overall expenditure of a Bureau within five years.

It has in fact been pointed out clearly in three consecutive reports of the Audit Commission that huge wastage and misuse of resources are found in secondary and primary schools and universities, and the cumulative wastage has amounted to \$5 billion, or 8% of the education funding this year. In other words, the education sector needs only to save a further 2% and it will be able to cope with the required reduction in funding. Is it really true that the education sector cannot even save this amount of resources?

Since Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong's original motion and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung's amendment both lay stress on opposing the Government's reduction of education funding, I, on behalf of the Liberal Party, shall move another amendment which opposes any unreasonable funding reduction but supports frugality wherever necessary. We do not agree to the argument that education funding cannot be reduced even by one cent. The Liberal Party also maintains

that the various tertiary institutions should not shift the impact of funding reduction onto students, lest this may add to their burden. Instead, they should focus on "reduction", I mean, the reduction of any unnecessary "fat" in the whole institutional framework of education. They should carry out a comprehensive review of the utilization of education resources, so as to minimize the impact on teaching quality.

In the interest of upgrading the quality of Hong Kong's population, the Liberal Party supports the Government's vigorous development of associate degree programmes, but we also think that the Government should actively assist the various tertiary institutions in developing their own education businesses as a source of revenue, so as to enable associate degree programmes to smoothly become self-financing, thereby gradually reducing the reliance on government funding. But this does not mean that we think that associate degree programmes are the same as diploma or higher diploma programmes. Nor do we think that diploma or higher diploma programmes, which have all along been publicly funded, should likewise become self-financing. The reason is that all along, the various diploma or higher diploma programmes have focused mainly on pre-vocational education and professional training for commerce and industry, so whether in terms of nature and structure, they are different from associate degree programmes, which emphasize liberal and all-round education.

Over the past two to three decades, the diploma and higher diploma graduates of some institutions and the Vocational Training Council have actually made very substantial contribution to the economy of Hong Kong. Many graduates of the commerce- and industry-related programmes, in particular, have become managers and professional technicians in the business sector. Even if Hong Kong is to develop into a knowledge-based economy, we still think that the commercial and industrial sector, financial businesses and services industries of Hong Kong will still need diploma and higher diploma graduates. Precisely because of the marked achievement of diploma and higher diploma programmes, the Liberal Party does not wish to see the Government's withdrawal of funding for these programmes.

Once the Government reduces the funding for these diploma programmes, their tuition fees may rise drastically, thus dampening the desire of working adults to pursue further studies. This does not only run counter to the goal of lifelong learning, but will also reduce the manpower training opportunities of the various trades and industries, producing a negative impact on the economy.

In regard to creating new sources of revenue, while we think that the various institutions should make better use of their own facilities by, for example, renting out their long-standing vacant quarters, we also maintain that the University Grants Committee should explore the possibility of relaxing the 4% quota for non-local students, provided that this will not affect the number of places available to local students and the Government does not have to provide any subsidy. Some programmes run by local universities have attained very high international standards and won a very good reputation. The respective Master of Business Management programme run by the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology and The Chinese University of Hong Kong, for example, are internationally renowned. If we can enhance the development of these programmes, we may well develop them into a kind of education business and induce more non-local students to come to Hong Kong. Maybe, we can even develop these programmes into a source of revenue. In this way, local universities may also become more international, thus facilitating our academic exchanges with the rest of the world. This is also good to students.

Besides, local universities have also attained very high international standards in their research efforts, and the results offer very high market potentials. For example, earlier this year, the University of Science and Technology achieved a breakthrough in nanotechnology research and produced the smallest single-walled nanocarbon tube in the world, which carries immense development potentials in the micro electronic industry; and The Hong Kong Polytechnic University is also conducting research on a revolutionary "electronic ear" for the blind which can help them identify directions. The research project has received sponsorship from the Innovation and Technology Fund, and the product is expected to come onto the market within two years.

All this shows that the Government should assist the various tertiary institutions in giving full play to their scientific research potentials and in enhancing their communication and co-operation with the business sector. Such communication and co-operation can, on the one hand, expedite the commercialization of the universities' research results, thus enabling them to get more research funding. On the other hand, the local business sector will be provided with more advanced technologies, and there will also be more opportunities to train up the talents required, thus achieving a win-win situation.

The Liberal Party also agrees that as long as resources can be appropriately deployed, small-class teaching should be implemented in secondary and primary schools. But we do also urge the Government to conduct comprehensive and in-depth studies before implementation, so as to ascertain what class size should be reasonable. The authorities must not forcibly implement this idea regardless of their own financial strengths and the question of effectiveness. As for the "3-3-4" system, since the four-year normative undergraduate structure is now the prevalent trend, we also agree that the Government should actively explore its feasibility.

In regard to Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung's amendment, as I said earlier on, the financial situation of Hong Kong will still be critical in the time ahead; so, even though the Chief Executive did make various pledges on education investment in past policy addresses, society should still show a kind of compassionate understanding in case the Government, after assessing the situation carefully, still sees a well-justified need to reduce various items of expenditure, including education investment. This is precisely a manifestation of the Government's sense of responsibility towards the people, so why should anyone be still discontented? Therefore, we oppose this amendment.

Madam President, I so submit.

DR ERIC LI (in Cantonese): Madam President, adjacent to Hong Kong is its vast Motherland, which is richly endowed with both manpower and natural resources. That Hong Kong should position itself for development into a knowledge-based society or economy should be indisputable. Education is the lifeline of Hong Kong, and higher education, in particular, is where our hope lies as far as our future economic restructuring and the sustained development of the Pearl River Delta are concerned. This is the opportunity we must grasp now. If we miss this opportunity now, it will be too late to mend. That being the case, if we now slash education funding, saying that this must be done under the policy, guiding objective, of eliminating what may just be a short-term fiscal deficit, I am sure that in the future, we will find our move extremely myopic.

As we all know, education in Hong Kong should follow the path of becoming a business in its future development. In the Hong Kong 2030: Planning Vision and Strategy report, the Government envisages the construction

of a university town in the boundary area of Hong Kong and Shenzhen. This is a very visionary plan, showing that the Hong Kong Government is aware of the significance of education.

Several months ago, in a Chief Executive's Question Time, I raised the question of whether or not we could admit students from the Mainland and overseas. This can both train up talents for Hong Kong and capitalize on the convergence of the Mainland with the world market. Specifically, Hong Kong will thus be able to bring into full play its advantageous status as the meeting point of Western and Eastern cultures; we may open up our education business, so as to make it a pillar of our economy like the financial and tourism industries. But I know that the attainment of this objective must be preceded by many fundamental reforms of the local education system, and such reforms cannot possibly be completed overnight.

Having put forward my views, I also wish to say a few words on my voting decision. After looking at the original motion and the amendment, I find it not at all easy to make a decision because both Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong's motion and Mr Tommy CHEUNG's amendment seem to have mixed up those education objectives I very much support with some short-term financial considerations. As far as these objectives and considerations are concerned, they are very difficult to reconcile in some ways. In the motion and the amendment, I do find something I particularly like, but I also have some reservations about other points in them.

First, let me discuss Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong's motion. To begin with, his motion is underlined by a condition of no reduction in education funding, not by any education objectives. His premise is very clear. However, I also think that he fails to make two points clear in putting forward this premise. Firstly, what is meant by no reduction in education funding? Does he refer to overall funding, or the funding for each university and secondary school? If the former is the case, the Financial Secretary will surely find it very easy to answer the question, because he has already pointed out, overall, there will simply be no reduction in education funding. So, why do people still grumble, still complain? But if Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong is talking about the funding for each university, the story will be entirely different. Secondly, the motion does not mention any timeframe. People thus have the impression that Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong will oppose reduction in education funding at all times.

But I think that in the long run, education should develop into a kind of business. What we must look at should be the resources expended by society as a whole on education, including the tuition fees charged, community donations and other resources as a whole. If, overall, there is no reduction in resources, this kind of social investment may well become a form of investment, instead of a burden of society. My viewpoint is totally justified. My alma mater is the University of Manchester. Its President came to Hong Kong two years ago. On the name card he handed to me, I found that he had won the United Kingdom Top Ten Industries Award. He was right. It was the Top Ten Industries Award. I was surprised and wondered why a university could win the Award. So, I asked him, and he replied that he had started to develop this university since some 20 years before. People may not know it, but this university is in fact one of the 10 organizations in the United Kingdom that earn the greatest amount of foreign exchange for the country. So, we can see that down through these 20 years or so of investment, instead of becoming a burden to the government, the university has turned out to be a major foreign exchange earner of the country. This is also the case with many prestigious universities overseas. There are eight or nine universities in Hong Kong; looking at these universities basically as institutions serving local students, some may think that there are just too many of them. But from the perspective of business investment, these universities can actually put us in an advantageous position. Having gone through so many difficulties, Singapore is still unable to set up a third or fourth university, but we already have eight or nine. With such an advantage, I think it is worthwhile for us to make this our long-term objective. In the long run, we need not insist on having no funding reduction as our objective. This is the reason why I have some reservations about Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong's motion.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG's amendment, however, is obviously my cup of tea, because I have all along been advocating this. But Mr Tommy CHEUNG's amendment at the same time also proposes many restrictions and resource management tactics as pre-conditions. These tactics may not necessarily be so bad. But if they are implemented too drastically before our universities or schools are psychologically and financially well-prepared, they come through more like a revolution than reforms.

Therefore, it can be seen that both the motion and the amendment contain things that I like and things that I do not like. But, anyway, I hope that the legislature can discuss the motion from a more positive perspective. As for Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung's amendment, since it is rather negative, I will definitely not

render my support. For the motion and the other amendment, after explaining clearly my reservations today, I wish to support them both. I am sure that our differences today do not actually lie in any long-term objective. But then, as the debate continues, the focus is somehow shifted to the deployment of financial resources and the pace of reforms. I hope that this will not shift Members' focus from the objective of supporting education in Hong Kong during the debate. Thank you, Madam President.

MR YEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): Madam President, several years ago, the Chief Executive issued a number of post-dated cheques in the Legislative Council. One of these cheques, the biggest one, and the most significant one is this: "Regardless of Hong Kong's economic situation, you can rest assured that in the next five to 10 years spending on education will continue to increase year after year." Everybody welcomed this commitment at that time. But, today, when we produce this post-dated cheque and ask the Financial Secretary to honour it, the Government seems to have forgotten all about it.

The Secretary for Education and Manpower also knows that it is difficult to honour this cheque, so he has sought to redeploy resources instead. The Secretary can be excused for playing electronic games to release his pressure, for he is pressured by his superior to reduce resources on the one hand and faced with the outcries of teachers and students on the other. Nevertheless, playing electronic games is not the best solution. The best solution should be to fight as best he can for resources from his superior. The original motion today aims to offer some help to the Secretary. The redeployment of resources is similar to playing a game of Puzznic — the better one can arrange the patterns, the higher will be the score; poor arrangement will not only lead to loss of score but also "Game Over", and failure of our education system. In Puzznic, there are triangles, squares and lozenges of various colours, which can be compared to the various crises confronting our higher education and basic education. A successful arrangement of these shapes will dispel all these crises.

The reduction of education funding has led to many crises in the education sector. Firstly, the universities are faced with the crisis of a drastic reduction of resources. Resources for the universities have been reduced to such an extent that almost no further reduction can be possible. In the case of the Lingnan University, for example, its funding in 2004-05 has been reduced to as little as some \$178 million, and for the Hong Kong Baptist University, it is only left with

some \$500 million. Since 1998, overall university funding has been reduced by 10%. The universities have reluctantly agreed to accept a further 10% reduction next year. As for 2004 to 2008, besides the funding reduction for taught master and associate degree programmes, there may be further reduction. When will funding reduction stop? The Report of the University and Higher Education Review published last year recommends that every tertiary institution be required to set their own missions and re-define their roles. But with such drastic funding reduction and grim prospects, how can the universities have any spare money and time for re-defining their roles? This is simply empty talk.

For associate degree programmes, the crisis is related to the withdrawal of funding for the associate degree programmes run by The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) and the City University of Hong Kong (CityU). The Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong (DAB) is of the view that associate degree programmes, which have been publicly funded, should continue to receive public funding. The CityU has been forced to accept the Government's withdrawal of funding for 13 associate degree programmes; the DAB respects the decision of the CityU and also thinks that the Government is morally obligated to accept the counter-requests of CityU, namely, land provision by the authorities for the construction of a community college, a 20-year college construction loan and the lengthening of the transition period of funding reduction.

Under the climate of funding reduction, the universities must shape up themselves. In case a university finds that its curriculums and research institutes are the same as those of another, or if it sees that a programme it runs is not as good as a similar one run by another institution, it should leave the job to the other institution. There is also no need to operate similar research institutes. As for staff salaries, there is still room for flexibility. In brief, the universities themselves must actively re-deploy their resources to cope with the current spate of funding reduction.

Another crisis faced by the universities is the change to the four-year normative undergraduate structure. In 2001, the Chief Executive already called upon the education sector to reach a consensus on this issue as soon as possible, and he also hoped that the change could come about within 10 years. The review report on the senior secondary school system recommends that the most appropriate time for a new senior secondary school system should be 2010, but because of the lack of resources, nothing has been worked out as to how a three-year secondary school system should be implemented, how it should

articulate with the four-year undergraduate structure and when the universities should adopt the four-year structure. The DAB does not wish to see any division of the education sector because of this issue. All parties involved should accord priority to the interests of students and reach a consensus on the four-year normative undergraduate structure as soon as possible.

The crisis faced by basic education relates to the emergence of surplus teachers and schools places brought about by a shrinking population and also to the need for small-class teaching. The declining birth rate offers precisely a good opportunity to reduce the number of students per class and to enable students to receive more attention from their teachers. Last year, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong moved a motion on small-class teaching, but since he rigidly limited the class size to 25 students, the DAB thought that there was too much rigidity and no scientific justification, so it abstained from voting. This time around, Mr CHEUNG's motion recommends a gradual approach without allusion to any specific class size, so the DAB will support the relevant motion.

Finally, I wish to say that it is so much more difficult to tackle all these crises than to play a game of Puzznic. Had the Financial Secretary honoured the post-dated cheque, the Secretary for Education and Manpower would not have to play electronic games in the Legislative Council, and it would have been much easier to tackle all these education crises. The DAB will support the original motion.

I so submit.

MR NG LEUNG-SING (in Cantonese): Madam President, the huge fiscal deficit is a hard fact before the whole community of Hong Kong. It is mere wishful thinking that the various policy areas can all maintain the original levels of funding under the increasingly tight financial situation. The reason is that resources simply will not emerge from nowhere just because someone says "no reduction". Given such a hard fact, all in society is obligated to share some responsibility in a reasonable and balanced distribution of resources. I agree that education is a cause of very long-term significance, a form of long-term investment, and probably the last policy area to be considered for reduced funding under the tight financial situation, but this does not mean that even when the Government is short of means, it must not reduce the funding for it. Besides, we should also agree to one point. While the upgrading of Hong

Kong's competitiveness will of course require continuous improvement to the quality of our education, we should also note that we cannot possibly count on resources alone to ensure the quality of our education. Faced with the serious fiscal deficit and difficulties in resource allocation, all in society should sensibly explore whether under the local education system, available resources can be utilized to the fullest to effectively bring potentials and creativity into fully play, so that good education quality can still be maintained even when resources are reasonably, I mean, reasonably, reduced.

According to statistics, the salaries of teaching staff actually occupy 80% of the overall expenditure of local higher education institutions. Some in society are of the view that the relevant pay scales are biased towards seniority instead of teaching and research achievements, so it is difficult to encourage teachers to strive for improvement. Such egalitarianism will achieve the opposite result of affecting the quality of teaching and research. So, if the pay structures of tertiary institutions can be reviewed and reformed, so that they can become more flexible and reasonable, so that teachers' pay can be linked with their teaching and research performance, so that the quality ones can be retained and the bad ones screened out, then we may well achieve cost-effectiveness and ensure teaching quality. This is probably one way to fully utilize resources and to induce teachers to give full play to their teaching potentials. Besides, the Public Accounts Committee of the Legislative Council has recently criticized the universities for long-standing poor management and serious wastage of resources. I believe improvement to resource management will help pool resources together for more effective utilization. This will also help tertiary institutions maintain their teaching quality.

The Government is calling upon the various tertiary institutions and society as a whole to join hands in tiding over the current difficulties. Reduction of education funding is inevitable. I am of the view that the rate of reduction should be reasonable, and adjustments should be phased in. And, we must refrain from causing too drastic and heavy impact on the tertiary institutions. The tertiary institutions must work with the Government sensibly, reduce their expenditure and create new sources of revenue and capitalize on their respective advantages to explore if they can increase the cost-effectiveness of education. One feasible way is to turn education into a business. On the one hand, this can ease the shortage of education funding, and on the other, new areas of educational development can be opened up. A colleague has told us of the success experience of some prestigious overseas universities in developing

education into a business. One example is the industrial park, silicon industrial park, set up by the Stanford University of the United States, which links teaching with industrial development. There is also the Boston Centre of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which has become an industrial research and development centre by making use of the research strengths of the university. It has not only promoted the development of the regional economy, but has also solved the funding problem of the university. In addition, tertiary institutions should also make their associate degree programmes self-financing step by step. And, overseas students, I mean, overseas students, should be admitted to create a source of education revenue. I believe that this should be one of the future development directions of our universities.

Madam President, "When one is at one's wits' end, one will work out ways of adjustment", as the saying goes. This applies to the people, members of the public, and of course, also to the reform of our overall education policy and the mode and direction of actual education provision. Small-class teaching in secondary and primary schools and the four-year normative undergraduate structure should of course be adopted as our long-term goals in education when there are sufficient financial resources. But if we do not change our approach to resource utilization, if we still stick to the development model characterized by high input, low output and low efficiency, then we will never achieve the goal of nurturing talents on a sustained basis.

Madam President, I so submit.

MR ABRAHAM SHEK: Madam President, as the Chinese saying goes, it takes a decade to grow a tree, but a century to bring up a generation of well-educated man. This metaphor may be slightly exaggerated but education is indeed a long-term commitment — one which needs constant investment and nurturing. Even under a tight fiscal budget, education must not be deprived of its necessary funding, although greater accountability should be installed to ensure that every dollar spent is worth its value.

It is true that every public sector should share the responsibility and burden of the huge budget deficit. The education sector is no exception. In fact, even the tertiary education sector has accepted its social responsibility willingly. What the tertiary education sector opposes are the Government's

perceived unreasonable drastic reductions. It will be very difficult for them to swallow an additional 10% cut in the next four years, along with an agreed 10% cut in 2004 and 2005. If this is imperative, we must consider the overall negative impact the reductions will have on the quality of our youngsters' education.

The Government should actually explore other innovative measures to reduce funding in education, such as the balloon method of funding, cut over not five but seven to 10 years, with no cut in the first two years. What we must keep in mind is that fiscal deficit should not be the only factor for consideration. Education is not stock speculation. To have its rate of return realized can be exceptionally long. It is an investment which is not likely to bear fruit within a few months or even a few fiscal years. Its cost-effectiveness cannot be entirely calculated by market values. The long-term social value of education needs to be taken into account, since nurturing future talents is crucial to Hong Kong's long-term development. It would be an extraordinarily short-sighted mistake, if the education sector has to endure more funding cuts than they can afford, simply because the Government wants to meet a short-term fiscal target.

Of course, the tertiary education sector should be encouraged to seek more sources of income, such as private donation, developing education-related businesses, as well as increasing their enrolment of overseas students. But, the education institutions should be given proper time to develop this programme and establish their network within the private sector.

In the meantime, stable public funding is crucial for the research and teaching quality to sustain. At the same time, the Government must step up supervision and put an end to the wasteful mismanagement of educational resources. It would be grossly unfair if the Government on one hand, initiates funding cut in one area of the education sector, and on the other hand, tolerates the under-utilization of resources and under-performance in another. The recently published Audit Report provides timely examples of wastages in government-run schools. In the previous Audit Report, inefficiencies in the management of the Quality Education Fund was also highlighted. Clearly, if it wants to convince the sector that funding cuts are necessary, the Government must first tackle its own inefficiencies and wastages.

Today's motion also encourages the Government to expedite the introduction of two new programmes, namely the concept of small-class teaching

and the introduction of a four-year undergraduate structure, as well as to retain funding support for the existing associate degree programmes. In general, teachers and parents all favour small-class teaching and the four-year undergraduate programme. There are many successful overseas precedents for both initiatives. Admittedly, both concepts involve a vast amount of resources and, therefore, a more prudent attitude should be adopted. But to achieve these goals in the long term, the Government must take the first step now.

Reform of this scope should be planned early and carried out in gradual phases. In particular, many in the community consider now an ideal time to introduce reform in class size. As Hong Kong's birth rate is falling, the enrolment rate for primary and secondary schools is falling too. Some primary schools are already experiencing difficulty in filling up their places. The last Audit Report has confirmed this fact. By redeploying existing resources, the Government will not have to suffer any additional financial burden while reducing classes to a smaller size.

With regard to the controversial funding method change from associate degree programmes to a self-financing basis, the Government must now ensure that financial assistance will be given to all needy students. In addition, the associate degree programmes are created to accommodate the Government's ambitious target of offering higher education opportunities to 60% of our youngsters by the end of the decade. It therefore has a duty to make sure that associate degree graduates, after paying an astronomical course fee of \$80,000, will not receive a dubious qualification which fails to help them move up the academic ladder.

Madam President, with these words, I oppose the original motion and support Mr Tommy CHEUNG's amendment. Thank you.

DR YEUNG SUM (in Cantonese): Madam President, I wish to declare my interest, for this motion topic is related to my teaching work in Hong Kong.

The Chief Executive says that he attaches great importance to education and he has pledged to make vigorous investments in education. While this pledge still rings in our ears, the Secretary for Education and Manpower said not long ago that funding for higher education would be drastically cut, and this has led to strong opposition from the heads of tertiary institutions as well as the

teaching staff and the students. A boycott of classes in all the tertiary institutions has almost happened.

The reason given by the Government in slashing education funding is mainly to reduce departmental expenditure and reach the goal of eliminating the fiscal deficit by the year 2008-09. But as Prof Paul Ching-wu CHU, President of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, said before the Legislative Council the other day, since 1998, funding for tertiary institutions has been slashed by 10%, a further 10% is slashed in 2003 and with the withdrawal of funding for the associate degree programmes and the taught programmes in the graduate schools, must the Government not consider these factors before arriving at a decision to further cut its financial commitment to tertiary education?

With respect to eliminating the deficits, the Government can think of other ways to increase its revenue, such as issuing bonds and formulating a fair competition policy and to strengthen the trade and economic ties between Hong Kong and the Mainland. These will boost the confidence of foreign investors in coming to Hong Kong for investments and make the territory a more attractive place to invest. On reducing expenditure, the Government should tackle the problem of wastage of resources in the departments specific to the items and expenses, and it should not adopt an across-the-board approach and require all departments to slash their expenditure by a certain percentage. That is unreasonable. For example, with respect to the problem of surplus school places in certain districts, can we not consider implementing small-class teaching in the schools there and raise the quality of teaching in these districts? If the surplus remains, then we should stop building schools in the districts and hence reduce wastage. The Democratic Party will not agree to any proposal made by the Government to build new schools and waste education resources when there is no justifiable ground for it.

With the objective of deficit elimination in mind, the Government only knows to cut expenditures on all areas, such as education, CSSA, medical and health care, infrastructure, and so on. The result will be a lot of people falling out of the safety net, or not getting any quality education services, social welfare and medical services from the Government. In that case, how can the people have any confidence in the Government? The people want the Government to use its resources well. Resources should be put where they are most needed and savings made where they are due. They will not like to see everything cut and slashed, even at the expense of quality.

Education is a long-term commitment. As the saying goes, it takes 10 years to grow a tree, but a century to raise a generation of quality people. It follows that the input of resources into education should be made with a vision into the future and it must not be viewed with such short-sightedness that education is merely a departmental expenditure and that its aim is to reach certain specified figures, such as meeting the target of having 60% of our senior secondary school leavers receive tertiary education.

With respect to tertiary education, the Government has completed its review of tertiary education in Hong Kong. A report has been compiled and various recommendations have been made to reform tertiary education. However, to date no blueprint has been mapped out for tertiary education in Hong Kong, for example, on questions like when universities should implement a four-year programme, how they should be restructured or developed, and so on. The community has yet to discuss the reform proposals in sufficient detail, let alone reaching a consensus.

In the meeting of the Legislative Council Panel on Education the other day, many professors from various tertiary institutions made direct criticisms of the Report on Higher Education in Hong Kong, including such recommendations as reducing the number of tertiary institutions in Hong Kong, focusing efforts to develop one or two world-class universities, and so on. These professors want the Government to produce a blueprint for tertiary education in Hong Kong so that the universities may have a clear picture of the future planning for education and how resources will be injected. Then they can discuss what resources should be cut or increased and how they can be best used. So there is really a need for the Government to respond to these demands.

Under the funding arrangements, the Government proposes to slash funding for tertiary institutions for the academic year of 2004-05 and the institutions have to reduce their expenditure by 13%. As for 2005 to 2008, there are speculations that a further cut of as much as 30% is on the table. No wonder the heads of the eight tertiary institutions are very worried and cast doubts on the commitment of the Chief Executive and the Secretary to education. Other reasons given by the Government are no more than a need to reduce more resources to set aside funds to set up some loan funds or to reorganize some others. But as there is no specific proposal from the Government on tertiary education planning, how can the people be convinced to accept the cuts presently proposed?

One of the arrangements in relation to reducing education funding is to reduce the funding for associate degree programmes and require them to become self-financing. Students hence have to pay expensive tuition fees. Recently, there are reports that the Government plans to reduce the subsidized places for the Postgraduate Certificate in Laws (PCLL) programme. As a results, those students who are not subsidized may have to pay a tuition fee of \$90,000. If they are unable to afford the tuition fees, they will have to forgo their studies. On top of that, though these students may have obtained a law degree, ultimately they cannot get a professional qualification to enable them to practise as lawyers. What the Government is doing is to divide post-secondary courses into classes and it will only finance degree places but not associate degree or other diploma courses. The Democratic Party considers that this kind of education policy is unreasonable and unfair to the students and their parents.

Madam President, I would like to emphasize that the Democratic Party opposes in principle the idea of self-financing for associate degree programmes. For as a matter of fact, students of associate degrees do not compare favourably with students enrolled in degree programmes, both in terms of prospects for further studies and employment. There is also the factor that the associate degree will probably need a long time before it can gain public recognition. It will be unfair to the associate degree students if they have to be in debts and face an uncertain future. What they should be offered are equal opportunities in society and I believe many students will make good use of the opportunity available to develop their potentials and contribute to the development of society.

Post-secondary courses are tailored to their respective objectives and academic requirements set, so there are different accreditation criteria. These are grounded in practical needs. However, these post-secondary courses are meant to offer training to our next generation so that they can contribute their part to the sustainable development of society. Any government which is responsible and considerate of the needs of its people should subsidize these post-secondary courses in order that students with different abilities may receive higher education. Even if the amount of funding for these courses may differ, the funding of certain categories of post-secondary courses must never be stopped. Therefore, the Democratic Party does not support the amendment proposed by the Liberal Party.

A suitable option for the Government is to make use of the Quality Education Fund and set aside some resources, or to allocate part of the income generated by the Exchange Fund to education funding. Madam President, for many years the universities have been making great efforts to reduce the wastage of resources, so if universities, secondary schools and primary schools are required to face further cuts in resources, I think this will only lead to protests from teachers and students alike.

The Democratic Party strongly opposes the reduction in education expenditure, for we are worried that this plan to eliminate the deficits will destroy the development of education and society will have to pay a heavy price for it. Thank you, Madam President.

MRS SELINA CHOW (in Cantonese): Madam President, the Liberal Party has always attached great importance to education and we agree that proper resources should be committed to education. However, attaching great importance to education does not mean that a disproportionate amount of resources should be put into it. In the face of huge deficits, the Government is obliged to review every item of expenditure, but why should the education expenditure be spared? The existing education structure does have a lot of room for streamlining and so it is perfectly possible to reduce expenditure through flexible deployment of resources while maintaining the quality of education. Insofar as this view is concerned, I have noticed that many members of the public also think that the issue of education funding should be considered in this perspective.

The last two value-for-money audit reports on the universities have both drawn the conclusion that there is room for improvement in the financial management of the eight tertiary institutions. For there is a waste of more than \$200 million of public money per annum and there is misuse of earmarked funds close to \$1 billion. The reports also point out that the Education and Manpower Bureau and the former Education Department have wasted nearly \$4 billion on secondary and primary schools over the past couple of years due to their inept planning. The above amounts together account for more than \$5 billion. This when measured against the \$61 billion total expenditure on education this year would take up a very high percentage of the total public expenditure, that is, 8.2%. Even Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong has recently attacked the Education and Manpower Bureau for squandering and wasting public money. Does this not mean that even Mr CHEUNG himself agrees that there is really a lot of room for economizing and "downsizing" in the education sector?

The audit reports compiled by the Audit Commission point out clearly that the average remuneration of professors in Hong Kong is as much as 40% more than their counterparts in Britain, and 16% to 30% higher than those in the United States. As the academic standing of local universities may not be higher than those in other advanced countries and that the cost of living between these places and Hong Kong is largely similar, so what grounds do we have to pay our teaching staff so much more? The Audit Commission also makes the criticism that some of the non-teaching posts on contract terms in our universities carry a remuneration which is 10% to 20% higher than comparable posts in the Government. For some posts, the end-of-contract gratuities are 15% of the basic salary and that is higher than the 10% found in the guidelines issued by the Bureau of Financial Services and the Treasury. As a result, taxpayers paid an extra amount of more than \$10 million during the period from 1995 to 2002. The remuneration for some posts is extraordinarily high, for example, the Head of Finance in a university is paid as much as \$180,000 a month, and that is higher than the Director of the Treasury in charge of the SAR coffers.

On 19 November, Members may still recall that the Deputy Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, Ms Emily LAU, spoke on the Supplemental Report of the Public Accounts Committee on Report No. 40 of the Director of Audit on the Results of Value for Money Audits. Ms LAU led the study on the Report because the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and some other members had conflict of interest. Ms LAU pointed out clearly that "despite the significant changes in the tertiary education sector in Hong Kong and worldwide, the linkage between the university salary scales and those of the Civil Service in Hong Kong had not been reviewed or revised for over 30 years." She also said, "The PAC agrees with the Audit Commission's view, and is also concerned, that in general, the average salaries of the academic staff of universities in Hong Kong appear to be on the high side, compared to those in other English-speaking countries." She said that "The PAC recommends that the institutions should, in the comprehensive review on their pay structure, pay due regard to the international pay levels for university academic staff.....The PAC also recommends that all the eight institutions should critically review the current remuneration packages of all their key management staff." This implies that there is some room for review and economizing in this regard.

These examples show that when universities are complaining that funds are insufficient and when some heads of universities even implicate a fee hike,

quite a substantial amount of money is senselessly squandered. So amid calls that resources cannot be reduced, the fact is that there is still room for economizing. Which is more unreasonable, reducing the resources or putting up a stubborn fight against the reduction of funding? The Liberal Party does not support pegging funding reduction with the increase in tuition fees. We are of the view that when some heads of universities link the two together, they are just evading their responsibility, that is, ensuring that the utilization of resources in their respective institutions is cost-effective. What they are doing is simply throwing the burden onto the shoulders of students and parents, while continuing to spend on those items that may well be saved. Would that make any sense?

The wastage of resources in the primary and secondary schools does exist and the report made by the Audit Commission at the end of 2002 points out that as it is known that there will be a surplus of 27 000 school places in primary schools territory-wide by 2010, therefore, the building of schools should slow down to reduce expenditure.

Madam President, the Liberal Party does not agree to arbitrary and unjustified reduction of funding by the Government. But on the other hand, will it imply that education quality will necessarily decline when the Government adheres to the principles of eliminating wastage and enhancing efficiency in order that the unnecessary spending on education can be reduced? We do think that as the Financial Secretary has given Prof Arthur LI, the Secretary for Education and Manpower, a free hand in funding allocation, and if the education sector can make use of their professional judgement and work with the Secretary in economizing so that when money is put to its best use and savings are made where due, then even if education funding is cut, it will definitely

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mrs Selina CHOW, your time is up. Please sit down.

MRS SELINA CHOW (in Cantonese): not sacrifice the quality of education.

Thank you, Madam President.

DR RAYMOND HO (in Cantonese): Madam President, education is of great importance to the future development of a country, for with quality education, quality people can be trained and it is only with quality people that there can be impetus to the growth of a country. Since the opening and reform of China, it has been able to achieve rapid progress. One of the major reasons for China's phenomenal growth is the commitment it gives to the training of talents for the service of the country. In the case of Hong Kong, since the introduction of nine-year compulsory education, the overall quality of the population has been enhanced. The illiteracy rate, at least, has dropped drastically as compared to the situation in the 1960s. In recent years, the Chief Executive has advocated higher education and formulated various policies. These include raising of the age participation rate of university education and setting up associate degree programmes. In view of these, I would like to express my appreciation. Having said that, however, there are still many facets of our education policy that warrant improvement.

The reduction of education funding is a heated topic these days. Although I come from the engineering sector, I am very concerned about the education policy in Hong Kong. It is because many people in the engineering sector are teaching in the tertiary institutions. I agree that education should not be seen as an item of expenditure, but an investment. As we are making investment now, we can hope to harvest in the future. However, the question remains how we should make this investment in order to obtain a reasonable return in the future. A few years ago, the Government introduced the associate degree as an alternative avenue to further studies. But now when the students of associate degree programmes have yet to finish their studies, the Government wants to stop funding for these programmes because of the fiscal deficits. As we all know, given the prevailing economic situation, if the Government does not offer any financial assistance, the students will find it very hard to afford the expensive tuition fees and so in the end they may be forced to quit. If that happens, the subsidies made by the Government in the past would come to nothing. I am well aware of the fiscal problems in the Government, but I hope that assistance should be given as much as possible to the associate degree programmes so that the students can complete their studies. And even in a few years later when the fiscal deficits problem is not eased as much as it has been expected and that further reductions in education expenditure are needed, the Government should consider the affordability of the students before making any appropriate adjustment.

In recent years university education has been becoming popular and university graduates are no longer a rarity. Admittedly, the popularization of higher education will help the development of society, but there is a growing trend in recent years that the quality of graduates is declining, and the situation is worrying. If this trend continues, our future competitiveness will certainly be undermined. To improve the situation, I think the universities must maintain their academic excellence, and the academic structure should also be revised from three years to four years. This will enable students to devote more time to their studies. In fact, the issue of changing the academic structure from four years to three years has been under discussion for many years, I think it is the right time the Government undertook a serious review of the urgency for this change.

While university education is important to the nurturing of talents, basic education should not be overlooked. With the decrease in birth rate over the past few years, the result is that classrooms and teachers are seeing surpluses and schools start to lay off its staff or close down. I would think that since schools have surplus classrooms and teachers, they should implement small-class teaching as it will enhance learning efficiency and motivation. Besides, the recent rise in student suicide cases may be checked with the adoption of small-class teaching as it will allow teachers to pay more attention to their students. Thus the problem of student suicides can be alleviated.

The quality of our manpower in the future depends to a large extent on the state of our education system and policies. Despite the fact that a lot of resources will be required to subsidize associate degree courses, change the academic structure of the universities from four years to three years and implement small-class teaching in primary and secondary schools, but since education is a long-term endeavour, the Government cannot abandon this long-term investment just because of its present fiscal deficits. I therefore implore the Government to undertake a review of the education policy and to maintain a certain level of education funding so that the problem of talent succession in the future can be pre-empted.

Madam President, I so submit.

MR LEE CHEUK-YAN (in Cantonese): Madam President, I would like to share with Members a dialogue which I had with a listener on a radio programme.

The person identified himself as a member of the middle class and at that time the topic of discussion was the fiscal deficits. He complained that only the grassroots were allowed to receive CSSA and that members of the middle class were denied any welfare benefits. I replied right away that the members of the middle class could not say that they could not get any welfare benefits, for there was still an education system. It is because schooling is subsidized in Hong Kong and anyone who pays tax can enjoy a right to education. I was surprised to hear him say that he did not send his children to study in schools under the Hong Kong education system because he was totally disappointed with the education system in Hong Kong. I was speechless, for he really could get nothing. Of course, I could have said that he could enjoy our police service, but I refrained from mentioning it.

I was sad because his words show that many people in Hong Kong are disappointed with our education system. They have voted with their feet, by paying expensive fees to send their children abroad for studies. This saddens me a lot. I fail to see why, despite the frequent calls for education reforms by the Government and the numerous reforms undertaken, one can only hear complaints. Hardly can we hear people say that the present state of affairs has become better. But things have only gone from bad to worse. This is really something for the Government to ponder over.

The speech made by Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong today is a discussion of the issue of resources from a general point of view. He has mentioned one point which is certainly supported by many people and, that is, small-class teaching. But I can see nothing done by the Secretary for this.

Secretary, I recall when you first took up the office, you said that you were in support of small-class teaching and you also said that there would be some testing grounds for it. However, if you really want to slash resources, I do not see how you can ever put this idea into practice, especially when it is done on a massive scale. You said that some schools would be chosen as testing grounds. Actually, these are not testing grounds, only that you have learnt after making some calculations that enrollment in these schools has fallen and so these schools are forced to become testing grounds. They are not really testing grounds, they are just forced to adopt this mode of teaching as a trial. If the Secretary does not really put this idea into practice, the quality of education in Hong Kong will continue to decline and it will never improve. So the Secretary should think harder on that for our next generation.

For teachers, if they have to face a class of 40 pupils, they would simply be exhausted both physically and mentally. There is not much they can do. I am afraid teachers will get more upset later on because pupils may play electronic games in the classroom. But it appears that teachers cannot rebuke the pupils for that, for the pupils may even complain that the teachers are not teaching them anything new and so they will keep on playing electronic games. It is very likely that they may say such things and they may even say that everything is in the book and it is all written there and so there is nothing new to learn. So in future teaching will become more difficult. For this reason, I think the Government should be more committed to the idea of small-class teaching.

I have talked with many teachers and for that matter I would think that Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong will know best. Many teachers complain that they have a heavy workload and they have difficulty in time management. They have to do the school work at home, so what can they do? In addition, teachers will have to face benchmark examinations. They will have to undertake further studies and face the students, so that is why they are burnt out. With the heavy workload they have, their morale is low sector-wide. If these problems are not addressed by the Government, I am afraid the teachers will someday vote with their feet in respect of education quality. So personally I really hope that the Government can drum up the resolve to implement small-class teaching.

However and in the last analysis, lies the problem of resources. If the people of Hong Kong are asked this question of resources, I believe everyone, including Mr TUNG, will say that education is the most important thing. He also thinks that education is the most important thing of all. But even as Mr TUNG will say that education is the most important thing of all, the worst thing is, as we have heard over and over again, the Government will talk one thing and do another. Mr TUNG says that education is the most important thing and that he would spare no efforts in making investments in education. He also says that he will make the commitment, for education is an investment, not an expenditure. All these may sound very pleasing to the ear and I believe every member of the public will be happy to hear it. But what happens in the end? Nothing. There are only cuts, cuts and cuts in resources. A new phrase has emerged as one columnist called TSO Yan-chiu puts it — "whooping cough", as "cough" Cantonese sounds the same as the English word "cut". So this whooping cough from the Government is persistent and our resources are coughed or cut until our education is choked by these whooping and wheezing coughs. With a lack of resources, how can education develop?

Recently, the reduction in funding for universities have caused great controversies. Funding will be slashed by 10% in 2004-05. As the Secretary says, funding will be further cut by 30% in the three years after 2005. Then the Secretary says he is merely flying the balloon. Despite this, I can see that the intention of the Government is to chop away the entire or a major part of university funding. Of course, I can still remember the remark made by the Secretary in the City University of Hong Kong to the students there, that the resources resulting from the cut in funding for the associate degree programmes will not be taken away and they will be used on the students.

Now I have a new interpretation of this remark. That is, when after the Government has ceased to finance the universities, how will the resources so obtained be used on the students? What is meant by to use? Lending it could be one way. So one day it suddenly dawned on me that I knew what Mr TUNG Chee-hwa meant when he said education was an investment. It is because education is an investment that money is lent to the students and a 4% interest is guaranteed. I hear that the prevailing lending rate is more than 4%. That is a first rate return from such kind of investment. Of course, there are bound to be some bad debts, but overall, that is a good investment. If that approach is taken to look at education as an investment, it would indeed be problematic. If it turns out that education is a business and when money is invested in the students, now the tuition fees for associate degree programmes are some \$50,000 a year and if investment is to lend money to the students and let them run into debts of a couple of \$100,000 or so when they graduate, then the Government is guaranteed a steady source of income every year. That is even better than loan-sharking, right? The only difference between the Government and loan-sharks is that the Government will not hire collection companies to collect debts and it will not spray red paints on doors. That is all. But the essence of it is to make many students enrolled in associate degree programmes burden with heavy debts as they study.

Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak?

MR SIN CHUNG-KAI (in Cantonese): Madam President, during these past few years, not only has the Government not increased its funding for the associate

degree programmes which are in fact bridging courses to undergraduate programmes, but that despite pledges made by Mr TUNG to spare no efforts in investing in education, the Government is sparing no efforts to slash funding for tertiary institutions.

There are many education workers in the information technology sector. They have told me that with the slash of education expenditure by the Government, information technology education will be a hard-hit area.

First, it is doubtful if the quality of education can be maintained in the face of reductions in education expenditure.

Like other academic subjects, information technology courses require the purchase of essential teaching equipment. Irrespective of computer hardware or software used in teaching, an expensive licence fee and maintenance costs have to be paid. When funding is reduced, can institutions contract the scope of their curricula or even cancel some subjects in order to save on these teaching facilities? Or should they try to tackle the problem of insufficient funding by raising the teacher-to-student ratio?

In fact, such things have indeed happened. As a result of reduced funding, the teacher-to-student ratio in the Institute of Vocational Education (IVE) has drastically increased from 1:20 to 1:30. In such circumstances, I cannot help but ask, "As education is the passing of knowledge from person to person, so with the increased teacher-to-student ratio, the time which each student will receive instruction from the teacher will be reduced, can the knowledge and experience students gain from their teachers not change?"

There is a need for individual instruction from the teacher when it comes to courses in information technology and computing studies. Can people who have been trained under these circumstances still be able to compete with talents from other regions?

Second, though the five-year information technology education strategy introduced by the authorities in 1998 is completed, there is still no clear direction for the way forward of information technology education in schools.

As far as I am aware, the Education and Manpower Bureau is mapping out a future direction for information technology education and consultation will be

conducted in the next few months. People from the information technology sector, including educators, are all very worried that the Government may cease to invest in information technology education because of the fiscal deficit problem.

I would like to make use of this opportunity today to say to Secretary Prof Arthur LI that there are successes in information technology education launched over the past five years. An example is the setting up of the post of IT co-ordinator in primary and secondary schools.

The sector is of the view that IT education must continue. Given that information technology will keep on advancing and skills will be upgraded, it is therefore all the more necessary for the Government to sustain its investment in IT education in order to keep abreast of the times.

Information technology education or learning by means of information technology is no longer merely the concern of the information technology sector or the education sector alone. It has become the concern of the community and will contribute to pushing the development of society into a knowledge-based and information society.

The World Summit on the Information Society organized by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) to be held next week will ratify a declaration of principles signed by all member states.

When drafting this declaration, members of the ITU have repeatedly mentioned that governments should promote the application of information technology in education and human resource development, including the popularizing the application of information technology.

Members of ITU also stress that when launching policies, governments should consider using educational principles like information literacy and lifelong learning. Secretary, a person who knows how to play electronic games does not have information literacy. It is only through education that information literacy can be provided and fostered.

They think that the key to the development of an information society lies in basic education. The use of information technology is conducive to the development of education. If people do not have any necessary cultural and educational attainment and training, there is no way that individuals can make

use of the existing information technology facilities to access the information society.

It can therefore be seen that there is consensus in the international community that an interactive relationship exists between information technology and education and that the matching of the two is helpful to the progress of society as a whole.

It is precisely because of this that the Government should assure that students from different social classes enjoy an equal opportunity to receive education and access the information society.

Costs for information technology courses are high and if they operate on a self-financing basis, students from the lower and middle classes will find it impossible to afford the expensive fees. So information technology talents may be barred from the education system in this way.

It is ridiculous that the IT policy of the Government points out that Hong Kong lacks people with certain professional skills and experience and so they have to be imported. On the other hand, the education policy seeks to wield the axe at the information technology sector, reluctant to train up more local talents. Prospects for the information technology sector will be bleak if there are insufficient IT personnel.

Lastly, I would like to advise the Government that if education expenditure is slashed just for the sake of tackling the deficit, it is in fact killing the hen to get an egg. With these remarks, I support the motion.

MR MICHAEL MAK (in Cantonese): Madam President, education policies are a long-term investment and educating the next generation is a sacred task and a noble mission. Therefore, the Government cannot link education funding directly with fiscal deficits, for that is not sensible. I hope the motion debate today can awaken the conscience of the Government, and I hope that it will think twice before trying to slash education funding blindly.

The Chief Executive said in his policy address 2003 that talents are the most valuable asset of Hong Kong and that he is determined to invest in education despite the deficit problem which must be tackled. The Chief

Secretary for Administration said in the Report of the Task Force on Population Policy issued this year that a goal is set to enable 60% of senior secondary school leavers to receive higher education by 2010-11. While these pledges still ring in our ears, the Government has taken the opposite course and planned to reduce education resources. That is indeed disappointing.

While the Government strives to raise the age participation rate for higher education, it is trying to cut the funding for associate degree programmes drastically and force these programmes to become self-financing. This kind of asking-without-giving approach is outright illustrative of a split personality. A knowledge-based economy is the global trend of economic development and to maintain sufficient competitiveness, the intellectual standard of the people must be raised. As undergraduate places in the universities in Hong Kong are limited, many senior secondary school leavers seek shelter in the associate degree programmes before they embark on further studies. If associate degree programmes are made self-financing, universities will be compelled to increase the tuition fees of these programmes and this will prevent those who intend to pursue further studies but are unable to pay the expensive tuition fees from enrolment. Besides, courses which do not have a large enrolment may be cancelled. That will in turn restrict choices available to students. I urge the Government to put into practice its stated objective of making higher education accessible to 60% of senior secondary school leavers and stop cutting the funding for associate degree programmes.

The Chief Secretary for Administration pointed out in the Report of the Task Force on Population Policy released this year that among the people aged 15 or above, there are 48% who only have an education attainment of Secondary Three or lower, and only 26% have an attainment of Secondary Five or above. It is estimated that by 2005, as many as 136 000 people who have an education attainment of junior secondary or below would be made redundant.

Many advanced countries have injected a lot of resources into education. In Australia and Singapore, for example, education expenditure takes up more than 7% of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP). In the United States and France, their education expenditure takes up 6% of their GDP. As for Hong Kong, it only takes up a miserable 4.9%.

Education plays a pivotal role in the culture, democracy, science and prosperity of a place. Not only will it help make a place more cultured, it can

also promote the development of science and democracy. Take the SARS epidemic as an example, the schools of medicine of the two universities in Hong Kong have made significant progress in their research on the SARS virus for which they are recognized by the World Health Organization. Besides, the findings of their research efforts are also published in reputable medical journals. If education funding is cut, these academic institutions will not have enough funding to carry on with their research and that will deal a heavy blow to the development of science and medicine in Hong Kong.

Information from the Education and Manpower Bureau shows that the average class sizes of secondary and primary schools in Hong Kong are 33 and 37 students respectively. The class size in other countries such as the United States and Britain is less than 30 pupils on average. If there are too many students in a class, the teachers will find it very hard to take care of the moral, intellectual, physical, social and aesthetic developments of their students. That is why small-class teaching should be implemented to ensure that students are given a quality individual education, Madam President, I mean an individual education.

As the saying goes, it takes 10 years to grow a tree but a century to raise a generation of quality people. The future development and prospects of a society hinge on education. If the Government further reduces education expenditure, it is not only the students who will be made victims, but the entire community will pay a heavy price in terms of its future development. I so submit.

MR MA FUNG-KWOK (in Cantonese): Madam President, only one third of the young people in Hong Kong have a post-secondary education attainment and the percentage is still on the low side when compared with other advanced countries. To raise Hong Kong's competitiveness, there is really a need for the Government to invest heavily in education. However, as education takes up as much as one quarter of our total annual expenditure, the authorities concerned should therefore look into the question of whether resources are put to their best use and that they are used properly.

The recent moves made by the Government to reduce university funding have led to strong protests from both teachers and students in the universities. This state of affairs has its causes. Universities in Hong Kong have made tremendous progress during the past decade and certain research undertakings and departments have even gained international recognition. That is

encouraging. But since the reunification, the Government has been trying to reduce resources available to the universities. Funding for universities has been slashed by more than 10% over the past few years. In the coming academic year, a further 10% will be cut. It is estimated that funds are likely to be cut again over the next three years. Thus universities are under great pressure in meeting their expenses.

Many people think that universities can adopt economizing measures like layoffs and pay cuts. But talents are vital to the academic growth of a university and they cannot be removed at will. Just imagine the amount of time and efforts spent to pool talents in an academic field and conduct high-calibre research, as if for reasons of financial stringency that these talents are given up, then how can the universities sustain their research efforts and continue with their development in all academic subjects? Universities are in no way like commercial organizations which can lay off their staff at a time of economic downturn and continue with their operation and recruit staff again when the economy starts to improve. If universities are to give up their talents now, I do not know when they can be replenished. If academic research is disrupted, academic standards will suffer. These are things we do not want to see.

That the academic structure of universities should change from three years to four years is not only a consensus in the education sector, but also in society. Unfortunately, with the reduction in university funding of more than 10% for 2004-05, the universities are already complaining as they are so much hard up, how can they undertake any change in their academic structure? The eight heads of universities have made it clear some time ago that if resources are not cut, the universities are prepared to undertake such a change in their academic structure using their existing resources. Such a proposal has the double benefits of speeding up the change in academic structure in the universities while preserving their morale. It is sad to note that the Government has failed to seize the opportunity and forge a co-operation between the universities and the secondary schools and map out a blueprint with them to change the academic structure.

For the primary and secondary schools, as the number of school-age children has dropped drastically, there is always news about cutting classes and funding. Some people think that the opportunity should be seized to implement small-class teaching. I have reservations about this proposal. First, the efficiency of small-class teaching in Hong Kong is still debatable. Second,

would it be according the wrong priorities to implement small-class teaching before the teaching quality of teachers is raised? Results of the benchmark tests in 2003 show that of the some 600 English language teachers who will join the profession in the coming year, 52% fail to meet the language competency requirements. It can be seen that the pressing task now is to raise the quality of teachers. It should be noted that the implementation of small-class teaching will require a lot of resources and it will be a waste of resources if small-class teaching is put into practice without the back-up of quality teachers.

The report released by the Audit Commission recently shows that the number of school places not taken up in secondary schools is as many as more than 20 000 a year. But the Education and Manpower Bureau is still purchasing school places from the private schools. This leads to a waste of public money to the tune of \$900 million. Though the finding of the Audit Commission is purely reached from an accounting point of view, and that could be biased as practical operational difficulties are not considered, but with the decline in birth rate and the drastic fall in enrolment in our schools, the authorities should undertake a fresh review of resource utilization and examine if there is any wastage. They should also consider questions like whether school building programmes should be suspended and where the resources thus saved should be put, such as IT education?

The Chief Executive has avowed as his ambitious plan to enable in 10 years' time 60% of our senior secondary school leavers to reach an education attainment at the post-secondary level or above. He also encourages the offer of associate degree programmes on a large scale by the institutions. Now when these associate degree programmes have yet to fully develop, the Government has announced that funding for such programmes will be withdrawn. That is indeed disappointing. However, to be fair, the Government is at present plagued by the deficit problem and it cannot afford to make any long-term financial commitment on the associate degree programmes. In addition, the original intention of setting up associate degree programmes is to offer a chance of further studies to young people who are not able to gain admission to universities by virtue of their public examination results.

Therefore, even though there is the fiscal deficit problem, the Government should support the development of associate degree programmes. Certain popular programmes in great demand and requiring less resources can be

financed through the tuition fees collected and offered on a self-financing basis, while those less popular programmes or those which need laboratories still need resources provided by the Government. Only in this way can there be a balanced development in the associate degree programmes. Moreover, the Government should also increase its support for needy students so that their studies will not be disrupted owing to their lack of means. Besides, more support should be given to the universities in terms of land and infrastructure.

Madam President, in the long run, the problem faced by associate degree holders is their recognition. At present, there is not much recognition of associate degrees on the part of employers and graduates of associate degree programmes do not stand great chances of rising to universities. All these problems will affect the continuous survival and development of associate degree programmes and the importance of these problems is definitely not less than that of funding. What the Government should do is to make a fresh review of the role played by associate degree programmes, their objectives and their market demand in order to determine if they can meet them, as well as to enhance their recognition.

All in all, the Government should conduct an overall examination of how education funding is used as a whole. Investments should be made where they are necessary and waste should be avoided. It should never cut funding across the board simply to eliminate deficits. After all, education is a kind of investment and when more investment is made today, a greater reward is anticipated. Any blind attempt to cut education expenditure will only lead to adverse results that will crop up sooner or later. Now as the economy of Hong Kong heads for a transformation into a knowledge-based economy, the future needs for development must be met by educating and training up knowledge-based talents.

I hope the Government can give serious thoughts to the issue of funding.

I so submit. Thank you, Madam President.

MS CYD HO (in Cantonese): Madam President, it is definitely not an act of good governance, or a wise choice to slash education funding as a means of tackling Hong Kong's fiscal deficit. During the many debates we have held, when the topic of the economic restructuring of Hong Kong was raised, we

would invariably point out that the only direction that we can go is to enhance the quality of our people and to enhance creativity and competitiveness. However, our policy on public expenditure runs away from this direction and that is surely disappointing. If we go on like this, we will make the transformation of Hong Kong economy very difficult and push get ourselves down a dead alley.

According to the projections and estimates we made last year on the manpower situation in Hong Kong, we will be desperately in need of professionals and managers with a post-secondary education. Labour at the basic levels is far too much in supply. So if we are to reduce our education funding even at this moment, some of those capable young people may be deprived of an opportunity to learn and the financial support that they deserve. For these young people, they may not be able to advance beyond a general education. That will not do these young people any good and will also cause great harm to Hong Kong as a whole.

When Mr Antony LEUNG, the former Financial Secretary, was the chairman of the Education Commission, he did put forward many new ideas and tried to remove the obstacles to reform. After he had assumed office as the Financial Secretary, he also tried hard to put these ideas into practice and made many efforts to bring about reform in education. In respect of things like resources, parents are required to contribute to the expenses involved in extra-curricular activities and they are also invited to join these activities. All these will help reduce government expenditure and they are good ideas.

Having said that, I wish to stress that financial commitment made by society and the parents can only meant be supplementary. We may only give parents a chance to let those who can afford pay more and have more choices. One example is private universities and that is a good idea. But commitment from society and parents can never replace government responsibility. The Government should be obliged to offer assistance to students from the grassroots or not so well-off families. Such a responsibility can never be replaced by resources from the community and it is a responsibility which the Government can never evade.

We may use tax deduction as a means to encourage donations. But government expenditure on education must not be reduced, even when these donations are added. For all along, education funding has never been enough.

The proportion it takes up in our GDP when compared with that in other places is far too small. This is more so important when Hong Kong is a place devoid of any resources. What can we ever fall back on except manpower and the quality of our population?

Madam President, the low quality of education has reached a state where no immediate improvement can be made even if money is expended on it. In respect of management and school administration, the Education and Manpower Bureau is still encumbered with hurdles after hurdles of bureaucratic structure and teachers are just wasting their energy and they cannot make the best use of their time. If funds in education were cut, no improvement would be possible in this respect.

So in addition to making a thorough examination of how resources can be best utilized, we also urge the Government to make a certain amount of commitment. Now that the universities are facing reductions in funding in the region of billions of dollars. Madam President, the latest mean monthly household income is \$16,000, but a student enrolled in an associate degree programme has to pay \$90,000 a year, that is, almost half of the income of the family. Even for those who are admitted into a university, they will have to pay tuition fees of some \$30,000 to \$40,000 a year. That is stretching the affordability of an ordinary family to the limits. For many graduates, they will only get a job which does not pay well and yet they have to repay loans to the tune of more than \$100,000.

Any further cut in education funding will greatly undermine the quality of our education and affect the chances of young people in pursuing post-secondary education. Now that funding cuts are not just confined to the universities, for the tide is sweeping across primary and secondary schools as well. We have been talking about small-class teaching for many years and likewise we have been talking about the change to full-day schooling in primary schools for many years. But nothing concrete has been done. Teachers' workload remains heavy, though the parents have made things easier somewhat already.

Yesterday I met a group of primary school pupils and we discussed some topics. They were led by two teachers and there were three parents in assistance. Now the parents are playing a more active role and they are giving much help to the community. But in some basic issues like resources, the Government just cannot sit back and do nothing.

In the education system of Hong Kong, we can see that in respect of some resources in the universities and tertiary institutions, it is clear to the community and the Audit Commission that some resources are misused. But this problem cannot be eliminated just by reducing the funding and these resources can then be considered as properly used. The proper approach to solving the problem is to let the students, the teaching staff, parents and members of the public play a monitoring role in the administration of the universities and other education institutions to examine if they are squandering the money of taxpayers and whether or not resources are put to their best use.

Madam President, the key to playing the Puzznic game is to arrive at an optimal use of resources and space through the accommodation of various interests. I hope the Secretary will know how to play the Puzznic game now. If we do not make compromise and accommodation and the best use of space and only know to challenge each other and waste resources, the time will soon come when it is "game over". Therefore, I hope that the Secretary can learn from games and draw reference from them to invest better and more sensibly in the future of our education. He must never resort to cutting funding to achieve his objective. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak?

MS EMILY LAU (in Cantonese): Madam President, I rise to speak in support of Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong's motion and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung's amendment.

Madam President, education in Hong Kong is literally under attack on all sides. I believe this huge problem was caused by the fact that Hong Kong was formerly ruled by Britain as a colony. For years, the British have made only little investment in education. It was only in its last several years of its governance that additional resources were injected. As a result, Hong Kong community was made to shoulder a heavy burden. Look at the hundreds of dilapidated primary and secondary schools across the territory. Although some millennium schools look impressive, their number is very small. Most schools are old and dilapidated. It is evident that the situation was truly terrible when Hong Kong was under British rule.

However, the education policies introduced by the Chief Executive since 1997 have not made things better. Not knowing what to do, the education sector and parents have completely lost their faith, because things keep constantly changing. I have talked to countless principals and teachers. I was told that those who were eager to focus more attention on their work were hard-pressed. On the contrary, it did not matter to those who were not devoted. What can be done under the current education system? Madam President, although public confidence in the system is diminishing, most children in Hong Kong have to receive education here, for not many people can afford sending their children abroad to receive education.

Madam President, I hope our senior officials can keep their children in Hong Kong to study in local schools. This is because many people have this question in their mind: How can senior officials be expected to show concern when their children are not studying in Hong Kong? Of course, we will not pass legislation to require all senior officials to keep their children in local schools. Neither will they be willing to do so as evident from the fact that they have voted with their "feet". Furthermore, senior officials are entitled to generous education allowances. Not only can they send their children to international schools operating in Hong Kong, they can send their children abroad to overseas schools as well. The fact that the expenses incurred, in excess of \$100 million, will be borne entirely by taxpayers has angered the poor people in the territory. For these reasons, Madam President, I do not, and neither will the Frontier, support slashing education funding.

On Sunday afternoon, Madam President, a meeting lasting nearly four hours was held by the Panel on Education. In addition to the Secretary, other officials were present too. The Secretary should be able to recall that, more than 30 groups were present at the meeting. All of them, except one, opposed slashing funding for education. The Secretary can certainly argue that they did that in their own interest. There is a popular saying that "heaven destroys those who do not look out for themselves". Moreover, a number of justifications were cited. I just cannot help asking the Secretary whether he is still reluctant to listen, despite the fact that a number of groups remained at the meeting until after eight o'clock in the evening and they unanimously stated that education quality would be affected should funding for education be slashed. After listening to their views, the Secretary simply said he did not find the views useful as nothing constructive had been put forward. I believe it was not at all appropriate for the Secretary to talk to the public in that manner. The Secretary was facing dozens of groups at that moment. Students, teachers, and

principals were there stating their points from different angles and perspectives. If everyone said that it was not the right thing to do, should the Secretary still insist on doing it?

Madam President, I noted that some groups suggested drawing a comparison with other countries. We often like to compare ourselves with other people. Some figures were cited during the meeting. Even Mr MA Fung-kwok pointed out earlier that the Chief Executive once made an ambitious wish that he sought to achieve the target of enabling more than 60% of the school-age children to receive tertiary education. But what are the percentages of people having received university education in other countries? Here is some information for our reference — 68% in South Korea, 63% in New Zealand, 56% in Taiwan, 44% in Singapore and Japan, and 77% in the United States. Economy is our pet subject. Hong Kong can be considered a developed city. In terms of development, Hong Kong does not compare poorly with these places, but why does Hong Kong lag so far behind on the education front?

It is now said that 4.8% of the GDP is injected into education in Hong Kong, though it was argued that the ratio should be 4.2%. In any case, the ratio should be around 4% only. Let us look at the resources injected by countries with a population size similar to that of Hong Kong: 8.2% in Denmark, 7.8% in Sweden, 7.3% in Israel, 6.1% in Finland, and 6.1% in New Zealand — though the last one has a smaller population than Hong Kong. These countries are all willing to inject additional resources into education. Moreover, it should be noted that the so-called research and development have not been factored into this. Madam President, we have a mere 0.4% even if everything is included. It is needless to mention the United States — the percentage of additional resources injected is 2.63%. Then we have 3.76% in Sweden, 2.82% in South Korea, and 2.78% in Finland. In other words, in addition to education funding, these countries also inject a lot of money into research and development. What are we actually doing?

Madam President, I do not know whether the education system or universities have extra "fats" that need to be "squeezed". I hope they can take care of their own matters. Now that universities are detached from the Government, they can discuss their own affairs through their own Councils. I was told by a professor that he felt the salaries of professors were too high and could be slashed. In my opinion, universities should be given the full power to determine their salaries. I also hope that, with the appointment of more Council

members from outside the universities, the Councils can determine how their universities should be administered — it is clearly stated in a report recently presented by the Public Accounts Committee that the governance of universities has to be strengthened. We have no intention to slash their funding. They should be allowed to decide how resources should be distributed. I only hope they can explain to the public.

For these reasons, Madam President, I disapprove of the present situation. The Secretary has often reminded us that around 1.6 million people in Hong Kong have an education level of or below the primary or kindergarten level. This problem was left behind by the British. Still, we hope to help these people to upgrade their standard. On the one hand, many people in Hong Kong are poorly educated, and on the other, as Mr MA Fung-kwok pointed out earlier, only one third of the population in Hong Kong has received tertiary education. Hong Kong therefore compares poorly with the countries mentioned earlier. From whatever angle, we are no match for those countries. At a time when competition is extremely fierce, we simply cannot slash funding. The Secretary will naturally ask what he can do. He is just a small Director of Bureau. Nonetheless, we cannot help it. Now that the "ball" is in the Secretary's court, he has to deal with it.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak?

MR SZETO WAH (in Cantonese): Madam President, slashing education funding has ruined the ambitious plan of educating the people. At the same time, it carries the hidden significance and purposes of dividing the community, making policies go backward, and dealing a blow to education workers and teachers' unions.

While the slogan "everyone has the responsibility of eliminating the fiscal deficit" sounds impressive, the unspoken message actually is: education workers have failed to shoulder their responsibility of "eliminating the fiscal deficit", and this is what they must not shirk.

Is education solely the responsibility of education workers? Actually, education affects all families that have children, adolescents or teenagers studying in school. Generations of people in the entire community are being affected too. Hong Kong is changing towards a knowledge-based economy,

and education is its driving force. Once education is stifled, Hong Kong's economic transformation, future and prospects will be affected. Education is not merely "everyone's responsibility", but "a shared responsibility for every one of us". How can the fiscal deficit be considered the responsibility of education workers only?

The unspoken message has sought to sour the relationship between people in the community and education workers. The latter are isolated, and social pressure is used to slash education funding. Education workers are now trying to argue strongly with justifications not for their own interest, but for the interest of the present and future of the whole community, for every one in the community.

The Permanent Secretary for Education and Manpower, Mrs Fanny LAW, once remarked to this effect, "Not only are universities required to cut funding, primary and secondary schools, as well as kindergartens, are required to do the same." It looks like tertiary education and basic education are competing against each other for funding, and resources taken by one of them will mean less for the other. This will also instigate tertiary education and basic education to split and swallow each other, instead of forming themselves into a united front. Why can the two not be exempted from the funding cuts? We in the education sector must unite as if we share the same fate in launching counter-attacks against the attempt to instigate us.

The six-year and nine-year free education programmes, launched in the '70s to carry out the policy of introducing universal and fair education, have served to sustain the economic take-off in the '80s and the '90s, and given rise to a large number of middle-class people. This has also prompted the grassroots to move upward and, to a certain extent, ease conflicts in society.

However, it can be seen that, under the cover of slashing education funding, some retrogressive policies have actually run counter to the policy of universal and fair education. For instance, some grass-roots children can no longer pursue further studies because associate degree programmes have to operate on a self-financing basis. At a time when the number of school-age children is rapidly declining, fees-charging Direct Subsidy Scheme primary and secondary schools are still being built, and over-enrolment is allowed in schools with higher admission grades. As a result, some schools insisting on providing education for all students without discrimination and those with lower admission

grades are forced to reduce the number of their classes and even close down. This is actually a "school-scrapping" policy. Under the pretext of "free competition", as it is euphemistically called, some ferocious predators are being reared to eliminate the weak.

For years, education workers and teachers' unions have, apart from safeguarding their own legitimate interest, formed themselves into a force to push education reform forward in the right direction. In this fight against slashing education funding, they are in confrontation with the Administration. The Administration's persistence in slashing education funding and its tough attitude have actually reflected its intention of combating their efforts in safeguarding their interest and eliminating the force that stands against the retrogressive education policies. Should the Government prevail in its intention, not only will their interest be undermined, the retrogression in education policies will deteriorate.

Lastly, I would like to say a few words on small-class teaching. The Secretary for Education and Manpower, Prof Arthur LI, once declared his support for small-class teaching, backtracked afterwards and used a pilot scheme as a delaying tactic. In the end, even the pilot scheme could not escape the fate of "downsizing" and "transformation". Once again, the Secretary has eaten his own words. Is he really a senior official responsible for making decisions? Can this be considered a "decision"?

A couple of years ago, owing to an abrupt increase in the number of new immigrant school-age children, schools were told to increase the number of students in each class. At that time, schools, principals, and teachers co-operated gladly. Now that the number of students has dropped sharply, this is originally the best opportunity to implement small-class teaching as a concrete effort to enhance the quality of education. Yet the idea was totally rejected by the Administration. When talking about the situation in a number of places earlier, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong mentioned Shanghai, a place we are more familiar with. The city has achieved remarkable results in implementing small-class teaching. Why must Hong Kong "downsize" and modify its pilot scheme even when the results are still unknown? If it is not the Government's intention to take this opportunity to reduce the number of classes and scrap schools, slash funding and secretly implement its retrogressive policy of undermining universal and fair education, a gradual reduction in the number of

students in each class by school and by district will not lead to a substantial increase in spending on education. Small-class teaching will upgrade the quality of education, particularly so for schools with lower admission grades. Students and parents will be benefited too. I hope parents will come forth to support the small-class teaching policy.

At a special meeting held by the Panel on Education on 1 December, more than 40 educational groups expressed their opposition to the proposal of slashing funding for education. I can see that fire is spreading underground and a volcano will soon erupt. The situation after the 1 July mass rally and the District Council Elections should suffice as a wake-up call on the Administration to heed advice in order to maintain social stability, and not to cause another dispute.

In the interest of education, a shared responsibility for every one of us, and the future of Hong Kong, I call upon the community and parents to support the united education workers in opposing the slashing of funding for education.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak?

MR ALBERT HO (in Cantonese): Madam President, a couple of days ago, after the holding of the District Board Election, I watched a video named "To the Future" in the evening while I had some spare time to get some rest at home. There was a scene about the Sino-Japanese War, after which China was forced to make colossal sums of money in compensation under various treaties. I was deeply impressed by the dialogue in one of the scenes. In the video, the Japanese Prime Minister said to the Japanese Emperor, "Now that we have received such a huge compensation from China, Your Majesty, what in your opinion should the money be used for?" The Emperor replied without thinking, "All on education." The Prime Minister thought for a while and said, "Your Majesty, can some of the money be used to improve the lot of the people as the battle was just over?" The Emperor became very angry and said, "All on education. Full stop." It can thus be seen that the then Japanese Emperor was a man of great vision. He could see the vital importance of the quality of a people. As Members should know, Japan went through a "restoration period". In the course of modernization, Japan did invest substantially in education. As

a result, the Japanese were turned into a quality and highly intellectual people; and Japan has become highly modernized. Of course, it was very unfortunate that Japan later took the path of invasion, but this was a separate issue. Japan's emphasis on education does reflect the vision of the country.

Actually, let us not talk about people in politics, we may cite families as an example. Most families of the friends of ours will say, when asked, they have the traditional concept that education is vitally important. In order to provide their children with ample opportunities of education, many families are even prepared to live frugally. Many families do think in this way. My own family also thought in this way. I have five brothers. All of us have been very lucky to have completed university education. Three of my brothers have even studied abroad. We were not brought up in a particularly well-off family. I still remember my parents told us that, as long as we could and had the chance to study, they would support us to continue our studies, however great the hardship the family would experience. In fact, countless parents, including the residents in my constituency, Tuen Mun, will tell their children the same thing. Even though they are middle- or lower-class families, they will still repeat the same thing to their children, saying that they will strive for every opportunity to enable their children to pursue their studies.

Yesterday, I joined a group of parents in seeking assistance from the Consumer Council in connection with an overseas student exchange programme in which a group of students were cheated. To enable their children to improve their English, the families had each spent more than \$100,000, but eventually it was found that the programme was a scam. Their children had returned to Hong Kong without having learned anything. Neither had they been treated well. None of these families can be considered to be well-off. Though it is said that they have learned a painful lesson, I believe Members will appreciate very well their high hopes for their children.

Madam President, Hong Kong is coming to the threshold of future development. Both the incumbent Financial Secretary and his predecessor have said over and over again that Hong Kong is changing into a knowledge-based economy. In the face of economic transformation, education becomes crucially important, much more important than it used to appear. One of the reasons for the emergence of a large number of middle-class people in the '70s and '80s was the popularization of university education. Although many of them came from

the grassroots, they managed to complete their university education thanks to the Government's financial support. Universities now no longer belong to the elite; instead, they belong to the ordinary people. Yet, does it mean that the education system we have today has been able to provide us with adequate opportunities? The answer is definitely "no", unless the Secretary can give me an answer in his response later.

We have recently noted from the Government's forecast on the future manpower resources that Hong Kong will still be facing the problem of insufficient university graduates and tertiary graduates in 2007 and 2008. The forecast has also revealed that there will still a need to import information technology and financial talents in 2007 and 2008, in order to meet the needs of society. Yet today, we are told by the Government that we should not spend so much money on education. How can the Government justify itself in saying so? What is the use of conducting so many researches? The Government should either tell us that those researches are rubbish and the data are totally wrong, or bury its head in the sand without caring about the present and keep acting like a skinflint. It can only tell us that Mr TUNG will leave behind a sum of money when his term of office ends, that we do not need to be frightened for our food supply will not be cut off instantly. Otherwise, how can we explain to the younger generation, explain to them the reasons why they can still have full education opportunities without government support?

Madam President, is the money actually spent on education in Hong Kong particularly abundant? The answer is "no". According to the recommendations of the United Nations, developing countries should spend 6% of their GDP on education. We have merely spent 4%, one third lower than the indicator of the United Nations. So, what excuses do we have to justify the slashing of education funding? Madam President, it is right that we should save education expenses which are wasted or not well-spent. But the crux of the problem is, we should not slash the abundant education opportunities provided because of the need to cut expenditure. As a result, many subjects and associate degree places pledged by the Government are going to be cut now. This is, in my opinion, a total lack of vision and commitment. I fear that we will let the next generation down.

Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak?

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, you may now speak on the two amendments.

MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG (in Cantonese): Madam President, with respect to the two amendments today, I would like to begin with Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung's amendment. It has indeed served to reinforce my motion in regard to Mr TUNG Chee-hwa's pledge on education. The pledge made was, regardless of Hong Kong's economic situation, the Government's investment in education will increase year after year in the next five to 10 years. If a policy of constantly slashing the funding as proposed by Mr Henry TANG is adopted in the area of education funding, it will be breaching the pledge made by TUNG Chee-hwa. The Government will then be seen as constantly changing its policies. For these reasons, I fully support Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung's amendment.

The Democratic Party does consider Mr Tommy CHEUNG's amendment acceptable in many aspects. Frankly speaking, the wording of the motion today, including the part concerning the provision of funding support for existing associate degree programmes, has essentially been re-written after fine-tuning, having regard to Mr Tommy CHEUNG and the Liberal Party. We have also evaded, offering a concrete figure for small-class teaching. It is most unfortunate that this revision, drafted by the Democratic Party having regard to the past opinions of the Liberal Party, is still rejected by the Liberal Party. I find it extremely regrettable because I thought education, a non-politicized issue, could win the support of Members.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG's viewpoint is indeed questionable. In a motion debate held on 12 June on associate degree programmes, Mr Tommy CHEUNG stated that a hefty increase in tuition fees would dampen the desire of the employed to study, that this was inconsistent with the goal of lifelong learning and would have a profound economic implication. It was on these grounds that the Liberal Party supported funding for diploma/higher diploma programmes run by universities be continued. Today, if the Liberal Party still cares about the

affordability of students of diploma/higher diploma programmes, how can it possibly show no concern for students of associate degree programmes, who are faced with the same problem of affordability? For this reason, the amendment proposed by the Liberal Party today, that calls for the associate degree programmes to switch to a self-financing basis, indeed conflicts with its views expressed on 12 June. The Liberal Party was being self-contradictory in saying that associate degree students should "pay exorbitant tuition fees" and repay their high-interest debts upon graduation, while diploma/higher diploma students should be given a certain measure of financial assistance.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG used to believe the importance of the quality of associate degree programmes. Should funding support for associate degree programmes be scrapped, the programmes have to be tailored according to tuition fees. As the popular saying goes, "quality is sacrificed because of cost considerations". This is one of the culprits that not only destroy the quality of associate degree programmes, but also undermine the excellent foundation of the programmes. Under such circumstances, the programmes will no longer be able to maintain their quality. The statement made by the Liberal Party that the quality of associate degree programmes is crucial has suddenly turned into an empty talk.

Thirdly, in a motion debate held on 12 June 2002 on associate degree programmes, Mr Tommy CHEUNG indicated that continuous funding support should be provided for diploma /higher diploma programmes in view of their obvious contribution. The associate degree programmes run by the City University of Hong Kong have been accredited as quality programmes. While diploma/higher diploma programmes are supported by the Government, why are associate degree programmes just as good denied funding support? This time, the revision was drafted in such a way as to accommodate and incorporate the views of the Liberal Party. It is most unfortunate that it is eventually rejected by the Liberal Party itself. As before, its present views continue to contradict its previous views. Nevertheless, I am pleased to find that my motion is supported by the Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong (DAB) and many other friends. The DAB supports my motion not because of its electoral setbacks. I think I have to make a special clarification for the DAB. Polling for the District Council Election had not yet started when this motion was proposed. The DAB already indicated very clearly at that time that my motion would have its support. I have to make this point very clear, and I thank them for getting closer to the minds of the people on education issues. Thank you, Madam President.

MRS SELINA CHOW (in Cantonese): Madam President, may I ask Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong to clarify as to why he said the Liberal Party had been self-contradictory? Since he said that our present position on the associate degree places is exactly the same as our past position, why would he accuse us of being self-contradictory. May I ask him to clarify?

MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG (in Cantonese): Madam President, if you permit.....

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, you may not speak until the President has asked you to clarify. (*Laughter*) You need not respond in such haste.

MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG (in Cantonese): Thank you, Madam President. So, may I have your permission to clarify?

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHEUNG, you may now clarify.

MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG (in Cantonese): With your indulgence, Madam President, I will say if only Mrs Selina CHOW has come earlier, she will have heard why I said so. The conclusion was drawn after I had explained everything. Nevertheless, if Mrs Selina CHOW would like to know, I can let her have a look at my draft speech for the debate.

MRS SELINA CHOW (in Cantonese): Madam President, I believe Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong has overlooked the fact that I have listened to his comments on associate degrees. Actually, he has not answered my question.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I will not allow both Members to continue with their debate, as there are many other channels and meetings through which they may make clarification.

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION AND MANPOWER (in Cantonese): Madam President, I have to thank Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr Tommy CHEUNG and other Members for their valuable opinions in the debate. Since 1997, there has been continuous increase in investment on education by the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR). The recurrent expenditure on education (excluding school building) increased from \$36.7 billion in 1997-98 to \$49.3 billion in 2003-04, with an increase of up to 34%. Therefore, to say that the Government has not kept its promise made in past policy addresses to invest in education is not correct.

Funding for education in 2004-05 is comparable in amount to that of last year, and the relevant figures will be announced in the Budget in March next year.

As the Chief Executive said, education is an investment, not expenditure. With the globalization of world economy, Hong Kong must head in the direction of developing knowledge-based economy, and continue to commit massive resources to education and training of talents in order to maintain and enhance its competitiveness. Therefore, in dealing with cuts in education funding, we have to be particularly careful in ensuring that a reasonable balance can be struck among the overall distribution of social resources, quality of education and long-term benefits of society.

I must emphasize that we attach great importance to education, and thus do not want to compromise the quality of education. We promise that we will not reduce funding unreasonably.

However, we are now facing a huge fiscal deficit, and the Financial Secretary estimated earlier that the deficit for the current year might be as high as \$78 billion. In order to achieve budget balance in the year 2008-09, we must exercise stringent expenditure control and cut the operating expenditure of all government departments at an average rate of 11%.

As the recurrent expenditure on education accounts for about 24% of the total government recurrent expenditure, if the funding for education is not reduced, it can be imagined that other government services (such as health care, social welfare, security, and so on) would have to endure a greater rate of reduction in order to attain budget balance. As a result, members of the public so affected will question whether government services other than education are not important or need not be maintained. Will a substantial reduction of funding in these areas seriously affect the quality of services?

Has funding for education been reduced to a level that a further reduction is impossible? Is it true, as some people said, that even a penny cut is not affordable?

This boils down to a question of overall distribution of resources. It is not easy for the Administration to balance the interest of all parties, but we have to try our best. As for education funding, our problem is not whether reduction can be avoided, but rather how much can be cut without least affecting the quality of education. The education sector is part of society, which has the responsibility to endure the pain caused by funding cuts like other sectors, and to ensure the cost-effectiveness and proper utilization of resources.

In reducing expenditure on education, we start with the Education and Manpower Bureau internally. In the financial year 2003-04, the Bureau reduced its recurrent expenditure by \$900 million.

In respect of education service, we will examine if there is any room for expenditure cuts in the light of the actual situation, such as the demand and cost-effectiveness of the services provided. We will not adopt a broad-brush approach to require all areas of education services to accept the same rate of reduction.

We have started meeting stakeholders to listen to their views on the reduction of education expenditure. It is hoped that better results can be achieved with lesser resources.

On small-class teaching in primary and secondary schools, from the education perspective, small-class teaching is actually an expert issue involving teaching strategy and learning effectiveness. With the appropriate teaching strategies, the interaction between teachers and students can be enhanced, allowing teachers to give individual attention to students and effect personalized teaching according to their abilities. Owing to the decline in school age population, some primary and secondary schools are facing the problem of reduction in the number of classes. However, the demand for implementation of small-class teaching under this situation is mixing two separate issues, confusing the supply and demand for school places and parental preferences with the professional issue of teaching. These two issues are completely different

and should not be discussed together. Besides, I disagree even more to making the implementation of small-class teaching a solution to teacher redundancy.

Some may question, given the Government's clear appreciation of the merits of small-class teaching, why is small-class teaching not implemented in full swing? This is because given the prevailing financial status, we must be careful in prioritizing different education services. At the same time, we must consider more seriously the cost-effectiveness and opportunity cost of various education initiatives. Certainly, some do think that the decline in the number of school age children offers the golden opportunity to implement small-class teaching without incurring additional resources. However, some consider that with the decline in the number of primary and secondary students, resources should be deployed to other areas.

Some overseas academics have conducted research to compare the effectiveness of various education strategies by placing the same amount of resources; these include an increase in teacher-to-student ratio, upgrading teachers' qualification and experience. Results show that the effectiveness of increasing the teacher-to-student ratio is less desirable than other measures. The full implementation of small-class teaching involves enormous resources. In California, the United States, small-class teaching was implemented across the board at lower primary grades a long time ago. As a result, many places had to give up other measures for the sake of implementing small-class teaching and to meet the expenditure so incurred. Other places with huge deficits were put in a difficult situation because of the continued implementation of small-class teaching. The implementation of small-class teaching has already placed heavy financial burdens on state governments and various places, but students have not shown prominent improvement in their performance.

I believe the Californian experience will very likely rise in Hong Kong. Take primary education as an example, the total expenditure incurred in the following three initiatives, namely native-speaking English teachers scheme, development grant for schools and curriculum development led by graduate masters, will account for less than one third of the cost incurred for universal implementation of small-class teaching in Primary One to Primary Six. We have to consider carefully whether it is worthwhile to abandon all these initiatives or even some other existing initiatives on education reform to implement small-class teaching.

We all know clearly that we indeed do not have sufficient resources to implement small-class teaching in both primary and secondary schools. However, we do not wish to shelve small-class teaching just because of the massive resources and high opportunity cost involved. Therefore, we are now exploring pragmatic ways to implement small-class teaching in primary schools within our means.

We plan to report to the Panel on Education of the Legislative Council early next year on the preliminary findings of the study.

As for the academic structure of senior secondary schools and undergraduates, we understand that the education sector in general agrees to the academic structure composing of three-year senior secondary school education and four-year bachelor degree courses. The working group under the Education Commission tasked to review the academic structure of senior secondary education released its report in May this year. The Commission supports the reform related to this academic structure which, it thinks, is conducive to the provision of a more coherent and enriched senior secondary education, and provide room for enhancing and widening tertiary education. This can upgrade the overall quality of students, preparing them to rise up to challenges in the global knowledge-based economy.

We understand that some people do hope for the early implementation of the relevant academic structure, so we have been actively discussing with secondary schools and universities on the methods and timetable for the implementation of this. A lot of factors and co-ordination have to be considered, including the design of the curriculum and open examination of senior secondary education, preparations to be undertaken by teachers and schools, construction of additional schools, and the complement of various universities and other post-secondary institutions. The implementation of this reform requires an investment of enormous resources, which I believe both the Government and various sectors of the community have to make their commitment.

For the time being, we have no plans to increase the tuition fees for senior secondary and tertiary education.

The tuition fees for senior secondary schools and institutions subsidized by the University Grants Committee (UGC) have been frozen at the level of the 1997-98 academic year.

Under the existing policy, the Government provides a comprehensive student finance assistance scheme to ensure that no student will lose their schooling opportunity just because of a lack of means.

Since the review on tertiary education conducted earlier, the authorities have decided to withdraw gradually the subsidies provided to general sub-degree courses. However, courses which have a relatively higher running cost, cater for the demand of the manpower market, or which have proved their preservation value will continue to be subsidized by public money. Moreover, students admitted before the withdrawal of subsidies will not be affected.

The above decision was made not out of the intention to save resources to resolve the fiscal deficit problem. Rather it was due to the consideration that, with the rapid development of tertiary education sector, many courses can be offered in a self-financing mode with higher cost-effectiveness. Therefore, we consider it necessary to release the resources to enable more students to enjoy the subsidies provided by the Government in various manners. At the same time, this will allow more room for the fair development of the tertiary education sector as a whole.

At present, students enrolled in self-financing tertiary courses are provided with grants and different types of loans. Since the scheme was introduced in 2001, grants and loans amounting to \$800 million have been approved as at September this year. We have also made the undertaking that resources thus saved by the withdrawal of subsidies for sub-degree courses will be reinvested on students of sub-degree courses by improving the mode for subsidies to students.

The authorities have all along been exerting efforts to help institutions to organize self-financing tertiary courses. To this end, a series of support measures have been introduced. In the past two years, we agreed to grant land to four institutions at nominal premium by way of fair competition. With the completion of those new campuses in the next few years, 9 000 post-secondary school students will be able to enjoy better campus life. Moreover, more than 10 school sponsoring bodies have been granted interest free loans totalling \$2.3 billion for the development of campuses and the purchase of new facilities. At the same time, we have earmarked \$30 million for subsidizing the academic accreditation expenditure incurred by school sponsoring bodies.

The above support measures will continue to be implemented. Institutes which intend to transform their existing sub-degree courses to the self-financing mode are welcome to apply to the Government for the various subsidies in accordance with the relevant procedures.

Regarding the timetable for transition, since the objective of withdrawing subsidies for sub-degree courses is to ensure that resources are distributed in a fairer way, enabling more students to benefit, we hope that the objective can be accomplished within a reasonable period. Actually, the independent expert team of the UGC has spent several months examining in detail the UGC-funded sub-degree courses now organized by the City University of Hong Kong (CityU) and The Hong Kong Polytechnic University. The present timetable is based on objective criteria and set after consultation with the two universities. We should not arbitrarily negate the objective recommendations proposed by the independent expert team. We understand that the task force set up by the Council of the CityU has almost completed its financial viability study and related studies on organizing self-financing courses. We will pay close attention to the final plan of the CityU and provide appropriate assistance.

For the school building programme of the Government, we attach equal importance to both quality and quantity. In respect of quality, we aim to develop linked schools, relocate and rebuild substandard schools, develop quality Direct Subsidy Scheme schools and private independent schools, so as to introduce diversified development and market mechanism into our education system, offering more choices to parents and students. In respect of quantity, we aim to provide nine-year universal basic education to school age children free, universal implementation of whole-day schooling in primary education in the academic year 2007-08, and to provide to all Form Three students with adequate ability and aspiration to further their studies subsidized places at senior secondary schools or vocational training schools. In projecting the demand and supply of places, we will duly consider changes in future population and the number of school age children to adjust our school building programme from time to time.

We understand clearly that if we implement the school building programme in accordance with the established policy, surplus places in individual districts may be resulted or increased. To honour its commitment to quality education, the Government should not only pay attention to the matching of supply and demand of school places, but also the enhancement of education quality. In the supply of school places, reasonable room should be left to give

parents genuine choices in arranging schooling for their children. Moreover, newly built school buildings will be made available to existing school sponsoring bodies with desirable performance for relocation, and quality school sponsoring bodies will also be encouraged to join the education sector, providing the opportunity for introducing new forces into the education sector.

On the suggestion of making provisions out of the Quality Education Fund (QEF) to subsidize recurrent expenditure on education, I would like to explain and clarify the issue here. The QEF, established since 1998, aims to provide subsidies to projects proposed by the education sector, including pre-school, primary and secondary, and special education, that are innovative and merit implementation. The QEF is not designed to subsidize recurrent expenditure on education. If the QEF is to be used to settle education expenditure, the fund balances will definitely be exhausted rapidly. In the long term, the QEF will fail to achieve its original objectives. In order to fulfil the objectives of the QEF, the Government inevitably has to inject additional funds. However, in view of the tight operating expenditure, the chances are extremely slim that the Government will inject additional funds.

In addition to the contribution in promoting education reform, the QEF helps to create many job opportunities. The request of using the QEF to meet recurrent expenditure on education is not only shortsighted, but will also hinder the progress of education in pursuing innovation and promoting new education concepts constantly.

Regarding the proposals of some Members on using the surplus of the Exchange Fund, as far as I know, the Exchange Fund Ordinance has specific provisions regulating the usage of the Exchange Fund. A vast foreign reserve can serve as a solid foundation to maintain the confidence of local and overseas investors in Hong Kong Dollar, particularly when the international financial market is volatile and unstable. In the interest of Hong Kong, sufficient resources must be maintained in the Exchange Fund to ensure the stability and integrity of the monetary and financial systems of Hong Kong.

Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now call upon Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung to move his amendment to the motion.

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): Madam President, I move that Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong's motion be amended, as printed on the Agenda.

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung moved the following amendment: (Translation)

"To add "expresses dissatisfaction with the Government for its failure to honour its pledge made in the past Policy Addresses in regard to investment in education and" after "That this Council"; and to add "at the same time" after "opposes the Government's reduction in spending on education, and"."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung to Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong's motion, be passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you as stated. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for three minutes.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Miss Margaret NG, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Mr CHAN Kwok-keung, Mr SIN Chung-kai, Dr LAW Chi-kwong, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Michael MAK, Mr LEUNG Fu-wah and Mr IP Kwok-him voted for the amendment.

Mr Kenneth TING, Mr James TIEN, Dr Raymond HO, Dr Eric LI, Dr David LI, Dr LUI Ming-wah, Mrs Selina CHOW, Mr HUI Cheung-ching, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Timothy FOK, Mr Henry WU, Mr Tommy CHEUNG and Dr LO Wing-lok voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies and Election Committee:

Ms Cyd HO, Mr Albert HO, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, Mr Martin LEE, Mr Fred LI, Mr James TO, Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr Andrew WONG, Mr Jasper TSANG, Dr YEUNG Sum, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Andrew CHENG, Mr SZETO Wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Albert CHAN, Mr WONG Sing-chi, Mr Frederick FUNG, Ms Audrey EU and Mr YEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.

Dr David CHU, Mr NG Leung-sing, Mr Ambrose LAU and Mr MA Fung-kwok voted against the amendment.

THE PRESIDENT, Mrs Rita FAN, did not cast any vote.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 25 were present, nine were in favour of the amendment and 16 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections and by the Election Committee, 26 were present, 21 were in favour of the amendment and four against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, she therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

MS MIRIAM LAU (in Cantonese): Madam President, I move that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of the motion on "Education policy" or any amendments thereto, the Council do proceed to such divisions after the division bell has been rung for one minute.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Ms Miriam LAU be passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any Member wish to speak?

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you as stated. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(No hands raised)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I think the question is agreed by a majority respectively of each of the two groups of Members, that is, those returned by functional constituencies and those returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections and by the Election Committee, who are present. I declare the motion passed.

I order that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of the motion on "Education policy" or any amendments thereto, the Council do proceed to such divisions after the division bell has been rung for one minute.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Tommy CHEUNG, you may move your amendment.

MR TOMMY CHEUNG (in Cantonese): Madam President, I move that Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong's motion be amended, as printed on the Agenda.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG moved the following amendment: (Translation)

"To add "unreasonable" after "That this Council opposes the Government's"; to delete "implement small-class teaching in primary and secondary schools by phases, adopt the four-year normative undergraduate structure as early as possible, and provide funding support for existing" after "and urges the Government to" and substitute with "comprehensively review the use of educational resources on condition that tuition will not be raised, and to actively assist the institutions in developing their education-related businesses with a view to increasing income and reducing expenditure, in order that the subsidized"; and to add "can switch smoothly to a self-financing basis; furthermore, the Government should examine the implementation of small-class teaching in primary and secondary schools, and adoption of the six-year secondary education structure and four-year normative undergraduate structure under the principle of appropriate deployment of resources" after "associate degree programmes run by universities"."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Mr Tommy CHEUNG to Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong's motion, be passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you as stated. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mrs Selina CHOW rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mrs Selina CHOW has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Mr Kenneth TING, Mr James TIEN, Dr Raymond HO, Dr Eric LI, Dr David LI, Dr LUI Ming-wah, Mrs Selina CHOW, Mr HUI Cheung-ching, Mr CHAN Kwok-keung, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Timothy FOK, Mr Henry WU, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr LEUNG Fu-wah, Dr LO Wing-lok and Mr IP Kwok-him voted for the amendment.

Miss Margaret NG, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Mr SIN Chung-kai, Dr LAW Chi-kwong, Ms LI Fung-ying and Mr Michael MAK voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies and Election Committee:

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Dr David CHU, Mr NG Leung-sing, Mr YEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr Ambrose LAU and Mr MA Fung-kwok voted for the amendment.

Ms Cyd HO, Mr Albert HO, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, Mr Martin LEE, Mr Fred LI, Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr Andrew WONG, Dr YEUNG Sum, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Andrew CHENG, Mr SZETO Wah, Mr Albert CHAN, Mr WONG Sing-chi, Mr Frederick FUNG and Ms Audrey EU voted against the amendment.

THE PRESIDENT, Mrs Rita FAN, did not cast any vote.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 26 were present, 20 were in favour of the amendment and six against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections and by the Election Committee, 26 were present, nine were in favour of the amendment and 16 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, she therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, you may reply and you have one minute 51 seconds.

MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG (in Cantonese): Madam President, education has the power of pooling the hearts of the people. The fact that the SAR Government is currently facing great opposition from the people has been fully reflected in the 1 July march and the District Council Election. For this reason, the SAR Government has to, on the one hand, carry out democratic reform and, on the other, listen to public opinions and act according to the will of the people on major topics of the utmost concern to them. And, education is the most important subject that can pool the hearts of the people.

Every parent has the highest expectations for the education received by their children; every Chinese family sees infinite prospects for their children's education too. On the topic of education, the Government, should it insist on slashing funding, will only end up losing chances one after another of reconciliation with the people. As such, if Henry TANG continues to slash education funding, he and the Budgets he is going to leave behind and future ones will surely, in the next five years, encounter opposition from the general public, owing to the fact that this very important policy is going to affect not only the people but also the SAR Government. On this issue, I very much hope that the SAR Government can pull back before it is too late, enable proper investment to be made in the provision of new, quality education, and thus bring hopes to every member of the Hong Kong community.

Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, as set out on the Agenda, be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Dr Eric LI, Miss Margaret NG, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Mr CHAN Kwok-keung, Mr SIN Chung-kai, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Dr LAW Chi-kwong, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Michael MAK, Mr LEUNG Fu-wah and Mr IP Kwok-him voted for the motion.

Mr Kenneth TING, Mr James TIEN, Dr David LI, Dr LUI Ming-wah, Mrs Selina CHOW, Mr HUI Cheung-ching, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr Howard YOUNG, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Timothy FOK, Mr Henry WU, Mr Tommy CHEUNG and Dr LO Wing-lok voted against the motion.

Geographical Constituencies and Election Committee:

Ms Cyd HO, Mr Albert HO, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, Mr Martin LEE, Mr Fred LI, Mr James TO, Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr Andrew WONG, Mr Jasper TSANG, Dr YEUNG Sum, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Andrew CHENG, Mr SZETO Wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Albert CHAN, Mr WONG Sing-chi, Mr Frederick FUNG, Ms Audrey EU, Mr YEUNG Yiu-chung and Mr MA Fung-kwok voted for the motion.

Dr David CHU, Mr NG Leung-sing and Mr Ambrose LAU voted against the motion.

THE PRESIDENT, Mrs Rita FAN, did not cast any vote.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 27 were present, 12 were in favour of the motion and 15 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections and by the Election Committee, 26 were present, 22 were in favour of the motion and three against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, she therefore declared that the motion was negatived.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Second motion: Improving the competitiveness of Hong Kong's container freight industry.

IMPROVING THE COMPETITIVENESS OF HONG KONG'S CONTAINER FREIGHT INDUSTRY

MR KENNETH TING (in Cantonese): Madam President, I move that the motion, as printed on the Agenda, be passed.

Madam President, over the past couple of years, I have repeatedly raised such questions as the exceedingly high handling charges of container terminals, the decline in the competitiveness of container terminals, and so on, for

discussion in this Council. Although the motion questions were supported by Honourable colleagues on each occasion, nothing has changed after each discussion.

Today, I propose yet another motion debate here on concerns about the competitiveness of container terminals mainly because the throughput of the container terminals in Shenzhen have caught up with that of Hong Kong's container terminals. While the throughput of the container terminals in Shenzhen, Shanghai, and so on, continue to rise year after year, the cargo throughput of Hong Kong's container terminals has declined rather than risen. The container freight industry accounts for a significant share of Hong Kong economy. The constant decline of the container freight industry will damage the local economy. For these reasons, I have to, on behalf of the Federation of Hong Kong Industries (FHKI) and the Liberal Party, take the trouble of proposing another motion debate, in order to arouse the concerns of colleagues and various sectors in the community about the development of Hong Kong's container freight industry.

Madam President, the decline in the competitiveness of Hong Kong's container terminals can generally be attributed to the following reasons. First, the terminal handling charges (THC) in Hong Kong are the highest in the world. Second, the Government of the Hong Kong Administrative Region (SAR) has been adopting a non-intervention policy with respect to the THC issue. Third, the efficiency of freight handling at the boundary is not satisfactory. Lastly, there is a lack of infrastructure networks between China and Hong Kong to cope with the development of the container freight industry. Next I will expound in detail on each of these reasons.

Madam President, Hong Kong's THC have ranked the highest in the world for a long time. The unreasonable rates are a long-standing cause of complaint by the business sector and consignors. The Hong Kong Shippers' Council, the FHKI and I have repeatedly complained to the SAR Government and called for government intervention to strive for reasonable THC for local consignors. However, the Government just keeps watching with folded arms every time, making excuses that THC is a "commercial decision" and it is inappropriate for the SAR Government to intervene.

Most shippers in Hong Kong, being small and medium enterprises (SMEs), lack bargaining power to fight for lower and more reasonable THC with shipping

companies. In order to ship their goods to buyers in Europe and the United States, the local business sector could only, for many years, brace itself to pay extremely unreasonable THC to various shipping companies. Although serious deflation has persisted in Hong Kong for a couple of years, THC remain exactly the same. Even though container terminal operators have pointed out that the cargo handling charges (CHC) levied on shipping companies by container terminals have seen a cumulative downward adjustment of 20% over the past years, there has not been the slightest reduction in THC levied by various liner conferences on local SMEs. Obviously, the crux of the issue lies in the fact that the liner conferences know it very well that local SMEs lack bargaining power and that the SAR Government has been using "it is inappropriate to intervene in commercial decisions" as an excuse for not intervening. As a result, the shipping companies have kept levying exorbitant charges on local SMEs over the years.

After arranging meetings to be held between shippers' bodies and liner conferences, government officials would then proclaim that the Government had made a lot of efforts on issues relating to THC. If the Government only adopts a non-intervention attitude in arranging for the meetings, how will the shipping companies feel the pressure? Without pressure, how can the shipping companies be expected to lower THC?

Statistics up to the middle of last month revealed that Shenzhen had officially surpassed Hong Kong in terms of container throughput. It was only then that local government officials pointed out that Hong Kong's competitiveness had been undermined by THC because they were exceedingly high and not transparent.

Nevertheless, what the Government did was to harp on the same old tune by arranging another meeting. Needless to say, Members should be able to guess the outcome of the meeting. The liner conferences once again claimed that their members were distributed all over the world. As a result, they had to liaise and discuss with various shipping companies before they could decide on lowering charges and enhancing the transparency of the charges. The Government did not even bother to ask the liner conferences the time required for them to conduct consultations. The Government's approach in handling the THC issue is no different from watching with folded arms. Eventually, the problem still remains, with THC continuing to stand high.

Madam President, in order to resolve the problem of the persistently high THC, the SAR Government must discard its non-intervention policy. With a target-oriented attitude and spirit, it should take a proactive approach and endeavour to fight for local consignors until the THC are lowered to reasonable levels that are affordable to local consignors. The Government should take the lead by joining with the FHKI and the Hong Kong Shippers' Council to negotiate with various shipping companies on the one hand and, with reference to a THC model used by Australia to regulate shipping companies, make it compulsory for THC to be determined by a mechanism comprising the government, liner conferences and consignors in consultation on the other, before the levels of charges can be recognized by law to be reasonable. Furthermore, the relevant legislation has to require that all THC be itemized. Only in doing so can the Government help local consignors argue strongly with various liner conferences on the basis of reason, to enable THC to be lowered to reasonable levels which local consignors will be pleased to accept.

Next, Madam President, I would like to say a few words on the cargo-handling efficiency at the boundary. Apart from the exorbitant THC, the cargo-handling efficiency at the boundary is one of the factors leading to the business sector abandoning local container terminals in favour of Shenzhen container terminals. According to an analysis by Mckinsey consultancy on freight journey, container trucks travelling from Kwai Chung to the Mainland often have to spend considerable time waiting for customs clearance. It has even been jokingly pointed out in a newspaper column that we can find out how long container truck drivers have been stuck in traffic jam by just making a trip to the Lok Ma Chau access to see how many vehicles are caught in traffic jam there and then count the number of water bottles filled with yellow fluid found on the lawns along the roads. In order to enhance the productivity of container trucks, sharply reduce freight charges, and upgrade the competitiveness of export commodities, the SAR Government must strive to shorten the waiting time as far as possible.

The FHKI calls on the SAR Government to negotiate with mainland authorities expeditiously, and put the policy of conducting joint customs and immigration clearance into full implementation. On the other hand, the Government may urge the Central Authorities and the Shenzhen Government to consider proposals similar to the one made by a major enterprise in Hong Kong for conducting customs clearance in places of origin. With the collaboration of China and Hong Kong, cargoes can be locked with the help of tracking devices

equipped with Global Positioning System (GPS) after going through direct customs clearance in its place of origin in mainland China, and then transported direct to vessels at Kwai Chung Container Terminal. In doing so, cargoes will not have to waste time in going through separate customs clearance in the two places.

Madam President, in order to upgrade the competitiveness of Hong Kong's container terminals, an infrastructure system specially designed for the flow of cargoes is indispensable. While the construction of such infrastructure as the Western Corridor and the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge is still being planned, the Shenzhen authorities have, for the sake of diverting traffic, embarked on building a road in Yantian port, Shenzhen to divert the flow of private cars and ease congestion experienced by local container trucks. The SAR Government should all the more actively consider Mr Gordon WU's proposal of constructing a comprehensive cargo transit road network. In order to give full play to the freight transportation strength of the new airport, a cargo crossing should be built along the seaside in Tuen Mun and a new container terminal be built off Tuen Mun. The container terminal will then be linked up with the airport by an elevated access road combined with a tunnel. Finally, the cargo crossing in Tuen Mun will be connected with Shekou by a sea crossing.

Constructing large-scale infrastructure is a time-consuming process. It is indeed imperative for the Government to, with the goal of rescuing Hong Kong's role as a logistics hub, take immediate actions to complete the construction of infrastructure facilities for the promotion of the flow of cargoes in a race-against-time manner.

Madam President, the logistics industry is an important pillar of Hong Kong economy. Should our container terminals lose their competitiveness, Hong Kong can hardly become the logistics centre of the region. At the same time, Hong Kong will painfully lose a locomotive that can pull economic development. Furthermore, the container terminal industry has employed, both directly and indirectly, more than 200 000 people, including employees in such industries as container terminal, transportation, trade and financial services, as well as many low-skilled workers. Should the container and transport industries continue to decline, the livelihood of many employees in Hong Kong will be affected. For these reasons, the FHKI would like to appeal to the SAR Government once again to expeditiously address the reasons for the decline of the competitiveness of Hong Kong's container freight industry and take

corresponding measures to reclaim Hong Kong's leading position as a maritime and logistics centre.

With these remarks, Madam President, I hope Honourable colleagues can support my original motion.

Mr Kenneth TING moved the following motion: (Translation)

"That this Council urges the Government to promptly address the problem of Hong Kong's container terminals rapidly losing their competitive edge, seriously examine the reasons for the decline in the competitiveness of the local container freight industry, and expeditiously take corresponding measures to reclaim Hong Kong's leading position as a maritime and logistics centre."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Mr Kenneth TING be passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr SIN Chung-kai will move an amendment to this motion, as printed on the Agenda.

I now call upon Mr SIN Chung-kai to speak and move his amendment.

MR SIN CHUNG-KAI (in Cantonese): Madam President, I move that Mr Kenneth TING's motion be amended, as printed on the Agenda.

The throughput of Shenzhen has surpassed Hong Kong, as evidenced by the fact that the throughput of the Kwai Chung Container Terminal and Shenzhen in October was 1.025 million TEUs and 1.03 million TEUs respectively. The Government must no longer turn a blind eye to Hong Kong container terminals' loss of their competitive edge.

The fees charged by Hong Kong port have always been 20% to 30% higher than those charged by Shenzhen. The fact that container terminal and container handling charges levied in Hong Kong are the highest in the world has severely impacted on the competitive edge of our freight industry. While the

former are charges levied by shipping companies on consignors, the latter represent charges paid by shipping companies to container terminals.

Last year, the Kwai Chung Container Terminal in Hong Kong handled more than 12 million TEUs. Together with other freight services, consignors have paid a total of approximately \$25 billion, of which more than \$10 billion goes to the Container Terminal and shipping companies as gross profit. In the opinion of the Democratic Party, the exorbitant handling charges are obviously attributable to the lack of competition. There is monopolization of charges, with up to 90% of the market share taken up by two major consortia. Should this continue, Hong Kong's freight industry will lose its competitiveness owing to high costs. The Government should therefore review its policy immediately.

The continuous development of the freight industry on the Mainland will definitely strengthen the country's competitiveness. Moreover, various terminals at the Shenzhen port have speeded up their pace of berth construction. The construction of berths at Shekou terminal phase II and Chiwan Port has also quickened, and the berths are expected to be commissioned within this year. Should Hong Kong container terminals fail to retain their status, our logistics industry is likely to, following industries and manufacturing industries, shift to the Mainland for further development.

The throughput of container terminals on the Mainland will definitely surpass that of Hong Kong should the territory fail to take immediate action to catch up and make future planning. To prevent the logistics industry from gradually moving northward and Hong Kong from voluntarily giving up its status as a container port, the authorities should provide against the future by conducting studies on the construction of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge and issues related to the siting and planning of Container Terminal 10.

Actually, all the container terminals in Hong Kong are located in Kwai Chung and Tsing Yi. The emergence of bottlenecks is inevitable as goods are mainly transported top-down by means of road facilities in Yuen Long and Tuen Mun to be handled at container terminals. Even if the future Shenzhen-Hong Kong Western Corridor can improve traffic flow, the handling of containers will still be concentrated on the south-western part of the territory.

To tie in with the port development of Hong Kong, there is an urgent need for the Hong Kong Government to conduct studies on the siting and planning of Container Terminal 10 in order to satisfy the future transport need, particularly

for the purpose of coping with the long-term economic development of the west bank of the Pearl River Delta (PRD) to provide an alternative transport option in the interest of maintaining the sustainable development of Hong Kong economy.

As pointed out in the consultative paper published by the Government last month on phase three of the Hong Kong 2030 : Planning Vision and Strategy, it is necessary for Hong Kong to construct a modernized logistics park and implement a long-term port development plan. The Democratic Party would like to recommend the Government to conduct feasibility studies on the siting and planning of Container Terminal 10 in the light of the construction of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge.

To start with, following the commencement of the Mainland/Hong Kong Closer Economic Partnership Arrangement, there are bound to be increasingly frequent contacts between Hong Kong and the Mainland and an increase in the inter-flow of goods. The existing container terminal facilities in Hong Kong will become inadequate to meet the future needs. The Government should therefore look for new sites of container terminals.

Where is the perfect site for the new container terminal? Definitely, the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge is a crucial factor for consideration. A track is likened by some people to the blood vessel of a nation. So, the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge is going to be a new blood vessel for Hong Kong to enable it to connect with key mainland cities, particularly those located west of the PRD.

The Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, in proximity to the west bank of the PRD, is adjacent to the waters off Guangdong and Guangxi, and even connects with Hainan, Yunnan and Guizhou. In the long run, goods from the western part of the Mainland can be transported to Hong Kong for handling. Of course, we have to take active matching measures. For instance, various relevant charges should be lowered to attract goods from the western part of the Mainland to the territory for handling. Then again, Hong Kong is already well-equipped with logistics infrastructure, and the Hong Kong airport is number one in the world in terms of its standard of handling air cargoes.

Therefore, with the implementation of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge project and the shortening of the distance between west-bank cities and the territory, the growth of the economy of the PRD West will be quickened.

The siting of Container Terminal 10 will therefore be vital in striving for a win-win solution for various ports in the PRD Region.

Moreover, the Democratic Party has consulted the logistics industry on the construction of a logistics centre for the development of the industry. The industry has expressed the hope that the Government can build a logistics centre in Kwai Chung and its vicinity to assist in the development of the logistics industry of Hong Kong. A lot near Wing Hong Street and Kwai Hei Street in Kwai Chung has been earmarked as sitting out area and left vacant for a long time. Perhaps the Government can conduct studies on the feasibility of developing this lot into a logistics centre. Due to its proximity to Kwai Chung Container Terminal, Stonecutters Island is also very suitable for development into a logistics centre, though part of it is now designated as a military base. I wonder if the Government can break the rules and examine the possibility of recovering this piece of military land from the Central Government for economic purposes. Although it is necessary for troops to be stationed in Hong Kong, as DENG Xiaoping once said, I think the economic development of Hong Kong is far more important than garrison.

Furthermore, as pointed out by Mr Kenneth TING earlier, local businessman Henry WU once proposed that a new container terminal be developed on the western part of Lantau. Actually, a number of container terminals in Shenzhen and the PRD are controlled by a businessman, or mainly by a family. Competition should actually not be very keen. The container terminal should therefore provide a good opportunity for the introduction of new operators and competitors. At the same time, there will be true competition in Hong Kong. It is my belief that, with better management of the container terminal, charges will become cheaper because of competition. In the long run, this will do Hong Kong good. The construction of a container terminal should not be delayed until there is an urgent need for it. Instead, the so-called "supply" method should be adopted to induce the growth of Hong Kong industries.

With these remarks, I support the amendment.

Mr SIN Chung-kai moved the following amendment: (Translation)

"To add ", including conducting feasibility studies on the selection of site for and the planning of Container Terminal 10 in view of the construction of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, so as" after "and expeditiously take corresponding measures". "

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Mr SIN Chung-kai to Mr Kenneth TING's motion, be passed.

MS MIRIAM LAU (in Cantonese): Madam President, Hong Kong has been the busiest container port in the world over the last couple of years, and the number of containers handled by us has repeatedly hit new heights. However, the growth in the total throughput has slowed down in recent years as only a single-digit growth has been recorded. On the contrary, the Shenzhen port has registered a double-digit growth in its total throughput and is growing robustly. In October this year, the single-month total throughput of the Shenzhen port has even surpassed that of Hong Kong for the first time, challenging the leading position of Hong Kong and posing a serious threat to the local container freight industry.

Hong Kong is a well-developed and modernized deep water port. Coupled with our advantages in a business-friendly environment, the rule of law and a free trading system, it will be difficult for container terminals in the Mainland to completely replace Hong Kong in the short term. However, given initiatives made by the Mainland to gradually improve its port facilities and legal system and to streamline customs formalities, together with new berths gradually coming into operation at Shenzhen terminals, the cargo volume in the entire South China region will outgrow the handling capacity of container terminals in the region. Hong Kong will inevitably face critical challenges in the next year or two.

Certainly, Hong Kong cannot just sit there to wait for the arrival of the doomsday. The Administration must expeditiously address squarely the reason for a rapid decline in the competitiveness of Hong Kong's container terminals. In fact, the reason cannot be simpler. It is because the total freight cost in Hong Kong is higher than that in the neighbouring region. Although charges in the Mainland have gradually increased in recent years, and this has narrowed the cost differential between Shenzhen and Hong Kong, the local freight cost is still higher than that in Shenzhen. Take a 40-foot container exported from Dongguan to the United States via Hong Kong as an example. The total cost is US\$260 higher than that in Shenzhen, which is nearly 10% higher than Shenzhen. If we analyse the total cost in greater detail, we will find that while the ocean

freight rate in Hong Kong costs US\$50 less than in Shenzhen, the terminal handling charge (THC) is about US\$97 higher than that of Shenzhen and our land transport charges are even some US\$200 higher than those in Shenzhen.

The main reason for land transport charges in Hong Kong to cost some US\$200 more than those in Shenzhen is that the operational costs of local container trucks are higher than those of their counterparts in Shenzhen. In fact, the cross-boundary haulage has continued to adjust downwards in recent years. The salary of cross-boundary container truck drivers has dropped 30% to 50% compared with three years ago and there is very limited room for any further reduction. As far as I know, the transportation cost has also been adjusted downwards by at least 30% to 50%. However, the rate of downward adjustment still appears to be inadequate, for there is still a gap of almost US\$200. It is necessary for us to further look into whether other parts of the operational cost can be curtailed or whether there is room for downward adjustment before this problem can be solved. For instance, cross-boundary container truck drivers are now required to pay for insurance premiums and vehicle inspection fees on both sides of the boundary. Can the two governments conduct studies to ascertain whether this arrangement can be streamlined, whether vehicle inspection is really necessary at both places, and whether insurance has to be taken out at both places. Another example is a quota-based user fee, which is commonly known as the "registration fee", levied on trucks. At present, the standard rate is \$100,000 per triennium, which means some \$30,000 yearly. Can the SAR Government study with the mainland Government as to whether there is room for downward adjustment in this fee. Besides, I have been told by the container freight industry that operators have to pay lots of other miscellaneous charges for operating trucking in the Mainland. There are dozens of such charges, including the "yellow insurance premium" charged by the customs authorities, the "blue insurance premium" by the quarantine bureau, and a parking fee at border control points. For these many fees and charges, can we study or discuss with the mainland Government as to which items of fees and charges can be adjusted downwards?

Apart from reducing the operational cost of container trucks as far as possible, it is also necessary for Hong Kong to enhance the efficiency of the container freight industry. To this end, it is necessary to solve the problem of a bottleneck at border control points, a point also mentioned by Mr Kenneth TING earlier. In fact, the Government has adopted a series of measures over the past

year, including introducing new technology, streamlining customs procedures, increasing the number of vehicular access, and providing round-the-clock customs clearance services. These measures have already shortened the time required for cargo clearance. As far as I know, 97% of the container trucks can complete customs clearance in an hour now. But there is certainly no room for complacency because we should aim at "seamless" border points, which mean that vehicles should not be made to wait for an hour to complete cargo clearance. That said, what has been done is already a great improvement when compared to the past. As far as I know, a container truck can now make 1.2 to 1.3 trips each day on average. If the cost is to be reduced, a more acceptable target is for a container truck to complete two trips daily. However, it seems that the goal of substantially increasing the number of trips made by container trucks can be realized only a couple of years later because the new bridge linking Lok Ma Chau and Huanggang will be completed only at the end of 2004, and the Shenzhen Western Corridor currently under construction will be completed only at the end of 2005.

So, I very much hope that the Government can expedite the relevant construction works, and it has been the wish of the industry that the Mainland and Hong Kong can implement the "logistics pipelines" as soon as possible, as also mentioned by Mr Kenneth TING, so that cargo clearance can be completed in the Mainland and then the trucks can cross the boundary direct without having to wait at the border control points for clearance. Yet, the Government has stated that it can be launched the earliest only after the commissioning of the Shenhzen Western Corridor. Can the Government further conduct a review on whether works can be expedited for the early implementation of this measure?

As for THC, it has actually been discussed for many times in this Chamber before. In fact, we all know clearly, so does Mr Kenneth TING, that THC is a very complicated commercial issue. It does not arise from a lack of facilities at container terminals. Nor does it arise from the problems of the container terminals or the problems of the shipping lines. That is, this problem cannot be solved by any affected party alone. Nor can it be solved by the SAR Government alone. However, I hope the Administration can actively facilitate negotiations among all parties concerned, in order to come up with viable options for reductions in THC.

Madam President, I so submit.

MR HUI CHEUNG-CHING (in Cantonese): Madam President, the topic of "improving the competitiveness of Hong Kong's container freight industry" is indeed vitally important to the sustained development of the overall economy of Hong Kong. The import and export industry is a pillar of Hong Kong economy. A decline in the competitiveness of our container terminals and a slowdown in the growth of container throughput will inevitably deal a blow to the import and export industry and also the related transport and service industries. As a result, a large number of people employed in these industries will become jobless and this will deal a blow to the pace of economic recovery. Meanwhile, the plan of Hong Kong to develop into a logistics hub in South China is bound to face setbacks.

In fact, the recent statistics on the container throughput of Hong Kong and Shenzhen have shown a declining trend in Hong Kong against growth in Shenzhen in terms of the development of container terminals. The container throughput of the Kwai Chung Container Terminal has dropped for five consecutive months from June to October this year. On the contrary, the three container terminals in Yantian, Shekou and Chiwan in Shenzhen have recorded continued growth in their throughput during the corresponding period. The growth from January to September has also increased by nearly 40% over the corresponding period last year, and the number of TEUs handled by them in October even surpassed the throughput of Kwai Chung for the first time.

(THE PRESIDENT'S DEPUTY, MS MIRIAM LAU, took the Chair)

Two weeks ago, in reply to my question about, among other things, the threats faced by the import and export and container freight industries of Hong Kong, the Secretary for Economic Development and Labour stated that in the short and medium terms, measures would be taken to enhance the competitiveness of the Hong Kong port on five fronts, namely, operating costs, communication between organizations in the port and freight industries, speed of cross-boundary clearance, commercial arrangements and port promotion. According to the statistics provided by the Secretary then, with regard to a 40-foot container, the handling charges at local container terminals are US\$261 higher than that in Shenzhen, of which US\$200 is the road transport cost between Hong Kong and Shenzhen and another US\$97 is the differential in the handling

charge levied by local container terminals over Shenzhen terminals. While we do have the advantage of a less expensive ocean freight, it can only reduce the total cost slightly by US\$50 and so, its effect is minimal.

The most shocking fact is that an extra US\$200 is incurred in the total cost mainly because container trucks travelling between Hong Kong and Shenzhen still have to wait a long time for customs clearance. This has greatly reduced the number of trips made by container truck drivers between Shenzhen and Hong Kong daily and hence substantially increased the road transport cost per trip. Moreover, members of the industry have pointed out that as the expenditure for operating local container trucks and goods vehicles licensed to operate both in Hong Kong and in the Mainland on such items as diesel cost, drivers' wages as well as vehicle inspection fees, insurance premiums and road maintenance fees is higher than that in the Mainland, hence it is difficult for the high road transport cost to come down.

Meanwhile, in addition to its advantage in the sourcing of goods, the Shenzhen port has vigorously drawn up plans and carried out construction works for terminal and other related infrastructure, including the construction of transport links and accesses to port, with a view to diverting traffic leading to the container terminals, reducing the waiting time of container trucks in the transportation of goods, increasing the number of trips made by trucks and lowering the road transport cost. It is learnt that the Shenzhen Municipal Government will inject at least RMB 5 billion yuan by 2005 into eight improvement and construction projects, with a view to ensuring greater convenience and smoothness in the flow of traffic into and out of Yantian Port. As for the interchange between Yantian Port and the two major transport lifelines, namely, the Beijing-Guangzhou Railway and Beijing-Kowloon Railway, that is, the Ping-Yan Railway linking up with Changping, while this is just a small-scale rail link constructed for a specific purpose, its role in attracting goods from various provinces and municipalities in the Mainland and in boosting the efficiency of transportation should not be underestimated. Moreover, the Yantian Port in Shenzhen will have four new berths completed in this year and the next, and the planning work for the Dachanwan Container Terminal project in which 15 berths will be developed may also commence in 2005. If the local container freight industry does not promptly enhance its competitiveness, thus allowing this trend of a shrinkage in Hong Kong's container freight industry against growth in that of Shenzhen to continue, it would persistently create on the local economy an adverse impact which would be irrevocable.

To upgrade the competitiveness of Hong Kong's container freight industry, we should focus on a number of major areas, including the road transport cost, reductions in the terminal handling charge (THC), speeding up customs clearance, and increasing the number of lanes and checkpoints for inbound and outbound traffic. I think the Government should expedite the implementation of such measures as the co-location of customs facilities, the "logistics pipelines" and electronic customs declaration, thereby speeding up customs clearance and streamlining customs formalities. In the meantime, efforts should be made to negotiate with container terminals and shipping lines on reductions in THC and removal of the various miscellaneous charges. I also propose that the authorities should conduct studies on the feasibility of providing feeder transport, including railway, to link up with the existing and new container terminals, and the feasibility of increasing inbound vehicular accesses or adjusting the directions of traffic flow. Efforts should also be stepped up for such projects as the Shenzhen Western Corridor and the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, in order to enhance the radiation of the local container terminals on provinces and municipalities in the Mainland.

Furthermore, given that 90% of our exports is related to the Mainland, the Government must make an effort to co-ordinate with the relevant mainland authorities on the many rules and regulations relating to, for example, the co-location of customs facilities, vehicle inspection fees for trucks licensed to operate in Hong Kong and in the Mainland and road charges before any satisfactory result can be achieved. The Government must not only negotiate with the Guangdong Province and the Shenzhen Municipality on the planning of and co-operation in the development of container terminals. It must spare no effort to encourage investment from mainland provinces and municipalities on Hong Kong's container terminals. This can open up the industry for competition on the one hand and encourage the Mainland to more actively capitalize on Hong Kong's advantages in this area on the other, thereby truly achieving reciprocal benefits for both sides.

Madam Deputy, I so submit.

MR NG LEUNG-SING (in Cantonese): Madam Deputy, a wide range of factors should be considered in the overall assessment of the development of Hong Kong's container freight industry and how the actual operating environment has affected its competitiveness. They include the cost-effectiveness of road

transport, such as whether the roads are easily accessible with smooth traffic, the adequacy of the cargo handling capacity of land crossings, flexibility of the clearance hours, and whether customs declaration and clearance formalities are simple and expedient. In addition, with regard to the port, the adequacy of the shipping schedule, the efficiency of the terminals in handling cargoes and whether urgent shipment can be handled flexibly and speedily will have a bearing on the consignor's choice of port.

Certainly, the effects of the price factor on the competitiveness of the local container freight industry cannot be neglected. The terminal handling charge (THC) in Hong Kong is the highest in Asia, and it is understandable that this has aroused concern from exporters and the transport industry. It is reported that the throughput of container terminals in Shenzhen in October this year surpassed for the first time that of Kwai Chung Container Terminal. Many people are of the view that this is largely attributed to the cost factor. Although the throughput of the Kwai Chung Container Terminal merely accounts for 60% of Hong Kong's total throughput, importance should indeed be attached to the changes in the growth of the container freight industry in Hong Kong *vis-a-vis* that in Shenzhen. I agree that the shippers and the Hong Kong Liners Shipping Association should have better communication in respect of THC, and there should be greater transparency in the fee structure and in the determination of the fee level. In this connection, apart from making ongoing efforts to maintain a good business environment, the Government can continue to play the role of an active facilitator and promoter. On the other hand, the Government should understand that the THC is only a part of the overall container freight cost and that Hong Kong's container freight industry, like the other local industries, faces competition from its counterparts in the neighbouring region and so, the prices are unlikely to remain unchanged in the light of competition. Apart from a differential in the cost of human resources, land-related subsidy has not been a feature of the *modus operandi* of the local container terminals, and the investment on and operation of container terminals solely depend on input from private enterprises. This is another reason explaining the cost differentials. If the further construction of new container terminals is deemed necessary in the future, from the angle of ensuring fairness in the market, it still may not be appropriate for any form of subsidy to be provided for their operation.

So, faced with these facts, it is all the more necessary to focus on certain factors other than the price in order to upgrade the competitiveness of Hong Kong's container freight industry. Container Terminal 9, which will

commence operation soon, can further increase the overall throughput of container terminals in Hong Kong. Obviously, the Government should also draw up plans for development in the longer term and constantly review the need to construct Container Terminal 10 in the light of changes in the actual environment. Moreover, the Shenzhen Western Corridor will further facilitate transportation of goods between the Mainland and Hong Kong. Meanwhile, ongoing government efforts are still required to foster co-operation with the mainland authorities, continuously improve the formalities of cargo clearance, enhance efficiency and streamline procedures, thereby making suitable improvements to the competitiveness of Hong Kong's container freight industry in terms of road transport.

Madam Deputy, I so submit.

MR CHAN KAM-LAM (in Cantonese): Madam Deputy, the Hong Kong port is still the world's number one port to date. However, the container throughput of the Kwai Chung Container Terminal in October recorded a drop for five months in a row. If we calculate according to the Government's estimation that each TEU imported or exported via Hong Kong can generate a relevant revenue of \$10,000, a 2.7% drop in last month's throughput will mean a loss of over \$280 million in business turnover. Meanwhile, the throughput of Shenzhen port has seen double-digit growth and has for the first time surpassed that of the Kwai Chung Container Terminal in Hong Kong. Under such an opposing development trend, the alarm has obviously been sounded for the leading position of Hong Kong's container freight industry.

The high freight cost in Hong Kong is mainly attributable to the high transportation cost which includes the terminal handling charge (THC) and trucking cost. The unreasonable rate of THC has long been criticized and has caused many disputes and finger pointing among the industry-related trades in recent years. Disregarding who is right and who is wrong, the fact remains that the charges payable by shippers have not come down by one single cent. The industry has all long refused to reduce the relevant charges in the overall interest of Hong Kong's container freight industry. We have warned over and over again that if the charges are not lowered, Hong Kong is set to lose its position as the world's number one port in a few years' time, and the goal of "developing into a logistics hub" will become nothing but just empty words. Although the determination of charges is said to be a commercial decision of the industry, it

has a bearing on the long-term interest and competitiveness of port development in Hong Kong. We consider that the Government of the Special Administrative Region (SAR) can no longer turn a blind eye to this. The Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong (DAB) considers it necessary for the Government to discuss with the industry on reduction of THC as soon as possible, with a view to maintaining the competitiveness of the business environment in Hong Kong.

With regard to the trucking charges, the operational cost of container trucks can be lowered in a number of areas. The most direct way is to reduce various types of expenses. On the rate of diesel duty, it has been the position of the DAB that there must not be any tax increase under the current circumstances, and ongoing efforts will be made in the future to strive for maintaining the rate of diesel duty at the present level. Moreover, on the point made by organizations in the China-Hong Kong transportation industry that trucks in Hong Kong have to pay for many extra charges in the Mainland, as a result of which they are not as competitive as their mainland counterparts are in terms of road transport cost, the DAB is deeply concerned about this. We urge the SAR Government to enhance communication with the relevant organizations and to obtain a more in-depth understanding of the situation. The Hong Kong Logistics Association Limited has stated categorically that because of the overall freight cost, more than half of goods in the low end have already been switched to the container terminals in Yantian and Shekou instead of those in Hong Kong for handling. The SAR Government must address this problem squarely and actively work with Guangdong Province to reduce the various administrative charges payable by trucks licensed to operate in Hong Kong and in the Mainland, in order to strive for fairer treatment for local trucks.

Certainly, we can also lower the road transport cost by enhancing the handling capacity of cross-boundary facilities. According to a recent report on the development of terminals in Hong Kong, cumbersome customs formalities and congested road traffic are the prime culprits behind the escalating cost. The bottleneck at border control points has all along stood in the way of logistics development on both sides of the boundary. We will have to wait until the completion of a new bridge linking Lok Ma Chau and Huanggang by the end of 2004 before we can expect the problem to be solved by streamlining passenger traffic and freight traffic. To address this pressing problem, the only solution now is to step up efforts to reduce the cargo clearance time and streamline customs formalities. We understand that a container truck has to spend at least

four hours on cargo clearance per trip. What makes drivers feel most helpless is that the customs authorities in the Mainland require declarations on the import and export of goods to be made to the local customs authorities of where the factory is located, and no changes concerning the driver, the truck, the rack, and the container will be allowed in the course of transportation. All these factors have posed limitations on cross-boundary truck drivers in that they can only make one trip hauling one container daily. In that case, how possibly could the freight cost be low? We consider that the SAR Government must forge closer liaison with the Shenzhen Government and discuss with it ways for co-operation on the border control policy, in order to ensure greater simplicity and smoothness in the process of cargo clearance, hence improving the efficiency of road transport.

Faced with an environment of fierce competition, everyone is racing against time to enhance their competitiveness. Guangdong Province has already finalized terminal projects in Nansha, Zhanjiang, Shantou, and also in Huiyang and Huizhou, according to what we have heard recently. For the Zhanjiang Port, there is even a plan to make an investment in the next five years that will exceed investment in the last 50 years, with a view to doubling the throughput. On the contrary, in the document on "Hong Kong 2030" published recently in Hong Kong, although it is affirmed that the existing container terminals will not be able to cope with demands in the long term, the SAR Government still has not acted promptly to immediately commence the construction of container terminals. Rather, it has chosen to commission the "Study on Hong Kong Port: Master Plan 2020", focusing more on the siting and timetable of future development. Let me assure Members that they have not heard it wrong, because the study is really a macroscopic outlook for the year 2020. I am afraid that when the results of the study are available, Hong Kong will have lost a huge volume of cargoes and the new terminals will not be serving any useful purpose. We hope that the SAR Government can realize the critical situation now and expeditiously finalize plans on Container Terminal 10 and launch its construction. Consideration should at the same time be given to introducing new operators, in the hope that with more competition and provision of additional berths, THC can return to a reasonable level through the market mechanism.

According to the report on "Review of Maritime Transport 2030" published by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the throughout of the top 10 ports in the Mainland recorded a growth of 35% on

average last year, which is far higher than the average growth rate of 2.2% of ports worldwide. Given that the threats from the Mainland are approaching like menacing torrents, Hong Kong cannot be hesitant and remain stagnant any longer. We must expeditiously formulate and implement policies to upgrade the competitiveness of the Hong Kong port.

Madam Deputy, I so submit.

MR MA FUNG-KWOK (in Cantonese): Madam Deputy, the logistics industry has all along been an important sector of Hong Kong economy. It is even regarded by the Government as one of the four pillars of our economy. However, given the rapid development of mainland ports, the advantages of Hong Kong in logistics have gradually come under threat. The throughput of the Kwai Chung Container Terminal has dropped for five consecutive months compared with the same period last year. In October this year, the throughput of the Shenzhen port even exceeded that of Hong Kong for the first time.

In fact, the logistics industry already pointed out as early as several years ago the many problems of the Hong Kong port, such as the staggeringly high terminal handling charge (THC), shortage of berths, and congested border control points and roads, and these problems have indirectly increased the cost. Regrettably, it seems that the Government has not given a positive response. Projects such as Container Terminal 10 (CT10) and the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge have only been dragging along.

As there used to be a gap between Hong Kong and the Mainland in respect of port facilities, Hong Kong could still enjoy certain advantages. But in recent years, as the logistics and shipping industries in the Mainland have endeavoured to catch up, if the SAR Government still sits by idly and turns a blind eye to this, I am afraid it would be difficult to maintain the advantages of Hong Kong.

Firstly, berths for container vessels have long been seriously lacking in Hong Kong. At present, an average of over 100 cargo vessels will arrive in Hong Kong daily. Even with the addition of the first berth of Container Terminal 9 (CT9) which commenced operation in July this year, there are only 19 berths in Hong Kong. That is why a majority of the vessels still have to rely on mid-stream operation to load and unload their goods at sea.

Secondly, as pointed out by a recent study, a major reason for the high cost borne by Hong Kong's container freight industry is traffic congestion at border control points and on roads. This has led to a decline in the productivity of the container freight industry and low cost-effectiveness of transportation, hence indirectly increasing the road transport cost by a wide margin. The industry has also stated time and again that the space for container storage is inadequate at the terminals and that the roads leading to the terminals are always congested. In fact, container terminals in Singapore, Rotterdam or New York's Long Island are much larger than ours in Hong Kong in size, with much more space for container storage and much wider roads.

For a long time, shippers have complained that the terminal charges in Hong Kong are the highest in the world. Regarding terminal charges, the Yantian Port in Shenzhen only charges one sixth of the charges in Hong Kong. Many people are of the view that terminal charges in Hong Kong are high because the operation is monopolized by a few consortia. For example, most of the 14 mid-stream companies in Hong Kong are owned by several consortia. As a result, the charging policy of mid-stream operation is open to manipulation. According to the industry estimates, even by 2004 when part of the operating rights of container terminals are handed out by the existing operators and new operators are introduced, the terminal charges can only be adjusted downwards by 5% to 7% and the charges would still be on the high side.

Given the prevalence of these problems, the Government has indeed taken steps to facilitate customs clearance at border control points. For example, the Government is working on an electronic land cargo advance clearance system under which cargo handling companies are required to submit to the Customs and Excise Department the electronic land cargo manifest for advance clearance. Under this system, goods vehicles, when crossing the border, can complete cargo clearance without having to stop, and this will ease traffic congestion at border control points. The Trade and Industry Department has also completed interconnection with the computer system of the mainland customs administration in respect of Hong Kong products under CEPA. Customs declaration for Hong Kong products will be made in the same manner as ordinary customs declaration, and the origin claims will be verified by checking against the electronic data submitted through interconnection. This will reduce the clearance time of vehicles. However, it is not enough to solely rely on these measures. The many projects involving large-scale infrastructure construction appear to be seriously lagging behind. For instance, the remaining five berths

of CT9 can be commissioned only in 2005, and the report on the assessment of CT10 can be completed only by the end of this year and worse still, a decision has yet been taken on siting.

It has always been the hope of members of the container freight industry that the "logistics pipelines" can be put in place expeditiously by Hong Kong and the Mainland, so that cargo clearance can be completed in the Mainland and the cargoes can then cross the border direct without having to wait for clearance at Lok Ma Chau. However, as stated by the Government earlier, owing to inadequate space at Lok Ma Chau, it is anticipated that the logistics pipelines can come into operation only by the end of 2005 the earliest upon the commissioning of the Shenzhen Western Corridor.

On the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, when this idea was brought up by many members of the industry and by the Guangdong Provincial Government before, the SAR Government had not only been cold and indifferent to the proposal, and it had even claimed that a need for this bridge was not envisaged in the next decade. As the port development in the Pearl River Delta (PRD) Region has become increasingly mature, the SAR Government has now proposed the construction of the bridge. Although it is still not too late, work must proceed at a quicker pace.

To conclude, as a result of the tardiness of the Government and its underestimation of the development in the Mainland, Hong Kong has already wasted several years of time for nothing. In the light of the competition arising from the rapid development of mainland ports, Hong Kong should expedite the studies and implementation of corresponding measures in order to maintain the advantages of our shipping and logistics industries. The Government should expeditiously improve facilities at border control points as well as the transport infrastructure linking with the terminals. It should at the same time introduce more competition into the operation of container terminals to ensure that our terminal charges are sufficiently competitive.

Regarding the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, many economists and members of the industry already pointed out in the last few years that this bridge can play a very positive role in expediting the development of western Guangdong and in developing Hong Kong into a logistics and freight centre. If arrangement can be made for the bridge to land in the proximity of CT10 and the airport, the efficiency of our logistics services may even be increased

substantially and hence the position of Hong Kong as a logistics hub will be consolidated. Therefore, since the Government has now recognized the importance of the bridge, it should expeditiously make a decision on the location of and the support infrastructure for CT10.

Moreover, to avoid vicious competition between the Hong Kong port and ports in the PRD, co-ordination carried out by both sides must also be enhanced.

For these reasons, Madam Deputy, I support Mr Kenneth TING's original motion and Mr SIN Chung-kai's amendment. Thank you, Madam Deputy.

MR LEUNG FU-WAH (in Cantonese): Madam Deputy, the October figures for container terminals show that the container throughput of the Shenzhen port has surpassed that of Hong Kong and become the world's number one. The container throughput of ports in Shanghai has also caught up with that of the Kwai Chung Container Terminal in Hong Kong. At present, an annual growth of about 30% in container throughput is registered at Shenzhen ports. After the completion of phase three of the Yantian Port in Shenzhen, a large number of new berths will be commissioned and so, a substantial increase in Yantian's throughput is expected. Apart from showing the rapid and auspicious development of the port cargo industry in Shenzhen, the above data have also sounded the alarm to Hong Kong's port freight industry. If the Government and the industry fail to promptly address the problem of the local container terminals not being able to maintain their competitive edges, and if they continue to stay aloof from this, knowing only to indulge in past glory of our container terminals, it can be foreseen that Hong Kong will eventually lose its leading position as a maritime and logistics centre one day.

I am not scaremongering here. But various signs are showing that individual mainland ports are developing at high speed. Not only are these ports close to the origin of goods. Their port charges are also lower than those in Hong Kong. So, these ports do have great potentials to gradually surpass and even outgrow Hong Kong in terms of the port throughput. While it may be said that Hong Kong still has an edge in river trade and mid-stream operations and also frequent shipping schedules at the Hong Kong port, for how much longer can these advantages sustain? It is possible that certain mainland ports will also develop these advantages in the future. By then, what competitive edges do Hong Kong's container terminals still have?

Take Shenzhen as an example. Nine new berths will be coming onstream in Shenzhen in the next two years, including phase three of Yantian, phase two of Shekou and phase three of Chiwan. Added to these is the scheduled completion of phase one of Dachanwan in 2008. On the contrary, Hong Kong will only have the six berths of Container Terminal 9 (CT9) coming into operation. The SAR Government must address squarely the problem that the leading position of the Hong Kong port is in imminent danger. It must expeditiously discuss with the industry the counter-measures to be adopted and take corresponding actions as soon as possible to ensure that Hong Kong's leading position as a maritime and logistics centre will not be snatched by the neighbouring regions. Since Shenzhen can ride on the momentum of the global development of freight industry to vigorously expand its existing ports and construct new ones, Hong Kong can also avail itself of this opportunity to examine whether the existing container port facilities are still adequately competitive. If it is because of a lack of port facilities in Hong Kong that we are forced to turn our customers away to the neighbouring regions, and when we are seeing profits going to others' pockets by then, it would be useless even to cry our eyes out.

In fact, the development of Hong Kong's container freight industry will have a direct bearing on the employment opportunities of workers in the related trades, including container terminals, transport, trade, and financial services. To put it simply, in times of an upward development of the container freight industry, the employment opportunities of transport and logistics workers will naturally increase considerably. On the contrary, when its development goes downhill, it would be difficult to safeguard the livelihood of workers in the related trades, let alone creating more employment opportunities. Therefore, three weeks ago, representatives of the eight trade unions in the logistics industry under the Federation of Trade Unions met with Ms Sandra LEE, Permanent Secretary for Economic Development and Labour, to express their concern for the development of Hong Kong's logistics industry, for they are worried that the development of the local container freight industry will lag behind that of the neighbouring regions and will hence affect the employment of workers in the industry.

How can our current situation in the competition of ports be reversed? Terminal charges and the labour cost may not necessarily be areas in which direct government intervention is appropriate, for these involve commercial operation. What the Government can do is only on the administrative side,

such as enhancing the facilities of local ports and streamlining the administrative procedures, with a view to boosting operational efficiency. In order to divert traffic, the Yantian Port in Shenzhen has constructed a dedicated road to divert private car traffic, which has hence eased the congestion of container trucks. This shows the efforts and resolve of Shenzhen to upgrade its competitiveness to become the world's premier port. The SAR Government, in planning such infrastructure as the Shenzhen Western Corridor currently under construction and the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, should draw on the experience of Shenzhen. I think the Government must be determined to speed up these projects. Otherwise, by the time when the roads and bridges are completed, they may not have any purpose to serve and as a result, we will only be seeing ourselves being overtaken by others with our very eyes.

Moreover, on the construction of Container Terminal 10 (CT10), there have been both supporting and opposing views. Recently, some container terminal operators have stated again that since Hong Kong has been operating with high efficiency in this area and as there is still room for upgrading the handling capacity of CT9, it seems unnecessary for Hong Kong to develop CT10. I, however, take exception to this view, because judging from the increasing container throughput of the Shenzhen port, there is indeed a very large demand in the container freight market, and it is because ports in Shenzhen have sufficient facilities to provide the required services that Shenzhen can surpass Hong Kong. But in Hong Kong, the existing port facilities can only cope with the present demand and may not be adequate to cope with a possible surge in demand in the future.

On the question of whether CT10 should be constructed, the most important consideration should in fact be the overall interest of Hong Kong. The interest of container terminal operators may not necessarily be consistent with the overall interest of Hong Kong, because some operators are at the same time operating many container terminals in the Pearl River Delta Region. So, to these operators, whether the goods are handled at the Hong Kong port or the Shenzhen port merely means that their business and profit flowing from their right pocket to the left pocket and they may not suffer any loss eventually. On the contrary, a decline in the container throughput of the Hong Kong port will affect not only the development of Hong Kong's port cargo industry, but also the employment of local workers. Such being the case, the losers will after all be the people of Hong Kong. Therefore, the SAR Government must consider from the overall interest of Hong Kong and discuss with the business sector and

the industry as soon as possible in order to reach an early decision on the construction of CT10. As to how the Government can balance the interest of the commercial sector against that of the community as a whole, it will be a very important consideration of the business sector in its decision on whether or not to support the construction of CT10.

I hope that the container terminal operators can take a broader vision in consideration of the overall interest of the community and work in concert with the Government and all Hong Kong people by supporting the early construction of CT10 to facilitate the development of Hong Kong as a shipping centre, so that Hong Kong will not eventually lag far behind the neighbouring regions in terms of cargo volume as a result of insufficient port facilities.

Madam Deputy, I so submit.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Madam Deputy, Hong Kong's container freight industry is, in fact, caught in grave problems and seriously ill now. But whether its conditions will critically deteriorate and become incurable may hang by a thread, for it depends on whether the Government can learn from the bitter experience and pull back before it is too late and properly address the problems. There are five reasons why the freight industry is seriously ill: First, monopoly; second, excessive charges; third, overcharging by many operators; fourth, lack of support, particularly a serious lack of back-up land; and fifth, wrong planning.

The success of Hong Kong's container freight industry can be said as a coincidence in history. Due to some coincidental development in history, Hong Kong has gradually become one of the best container ports in the world. However, we can see that problems with the design of our container port and many other problems have arisen continuously, and they keep on recurring and deteriorating. But the Government is like the descendant of a rich tycoon as it harbours the mentality of a "prodigal son", thinking that there is still money to spend and that it is unnecessary to really take anything seriously. An example is evident in the discussion a few years ago on the development of Hong Kong's container freight industry. The relevant government officials were still thinking too highly of Hong Kong then, taking the view that when compared to Hong Kong, the Mainland was unlikely to catch up with us as Hong Kong had a sound financial system and the laws here were good. Just check the records of debates

back in the 1990s and we can find that government officials had said that the Mainland was no match for Hong Kong. But a few years have passed in a blink of an eye. Let us take a look at the situation now. Hong Kong has already been overtaken. Let us not talk about Shanghai. Just look at places in South China, say, Fujian, Shenzhen, the Huangpu Terminal in Guangzhou, and Zhuhai. Their planning is ten times more advanced than that of the Hong Kong Government. For the advantages and strengths of Hong Kong emphasized by the Hong Kong Government over the years, I do not know whether or not the Secretary is going to repeat them later on. But even if he will, I think that will only be a laughing stock. Basically, any further mention of them will only make people laugh their heads off. I hope the Government will take concrete actions to tackle this problem at root.

In fact, when the Government decided to construct Container Terminal 9 (CT9), I had already proposed to the Government repeatedly that it should introduce new operators. But regrettably, the Government, as usual, did not heed our views. Adopting the "pie-sharing" approach in a political sense, the Government granted CT9 to several operators by way of a private agreement. My judgement is that in order to make these few trees stronger, the Government has given up the whole forest. This evil consequence has caused the entire container freight industry to be further monopolized, hence aggravating the various problems that I have just mentioned. Consequently, the competitiveness of Hong Kong's container freight industry has been further undermined to become inferior to container ports in South China. Therefore, Madam Deputy, if the Government is truly committed to ameliorating the problems confronting the container freight industry, I think it must expeditiously draw up plans for the development of container ports. It is because the container port as originally planned has now been turned into the Disney Theme Park. The Government prefers Mickey Mouse to the future of Hong Kong. The Government has always said that Hong Kong's future lies in the container freight industry, tourism, and so on, and while the container freight industry is the lifeline of Hong Kong's economic development, the Government still has a greater liking for Mickey Mouse than the development of the container freight industry. This very decision may be a disastrous decision which will cast a shadow on the future of Hong Kong. If we do not learn from the bitter experience and draw up plans for the future development of the container freight industry, when the need for Container Terminal 10 arises in future and when we rush to set it in motion only then, various serious problems are set to arise and

past problems would only recur, including wrong planning, unsatisfactory roads, inadequate back-up land, and granting projects to certain consortia by private agreement, and all these are going to condemn Hong Kong's container freight industry to even greater plights.

Madam Deputy, excessive charges are among the several problems that I mentioned earlier. Excessive charges are precisely the result of the method or approach adopted by the Government in granting franchise or land in the past. For some time, the Government put the projects to public tender, awarding the contract to the highest bidder, and this will naturally lead to high charges. Then for another time, the Government considered tendering undesirable and subsequently awarded the projects to certain people by way of private agreement. So, even the Government had been at sixes and sevens, adopting different practices at different times. But in any case, the beneficiaries will be the same group of people and the outcome will be just the same, because it is the same group of people who are going to benefit from this, and the approach to be adopted is premised purely on the interests of those consortia. If this attitude is not changed and under the monopolization of these consortia, public interest in Hong Kong will stand to be sacrificed.

The Government should address squarely the problem of overcharging. The Government has always said that this is a problem of the market over which government regulation is impossible. However, I have seriously warned the Government that overcharging will seriously enrage many of those who operate with a small capital in the transportation industry, particularly drivers. In the future, the instability faced by the Government may stem from resistance put up by enraged container truck drivers against overcharging by a couple of companies, and this will lead to overall instability in Hong Kong. The several riots previously occurred in Hong Kong were related to the transportation industry. So, the Government must not ignore the explosiveness of public anger and grievances. If the Government continues to condone overcharging by these consortia despite the fact that these consortia have amassed profits in billions of dollars, drivers in the container freight industry will not just sit by to wait for the arrival of the doomsday. I hope that the Secretary can heed the views of Members from the many political parties, because Members from all political parties hold the unanimous view that the charges are excessively high and mistakes have been committed in planning. If the Government still turns a blind eye to these problems, the Secretary will not be the one to suffer ultimately as he may reach the age to draw pension and retire, but it will be the people and the future of Hong Kong that will suffer ultimately.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak?

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Kenneth TING, you may now speak on Mr SIN Chung-kai's amendment. You have up to five minutes to speak.

MR KENNETH TING (in Cantonese): Madam Deputy, regarding Mr SIN Chung-kai's amendment, I originally thought that there was no specific and practical need for his proposal because, as we all know, the Government had already commissioned consultants to conduct feasibility studies on the planning and siting of Container Terminal 10, and the consultancy report has also covered the positive impact of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge on Hong Kong's container freight industry. So, it is unnecessary to discuss this any further.

However, Madam Deputy, the throughput of the Kwai Chung Container Terminal has declined for five consecutive months since June this year. To solve this pressing problem and to reclaim the leading position of the Hong Kong port, the Government should, as also suggested by Members from various political parties, immediately draw up effective measures to facilitate an agreement among shipping lines on the reduction of THC, enhance customs clearance facilities and efficiency, and expedite infrastructure projects with a view to linking up the sources of goods in the Mainland with the network of Hong Kong's transportation industry. These suggestions are all covered by my motion, but we will support Mr SIN Chung-kai's amendment nonetheless.

SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOUR (in Cantonese): Madam Deputy, first of all, I would like to thank Mr Kenneth TING and other Members who have spoken for their valuable opinions on the competitiveness of Hong Kong's container freight industry.

Enhancing the competitiveness of the container freight industry is a matter of concern to us all. It has been discussed in past Council meetings and those of the Panel on Economic Services. In my reply to a Member's oral question in a

Council meeting last month, I reported the measures taken by the Government to upgrade the competitiveness of the Hong Kong port. I wish to stress that the Government has always been concerned about the competitiveness of the container freight industry in Hong Kong and has made a lot of effort to enhance it. We definitely have not sit on the sidelines.

The Kwai Chung Container Terminal (KCCT) accounted for 60% of Hong Kong's container throughput, with the remaining 40% being handled by mid-stream operation, the River Trade Terminal and other facilities. Even if we look at the KCCT's performance alone, its throughput in the first 10 months of this year was 10 million TEU, representing a year-on-year growth of 2.3%. It is anticipated that the entire Hong Kong port's throughput for the whole year will reach about 20 million TEU, thus maintaining its position as the world's busiest container port.

(THE PRESIDENT resumed the Chair)

For the Shenzhen port, its throughput from January to October this year was 8.67 million TEU, representing a 40% increase over the same period last year. It is estimated that its throughput for the whole year will be around 10.5 million TEU.

Although at present, there is still a considerable gap in the total throughputs of the ports in Shenzhen and Hong Kong, the throughput of the Shenzhen port has seen a sustained high rate of growth in recent years. Undeniably, this has diverted some of the port cargo from Hong Kong.

As pointed out by Ms Miriam LAU and other Members, the total transport cost of exporting a 40-foot container, including trucking cost, terminal handling charge (THC), ocean freight, and so on, from Dongguan to the United States via the Hong Kong port is about 10% higher than that via the Shenzhen port. Freight transport is a commercial activity and its operating costs, in particular the THC and trucking cost, will directly affect our competitiveness. To lower the operating costs and enhance the efficiency of land transport are the most pressing problems on hand.

The Government is very concerned about these problems and maintains constant contact and communication with the industry. The Hong Kong Port

Development Board (PDB) is examining ways to enhance the competitiveness of the Hong Kong port and the container freight industry. The PDB unanimously supports the adoption of measures in the following five areas to enhance the competitiveness of the Hong Kong port and the container freight industry in the short and medium terms: a) operating costs; b) speed of boundary clearance; c) communication between organizations in the freight industries and of the port; d) commercial arrangements and e) port promotion.

In respect of lowering operating costs, we will continue to study ways to lower THC and road transport cost to narrow the cost differential between Shenzhen and Hong Kong. The mechanism for determining the level of THC is based on international practices and decided by overseas liner conferences. It is a commercial matter between shippers and shipping lines. The levy of THC is a common practice in other parts of the world and the Government should not interfere with, nor is the Government empowered by law to interfere with such commercial activities. Ms Miriam LAU has already pointed out that THC is a complex commercial issue and has to be resolved with the efforts of many parties. I also wish to point out that we definitely have not stood on the sidelines. In the past few years, we have actively negotiated with the Hong Kong Shippers' Council (HKSC), the Hong Kong Container Terminal Operators Association, the Transpacific Stabilization Agreement (TSA) and Intra Asia Discussion Agreement to strengthen communication and co-operation through dialogue. THC has not been adjusted upwards in the past five years. At another meeting with the TSA and the HKSC last month, representatives of the TSA expressed their understanding of the shippers' concern in relation to the transparency of THC and undertook to provide the relevant information as soon as possible.

Madam President, regarding port infrastructure, the first and second berths of the newly commissioned Container Terminal No. 9 (CT9) commenced operation in July and October this year respectively. With a total of six berths, CT9 will become fully operational by the first quarter of 2000 and provide a capacity of over 2.6 million TEU. By that time, the KCCT's total capacity will exceed 15 million TEU. In addition, there will be an additional container terminal operator, so competition among container terminal operators will be promoted and operating cost lowered.

I wish to point out also that in terms of cost, river transport is more competitive than container trucks. In fact, if cargoes from the west bank of the Pearl River Delta (PRD) are delivered by barges to Hong Kong for export, the

cost-effectiveness is on a par with delivering them to Yantian port in Shenzhen by road transport.

Secondly, to increase the speed of boundary clearance. Improving the handling capacity of cross-boundary facilities so that container trucks can make multiple trips in a day is an effective way to reduce road transport cost. Measures implemented by the Government in the past year include the extension of customs clearance hours for goods vehicles and the shortening of customs clearance time. Starting from October last year, we have provided additional lanes at the Lok Ma Chau Control Point for 24-hour clearance of goods vehicles and the handling capacity of cross-boundary freight movements at night-time has been greatly improved. The flow of goods vehicles from midnight to 7 am has increased by several folds, from 605 vehicles in November 2001 to 1 979 vehicles in September this year, with a more than three-fold increase. Moreover, the land boundary crossings have also introduced new technology to further reduce the time for cargo clearance. At present, the clearance time has been reduced from 45 seconds to 33 seconds at Lok Ma Chau for a laden goods vehicle, and from 20 seconds to 16 seconds for an empty goods vehicle. The handling capacity of each lane has increased from 90 vehicles to 120 vehicles per hour, representing an improvement of 33%. According to a survey by the Hong Kong/Guangdong Cooperation Coordination Unit in the first half of this year, 97% of northbound vehicles and 84% of southbound vehicles managed to cross the boundary within one hour. This compared well with the respective 79% and 67% recorded last year.

In order to tackle the bottleneck at the control points, an additional bridge linking Lok Ma Chau and Huanggang is also under construction. When completed at the end of 2004, it will help segregate freight traffic from passenger traffic and double the handling capacity of this crossing. In addition, we will also strive to complete the Shenzhen - Hong Kong Western Corridor (SWC) by the end of 2005 so as to provide a fourth land crossing between Hong Kong and Shenzhen. With a capacity of more than 80 000 vehicle passages per day and the co-location of immigration and customs facilities, it is anticipated that cross-boundary freight movement will see marked improvements. In addition, the planned Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge will link Hong Kong with the cities on the west bank of Pearl River, thus enlarging the hinterland served by Hong Kong. These two important infrastructure projects will speed up the flow of cargoes and lower operating costs.

Thirdly, to improve the communication between freight and port organizations. We will continue to arrange meetings between liner conferences and shippers in order to further the achievements made concerning the transparency of THC. The Hong Kong Logistics Development Council is collecting and analysing the latest breakdown of the total transport cost. We will also actively examine measures with the Environment, Transport and Works Bureau to reduce the cost of transporting containers on land.

On the development of the logistics industry, given Hong Kong's geographical location, infrastructure, ease of transportation and communication, as well as the high-growth economic development in the neighbouring PRD, we have a considerable edge in developing inter-modal transportation links. In order to make Hong Kong the preferred international transportation and logistics hub in Asia, we have to focus on projects which will significantly enhance Hong Kong's connectivity with the hinterland and our overall competitiveness in providing integrated logistics services. Apart from improving cross-boundary clearance and infrastructure, we are actively pursuing two major items. The first is the development of the Digital Trade and Transportation Network System to provide a neutral e-platform for the exchange of information and data among participants in the supply chain, thereby enhancing the speed and reliability of information flow. The second is to identify a suitable location for private enterprises to develop a value-added logistics park and provide a designated facility for handling high value, time critical merchandises, thus enhancing Hong Kong's ability to provide "through-train" logistics services. In addition, the joint study with the State Development and Planning Commission to explore the scope for co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland in logistics development will be completed soon. Within this context, we will also explore the feasibility of two specific concepts, namely "logistics pipelines" and "inland freight villages".

The E-logistics Project Group and the S-logistics Project Group under the Hong Kong Logistics Development Council will also examine how to promote and assist the logistics and transport industries in introducing new technologies such as the Global Positioning System, electronic locks and receiving and sending logistics information by mobile phones, so as to enhance the efficiency and competitiveness of the industries.

Since the whole container freight industry is run by commercial enterprises, the Government will maintain close contact with the industry

through the Hong Kong Port Development Board, the Hong Kong Maritime Industry Council and the Hong Kong Logistics Development Council to jointly implement various initiatives on enhancing the competitiveness of our port.

Fourthly, relevant commercial arrangements. Regarding commercial arrangements, we will encourage container terminal operators to develop closer partnership with the liners so as to attract more shipping lines and foreign buyers to use the Hong Kong port in order to consolidate the existing superiority of the Hong Kong port and container freight industry.

Fifthly, on promoting our port, Hong Kong has an advanced and well-developed transportation and logistics network. We also have very close links with the source of cargoes, the PRD. In addition, the Hong Kong port offers reliable and quality services, which are internationally renowned. We will join hands shortly with the industry to actively promote the aggregate superiority of our port to local exporters and overseas buyers.

From the above measures, we hope Members will all agree that the Government has been endeavouring to enhance the competitiveness of our port. Faced with the challenge posed by nearby ports, we are now formulating corresponding strategies and plans for the long-term development of the port.

The policy on port development in Hong Kong is to ensure that the planning for port-related infrastructure development matches the actual need. Mr Albert CHAN has said that we only love the Mickey Mouse. I hope he will not forget that we are now building CT9 and its berths are also under construction. In addition, in order to tie in with the long-term development of the container freight industry in Hong Kong, we have not just sit on the sidelines, but rather, we have taken the initiative to commission a consultancy study on the Hong Kong Port — Master Plan 2020 to comprehensively review the operation and system of the port and examine the need to construct Container Terminal No. 10 (CT10), its siting and feasibility, as well as making recommendations on the long-term port development strategy and ways to enhance the competitiveness of the port. It is expected that the entire study will be completed early next year. We will of course comprehensively evaluate the need to construct CT10, its siting and ways to enhance our competitiveness, which has already been mentioned by Members a number of times.

Madam President, the Hong Kong port is an important asset in driving Hong Kong's economic development. The Government will continue to co-

operate with the industry and take effective measures to enhance the competitiveness of the container freight industry and consolidate the position of Hong Kong as a shipping and logistics centre.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Mr SIN Chung-kai to Mr Kenneth TING's motion, be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(No hands raised)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I think the question is agreed by a majority respectively of each of the two groups of Members, that is, those returned by functional constituencies and those returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections and by the Election Committee, who are present. I declare the amendment passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Kenneth TING, you may now reply and you have two minutes six seconds.

MR KENNETH TING (in Cantonese): To start with, Madam President, I would like to thank the eight colleagues for supporting the original motion on behalf of various parties and factions.

I am very glad to hear that the Government has made several proposals this time. I hope the motion, after passed, will bear fruits this time, unlike the case in the past. I hope the Government can really put into concrete implementation proposals related to transparency and other issues.

Madam President, it does not actually matter whether the original motion or the amendment is passed. What matters most is that the Government clearly

knows this Council is unanimous in its views on the question of improving the competitiveness of Hong Kong's container freight industry. We now call upon the Government to expeditiously take pragmatic and timely measures to rescue the leading position of container terminals in Hong Kong. Thank you.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Mr Kenneth TING, as amended by Mr SIN Chung-kai, be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(No hands raised)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I think the question is agreed by a majority respectively of each of the two groups of Members, that is, those returned by functional constituencies and those returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections and by the Election Committee, who are present. I declare the motion as amended passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Honourable Members, it is now precisely 8.12 pm. I think we should have enough time to finish the third motion on the Agenda before midnight. Therefore, I have decided that the meeting be continued.

Third motion: Appointing least number of District Council members.

APPOINTING LEAST NUMBER OF DISTRICT COUNCIL MEMBERS

DR YEUNG SUM (in Cantonese): Madam President, I move that the motion, as printed on the Agenda, be passed.

On 23 November, over 1 million people voted in the District Council (DC) Election, which is a historical high. DCs have all along been perceived as

institutions that have no significant influence on policy formulation, but as many as 22% of the voters were first-time voters. The fact that these people have come out to vote in this election shows that the people have, through their votes, issued a very clear message and that is, "return the political power to the people".

After the reunification, Chief Executive TUNG Chee-hwa restored the appointed system in DCs, causing a retrogression in democracy. The appointment of DC members by the Chief Executive is tantamount to changing the choices made by over 1 million voters who have voted in the DC elections. In the past week or so, supporters of the appointment system stated that the voices of these 1.06 million people should not be distorted. They argued that these 1.06 million people had only come out to vote and that not all the 1.06 million people opposed the appointment of DC members. From a technical viewpoint, certainly not everyone who voted on that day opposes the appointment system. But if the Government and supporters of the appointment system persistently turns a deaf ear to these people's aspiration for a return of the political power to the people and the signals of dissatisfaction sent by the people to the Government, the losers will not be the Democratic Party, but the Government which is already caught in a crisis of governance and also the 6 million-odd people who are dissatisfied with the Government's administration. Furthermore, according to a survey of the Democratic Party, regardless of whether or not the respondents have voted in this election and excluding those who had no opinion, 60% of the respondents considered that TUNG Chee-hwa should give up appointing DC members and abolish the appointed and ex officio seats of DCs. However, under section 9 of the District Councils Ordinance, Chapter 547 of the Laws of Hong Kong, DCs shall consist of elected members, appointed members and also ex officio members being Chairmen of Rural Committees. Therefore, Members of the Democratic Party urge the Chief Executive to appoint the least number of DC members in accordance with the law, that is, appointing one or two DC members to each DC, and in the long term, the Government should abolish the appointed and ex officio seats to return the political power to the people.

In fact, the appointment system is an obsolete system. Today, when everybody is heading for democratization, Hong Kong is nevertheless moving backward. The Government's argument in defence of the appointment system is that some people of insight or professionals who wish to serve the community may not wish to stand for election and so, the appointment system can give them

the opportunity to participate in community service. Joining the DCs is only one of the many ways to serve the community. Democracy is an irresistible trend of development. If professionals wish to join a representative assembly to serve the community, they should stand for election. For those who do not wish to stand for election but wish to serve the community, the Government can in fact appoint them to other advisory bodies. These bodies are not returned by direct elections, and if the Government appoints these people who do not wish to stand for election but wish to serve the community to the advisory bodies, they can be given the opportunity to serve the community without distorting the choices of the people. There are actually hundreds of these bodies, such as the Housing Authority, Board of Education, Advisory Council on the Environment and Fight Crime Committee.

In fact, the purpose of the Government in restoring the appointment system is to enable more members of the pro-government camp to join the DCs. In the last-term DC Election, Chief Executive TUNG Chee-hwa appointed 100 DC members, of whom 13 were members of the Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong (DAB), 11 were members of the Hong Kong Progressive Alliance (HKPA) and nine were members of the Liberal Party. The results of this DC Election have reflected the people's aspiration for a return of the political power to the people and for kicking out the royalists. On the one hand, the people have sought to kick out the royalists by casting their votes, but on the other, the Chief Executive is appointing members of the pro-government camp to the DCs. As each DC member has to obtain some 2 000 votes on average in order to be elected, so if the Chief Executive has the power to appoint a maximum of 102 DC members, it means that one single person can have over 1 million votes and the one vote cast by him is equivalent to 1 million votes. The appointment of DC members by the Chief Executive is tantamount to overruling the people's judgement and a disrespect to the choices of the people.

The Government has said that people of insight and professionals should be facilitated in serving the community. Could it be that only talents from the DAB, the Liberal Party and the HKPA are people of insight and professionals? In fact, the appointment system of DCs is a pie-sharing system. Each political party which accepts appointment by the Government is given a subsidy to the tune of \$20 million in four years. Although Mr James TIEN, Chairman of the Liberal Party, has said categorically that the Liberal Party has plenty of resources and therefore does not need to obtain benefits by this means, the taxpayers are indeed made to subsidize these political parties even though they have not given a mandate to these appointed members.

Madam President, I learn from newspaper that the Liberal Party and the DAB stated that they had submitted respective lists of recommended candidates to the Government for appointment. A few days ago, they already stated that they would oppose my motion. I hope they would declare their interest in their speeches and tell us clearly whether they had submitted such lists to the Government. Is it because members of their parties have accepted appointment before or will soon accept appointment that they oppose this motion? Obviously, they have a conflict of interest on this issue and they are obligated to declare interest.

Results of the DC elections show that the people's aspiration for a return of the political power to the people is very clear. In fact, after the 1 July march, Chief Executive TUNG Chee-hwa undertook to open up channels for discussions on politics. It has been five months since the 1 July march, but the Government has yet made any undertaking on democratic reforms. It has only stated that a timetable for the constitutional review will be announced by the end of the year, and it is just a timetable. Now, the people have again expressed loud and clear through the DC elections their dissatisfaction towards the Government and their aspiration for a return of the political power to the people. If the Chief Executive still sticks to his old rut and appoint DC members at a number higher than that required by law, public discontent will only be intensified. For this reason, here I call on the Chief Executive: (1) to appoint the least number of DC members in accordance with the law, that is, appointing one or two members to each DC; (2) not to appoint people with political affiliation to the DCs, for this group of people with political affiliation can stand for election, or else it would be tantamount to changing the decision of voters who have cast their votes; and (3) to amend the law in the long term to abolish the appointed and ex officio members of DCs in order to develop in the direction of returning the political power to the people.

With these remarks, Madam President, I beg to move. Thank you.

Dr YEUNG Sum moved the following motion: (Translation)

"That, as more than one million voters cast their votes in the District Council elections on 23 November, the appointment of District Council members by the Chief Executive will be tantamount to changing the results of voting by the public, this Council urges the Chief Executive to appoint the least number of District Council members in accordance with the law and respect the choices made by more than one million voters who cast their votes in the District Council elections."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the motion, moved by Dr YEUNG Sum, be passed.

MR NG LEUNG-SING (in Cantonese): Madam President, according to the Basic Law, the DCs are just consultative bodies to advise the Government on district administration, but they are not organizations of political power. If they are organizations of political power, they may be viewed differently, and be even seen as kind of political interests. However, as consultative bodies, the broader the backgrounds of their members, the more comprehensive and in-depth their advice to the Government will be, and the more beneficial they will be to district affairs and the well-being of the people. This is a simple rationale that is readily understandable to all. In fact, for a very long time, appointed members have existed in many other advisory bodies. Some of these bodies consist entirely of appointed members. This has been basically a normal system and practice that has existed in Hong Kong for a long time, and proven before and after the reunification. Some people are of the opinion that, in appointing DC members, the Chief Executive should take into consideration the professional knowledge and experience of the appointees. Some other people have also put forward the view that, apart from the residents, there may be a large number of employers and employees who are not living in the districts, and the Chief Executive should also take this factor into consideration in appointing DC members. Recently, some professionals have even proposed that the Chief Executive may consider adopting an approach similar to the proportional representation system in appointing DC members, that is, making appointments with reference to the proportion of votes obtained by various political organizations and independent candidates in the recent DC elections. From the perspective of promoting the work of the DC, I think all the above views are constructive and pragmatic opinions that merit consideration by the Chief Executive when he exercises his statutory authority conferred by the existing legislation, that is, the District Councils Ordinance.

As for this motion, it mentions that as more than 1 million voters cast their votes in the DC elections on 23 November, the appointment of DC members by the Chief Executive will be tantamount to changing the results of voting by the public, so the Chief Executive should appoint the least number of DC members. First of all, if the number of people who had voted did not exceed — did not

exceed — 1 million, then even if the Chief Executive does appoint DC members, he will not change the results of voting by the public. Is this the rationale of the motion? Secondly, whoever are appointed, the appointment is tantamount to changing the results of voting. I fail to see the difference between appointing the least number and the largest number of DC members. The logic carried by this motion is incomprehensible. In fact, before this election — I said before — the District Councils Ordinance had already stipulated that the DCs should consist of three types of members, namely, elected members, appointed members and ex officio members. Elected members are just one kind of the members, not all the members. The appointment of members to the DCs by the Chief Executive is a completion of the ultimate formation of the DCs for the new term as stipulated by law, instead of changing the results. Maybe this ultimate result is not the result desired by certain people, but, by any measure, the appointment of members to the DCs cannot be distorted as changing any result.

Besides, the voting rate of the latest DC elections was 44%, which meant that 1.06 million people, including you and me, had exercised their civil right to vote. We had set a new record for the DC elections. In any election, there must be winners and losers. In a single-seat-single-vote system, the difference between a victory and a failure in the battle for a DC seat could just be a matter of several votes. In this election, the margin was even as small as one vote. However, the choice of each voter should be respected. No matter which candidate he has selected, no winning candidate or political organizations could claim to represent the views of all these 1 million people. In this election, the voters have made different choices. It has never been declared that the purpose of polling was to determine whether the appointment system should continue to exist, nor had there been any direct relationship with the appointment system. If someone ignores this fact and tries to distort the view of the public as making a decision on the appointment system of the DC, will it give others the impression that these people have been carried away by their victory? I cannot see any respect for the voters in their action.

It is inevitable for one to feel a bit excited after winning an election. This is understandable. However, if you try to stir up a political issue by manipulating this excitement, it is very easy for you to get carried away and speak nonsense. Members may recall that, not long ago, some people had voted in the elections of DC chairmen, in which some appointed members were

elected the chairmen. But today, these same people have suddenly turned completely hostile to the appointment system. The statutory method of formation, status and functions of the DCs will not be affected suddenly by the number of voters having cast their votes on 23 November in the DC elections. The opinion of the people should be fully respected, instead of being hijacked by anyone who claim to represent the views of all the people. Instead of stirring up a fuss and claiming falsely to represent public opinions, they had better be more sincere in showing their concern about district affairs and providing the Government with advice. In this way, they will not fail to live up to the expectations of the voters, and this is genuine respect for public opinion.

With these remarks, Madam President, I oppose the motion.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Madam President, it will only make the DCs a laughing stock and bring Hong Kong to disgrace if TUNG Chee-hwa, who does not have a popular mandate himself, appoints a group of people also with no popular mandate to become DC members. DC members should be representatives of public opinions. Representatives who do not carry any representation could only be described as political parasites.

Talking about political parasites, we must turn to history. If we take a look at the history of political development during the past 50 years, we can see that many revolutions were initiated by angry peoples who were discontented with the manipulation of the parliaments, the political situations and governing frameworks by political parasites. Thomas MORE in the 16th century, Jean Jacques ROUSSEAU in the 17th century, Karl MARX in the 19th century and Vladimir LENIN in the 20th century all mentioned that political privileges would breed political parasites, including noblemen, landlords and capitalists. The TUNG Chee-hwa system in the 21st century has also created another group of political parasites.

Before the French Revolution, a group of nobles, by virtue of their blood and heritage, enjoyed many privileges without making any effort. For example, they could own the fiefs, sizeable incomes and power. Eventually, the public anger led to the French Revolution. Similarly, in the early stage of development of the Soviet Union, the complete control of the political framework by a group of bureaucrats made many poor families suffer badly, and

then it led to the problems of unemployment and public anger, and eventually to the outbreak of the Russian Revolution.

Hong Kong is under a similar situation now in which a group of political parasites have been taken care of by TUNG Chee-hwa without any regard to public opinions, public sentiments and public anger. Therefore, 500 000 people took to the streets on 1 July. However, Hong Kong people are very good in self-discipline. Hong Kong people know very well that, under the shadow of the Communist Party, no one dares to start any revolution, nor does anyone have the slightest intention of overthrowing the Communist rule. We only have the intention of calling TUNG Chee-hwa to step down.

The continued existence of political parasites will only suffocate this framework. LENIN once said, "Officials and the regular troops are parasites on the body of the capitalist society. They are the parasites, bred by the internal contradictions in society, that corrupt the whole society, and they are the parasites that block lives." Using this as a parallel example, I interpret TUNG's DC appointment system as "The system of appointed members in DCs is a parasite on the body of Hong Kong society. It is the parasite that corrupts the whole society, and it is the parasite that block the political life of Hong Kong." This blocking hampers the reasonable development of the political life of Hong Kong, and it prevents the expression of public opinions. This is essentially because of the existence of such parasites. These parasites eat into the host, pushing the political framework of Hong Kong to its deterioration and eventual extinction. They deteriorate and eventually die, but it is the community of Hong Kong that will suffer the greatest damage. Therefore, if we want the political system of Hong Kong to develop really healthily, we must eradicate these parasites, instead of allowing them to continue to grow on this political system, as suggested by some Members.

In 1999, as a move of dividing the "political loots", TUNG Chee-hwa appointed some people to the DCs. I had been working in Tsuen Wan for a certain period of time. However, I had never met or heard of the DC member appointed by TUNG. Nor had I known what he had done during my service in Tsuen Wan for more than a decade. He was appointed simply because of his membership in the DAB. Even some very experienced community workers in Tsuen Wan did not know who he was, but he was eventually appointed. After appointment, he made use of the money provided by the Government to start a ward Office, and used this office to undertake his work in the district in a bid to

lay the ground work for this election. However, he did not succeed in the end. Of course, on the other hand, there are many success examples, in which the indirect subsidies and sponsorship from TUNG Chee-hwa had enabled DAB members and other appointed members to receive more than \$30,000 monthly to counter other people who did not have any financial assistance in their district work. I have been serving on the DC with some appointed members for three years, but never have they spoken a single word in DC meetings. If we allow such political parasites to continue existing, they will continue to disgrace DCs, continue to bring Hong Kong into disrepute.

MR HOWARD YOUNG (in Cantonese): Madam President, on the issue of whether appointed seats in the DCs should be abolished, there are always two opposite camps in society, namely the supportive and the opposing. So there is no consensus on the issue. Maybe the only consensus is: In the long term, DCs should follow the example of the Legislative Council, and the long-term goal is that the appointment system should be abolished. However, what we are discussing now is the new term of the DCs which will start from the beginning of next month. I notice that in the motion moved by Dr YEUNG Sum today, he is proposing "to appoint the least number of DC members" — he is not requesting an abolition of the appointment system altogether. His motion on "Appointing least number of District Council members" is not proposing a complete abolition of all the appointed seats in DCs. From this, we can see that the appointment system is really not as evil as alleged by some people. Instead, there must be some merits in the system.

In fact, all along, appointed members have been playing the role as providers of professional advice in DCs, even at the expense of their private time so as to fulfil the spirit of serving the community. Many appointed members have done well in district services, and some even expend their own money and efforts to support the launch of district services. They enjoy a most harmonious co-operation with elected members.

I am also an elected member, and I have defeated my competitor in the latest DC Election, and successfully won a seat for the coming term. However, even as an elected member, I still think that both elected and appointed members could take pride in their service and contribution to the DCs. There should be no distinction between both types of members in terms of their significance. This is my personal experience. They are equally important, and more

importantly, they must have a sincere heart to serve the community, and are willing to make contribution by bringing their expertise into play.

After working for a certain period of time, the zeal in politics of such appointed members could have increased to such an extent that they may become interested in participating in politics through running in elections. Should that happen, in fact, they may start serving the public through taking part in elections. In other words, the appointment system of DCs, apart from rendering the contribution of the professionals in the DCs, could actually serve some more positive functions, and it is an effective way of training political talents. Madam President, a Liberal Party member, who used to be an appointed DC member, has successfully gained his seat in the DC through running in this election, and he shall continue serving the people of the district after taking over the seat originally occupied by our Chairman, Mr James TIEN.

If the appointment system is to be preserved, then on the number of members to be appointed, I believe the Chief Executive would definitely act in the best interest of society in appointing the suitable candidates and the appropriate number of members to the DCs, so that those who are keen on providing district services but not interested, or not interested at the moment in politics could have more opportunities to take part in district affairs.

However, on the issue of what number should be the least number of DC members, I believe different persons would have different interpretations. Of course, some people may think that it would be ideal if only one or two DC members are appointed for all the 18 DCs, instead of 102. However, some people may think that there should at least be 100 such members. How should we draw the line? I believe this is just a matter of opinion. As it is very difficult to have a clear-cut definition on this matter, the Liberal Party will not support this motion moved by Dr YEUNG Sum today. However, the Chief Executive does have the authority to appoint DC members at a number not exceeding the ceiling stipulated by law, and this ceiling is understood to be 102.

Moreover, I also wish to point out that, among the present chairmen of the 18 DCs of Hong Kong — I mean the present term DCs — five chairmen are appointed DC members. As far as I understand it, these appointed members have evidently won the trust of other colleagues, including the elected members, from various parties in their respective districts. If not, they would not have

been elected the chairmen. I think this in fact has proved that appointed members also enjoy some prestige and a certain degree of support.

Presently, there are 102 appointed members. I have also compiled some statistics. Many newspapers have featured reports on the political affiliation of these members. I find that, it seems only about 30 persons, that is less than one third, come from the Liberal Party, DAB, Hong Kong Progressive Alliance and the New Century Forum which are all political parties not to the liking of the Democratic Party or Dr YEUNG Sum. They only occupy a minority of the total number of appointed seats, whereas most of the remaining 70-plus appointed members are independent persons who have no political affiliation. If they are compared against the total number of elected and appointed members of DCs, which amounts to about 400, the proportion would even be smaller. If someone accuses the Government of "dividing political loots" through its appointment of members, or trying to manipulate the election results with the appointment system, it will be oversimplifying the situation. It will also foster the impression that these are deliberate attempts of smearing the Government. In other words, people will suspect whether they are trying to smear the Government deliberately, because such an allegation is not founded on facts, and is unfair to those who aspire to district service and wish to make contribution by offering their own expertise. It will only deal a blow to the enthusiasm of aspiring people who want to serve the districts.

Therefore, Madam President, with these remarks, I do not support the motion.

DR LO WING-LOK (in Cantonese): Madam President, I have taken part in the recent DC elections in two ways. On the one hand, I was a voter, and on the other hand, I was also a member of electioneering teams.

Although not all the candidates I supported had won the elections (some won, while some lost), their dedication and all-out efforts in the electioneering campaigns really deserved our commendation. After gaining the experience from my electioneering work in this election, I shall encourage more people who are interested in participating in public affairs to run in future DC elections. High-calibre people with the heart to serve the districts should stand certain chances of success in DC elections, regardless of the political ideologies they hold.

One of the tricks of winning in the DC elections is to grasp fully the concerns of the voters, and employ the polarization tactics on such issues. A candidate should of course side with the preference of the majority of voters. Meanwhile, he should push his rival to the opposition side of the majority of voters. This electioneering strategy has demonstrated to be extremely effective in the recent DC elections.

The first type of polarization mentioned by me refers to the opposition between candidates who do not favour the administration of the Government on the one side, and the so-called "pro-government" candidates on the other. The second type of polarization refers to the opposition between candidates who aim at removing members of certain political parties from office on the one side, and candidates of such political parties on the other. The successful polarization has turned the recent DC elections into an expression of the people's discontent towards the administration of the Government.

Polarization does not work in every election. In the long run, if political parties and candidates wish to gain the support of voters, the most important factor is still their performance. In the past, the yardstick for measuring the performance of DC members is mainly their achievement in district work. However, time has changed. Apart from doing well in their district work, such as receiving complaints, conveying opinions on environmental, hygiene, medical and transport issues to the relevant authorities, DC members will have to do well in another very important aspect as well. The importance of this aspect may even exceed that of district work, that is, the work on promoting their political ideas and ideologies.

Why should DC members be bothered with the work on political ideas and ideologies? If a DC member belongs to a certain political party, he actually does not aim at becoming the permanent opposition party. Instead, he aspires to become the ruling party. It is very easy for a party to become a permanent opposition party. All it has to do is to fight for all kinds of benefits and rights for the people and criticize the Government on whatever it does, be it significant or otherwise. However, it is very different to be a ruling party. Apart from making criticisms, it has to face the significant issue of realizing political ideals and fulfilling political pledges once it comes into power. Political parties aspiring to become the ruling party must have political ideas that are readily acceptable to the people, and measures of governance proposed by them must be feasible and pragmatic. Otherwise, they will be abandoned by the voters eventually.

Therefore, I think all political parties as well as those aspiring to run in elections should be encouraged to work pragmatically in promoting their political ideas and ideologies.

If a political party wishes to win the support of the people, they should work hard on their own without relying on the Government on all issues. One of the ways of relying on the Government is to accept appointed seats. Appointed seats are actually a kind of political welfare allowance, which will undermine the political will of the candidates. The Government thinks that, appointing people from pro-government parties is helping such parties. But, in fact, "Loving them too dearly is killing them." It is comparable to the situation in which a father urges all day long the son to look for a job. Yet, at the same time, he tells his son that if he cannot find a job, he will give him a very good post. In this case, will the son try his best to look for a job? Even if he manages to find a job, will he do it with all his heart? If a pro-government party accepts appointments, will it really help the Government in return? How many such appointed members could eventually become very distinguished political celebrities and, at the same time, be loved dearly by people in the districts?

In order to facilitate the pluralistic development of the political ecology in Hong Kong, different interests and viewpoints should be given opportunities of expression, thereby enabling political parties with divergent interests to develop in a healthy way. This is the only correct direction. Therefore, I think the Government should refrain from appointing people with any political affiliation as DC members. What is more, the Government should gradually reduce the number of appointed DC members, with the ultimate goal being to abolish all such appointed seats.

During the transitional period, the Government may consider appointing some independent professionals to serve on the DCs. However, each appointment should be made on sound justifications. For example, the appointees should be able to make material and substantial contribution to the medical, environmental, transport and educational affairs in the districts. It will be unwise of the Government if it attempts to balance or even dilute the political inclination of DCs by way of such appointment.

With these remarks, Madam President, I support the motion.

MR LAU WONG-FAT (in Cantonese): Madam President, the advantages and disadvantages of appointed seats in the DCs, as well as the issue of whether such seats should be maintained had been debated on many different occasions in the former Legislative Council before 1997 and the Legislative Council after the reunification. Both the pro and con arguments have been put forward: All the arguments that can be advanced have been advanced. We are debating on this old theme again simply because the pro-democracy camp wishes to exploit their unprecedented victory in the recent DC elections that were held earlier on. They wish to get the most from this victory, which is only understandable. However, irrespective of the reasons behind the move, the most crucial consideration is still which kind of method for returning DC members or which kind of composition of such members would best serve the interest of the residents of the various districts.

The DC is a district organization mainly advises the Government and urges it to make improvement on issues related to the livelihood of the people, such as transportation, environmental, entertainment and cultural issues, and so on. While issues under its terms of reference seem trivial, they are all pressing and immediate to the people. Precisely for this reason, the work performance of DCs and its effectiveness in benefiting the people depends, to a large extent, on whether or not a balanced and comprehensive organization is in place, whether or not different voices can be accommodated in dealing with the various problems in the districts.

As there are no functional constituencies in the DCs, it is really necessary to have appointed members to complement elected members, and this is a pragmatic approach. The appointment system serves to provide opportunities to people who are familiar with district affairs yet not belonging to any political parties or organizations, nor are they good at electioneering, to serve the districts. They will achieve the effect of complementing the work of other members. In fact, this arrangement has worked well throughout the years with very obvious results. Therefore, I feel that this system should be preserved.

Madam President, the number of appointed seats in DCs roughly accounts for one fifth of the total number of seats in the DCs. So they will by no means form the mainstream. The proposal of appointing the least number of DC members is tantamount to cancelling the appointment arrangement, thereby wiping out this mechanism which has a proven track record of success. The DC is a place for serving the practical needs of the people. If gentlemen from

all walks of life could be more tolerant, while political disputes could be reduced as far as possible, then members could concentrate their efforts on district affairs. It will be far more beneficial and constructive.

Madam President, I so submit.

MR SIN CHUNG-KAI (in Cantonese): Madam President, the appointment system of the district boards (DBs) was already abolished in 1994. At that time, the pro-democracy camp held the majority seats in four of the 18 DBs, namely, the Central and Western District, Kwai Tsing, Kwun Tong and Shum Shui Po DBs. As a result, democrats were elected Chairmen of these DBs. After the reunification in 1997, the Government established Provisional DBs, and appointed members were introduced to the various Provisional BDs. After this change, only one out of the four democrat DB Chairmen managed to retain the chairmanship. Being that only remaining pro-democracy DB Chairman, I continued to act as Chairman of the Kwai Tsing DB. Obviously, the appointment system twisted the will of voters. It was not only a system of political free lunches, but also a system of political deals.

Under the British administration in Hong Kong, the appointment system was a means employed by the British to nurture elites and absorb political activists into the executive. After the reunification, the policy of "Hong Kong people ruling Hong Kong" was adopted, and Hong Kong people became masters themselves. Naturally, the people should be allowed to vote in the selection of their own representatives in order to express their opinions. However, TUNG Chee-hwa "tried to paint a tiger, but it turned out to be a cat" — he made a poor copycat. He bribed the royalist politicians by offering political free lunches to royalist political parties through the appointment system. After the political awakening has dawned on the people, such a system should come to an end.

Through the appointment system, the DAB, the Hong Kong Progressive Alliance (HKPA) and the Liberal Party have received a lot of political free lunches, or political welfare allowances, as described by Dr LO Wing-lok, or even "political Comprehensive Social Security Assistance", as described by some people. TUNG Chee-hwa treated these people to big lunches, but the bill is paid by Hong Kong people. Since 1997, Hong Kong people have paid nearly

\$100 million in benefits to the DAB, the HKPA, the Liberal Party and some "undercover" royalist politicians.

Let us take a look at the example of DAB. Before the recent DC elections, a total of 13 DAB members were appointed DC members, each of them receiving an accountable allowance of \$17,000 and a remuneration of \$17,000 monthly. Each member could also receive \$10,000 as information technology expenditure. They needed not run in any election, so it saved them the election cost of \$45,000. In four years, the people of Hong Kong have subsidized the DAB with a total of over \$6 million (\$6,019,000). So, the DAB is the largest political party in Hong Kong on political dole. This sum has not included the remuneration received by the appointed Provisional DB members of the DAB from 1997 to 1999.

The HKPA is not less off. Eleven of its members are appointed DC members, receiving political subsidies of over \$5 million (\$5,093,000).

For the Liberal Party, they have now seven appointed members, receiving the least amount of subsidies, which still amounts to about \$3 million.

As far as I know, some people had once intended to run in the elections. But they gave the idea after learning at the last minute that their names had been included on TUNG Chee-hwa's list. Obviously they were waiting for appointment, because they were unwilling to curry votes from voters days and nights and tried to avoid the risk of being dumped by voters in the elections. DAB members, including IP Kwok-chung, AUYEUNG Po-chun, and also Joseph CHAN and Peggy LAM, were obviously such persons. I had even been told by a Liberal Party member in person that he was waiting for appointment by the Government.

On the other hand, the Government also appointed members of certain political parties as DC members, so that they might take advantage of their capacity as DC members and their remuneration to compete with pro-democracy members in the respective districts. This was aimed at "kicking away" pro-democracy members and taking full control of DCs. Perhaps this was only one of the reasons why the DAB was so devoted to supporting the Article 23 legislation, which led to their landslide failure in the recent elections. I wish to advise Honourable colleagues from the DAB by quoting a slogan in an ICAC TV

commercial: "Don't be blinded by bribes." Do not be bribed by TUNG Chee-hwa, because it is most important for us to have fair elections.

Recently there was a rumour to the effect that the Home Affairs Department had intervened in the election of DC Chairmen. This was no secret at all. In fact, there were similar incidents as early as in 1999, when Kwai Tsing District Officer Allan CHOW persuaded DC members to make appointed member Edinson SO the Deputy Chairman of the DC.

Furthermore, as most appointed DC members are appointed by the Government, they used to support measures and plans proposed by the Government. Therefore, they serve as staunch supporters of policies implemented in the districts by the Government.

Although the District Councils Ordinance stipulates that DCs must comprise elected and appointed members, TUNG Chee-hwa should appoint only one member to each district so as to satisfy the statutory requirement and avoid being accused of offering political free lunches by giving away appointed seats as rewards to his supporters in the Election Committee or of intervening the operation of DCs.

TUNG Chee-hwa has claimed all along that the appointment of DC members is meant for "provide a channel for individuals who are enthusiastic and interested in district affairs and are capable and experienced but have no intention of participating in direct elections. Appointed membership would help reflect the different interests in the district and enhance the quality of DCs in deliberating district business." (Quoted from Mr TUNG Chee-hwa's response in a Question and Answer Session.) If the Government was telling the truth, I hope it will not appoint anybody with political affiliation anymore, or any former candidates who had run in any elections since 1982. However, regrettably I learn that both Wellington CHENG Wing-kee of the HKPA and CHAN Yung of the DAB have run and have been defeated in past elections. DAB's CHAN Yung, who was defeated by Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, will turn to the Tai Po District now. It is said that he will be appointment, a Tai Po DC member. I hope these are only rumours. Well, if the DAB, the Liberal Party and the HKPA could declare that they would not accept any appointment, then all that I have said is wrong, and in that case, I shall make an open apology to all of them.

Madam President, what I want to say is that the DC appointment system is, in fact, a system of political deals, a system of free political lunches, and a system that deceives voters. Today, the political awakening has already dawned on Hong Kong people. The appointment system is "a system wanted by TUNG Chee-hwa, but not the people".

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): Madam President, the appointment system under discussion again today is, as Mr LAU Wong-fat said, a motion about which the pro and con arguments have been heard many times before. So why do we have to discuss it again today? As I told the President before, our motions this year are old tunes, many of them have been repeatedly discussed in the past. Why? This is not because we are running out of topics or simply because the pro-democracy camp has won a major victory in the election, but because the problems have not been solved at all. Therefore, we have to keep on discussing the same problems with perseverance when the right opportunities arise. In particular, when the DCs will be formed next month, we find that the Government is in the process of selecting candidates for appointment as DC members. We think it is high time we told the Government that there is huge opposition in society to the appointment of DC members, because it will stifle the rights of the people to express their opinions.

In fact, we find that the voters hoped that, by casting their votes in this or the previous election, they could elect their own candidates to the DCs to reflect their opinions. However, if the appointment system continues, the expression of public opinions will be obstructed, as in many cases the inclusion of appointed members would undermine the strength of elected members and dilute the opinions expressed. In such cases, public opinions are usually twisted. Therefore, we strongly oppose the system of appointed members.

However, the Government and some supporters of the appointment system keep telling us the following arguments. First, the appointment of some professionals to DCs aims at obtaining more balanced and professional opinions so that problems at the district level could be tackled more effectively. Those who hold this argument do not understand the nature of DCs. Of the six functions of DCs, only two functions carry the authority to approve the allocation and spending of funds. The other four are advisory. If the professionals want to serve the community and express their opinions, they may

do so through any channel and not necessarily through DCs nor on appointment to DCs. Now I find that members of many professional sectors may express their opinions through their own trade unions or at professional conferences. Why should the professionals be given the privilege of appointment to DCs to express their opinions? If they are keen to serve the community, why do they not try to enhance their credibility by running in the elections and express their opinions through this channel? Why do such professionals like to enjoy convenience so much, simply sitting back and waiting for appointment so as to express their opinions? Why? I really do not understand. If the Government stresses professionalism, it should simply open a professional school to nurture professionals. Then we do not need to have representative assembly members or elections. It can fill up the places with professionals. What do I mean by all this? What kind of representatives councils do we want? We want councils that can reflect different opinions. Why should the professionals be so respected and so superior? I really despise such professionals if they have to serve on the DCs to express their opinions through their personal connections. If they have guts, they should join DCs through elections.

The second argument is about the need to balance different opinions. If we want to balance different opinions, we should do so through elections so that different opinions can be balanced by the popular mandates of elected members. What sort of opinions have the appointed members expressed? How can the opinions be balanced? I do not know how this can be done, unless the Government interprets the meaning of balance as a means to facilitate government representatives reflecting its opinions. This is because there were government officials among DC members in the past, which led to the creation of the appointment system. And as there are no government representatives now, there must be some appointed members. The Government should simply tell us, that as there is nobody speaking for it, it has to appoint some people to speak for it. I prefer the Government say it this way. Do not put forward the excuse that this could balance different opinions or absorb professional opinions, which is sheer nonsense — an act that shows the speaker has no "guts".

Finally, regarding the appointment system, both Mr LAU Wong-fat and Mr Howard YOUNG have mentioned that many appointed members were elected as DC chairmen, reflecting that appointed members were widely accepted, otherwise they would not have been elected as chairmen. But the fact is that they were elected simply because they were appointed. If the appointment

system did not exist, they would not have been able to take up those positions. This is probably because they had controlled the majority of votes, reflecting that the appointment system helps safeguard the special advantage of such members. In this way, the whole operation of DCs is monopolized, the equality advocated by the public will never be attained, and matters will not be handled fairly.

Members seem to be unhappy about the motion proposed by Dr YEUNG Sum today, as the motion proposes that the least number of DC members be appointed. In fact, there is nothing we can do with it because the law still exists. What can we do? A complete abolition is our ultimate goal, but as the law still has not been repealed, we have no alternative. However, if Mr TUNG submits a bill tomorrow on abolishing the appointment system, we shall be very happy to support it immediately. Therefore, though some people say that to a certain extent we seem to have compromised over the matter, there is in fact nothing we can do about it. Since we respect the rule of law, we have no alternative. However, we hope the Government will submit a new bill to abolish the system of appointing DC members so that our agenda of democratization will not be obstructed.

Madam President, I so submit.

MR FREDERICK FUNG (in Cantonese): Madam President, should there be appointed seats in the DCs? There should not be appointed seats in DCs, no matter from the ideology perspective or a pragmatic point of view.

The district boards (DB) were first established in 1981. In 1982, directly elected seats, which accounted for one third of the total number of seats, were introduced. Later, more directly elected seats were gradually introduced into this district organization, and subsequently ex officio seats and appointed seats were removed. By 1994, all DB members were returned by "one person, one vote" with all the votes carrying an equal value. Insofar as that term was concerned, there was no problem in the election as well as its overall operation, bearing sound testimony that it was feasible to have a "full-scale direct election", and basically there was no problem at all. However, the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR) suddenly retrogressed in the democratization of the territory in 1999 by re-introducing appointed seats into DCs. To this, both ADPL and I feel disappointed and angry.

In fact, DCs are by nature responsible for conveying to the authorities the views of the people of the districts on district issues, and at the same time, they are the SAR Government's major district consultation target on its policies. Directly elected members are the real representatives of public opinions, as they have the mandate of the people who authorize them by their votes. If the SAR Government really wishes to listen to public opinions in the districts, it is most important for it to listen to the opinions of the elected members. Now, officials of the SAR Government and some members of the public insist that appointed seats should be preserved in the DCs, so that some people who are reluctant to run in elections, particularly the professionals, the ethnic minorities or even women, could join the DCs, thereby making the DCs more pluralistic and more capable of reflecting the different voices in society.

This theory is invalid, because the Government may appoint the professionals and women to join hundreds of various advisory committees, so as to enable them to give full play to their abilities in such specialized committees. In fact, the DCs also make use of the system of "co-opted members" to invite professionals to take part in the work of DCs in some specialized discussions or the meetings of some ad hoc committees. For example, the Urban Renewal Group of the Shum Shui Po DC had invited town planners, surveyors and architects to join it, thus incorporating the voices of the professionals, other than those of DC members. When we see that a special issue has come up, we can specifically invite them to take part in the meetings, to make the discussions more useful. In this way, we can effectively enable the professionals to make good use of their expertise in district work. It is not necessary for the Government to employ some political means to achieve the purpose, especially for the Chief Executive to appoint them to a political council.

Secondly, the ADPL and I think that, both the appointment system of the DCs and the functional constituency elections of the Legislative Council share one common characteristic, namely, an elite mentality — that the elites involved are required to participate in politics with a "free lunch" approach. This is incompatible with the contemporary spirit of democracy. The foundation of democracy is the spirit of "All men are created equal". However, the appointment system of the DCs implies that a small group of people in society enjoy some superior treatment. Relying on their professional qualifications, social status, or even the wishes of individual senior officials, they can easily become DC members without making any special efforts. Meanwhile, the people have no way of exercising monitoring over appointed members. For this

reason, the appointment system represents a great retrogression in democracy in Hong Kong. In fact, many aspiring professionals have already run in direct elections. Actually it is not necessary for the Government to protect such so-called professionals who are reluctant to run in elections, and send them safely to the DCs, thus providing them with a channel through which to enjoy "free lunches".

From a pragmatic point of view, the appointment criteria adopted by the Government in appointing DC members are also subject to challenges. According to Article 97 of the Basic Law, the DCs are not organs of political power to be consulted by the government of the Region on district administration and other affairs. The Government claims that the intention of appointing DC members is to introduce professional, neutral and minority voices into the DCs, so as to provide a so-called objective view on district affairs. However, according to an analysis made by us on the background of the 102 appointed members in the last term of DCs, only 38%, or 39 members, are the so-called professionals as in the eyes of the general public, such as lawyers, accountants and school principals. Besides, a further analysis of these appointment arrangements by their political affiliation reveals that another 38% of the DC members come from pro-government parties. Therefore, such figures have vividly illustrated that the DC appointment system is just a nominal game for the professionals. In essence, it is a pie-sharing game to reward supporters of the TUNG Administration.

Madam President, the DC elections held some two weeks ago set an unprecedented record of voting rate. Among the additional 200 000 voters, I believe many of them did intend to use their votes to penalize pro-government parties, and they used their votes to cast a vote of no confidence on the policies and blunders of the SAR Government. Therefore, if the Government should still stubbornly insist on its wrong course of action by appointing all the 102 DC members by the end of the month, I believe more Hong Kong people will hold grievances against the Government, thereby making its administration even more difficult in the future. The ADPL and I strongly urge the Government to think twice, and hope that the Government can appoint the least number of DC members as stipulated by law, and introduce legislative amendment as soon as possible to abolish the ex officio and appointed seats in DCs.

Madam President, I so submit.

DR RAYMOND HO (in Cantonese): Madam President, people with different political ideologies or backgrounds will have different interpretations of the result of the DC elections held on 23 November. Some people may consider it as an "opposing vote" cast by voters on the Government, whereas some may conclude it as "a reflection of the public concern about council affairs and community development". However, irrespective of the interpretations, an undeniable fact is that a large number of voters did turn out to vote in this election. More than 1 million people have cast their votes, representing a polling rate as high as 44.06%. It is a substantial increase over the corresponding figure of 35.82% in 1999. The seats secured by various political parties in this election indicate, to a certain extent, the voting inclination of the people.

Regardless of whether the result of this election should be considered as a revelation on public opinion, we must use the present constitutional system as the foundation and act according to the relevant legislation. Under Article 97, Section 5 of Chapter IV of the Basic Law, which is on District Organizations, "District organizations which are not organs of political power may be established in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, to be consulted by the government of the Region on district administration and other affairs, or to be responsible for providing services in such fields as culture, recreation and environmental sanitation." Basically, DCs are district organizations, with their functions and responsibilities limited to their respective districts. So to a great extent, they should mainly play the role as consultative organs.

As the DC is a district organization which is not an organ of political power, the Government would appoint some people who are familiar with the affairs of the respective districts, especially the professionals, as members. This would enable the DC to do a better job in discharging its duties as a consultative organ. In the engineering constituency which I represent, though only two engineers were appointed as members in the last-term DC, they had been very active in participating in the work of the DC. Their performance was not in any way inferior to that of elected members. They would particularly play a significant role in certain public works projects to be launched in the districts, or in certain district environmental improvement projects, and they could provide some professional engineering opinions or suggestions. They might even invite some friends from the engineering sector to provide assistance.

Among these two friends from the engineering sector, one of them had chosen to run in a direct election to face the voters direct in this past election. Although they do possess practical working experience and a good track record in their service in the districts, they lost the election to candidates belonging to certain political parties which could mobilize a lot of supporters. The same situation happened in the last term. Given such a political reality, some professionals could only serve society by way of the appointment system if they are not too enthusiastic about politics, albeit they aspire to district service.

In fact, having a small number of appointed members in the DCs is in line with the present constitutional arrangements, and this does not conflict with the voting inclination of the voters in this past election. The votes cast by voters in the recent election is an indication of their choices of candidates who ran in the election, and the voting result should not be distorted as their declaration of stance on the existing appointment system of the DCs.

Madam President, I think the future arrangements in respect of the appointment system of the DCs should be decided only through rational exploration and extensive discussions among the people of the territory. With these remarks, I oppose the motion.

MR LAU PING-CHEUNG (in Cantonese): Madam President, the issue of appointed seats in the DCs is a sensitive political issue because some political parties have already declared that their members are not allowed to accept appointed seats. However, some other political parties consider such appointments as a way of serving society, and are glad to recommend suitable candidates for appointment. As such appointments will only be made after the DC elections, and if members of political parties are appointed, regardless of the actual number of such appointments, the balance of power between political parties in a DC will be affected. Therefore, various political parties have their explicit respective stands on appointed DC seats.

Madam President, in ancient China, when the people came together to discuss political affairs, they had two choices, namely, "the majority prevails" and "the virtuous prevails". In contemporary wording, "the majority prevails" means that the minority shall follow the opinions of the majority; whereas "the virtuous prevails" means that the people shall listen to the opinions of a wise scholar, expert or leader.

In the representative government of Hong Kong, like it or not, it is an objective fact that party politics play a significant role in councils. The merit of active party politics in councils is that views can be quickly formed and discussions conducted systematically. However, the demerit is that, once the party concerned has formed a party line on individual subject and policy, individual members cannot depart from the party line in their speeches delivered in councils. Certain viewpoints and perspectives held by individual members, even if they sincerely believe in such viewpoints, cannot be openly declared. This has undermined the strength of rational discussions.

All along, I have been encouraging the professionals to discuss political affairs and participate in politics, so as to bring voices of the professionals into councils, as well as to enable the decision-makers hear the voices of the professionals. I stress that the professionals are not any cleverer than others, not that they can identify viewpoints that the layman fails to see. Instead, the professional training received by the professionals enables them to stress on the objective facts and rational analysis, thereby eliminating subjective personal preferences as far as possible.

Unfortunately, the objective fact is, even if the professionals would like to take part in politics and are willing to undergo the harsh test of elections, they will still face all kinds of difficulties or be placed in disadvantageous positions. For example, in DC elections, the sizes of the constituencies vary. The candidates must launch large-scale propaganda called "sweeping the floors". The front-line promotion and the behind-the-scene production of publicity materials all require a lot of manpower and resources. All these requirements have deterred the professionals who used to work independently. For example, in the recent DC elections, as far as I know, in the architectural, surveying and planning sector, there was only one architect who ran in a direct election. Of course, I gave him encouragement, and I also went to his electioneering position on the polling day of 23 November to give him some support and to cheer him up. In the end, this architect won the election. However, examples like this architect are in the minority.

To enable the voices of the professionals to be heard in the councils, appointment is one of the possible ways. In society nowadays, it will certainly be undesirable if the executive appoints a large number of council members. However, the appointment of a suitable number of members could achieve a

balancing effect, especially in the Government's appointment of some professionals who have no political affiliation. For example, in the recent reclamation incident in Central and Wanchai, the media tended to polarize the differences between the Government and non-government organizations. However, the major difference in the Central reclamation project actually lies in the size of the reclamation rather than the need. The Government proposes reclaiming 18 hectares, whereas the non-government organizations think that 8 hectares would be sufficient. If there are enough town planners or other relevant professionals on the DC, they should be in a better position to explain the situation to members and to provide professional advices. In that case, I believe it would be much easier to narrow the differences, and then it might even be unnecessary to take the case to Court.

Madam President, in the above example of the reclamation incident, as the professionals do not have the burden of political affiliation, I believe they would be more ready to speak true words in the overall interest of Hong Kong. On the contrary, members who are affiliated to a political party might prefer chanting the slogan of opposing the reclamation, even though they support the 8-hectre reclamation, the construction of a seaside promenade and leisure facilities in their heart.

Therefore, I think that the professionals without any political affiliation can contribute to the DC their professional expertise. As for eliminating the political party factor in appointing members, I think one of the possible options that we may consider is nomination by the professional bodies. As professional bodies are usually neutral with little involvement in political affairs, and they seldom indicate their support openly for any political parties, the professionals nominated by their respective bodies should be able to maintain a neutral image. Furthermore, professional bodies usually have a better understanding of the strengths of their individual members, and it will be easier to identify suitable candidates through their recommendation.

Madam President, as an ancient Chinese saying goes, "A man who have the courage to put forward different viewpoints is better than a thousand persons repeating what others have been saying." Nowadays, the councils of Hong Kong are really in need of some members who have the commitment, the fearless mind against the voting pressure, the will to act on conscience and the courage to

speak his mind in the overall interest of Hong Kong. Such members should be able to balance the voices of those members with political affiliation. And I believe such professionals with no political affiliation should become the men who have the courage to put forward different viewpoints in the councils. As for the number of appointments to the DCs, I think this should be left to the Chief Executive to decide with his wisdom. Madam President, I so submit.

MISS MARGARET NG (in Cantonese): Madam President, to say that it is essential to have the participation of professionals and people from various sectors in councils may be a perfectly fine reason for encouraging more candidates to stand for election. However, if this is used as the pretext to create appointed seats, it will be utterly ridiculous. No councils, be they the Legislative Council or the District Councils (DCs), should rely on the professional input of members with professional background. Instead, such input should be provided by expert advisers of the councils. For legal advice, there are legal advisers in the councils. For professional input in the medical, engineering or economic field, we can commission consultants for provision of expert advice on the issue.

In the past, in the inquiry into the issues relating to the new airport, the Legislative Council Select Committee has commissioned experts in computer and flight path. For the planning of the new Legislative Council Building, the Legislative Council Commission (LCC) has employed the consultancy service of professional architects. Such examples abound.

In fact, we have passed some rules in this Council lately to stipulate the employment of experts by committees and panels if required. Should the Government need to gauge the opinions of various sectors, the proper approach is to invite submissions or discussions from deputation representing different industries. If it is the Government's aim to collect opinions that are more comprehensive, then apart from making reference to the input of DCs, it can also consult and consider views expressed by other organizations and bodies.

This being the case, Madam President, I cannot see the reason, the need and the rationale for appointment. The only reason for the Chief Executive to appoint members in addition to the elected members is the requirement in law.

Section 9 of the District Councils Ordinance (DCO) provides that DCs shall consist of elected members and appointed members. However, for the purpose of this section, there is no provision for a minimum number of members to be appointed, as such, only one appointed member will suffice. Although the plural is used in the English version of the law, under Chapter 1, words in the plural include the singular and *vice versa* in law. Therefore, the appointment of only one elected member is sufficient for the purpose of this provision. As it is not necessary to appoint other members, I think the Chief Executive should not appoint more than one person.

Indeed, section 11 of the DCO stipulated the power of the Chief Executive to appoint a certain number of members, which has been specified in Schedule 3. Nonetheless, as it only stipulates the maximum number, it is obviously giving the Chief Executive the discretion. In view of the development of events and the abovementioned reasons, I cannot find any ground or need for him to appoint more members than the required number as stipulated in the law.

Thus, I consider that the Chief Executive should only appoint one person and not more than one person into each DC.

With these remarks, Madam President, I support the motion.

MR HENRY WU (in Cantonese): Madam President, first of all, I have to declare interest as being an appointed member of the Eastern District Council. As many colleagues have expressed many views on the appointment of DC members, I do not wish to repeat them here.

I would like to share with Members the experience and observations I have in practical work in the DC. To start with, I am not going to talk about my performance, as it should be fairly judged by others. As such, I will make a simple analysis of the performance of members of the Eastern DC as a whole. The performance of appointed members on the Eastern DC has been comparable to that of elected members. It has been so both in terms of the dedication in council business, the participation in the district services and the provision of input and suggestions. Besides, appointed members are in a better position to provide expeditiously incisive opinions and suggestions with their expertise and experience in different areas and matters, thus contributing to the long-term development of the district and the healthy life of the public.

A lot of citizens hold the wrong perception that appointed members are royalists who support the Government's work. However, the fact is, be they royalists or not, the nature of district work is district-oriented. In fact, appointed members will invariably make reasonable and appropriate judgement in accordance with the actual situation of the district, and will not blindly support the Government's work. Take the Eastern DC as an example, some public works projects had to be shelved or revised as they failed to get the support of the DC. The site originally identified for constructing the Headquarters Building of the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) is one of these projects that is better known to the public. The project site has to be relocated due to objections from the Eastern DC, including appointed members, notwithstanding that the detailed layout of the headquarters building has been finalized.

Madam President, the nine appointed members on the Eastern DC come from different sectors, including professionals, businessmen, academics and veteran district and community workers. They can thus provide extensive and impartial views in the Council. Being a member of the Eastern DC, I have a profound understanding that appointed members can perform their due functions and role in district work, thereby bringing a better living environment and providing effective services to the public. For this reason, I support the DC appointment system.

With these remarks, Madam President, I oppose the motion.

MR LAU CHIN-SHEK (in Cantonese): Madam President, men are by nature virtuous, but they are vicious as well. They have a bright side as well as a dark side. Madam President, you and I are no exceptions.

Different Members have adopted different perspectives in either criticizing or defending the appointment system. I would like to look at the appointment system from the perspective of morality. The criteria we adopt in assessing the system from this perspective are very simple: Does the appointment system make us virtuous persons or vicious ones?

Obviously, the appointment system will turn us into ingratiating persons who are always ready to please the powerful and influential people. It will turn us into vicious persons, challenging the weaknesses of human beings. The

more "obedient" a person is, the greater chances of him to be appointed. Therefore, it is a system that will make us vicious persons. It is a bad system.

On the contrary, direct elections will subject you to public scrutiny. Are you trying to please the influential and powerful? Are you ingratiating? People will know it immediately. So there is no trick, other than working hard with a true heart.

Madam President, it is easy to distinguish between the virtuous and the vicious. Both you and I can tell.

MR HUI CHEUNG-CHING (in Cantonese): Madam President, Article 97 of the Basic Law stipulates that: District organizations which are not organs of political power may be established in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, to be consulted by the government of the Region on district administration and other affairs, or to be responsible for providing services in such fields as culture, recreation and environmental sanitation. We can see that the District Councils (DCs) are consultative organs, the nature of which is practical rather than political. We must of course consult the people for the mainstream opinion, yet the views and suggestions given by DCs could be balanced and impartial only when people from all walks of life, different trades and schools of thoughts are included. Therefore, we need people from the professional or business sectors to work out some long-term strategies in the interest of various sectors. We must realize that Hong Kong is a economics-driven community with robust activities in industry and trade. The absence of participation of the business sector will definitely do harm than good to community work in the territory as a whole. With the appointment system, those professionals and owners of small and medium sized enterprises who may not have time to stand for election or the skill in approaching the public can also become a member of the councils. People are endowed with different temperaments, and not everyone is adept at dealing with people. If these people are excluded from the consultative structure for not having the time or for their character, it will be a loss to society.

While the democratic camp's efforts in striving for democracy are commendable, the means adopted by them are questionable. They have been labelling appointed members arbitrarily by simply dividing them into elected members and appointed members in the process, so the logic is simply incomprehensible. In fact, with the exception of the period when Chris

PATTEN was Governor of Hong Kong, the appointment system has already been in place since the establishment of district boards (DBs) in 1982. The purpose is to facilitate people who are enthusiastic in and familiar with local affairs, but for certain reasons, unable to stand for election, in participating in the operations of DBs. As the appointment system has been operating smoothly, it is not necessary to make any change. Besides, the system will not delay the development of democracy. The achievement enjoyed by the DCs today should be attributed to those DC members who have been given seats on the DCs by way of appointment.

We must realize that the relationship between elected members and appointed members is not diametrically opposed. Appointed members are never enemies of elected members. As both of them work for the welfare of Hong Kong people, they should foster a co-operative relationship.

As elected members are more at ease in facing the public, they should naturally assume the responsibility of reflecting public opinion. Equipped with better expertise or carrying a commercial background, appointed members are better able to give the Government input other than the general view. So both kinds of members have their respective strengths that can be mutually complementary.

Finally, I wish to add that, if the Government decided to "appoint the least number of DC members" only at this moment, it would be unfair to those people who planned to vie for an appointment seat. Should the Government decide to "appoint the least number of DC members" right now, they can no longer change their mind and stand in the direct elections.

To sum up, I think the usual practice of appointing 102 members should be adopted this year. The Government should make a decision in accordance with law when it has enough time in future to conduct fair, open and extensive consultations and reviews to ascertain the public views. No resolution should be made in a careless, rash, groundless and hasty manner on the impulse of the moment.

With these remarks, Madam President, I oppose the motion.

MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG (in Cantonese): Madam President, I would like to respond to some viewpoints of my Legislative Council colleagues. The first

one is Mr NG Leung-sing. He criticized the democratic camp as talking nonsense after having achieved some success in the latest DC elections, and creating a political subject amid the political euphoria. On this subject, Mr NG Leung-sing seemed to have suffered from amnesia. Actually, for a long period of time, both the democratic camp and the Democratic Party have been fighting for the abolishment of the appointment system and it has nothing to do with the performance achieved by the democratic camp in this election. You will see that the position of everyone in the democratic camp has remained the same and consistent if you look up the record of proceedings of the past discussions. Accusing the democratic camp of talking nonsense after having achieved some success in the DC elections is defamation, and it is not true. However, one of the viewpoints of Mr NG Leung-sing warrants discussions. He says that the DCs are not one of the power frameworks. According to the provisions of the Basic Law, it is true that the DCs are not substantive power frameworks, nevertheless, the DCs can elect the Chief Executive, and in the past, they could even elect Legislative Council Members. Is the Chief Executive elect not a centre of power? Are those Legislative Council Members elected by them not a centre of checks and balances on the power of the Chief Executive? The DCs are indeed power frameworks, why do you say that they are not? You are cheating the public.

Mr NG Leung-sing also says that more professionals can be appointed through the appointment system of the DCs. He is in fact taking advantage of the professionals. Mr MA Ngok, an academic, has conducted a survey on the major sectors to which appointed DC members belong in 1999 to 2003. According to the findings, most of them came from the business sector, accounting for 40%, only 20% were professionals, and the success rate of professionals in the election was also close to 20%. In other words, high quality professionals willing to offer their service could stand in DC elections with their own capability and competency, and they shared 20% of the total membership. Thus, do not use professionals as a pretext for appointing members of the business sector to DCs. As a matter of fact, it is a political imbalance created by a businessman-run government that seeks to taking advantage of others. Besides, the crux of the issue is, professionals in support of democracy will stand in the streets sweating for election, rather than sitting in air-conditioned offices waiting for appointment.

Mr Howard YOUNG stated that the contribution made by appointed members was on a par with that made by elected members. It is not true! The greatest contribution made by appointed members is upholding the appointment

system, a system of political free lunches. In this regard, their difference from the elected members is heaven and earth in nature. How can we say that there is no difference? According to Mr Howard YOUNG, some people may not be interested in politics, but they are enthusiastic in local affairs. Then we should employ them as advisers and let them participate in consultancy. Why should they become DC members? Why should the people's choices be subject to checks and balances in an elected council and be even distorted or altered? It is also suggested that the issue could be addressed by simply appointing non-affiliated members. Dr LO Wing-lok suggested that the Government should try to appoint more non-affiliated members. It is again wrong! What are non-affiliated or independent members? For those members who always go undercover, those members who support the appointment system and accept appointment, can we consider them as independent members? In fact, they are only pro-government and uphold a system that is anti-democratic independently. In what way are they independent? The fact of accepting appointment is in itself a political option and preference. Do not call them independent. Be they appointed or elected.....

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): Madam President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Andrew WONG, do you have a point of order?

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): Yes, a point of order.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, please sit down.

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): I wish to ask Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong if he has accepted any appointment before. I did, as I used to be an appointed district board member, that is, I had been appointed as a member of a representative assembly at the district level, but I oppose the appointment system.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Andrew WONG, are you asking me to make a ruling?

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): I wish to make this clear.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Or are you asking for his elucidation?

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): I take that as an offence to me.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Then would you like me to make a ruling?

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): Yes, please. Yes, please.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Please sit down first. I have to review the video recording before I can make a ruling. I now suspend the meeting.

9.36 pm

Meeting suspended.

9.44 pm

Council then resumed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Members, I have reviewed carefully Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong's speech and I do not consider his statement offensive. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, you may continue with your speech.

MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG (in Cantonese): Madam President, I may have offended a Member for drinking, just now I saw him in the corridor.....

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): Madam President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): If it is a point of order, please rise to speak.

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): Madam President, that statement is offensive, it is indeed offensive.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Please sit down. He said a Member had drunk, but he did not mention who, did he?

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): He was obviously meaning me. *(Laughter)* The whole world knows it. *(Laughter)*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Andrew WONG, you have the liberty to drink. Even if he said you had drunk, it is not offensive.

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): Madam President, I am sorry. I respect your ruling. I did drink. If I have offended Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong for drinking, I tender him my apologies. Yet, I do not think it is graceful of Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Fine.

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, please continue with your speech.

MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG (in Cantonese): Madam President, what I want to say is: Be they appointed or elected members, the key is the source of their power. If he is elected by the public and the power comes from the public, he, as an elected member, has to reflect the public will. If his power comes from the person who makes the appointment, that is, the Chief Executive, he can only

reflect the will of those in power, otherwise, he will not get an appointment in the next term.

The reason for us to bring up the issue of appointment system for discussion again it is to draw the Government's attention to the people's aspiration for a democratic system after the 1 July rally and the DC elections. If it carries on with the appointment system blatantly without paying heed to the people's votes, it is like playing with fire and will ultimately draw fire onto itself. Thank you, Madam President.

MS EMILY LAU (in Cantonese): Madam President, I rise to speak in support of Dr YEUNG Sum's motion.

After the march by hundreds of thousands of people on 1 July and more than 1 million people having cast their votes in the District Council (DC) Election on the 23rd last month, it has been demonstrated very clearly that Hong Kong people are very mature politically and they are truly responsible. It also reveals their aspirations the expeditious democratization of the political system in Hong Kong and becoming masters of their own house. Therefore, I find Dr YEUNG Sum's motion worth supporting. As we can see, and it has been laid down in the Basic Law, that political reform should be carried out in the light of the actual situation. Everyone, even those coming from other planets, should see that the actual situation in Hong Kong is very different from what it was a few years ago. The expectation of the public has risen and they would take to the streets spontaneously in times critical. Madam President, I hope they are going to come out again this Sunday, for we will have a demonstration then. Thus, I think the Chief Executive should critically consider the actual situation now.

Miss Margaret NG mentioned the legal issue earlier. I have also made enquiries in this regard and got different opinions. According to the legal advice, the original intent in drafting the whole legislation should be taken into consideration. While we have voted against the appointment, he is empowered to do so according to the intent of the legislation. He may decide to make the appointment or otherwise in the light of the general situation. This is the different view I heard, I hope when Secretary Stephen LAM responds later, he can tell us the legal advice that the Administration has received: Whether it can choose not to make the appointment, or as other Members have suggested, it can appoint only one member or nil member.

Earlier in the debate, Mr SIN Chung-kai mentioned that name lists had been submitted to the Chief Executive, and I am not at all surprised as it is early December already and the Chief Executive should make his appointments very soon. Nevertheless, while some officials indicated that they could do without the appointment or the least number of members should be appointed, some other officials were afraid that this might break the promises made to the public or to certain people. Why? They were saying this because some people had already got messages telling them it was not necessary for them to stand in the elections. Just as Mr HUI Cheung-ching said, as they were to be appointed, they did not have to stand in the elections. The sudden decision of not making any appointment would fail the expectation of those people. The Secretary can prove to us if it is the case later. As such, the problem is, how many such deals were in fact cut behind the scene? How dirty and filthy are they? I believe we should make the inside stories known to the public in Hong Kong.

I agree that in the votes cast by more than a million people, some were cast for the Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong (DAB) and some for the Democratic Party. They reflected the preference of the people. However, the only happening they do not want to see is: after they have cast their votes, more than a hundred people are elected on the vote of one single person. The preference of the voters should be taken as it is. Voters were even more furious when they found out that some plots and arrangements had been made beforehand, so that certain people could elect not to run in elections and enjoy free political meals after the elections. Now that if the appointment system is abolished, there will be nothing for them and it is indeed difficult to account for the failed promise. Madam President, if there is a need to be accountable to a small coterie, how are the millions of Hong Kong people going to be answered. Thus, Madam President, these issues are inter-connected. I believe the Secretaries — the two Secretaries — must explain to the public whether or not there are such promises so that some people needed not run in the elections.

Just now some colleagues said that these candidates do not have the temperaments of standing for elections and they are rather reserved. Then let them not stand for election. This is the way with elections which are demanding and oblige candidates to be outgoing. You cannot have your cake and eat it. You can remain your good old selves and get seats in the DCs, such situation can only happen in Hong Kong. Yet, Madam President, we have been too lenient to these people.

Besides, some colleagues suggested that the appointment system is feasible, but the appointment should only be made to those who have no political background, those neutral and independent persons. What does it mean? Are political parties always unfair and partial? Are they always biased? The Secretaries and the Chief Executive have repeated this several times. The persons who just said this are only stealing others' sayings. How can you consider yourselves independent, fair and impartial?

Madam President, I have heard people defaming political parties more than once. Indeed, there are political parties that are unfair, partial and biased, but not all of them. Why attack others to build up oneself? Besides, most people cast their votes for political parties, does it mean that the public still cast their votes for them even though they are fully aware that these parties are not so impartial and fair? As regards those professionals whom they want to appoint, are they indeed independent and impartial?

Thus, I find all this sophistry. I also agree with Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung — sorry for dragging you into this, I may agree with what you have said, you may elaborate later — it is difficult to control one's temper when this kind of sophistry is advanced repeatedly and someone has even drunk. Madam President, what should we do? Madam President, I believe I have stated my case, however, for the points I have just raised, I think the Secretaries owe not only this Council, but the general public an explanation. I so submit.

MR ANDREW WONG (in Cantonese): Madam President, I wanted to press the bell. I am sorry, perhaps I have drunk a bit too much.

Madam President, but I must make these points. I used to be an appointed DB member. That was a long time ago before the DCs were even set up when we had District Management Committees in the districts. I was working in the belief of serving the community.

First of all, what I want to say here is that I agree with every word Miss Margaret NG has said. The appointment system is not a good one, and there are a lot of problems. In the past, as appointed members, we were working in the belief of serving the community without any political agenda. In other words, we were only providing our service to the district without any political

motive. I can tell Members that, were it not for Miss Margaret NG, we could not have built the back-stage of the Shatin Town Hall so spectacularly. A lot of facilities in Sha Tin can be attributed to the efforts of Miss Margaret NG, though we may not know her so well. For instance, when the cycling track was built in Sha Tin, Miss Margaret NG was the Chairman of the ad hoc group then, and she had been working hard to fight for its construction. The cycling track was very narrow then, it has been widened now. I think the appointment of DC members is good (*laughter*) — I mean it used to be good, a long time ago. (*Laughter*)

Yet, unfortunately, the system of appointing members has changed in the whole development process of the DCs. The DBs were formally established in 1981 and members of the District Management Committees before that were all appointed. A election was subsequently held in 1982, and members returned by election accounted for one third of the membership, with another one third being appointed members and the rest ex officio members. More and more changes came to light as time passed. There were no more appointed and ex officio member in 1994. The ex officio membership was in fact abolished as early as in 1985. Then in 1994, even appointed membership was totally abolished.

Though all this was history, yet it came back in 1997. Why? I do not quite understand. No matter how, I do not want to discuss it anymore. The past is the past, we should not look back. It used to there, it is here now. As to whether or not it should be kept, we have to check the appointment record of the past term. What kind of record is it? Is it simply something we could refer to as the British Hong Kong Administration, a term which is quite ugly. Who were appointed then? They were people like Margaret NG and Andrew WONG. As far as I can remember, appointed members of the Sha Tin DB also included Prof KUAN Hsin-chi — he was before me — Mr LEE Pui-leung from The Chinese University of Hong Kong and Dr Fanny CHEUNG — she just filled in for somebody who did not want to take up the job. It is evident that appointees then were professionals and academics, but not politics players. The atmosphere then was different, yet these appointed seats are now used to rectify the situation. The approach is entirely wrong.

I just want to see the materialization of one simple matter, that is, as it is provided in the existing law that the Government may be obliged to appoint a certain number of appointed members — though it is not stipulated in the law that these appointed seats have to be fully utilized — I hope the Government can, in

exercising the power, adhere to two basic principles. What are these two principles? The first one is to maintain a balance in the community. To maintain a balance does not mean to manipulate. It means that it should appoint people from the ethnic minorities without any channel to voice their opinions, or the disadvantaged groups having lost in the election. Besides, some enlightened persons and professionals may not be elected as some people do not desire their winning, but it is in the interest of district development to appoint them to provide assistance. For instance, we need engineers in new development areas, so it may be desirable to appoint such persons. I can recall that Mr CHAN Kai-ming of Sun Hung Kai was appointed a member in the Sha Tin DB for helping out in the then largest project of New Town Plaza, connecting all the footbridges. It was something beneficial to the district and also a good effect created by the appointment system. As it did not create the effect of manipulating the community, it was a good thing.

Nevertheless, many changes have taken place to date. Some systems have been abolished since 1994 — it is how the world should be. As any other views can be relayed to the Government through the councils, I support the motion moved by Dr YEUNG Sum without any reservations. Even though I have been an appointed member — a former appointed member, I wonder if Miss Margaret NG will share my view, but quite a number of people here have been or are appointed members. Yet it does not matter. Under the system of parliamentary politics, the public should be given the right to choose their DC members to voice out their views. People who are eligible to represent the public should not be someone chosen by the power that be for appointment. I fully support the motion moved by Dr YEUNG Sum without any reservations.

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you.

MR WONG SING-CHI (in Cantonese): Madam President, I also have to declare interest as a serving member of the North District Council. However, the topic today is not going to do me any good as my term will end on 1 January.

In the latest DC Election, the Democratic Party has won eight seats in the North DC, together with an elected member who is very friendly with the democratic camp, we have altogether nine seats in North District. In fact, there are 16 directly elected seats in the North DC, in other words, the nine seats we

have got account for more than half of the total number of seats. This will in fact facilitate and greatly enhance our work in the DC. We got the support of about 23 000 voters in the election. However, the present situation is, apart from the 16 directly elected seats, there are four seats for the Rural Committees. Each Rural Committee will return an ex officio member in the DC, making up 20 DC members altogether. Yet, with the five additional appointed members to be appointed by the Government, there will be a total of 25 DC members in the North DC.

The ex officio and appointed seats account for nine seats in the DC. From this perspective, if these appointed members are all pro-government, despite we have won the majority seats in the direct elections, we are still subject to the domination of pro-government DC members.

In the past, there were five appointed members in our DC. Among them, there were an accountant, two school principals (a primary school principal and a secondary school principal), the wife of a senior official whom I had never seen her taking part in the activities in North District — she was appointed for being the member of a uniform group in the district, and also a former DC member who had not run in the election. Both the accountant and school principals are professionals. Yet, unfortunately, shortly after being appointed into the DC, the licence of the accountant seemed to be revoked by the Hong Kong Society of Accountants. However, neither Mr TUNG nor the Secretary has ever asked him to resign from his office and he continued to serve on the DC. Nonetheless, he seemed to have got back his licence lately. As to one of the school principals, he had become redundant and ceased to be a principal, yet he continued to serve as a DC member. He was employed as principal again by another school later, but he lost his job eventually. As to the wife of the senior official, I have never seen her having any contact with any organizations in the district. However, it is stipulated clearly in the functions of the DC that the DCs should advise the Government on matters affecting the interests or well-being of the people in the districts, the provision and use of public services and facilities within the districts, and the adequacy and priorities of government programmes for the districts. However, other than the administration work in her own organization, the wife of the senior official has never made contact with anyone. How can she understand the situation of the whole district? Still, she is an appointed DB member.

Under these circumstances, if it is maintained that DC members have been appointed into the DCs for their professional qualifications, I cannot see this as a fact in the North DC. Obviously, the function of these five appointed members in the DC was to provide support for the government view whenever it was different from ours. Thus, as far as the experience in North District is concerned, the appointment system is in fact not meant for enabling professional service to the district. Apparently, they simply lobby for support for the Government.

Throughout the development of the appointment system, we can see that appointment was inevitable due to the absence of directly elected members in the past. Just Mr Andrew WONG said, he was appointed and so was Miss Margaret NG, but then there was no option. Nevertheless, as the public can make choices according to their will now, they expect to be genuinely represented by the DC members elected by them. Under the circumstances, people obviously want these DC members to do things they expect them to. But, unfortunately, if they see problems and want to make suggestions, given that there are appointed members on the DCs, the motions moved by them will not be passed, or not taken seriously by the Government as the view of the majority.

In the light of my experience in the North DC, it is obvious that the existence of appointed members is simply to dilute the opinion voiced by the public, so as to make the genuine needs and expectations of the public inaudible to the Government. If the Government continues to appoint pro-government members blatantly, I am concerned that it will further reduce the credibility of the Government, thereby creating more problems in public administration. Instead of lobbying for the Government, these appointed members will spoil the image of the Government, which in turn will further weaken the overall governance by the Government. As such, I support the motion moved by Dr YEUNG Sum in urging the Government to abolish expeditiously the appointment system and appoint the least number of appointed members as far as possible in the current term. Thank you, Madam President.

MS AUDREY EU: Today's motion is not so much about democracy or the pace of democracy, rather, it is about equality, openness and transparency in the make-up of the District Councils.

Hong Kong is an advanced and mature society. We know how to elect our district representatives. We do not need the Chief Executive or anyone else

for that matter to do it for us. The people have spoken. The election result best represents the balance of power and the interests of society. No sensible government should try to upset that.

As a professional, I am ashamed to hear the Honourable LAU Ping-cheung, also a professional himself, say that the reason for the appointment system is that a professional person has little resources and manpower and does not stand much chance in an election. If a professional person, with all his or her educational background and advantages in society, is unable and unwilling to run an equal risk as another non-professional in an open election, he lacks the professionalism and the respect for fair play which should be the hallmark of any profession.

My primary position is simple. We should abolish the appointment system for the District Councils as soon as possible. Until that happens, I support the compromise put forward in the motion. Thank you.

MR IP KWOK-HIM (in Cantonese): Madam President, the Democratic Party has recently distributed many leaflets to oppose the appointment system. I quote from the leaflet: More than 1 million voters, through their votes, have expressed their support for direct elections. However, as there are still appointed and ex officio seats in the District Councils, the voters' wish will definitely be diluted or distorted. End of quote.

In the latest DC Election, the outcome in some constituencies was decided by just a few percentage points of votes. Take me for instance, I got more than 1 800 votes, losing by a margin of 64 votes. The candidate of Eastern District, Mr CHU Hon-wah, lost by only one vote. Though a number of candidates in the Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong (DAB) lost in the election, they still got considerable support from the public. These voters gave us their votes for their recognition of our work in the district which they considered better, many of them even supported our stance in relation to the appointment system. In the last few days, I met a number of voters who had voted for me. They indicated clearly to me the message. Also, candidates of the DAB in other constituencies heard similar views. Many of our candidates have got more than 40% of the total votes, and they lost only under the simple majority system. Do we not need to respect the opinion expressed by these over 40% voters who voted for our candidates?

The leaflet of the Democratic Party also requested the Government to undertake not to appoint members of the "pro-government camp" who have been "abandoned" (quoting from the leaflet) by voters. I have to point out that, though the number of seats won by the DAB has dropped from 83 in 1999 to 62 this year, the number of votes it got amounted to 246 000, representing an increase of more than 50 000 votes compared to the previous term. It is a fact. It is also a fact that the DAB ranked number one in terms of total votes cast in its favour. It is totally groundless to say the we have been "abandoned by voters".

Members of the Democratic Party have been saying that appointed members have no mandate. As Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong just said, appointed members are vastly different from elected members in nature, and appointed members only reflect the wishes of those in power. It is what Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong has just said. Nevertheless, I wish to point out that, on 6 January 2000, in the Central and Western DC election of chairman, the DC members of the Democratic Party went so far as to throw full weight behind a newly appointed member for chairmanship and opposed a candidate who was an elected member. The reason for doing that was to prevent a DAB member from being elected chairman. It is obvious that the Democratic Party does not really oppose the appointment system, but indeed try to eliminate their political opponents.

Madam President, in the DAB's view, the DCs are councils for handling practical issues such as those relating to everyday life and community development. A wide representation will be beneficial to ensure that there will not be any bias and minority interests will not be ignored. Through the appointment system, talents from different sectors can be absorbed into the DCs, and this is precisely the function that appointed members will effect.

Appointed members use the resources of the councils to serve the district, yet they have been labelled as enjoying "free lunches". Only those people looking at the seats as personal interests will regard them as "free lunches" and will be jealous of others being appointed.

We hope we can have appointed members from the grassroots, business and professional sectors in future, so that the level of representation in the DCs can be wider. The number of appointed seats can be reduced gradually, but in the meantime, it will be beneficial to the community to retain a certain number of appointed seats.

Madam President, I so submit.

MR MICHAEL MAK (in Cantonese): Madam President, 23 November 2003 was historical, in that it was the polling day of the DCs. The turnout rate rose from 35.82% in 1999 to 44.06%, representing an increase of 8.24%, and the number of voters exceeded 1.06 million.

In fact, in the 400 seats of the 18 districts, 74 seats were returned *ipso facto* in the latest DC Election. In other words, voters did not have to vote for these 74 seats. If these 74 seats were not returned *ipso facto*, then the voters concerned would have to cast their votes. According to the voters turnout and the number of elected seats in the current term, it could be estimated that there should have been as many as 1.3 million voters. The registered electorate stands at 2.41 million, so 1.3 million would exceed half of that number. The decision of the majority voters should be final in deciding all the seats of DCs! To impose an appointment system on top of the election, it is tantamount to ignoring the public aspirations and depriving the people of their voting right. It is totally ridiculous!

The Government has been using the appointment system to divide the DCs. In the past, as some Members have said, those members appointed by the Government were in fact pro-government and invisible members. To check the power of DC members belonging to the pro-democracy camp, the Government may appoint the maximum number of seats and that will certainly impact adversely on the political harmony in the DCs.

On 1 July, over 500 000 people took to the streets to express their aspirations for democracy. Some people said at the time that the public had been fooled and misled. On the historical date of 23 November, more than 1 million people expressed their wish once again by their votes, telling the Administration to return the political power to the people. They let them know by their firm action that the Government should return the political power to the people as soon as possible.

However, to date, many people still regard the return of political power as something monstrous, and distort the truth on purpose. Mr Peter WONG, a Deputy to the National People's Congress, said in a recent forum that a 44% voter turnout could not represent the majority of voters, as over 50% of the voters did not express their stance, therefore 55% of the seats in the DCs should be given to appointed members. This is of course fallacy. He should be

condemned not only for holding the result of a democratic election in contempt, but also for insulting the choices and intelligence of voters!

The appointment system was reintroduced into the DCs in 1999 by the Government. It was a retrogression in democracy which suffocated the development of political parties and dealt a heavy blow to the progress of democratization.

The appointment system is, in my opinion, an unethical political deal, or political bribery! The appointees would not have to present their platforms, how can they be monitored by the public? I hope the Secretary will let us know later. I believe they would be monitored only by the Chief Executive or people making the appointment or finalizing the list of appointees. The people have expressed a very strong aspiration for political power to be returned to them. The urgent task for the Government now is, instead of trying to deceive oneself as well as others, to appoint the least number of members as required by the law, and to appoint only one member to each DC as suggested by Miss Margaret NG, to show that public opinion is heard and respected. Section 5 of the District Councils Ordinance (Cap. 547) provides for the "Number of members to be elected to a District Council and the number of members to be appointed to it", but it does not specify the minimum number of members to be appointed to the DCs, thus it is perfectly compliant with the requirement in law to appoint only one member. In the final analysis, the Government should amend the relevant legislation to enable all seats in the DCs to be returned by direct elections.

Council work is no political "free lunches". For those who do not have the courage to face the public, but want to be appointed without going through the baptism of election, I think they should feel ashamed for their cowardice. The best person should be given the job. Those who sincerely want to serve the public, be they professionals or not, should come forth and let yourself be found fault with, be criticized, or even be insulted. I remember that day when I was helping Ms Cyd HO in electioneering, there were dozens of women protesting in our face. What could we have done? Ms Cyd HO said that they did not let us speak or listen to us, but we just accepted it. Ms Cyd HO and I accepted without any complaints. Thus, will those behind the scene not regard this as political "free lunches"?

After the 1 July march, we can all take pride in ourselves. Again, we made history in the DC Election this year. It is a landmark on the road to

democracy. I hope the motion moved by Dr YEUNG Sum today will also bear testimony, in particular for those Members who face the public. Please face the people's aspirations and support Dr YEUNG Sum's motion. I hope this will go down in the records.....

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Michael MAK, please face the President when you speak.

MR MICHAEL MAK (in Cantonese): I am sorry, Madam President. I was trying to get the message across to some Members. I hope this will go down in the records of history because it is a reasonable aspiration of the electors.

Thank you, Madam President. With these remarks, I hope those Members who claim to face the public will vote for the motion moved by Dr YEUNG Sum. Thank you.

MS CYD HO (in Cantonese): Madam President, in the last DC elections, the turnout rate of voters broke the record. It reached 44.06%. It is a record high since Hong Kong has district-level elections, and is comparable with the last Legislative Council Election in 2000. In my constituency, the turnout rate even reached 52%. This is the public's choice and the public's victory, as everyone has used his own vote to earnestly and courageously speak out.

A lot of people think that the DC elections are only elections of local districts which would not arouse the people's interest. A turnout rate of voters at 25% or even 35% at the most is considered desirable, which would not rise because of the controversy surrounding the legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law and the march on 1 July. However, the public are more insistent than anticipated by many politicians, academics and the mass media. They proved that these analyses are wrong by action. By making use of their votes on hand, they have clearly voiced what they wanted to say to the Government.

Some commentaries considered that the voting this time is irrational. About this point, I really have to speak up for those members of the public who have cast their votes. Before 1 July, many people were disappointed with and

saddened by the legislative procedures of the Government. After 1 July, the Government's administration and its respect for public opinions have remained basically unchanged. When public expectations continued to fall through, they could only vote casually on 23 November, which could also effectively express their dissatisfaction.

As the people are worried about the future of Hong Kong, they strive for every opportunity to make their voices heard and sound warnings to the Government. This is a matter of course, the right of the public and the obligation of the public. But, unfortunately, after 23 November, the Government is still unwilling to face squarely to the aspiration of the public for returning the political power to the people. On the appointment agenda, there is no clear indication yet. The Chief Executive has once said that he would "sense the urgency of the people and think in the way they think". The public have now spoken out what is of the utmost urgency and what they think by way of their votes. Is the Chief Executive willing to listen, or is he still making use of his privileged "one person, one vote" to distort the voices of the people? In fact, any attempt to maintain the safety coefficient of DCs desired by the Government by means of appointment is tantamount to declaring that the election result on 23 November is nullified. On that day, a majority of the people made their choices. But after the appointment, they may contrarily become the minority. If that situation really happens, it will definitely intensify the division and conflicts in society, further pushing the Government to the opposite side of the public.

The Government today is actually in a very weak position. If it still acts unwisely as to go ahead with the appointment which will distort the voting results, it is bound to cause more discord in the future. Therefore, what the Government should do now is to announce immediately its views on appointment, to appoint the least number of DCs members in a bid to comply with the law and respect the choices made by the people. As a further step, it should amend the legislation as soon as possible, abolish the appointment system, and implement democratic political reforms, so that the people will have more choices while community wisdom can be better brought into play.

Madam President, I would also like to respond to the speech just delivered by Mr IP Kwok-him. Indeed, I have been advocating that since there are so many seats in the DCs, the proportional representation system should be adopted. There are 15 seats in Central and Western District, but the "single vote, single seat" system is adopted. However, Madam President, you and I may run in the Legislative Council Election next year. While there are only six seats in that

election, the proportional representation system will be adopted. This is totally anti-intellect. Where there are enough seats, the proportional representation system is not adopted. Where there are fewer seats, the "single vote, single seat" system is not adopted. This is a totally inappropriate approach. In fact, the Government is making use of these weird systems to distort the representation of people's views. The DAB could actually have quite many votes. If the proportional representation system was adopted, I believe the number of seats that it could secure would not have been so few. Thus, I hope that we will not comment on whether the election system is favourable to which party or unfavourable to which party only after the election result is known. We should, before the elections start, discuss the election system objectively and openly.

I truly hope that we can, through an election system founded on social consensus, enable the people's opinions to be reasonably and proportionately represented. By that time, not only will the unfavourable political parties be represented, ethnic minorities may also have one or two representatives, even prostitutes who are very much despised by society may have one or two representatives. This will be more consistent with the interest and need of society. No matter what kind of system we adopt, we should absolutely not, after the result has come out, let the Government distort the people's elections by means of the appointment system. We can, in fact, make reference to the system in Germany, where the proportional representation system is adopted. After the election, each political party will absorb professional views according to the ratio of the votes that it has obtained. This also represents the people's choices and wishes. Indeed, we do not need Mr TUNG to exercise his one person, one vote to distort the people's voices.

Thank you, Madam President.

MRS SELINA CHOW (in Cantonese): Madam President, in this Council today, I believe it has been a long time since we last heard such strong wordings. Comparing this debate with the past debates, we may feel that it has been a long time since we last had such a heated debate. However, I also feel rather disappointed, because some Honourable Members, whom I respect much although we hold different political views, have used arguments in support of their own viewpoints today that are actually very unfair to certain people or to those who have contributed to society. They were even called some unpleasant names, and I find this rather inappropriate.

Our difference today, basically, may be on whether the appointment system should exist or otherwise. That boils down to whether we should have the appointment system at all. In regard to the appointment system, actually many Members, including elected Members or formerly appointed Members, or Members returned by geographical constituencies or functional constituencies, have been called into service under this system. I, of course, do not necessarily refer to the DCs, but there are some who have been working on DCs. Apart from DCs, some Members have taken up various kinds of appointed seats. For example, Miss Margaret NG and Ms Audrey EU have taken up those positions, and so has Mr SIN Chung-kai, as he said just now.

Insofar as the work is concerned, although many Members were actually not elected to take up those positions, we were still dedicated to the work. Is it because we have been approached for appointment, so we definitely are coming to take some advantages, or some sort of Comprehensive Social Security Assistance, or having cut some deals as remarked by other people? All this is not true. Just like Mr LAU Chin-shek and Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, I think, by occupation, they are also appointed to do such work. They are also not elected. Does it mean that they cannot faithfully serve their targets? The answer is negative.

Therefore, the nature of appointment should not be so determined with such assertiveness that the appointees will not work in the interest of the public. Similarly, elected members may not necessarily be serving the public well. Facts in the past have told us that no matter in DCs or in other public organizations, the performance of the elects may not be better than the appointees. Different persons have different performance. Thus, I think sweeping generalization will negate the contribution actually made by many people.

As to the question of whether there should be appointed seats in the DCs, Mr LAU Wong-fat has also mentioned at earlier that it has been debated many times. Due to the different viewpoints and angles, we could not come to an agreement. In regard to DCs, it is undeniable that there are stipulations in the Basic Law, and I will not repeat them as many colleagues have mentioned them already. Nevertheless, we can talk about the real situation. As a matter of fact, insofar as DCs are concerned, I understand that members of different parties in various DCs, be they appointed or elected members, are generally

working in amity with one another on district affairs. Besides, they can serve the respective districts quite well, able to greatly improve the living environment of the districts. This can be achieved only with their concerted efforts and harmonious co-operation. Furthermore, on many issues, as far as I understand it, since local affairs involve more practical than political aspects, the working atmosphere is more harmonious. It is a fact that many appointed members in DCs have rather good performance.

Should people with political party affiliation be appointed? This has just been referred to as "under-the-table deals", and so on, but I think otherwise. Every organization or political party can provide the necessary talents. But if you do not support the appointment system, then you neither give nor take. Certainly, we will respect your stance. However, if you think that there are talents in your political party, then why do you not offer their service? We reckon that the appointment system is one of the channels through which to serve the community, and thus we offer some talents to the Government for consideration, why not? Why should we be shameful? Why should that be considered "under-the-table deals"? I do not think this should be perceived as such.

Besides, as regards declaration of interest, I opine that if declaration of interest is necessary, it is probably all the more necessary for the organizations that appoint us to declare their interests. As I am appointed to the Hong Kong Tourism Board, I have not taken a single penny, but on the contrary, may even have to pay a lot. So it should declare interests to me instead.

As far as DCs are concerned, I understand that many people have actually put in a lot of efforts, even more than those elected members. I am not making a general comparison, but only remark on individual situations. Therefore, I do not think it is necessary to declare interests on the provision of service to the people, and this also depends on the level of personal contribution.

In conclusion, I think that some people have actually made a lot of insulting remarks today — there is a clear division between good and evil. If you accept the appointment, then you are evil — If you are dissatisfied with the system, we definitely understand and respect you. However, if you insultingly make sweeping generalizations against those who have made contribution, then I consider it grossly unfair. We in the Liberal Party, of course, will oppose the motion today. Thank you, Madam President.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): Madam President, recently, after the DC elections last week, I noted that the Chairman of the Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong (DAB), Mr Jasper TSANG, also resigned. He said that he had to be accountable for his own remarks or for the duties that he had not performed well.

Subsequently, I noted Mr IP Kwok-him had used a milder tone when he spoke in some forums. He said that the number of appointed members should be gradually reduced. It seems that he is showing to the majority public a stance in compliance with their wishes, intimating a trace of retreat. However, after listening to the arguments of Mr IP Kwok-him (I did listen very carefully) today, my impression is: They, after the Central Committee meeting of the DAB, have felt a need to bind their supporters, or they might have made some undertakings to some of their members (for example, Mr IP Kwok-chung, brother of Mr IP Kwok-him, may probably be appointed). As they are facing a lot of difficulties, they are forced to hold firmly to their position.

However, the Mr IP Kwok-him presented his argument in a few aspects. He said: They have got supporting votes, although they lost a lot of seats. Of course, when they have more candidates, the overall number of votes won would naturally rise. But if we simply look at the number of votes, we can see that the will of the public is very clear. They do have some supporting votes.

The second line of argument is that among those people who support the DAB, some also support the appointment system. If we check the results of the opinion polls (we have also conducted an opinion poll recently), we can see that the results are actually very consistent. For example, on 23 November before I proposed this motion debate, a little more than 50% of the respondents were against the appointment system of the DCs, while a little more than 20% were in favour of it. Thus, the ratio is 50-odd to 20-odd. This is fairly consistent. Within two to three weeks, I have conducted two more polls. I do not deny that some people support this system. This is not surprising, as this will happen.

Finally, the third line of argument is that under the present situation, we should have appointed members, as we have to respect the views of the minority through appointment. I find this point rather ridiculous. And this reminds me of the remarks made by Mr Peter WONG Man-kong, Deputy to the National

People's Congress, as they are cognate. He said that we have lost, but we have the support of some people, and thus the Government should appoint some people to fill our vacancies. I can draw a very simple analogy from this, and I wonder if Mr IP Kwok-him will be shameful or not. He said that he lost by a narrow margin. He lost only four votes to Ms Cyd HO. But that is fine if the Government can find a member of the DAB to fill his position. Just that simple, is it not? I reckon that if he adopts such an attitude, he is plainly asking the Government to appoint a member of the DAB to avert their defeat in the elections. This is what he meant.

In the past, this argument was not that clear. We have been saying that public opinions have been distorted and we are looking at the situation from a historical point of view. However, in this case, following and summing up his few lines of argument, the only possible conclusion that can be deduced is that he thought that they had the support of some people, that is, they also had some supporting votes, and some people even supported the appointment system, though they belong to the minority. Although they have lost in the elections, there are still a few remaining seats. Thus, the Government should appoint some members of the DAB. That is what he meant. Therefore, they are actually encouraging the Government to appoint these people and to avert the situation. This is a far cry from what other Members meant by appointing professionals.

I dare not comment on other DCs. However, take the Yau Tsim Mong District Council as an example, we actually have a few appointed DC members, among whom there are doctors and computer experts. But they never speak from the angle of doctors or computer experts. Generally speaking, they are very honest. We have met on some private occasions, and I found that they are very honest. On some major political issues, they said that as they were appointed, they would speak in favour of the Government first (because they were appointed by the Government), and would speak in favour of the "royalist party" later. When voicing their opinions on any issue, they would take sides. When meeting with Mr TUNG, I told him that I did not know whether he was really naïve or ignorant. But I do not understand why he would believe in professionals. He can ask the District Officers of local districts, and then he would find out that all these people would actually take sides. Even though they are professionals, they would not provide professional views. All of them take

sides politically. Of course, those who take sides may not necessarily support the DAB. Some of them will find this all very annoying and will just walk away. But the problem is, a majority of them, according to my understanding, will take sides, then start lobbying, apply for resources, do local work and then run for elections. The whole process is like that. They will not provide impartial, neutral or rather independent views. When they see that there are strong arguments between two parties, will they try to reconcile them or act as mediators? Never. They definitely will take sides.

Recently, some incidents have been disclosed in some districts like Yau Tsim Mong District. The case is that a government official told one of the DC members (who does not belong to the Democratic Party) that Mr IP Kwok-chung had been proposed for appointment. He then added that in the election of chairman, if you did not elect Mr IP Kwok-chung, then elect Mr CHOW Chun-fai. Mr CHOW Chun-fai carries a criminal record. Mr IP Kwok-chung has been running in elections for eight to 10 years. He chose not to run in the election. He has openly said that the burden of election was too heavy for him, as he has been ill. But if he was given an appointment, he would consider it. That is the attitude adopted by him. Since he is such a heavyweight member and he is such a party branch chairman of the district, why did he not run in the election again? He could choose not to run in the election, and in the end, a member of the DAB in district level would also successfully take up his position. However, he cannot say that this is done out of respect for the minority. In that district, he does belong to the majority and has already secured a seat. How can they still ask the Government to appoint Mr IP Kwok-chung? What kind of approach is that?

The statement of the Government is that: there is no instruction telling our officials to do that. However, it should be borne in mind that the officials indeed have done so. I reckon that the Government has to investigate this case thoroughly, instead of saying that there has been no instruction and full stop. If any official has really done that, this official should even be fired. I suspect the official concerned has been too close to the former chairman, deputy chairman, and so on, so that he has also been influenced or fooled. I think that the Government should investigate this case thoroughly.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak?

DR ERIC LI (in Cantonese): Madam President, I have already pressed the button. In regard to the appointment system of the DCs, since it involves some beliefs concerning reforms of the political system, I would like to sum up or expound my position on this issue from three perspectives.

First of all, personally speaking, I have adopted all along an open attitude towards the progress of democratization of the political system. On 24 June 1992 and 15 July 1998, this Council also conducted similar debates on the so-called political reforms. I said at that time that since the drafting of the Basic Law in 1988, I had stated clearly, and was also the first to state clearly that it was my hope that the legislature then and the Chief Executive office could progress gradually so that both could be directly elected ultimately. However, when should that change take place? I put forward a "trigger point" concept then, meaning that the appropriate time was when the turnout rate of electors reached a certain percentage, and 50% was proposed then. At that time, Members from the pro-democracy camp (a lot of them are still in this Chamber) felt that it was not acceptable. However, it was subsequently proved to be possible. In the 1998 Legislative Council Election, the turnout rate of electors reached 53%. In the recent DC elections, the turnout rate of electors even reached a record high of 44%. Personally speaking, in view of the position that I mentioned before, I reckon that the direction of universal suffrage is no longer a major problem. I have also mentioned that in 2008, I definitely will not run in the functional constituency election. As I adopt such an attitude towards the seats in functional constituencies, there is no need to mention my attitude towards appointed seats.

Apart from this personal position, I would also like to point out that the entire political reform, particularly in relation to the two reform options that I have mentioned in the Legislative Council, should also be conducted in a gradual and orderly manner. One of the options was put forward about five years ago, and I have already forgotten the exact date. I proposed then to increase 30 directly elected seats. In April this year, I also proposed that candidates from functional constituencies should be nominated by the Election Committee for election by universal suffrage. Madam President..... I am coming to that.

(The President indicated that Dr Eric LI was not speaking to the question)

DR ERIC LI (in Cantonese): I understand. As these are the ideas and concepts mentioned by me at the time, I also hold the same attitude and beliefs towards DC elections. Therefore, I have to mention my past beliefs in order to prove that these were not created today, but have been upheld by me all these years. I will suggest that the appointment system should develop gradually and progressively, or should provide some choices.

Thus, these are my consideration and my thinking. I find that the suggestions made by Mr NG Leung-sing earlier tie in well with my speech. Madam President, he was the first speaker, and Members may not be able to remember his speech very clearly. As I can recall, he said he hoped that the appointed seats could be, based on the voting results of the recent DC elections, distributed according to the ratio of votes secured by persons of different political inclinations or affiliations. I would like to further mention that I hope that by gradual process, the number of appointed seats can be gradually reduced to zero in two or three terms. This approach is more similar to my view. The motion today points out that when more than 1 million voters cast their votes, they seemed to hold the same intention, and that is, to abolish the appointed seats. However, I think that among the 1 million-odd voters, some of them (as my colleague from the Democratic Party said, some of them might not share such a point of view) might have voted for the DAB, independent candidates, the Liberal Party or the Hong Kong Progressive Alliance. Not all these votes were asking for the abolition of appointed seats. However, how can these views be fully reflected? I reckon that the seats can be distributed according to the ratio of votes secured. That way of distribution suggested by me will not alter the existing election result. It is because the political inclination should be the same as the election result. From that angle, I think that this approach can reflect the election result more accurately.

Thirdly, I have said I hoped that the Government could conduct a political review as soon as possible. This was mentioned since the policy address in 1997. I reckon that in order to conduct such a review, the Government should consider the entire political system, including the appointment system. If Members can recall, political reform is to start from the review of the entire three-tier structure (now that only two tiers are left). Only in this way can the public see a clear direction, and can we have a chance to air our views on the affiliated parts of the entire political structure in Hong Kong, before a more comprehensive result could be reached finally.

I thank the President for her indulgence that has enabled me to speak a little further away from the question. I so submit.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak?

MR MARTIN LEE (in Cantonese): Madam President, I just returned by taxi, hoping to catch the voting in time. The taxi driver asked me if I had to attend a late meeting. I answered yes. He further asked me what kind of meeting that I have to attend, and so I told him about this topic of discussion today. Having heard this, he said, "Alas, this Government is only making a fuss. It does not respect the public." And now I am reflecting his views.

Dr YEUNG Sum told me that Mrs Selina CHOW of the Liberal Party felt that there were talents in her party. She also believed that the appointment system was effective, and so she did not understand why they could not submit a list to Mr TUNG. Is it true that only the Liberal Party has talents, while the Democratic Party or this community has no talents? Is it true that when there are talents, they are suitable or should be appointed? Do these people have confidence that they can win in the election? Can we say that now that there are some talents, although they are very smart, they have no confidence in themselves or do not have commitment to the public, and thus are not willing to run in the election. Besides, they do not respect the public. Thus, they just wait for appointment by the Chief Executive. If the Chief Executive really appoints these people, then I feel his wisdom is really down to zero.

Some said that there had been appointment during the Provisional District Boards, as they were "provisional", there were no other alternatives but to restore the appointment system. I found this rather unpalatable when I heard of it. What it meant is that there were no other alternatives as they were "provisional", and they could do whatever they want. This also applies to the Provisional Legislative Council, the seats of which were also appointed. However, they were not "provisional" in 1993. Why should appointment be still necessary? This proves that the SAR Government has no confidence in itself. It is afraid that once there is election, the situation may run out of control, and the position of chairman may not be taken up by a person on its side. When a government has no confidence in itself as such, how can the public have confidence in it?

Has the Government ever thought that during the administration the United Kingdom, that is, under the Hong Kong British Government when Hong Kong

was still a colony, people could elect their own District Board members and appointment could be done away with. Now that Hong Kong has become a SAR of the Republic of China, why would it revert back to the old system of the United Kingdom? I am really baffled. Mr TUNG always asks us in the Democratic Party to move with the times. Does Mr TUNG himself believe in what he says and move with the times, too? All the people of Hong Kong have come out now and walk on the path of democracy, moving forward with the times. Why is our Chief Executive still staying behind?

Therefore, this motion debate moved by Dr YEUNG Sum is actually doing Mr TUNG a service. He should really think about it carefully. In fact, leaders of the Central Government also want him to think carefully, want him to listen to the wishes of Hong Kong people, to do a good self-reflection after returning to Hong Kong. No matter how we in the Democratic Party ask him to reflect on himself, he will not listen. However, if leaders of the Central Government tell him to do so, I believe he will surely listen. Do not tell us that he cannot sleep at night. It would be better if he can reflect well tonight and decide tomorrow to appoint only one member to each DC.

There is a stipulation in Chapter 1 of our laws that plural includes singular while singular includes plural. Thus, it does not matter even if there is an "s" at the back of an English word, as it also includes the singular. In fact, if he appoints one member to each DC, it is already in compliance with the law. Thus, I hope that he can really do a good reflection tonight. When he wakes up tomorrow, he will listen to what the leaders of the Central Government tell him to do, and that is, to listen to the wishes of Hong Kong people in appointing the least number of DC members, which is one member to each DC.

Thank you, Madam President.

MR LEE CHEUK-YAN (in Cantonese): Madam President, I would like to remind Members that this is December 2003. When I listened to the debate of Members, I felt that we had gone back to more than 10 years ago. Why? The theory of Mr Andrew WONG is that the appointees can make contribution. I believe that it was right in the '80s, as the elections concerned had yet to be conducted. Members always talk about gradual and orderly progress. Indeed, when the entire political system developed in a gradual and orderly manner to

1994, the appointment system was already abolished. Why was the appointment system abolished in 1994? It is because in the past, it was argued that more talents or professionals should be given opportunities to participate in politics, and appointment was thus necessary. The argument on this issue was already finished more than 10 years ago and was pretty exhausted. The professionals, talents, those who were willing to serve people locally and so on had already come out to run in the elections. Thus in 1994, the appointment system was abolished. Subsequently, when the Provisional Legislative Council came into existence, the situation became regressive. Honestly, the motion today is not simply attributable to the 1.06 million voters who have cast their votes, but is related to the mistake that the political system has retrogressed in history, which is also a mistake in history made by the Provisional Legislative Council then.

In 1994, it was felt that the professionals concerned had already come out. But it was only TUNG Chee-hwa who turned the political system back. I heard Members pointing out just now that the number of appointed seats could be gradually reduced in the future, as the so-called gradual and orderly development suggested by Mr IP Kwok-him and Dr Eric LI. Is it tantamount to walking 20 steps forward, 10 steps backwards and then forward again? Members said that this is gradual and orderly progress. This is history indeed, and I hope that the people of Hong Kong can hear this clearly. They dare to speak out now that reducing the number of appointed seats is a gradual and orderly development. Reducing the number of appointed seats is not a gradual and orderly development, it is retrogression. Basically, Hong Kong has been retrogressing, and that is disappointing to the public.

Moreover, I reckon that Mrs Selina CHOW has just hit the nail on the head. She said that it was not she who had to declare an interest. As the Chairman of the Hong Kong Tourism Board, she works very hard. Thus, if a declaration of interest is required, it should be the person who appointed her to declare interest, and I agree with that. If we look at the whole issue in detail, TUNG Chee-hwa has to declare an interest. After appointing 102 people, what interest does he gain? Has he got the pro-Government interest, or has he got an interest in terms of votes from the Election Committee? I feel that he has to declare an interest, and that is right. Mrs Selina CHOW has given us a good reminder, and I have never come across that point. Frankly speaking, TUNG Chee-hwa has to declare an interest. But I have no idea what interest he can get. Through political "pie-sharing", what interest does he get actually?

For the DAB, the Liberal Party, those political party members appointed and all those appointees, we can see clearly what interest they can get, and that is, \$34,000 in cash monthly. This is clearly a direct pecuniary interest. Mr IP Kwok-him said that the \$34,000 that he got was for serving the public. Fine, I am not saying that you are not serving the public. But do not forget, other people have to conduct electioneering in order to get that right to serve the public, while you, the appointed ones, do not have to do anything before getting that \$34,000 in cash. This is where the unfairness lies. I am not saying that you are unwilling to serve the public, but that you obtain this right of serving the public through a dishonourable channel and that is not right. Even though you have served the public, this is still not right as the means itself is not honourable. However, you are not required to declare interest, while very clearly, the interest in question is widely known: obtaining the seats without reasons and getting \$34,000 without reasons. What is dishonourable? It is simply because you are not required to go through election, and that is dishonourable!

Moreover, some Members told us not to take the seats as personal interest or franchise, and remarked that we were jealous because we were not appointed. This has totally distorted the picture. We definitely are not jealous of them. Instead, we are angry, because the seats are originally a kind of franchise of the public. As this is an election, the seats belong to the voters, those who cast their votes. They have a part to play in deciding the distribution of the council, to decide on their representatives. Thus, this is the franchise of the public. The appointment system itself deprives them of this right, distorts their choices. We are not jealous of them. Please do not judge us with such a low mindset, do not think that every one of us yearns for that \$34,000. If I do, I will urge the Government to appoint Mr LAU Chin-shek, making him suffer in the living hell, but we do not yearn for that. Thus, our frustration is that this system has distorted the people's choices, so much that finally, the entire issue has been turned into — a lot of people say that they did not like listening to these adjectives, and I do not like listening to these adjectives either, but they are actually quite right — a case of political deals, political loot-sharing. They could not be more correct. However, some adjectives are not right. For example, adjectives like political Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) and political security allowance are not right, as they are insults to those CSSA and social security allowance (SSA) recipients. CSSA is meant to help those in need, while SSA is for the elderly and the disabled. Through assisting them, we are expressing a spirit of solidarity in community. If we say that those appointed DC members are on the political dole, it will be insulting to the

CSSA recipients and putting a negative label on CSSA. I can see that most colleagues are here. I now say to you that this is not tenable. That line of argument is insulting to those CSSA recipients. CSSA recipients will not be so dishonourable. Those who obtain \$34,000 monthly through dishonourable means are the true dishonourable.

A lot of people have to make their own investment in the election expenses and have to work hard night and day. They really fight for each and every vote from the public through proper means. Compared to those who fight for votes on the power of their election platforms, it is undeniable that those appointed DC members are really dishonourable.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak?

MR JAMES TIEN (in Cantonese): Madam President, the motion debate we have today seems to have split up into two different topics. We are no longer discussing whether or not we should maintain an appointment system for the DCs, but two questions of whether the appointment system is very wrong in itself and whether it is the role of the DCs that renders the appointment system inappropriate.

Insofar as the appointment system is concerned, many colleagues, including those from the Democratic Party, have been appointed to serve in government organizations. I have a list here — Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong has been appointed to the Education Commission, Mr SIN Chung-kai has been appointed to a committee of the MPF and Dr LAW Chi-kwong has been appointed to the Social Welfare Advisory Committee. Therefore, I think the appointment system is accepted by the democratic camp or the Democratic Party, or they would not have accepted the appointments to serve in government organizations. Could you, on the contrary, say that your nominations are completely unacceptable to the Government? We have plenty of examples here showing that many of you have been appointed under the appointment system.....

MR MARTIN LEE (in Cantonese): I think the topic is about appointed members of DCs, is it not? It is not about members and other people of other organizations.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Even so, as many Members did talk about other issues in the debate, I want to listen to what Mr James TIEN is going to say to determine if it has anything to do with the motion question.

MR JAMES TIEN (in Cantonese): Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr James TIEN, you may continue with you speech.

MR JAMES TIEN (in Cantonese): Thank you, Madam President. Your judgement is wise. I said so simply because a lot of democrats have been vilifying the appointment system. Of course, the appointment system is adopted in a lot of places in the world. Do not say that it is only practised in the United Kingdom or it is practised here only now. I think the appointment system is not necessarily to be impracticable.

I now come back to the present argument on DCs. In fact, I also appreciate the crux of the contention. Similar to the Legislative Council, DCs are, after all, organizations with political functions. They are district organs. If we think it that way, we will come to a different view. In the past, the Government appointed district board members because in the DC elections, only residents of the respective districts could enjoy the right to vote.

Madam President, Honourable Members, I can talk about this issue from both sides because I have been an appointed member and also an elected member, but now, I am neither. Back then, I was appointed to the Kwai Tsing District Board, as my factory was in Kwai Tsing. However, the industrialists of Kwai Tsing were all not living in that district, while the workers lived in Kwai Tsing District. The Government considered that if the industrialists were appointed to the Kwai Tsing District Board, they might be able to provide some input to assist the operation. I felt that my input then was effective. At first, the number of appointed members was more than that of elected members. But later, the situation was reversed. If someone thought that those who only worked in that district should not be appointed to the district board, while only residents of that

district could become district board members, he might be right. People who lived there at night could make the operation of the relevant district board better. However, those who worked in that district during the day could also provide opinions effectively in areas like the arrangement of bus services, whether goods vehicles were allowed to conduct loading/unloading activities, and so on. In fact, I found that in course of debates in the district board, there were not so many opposing views. During the meetings, members would air their views. If they were accepted, a consensus could be reached and the Government would be advised of what to do.

Members can say that the situation may have changed today. Since there have already been so many elected DC members all these years, is it still necessary to make appointments? Are there people living in Central now? The work of the Central and Western District Council involves the operation of the entire Central during day-time. Can the appointment of some DC members provide any assistance to the operation? In my opinion, before the Government makes any appointments, it should wait until the elected members have been returned. It can then check what kind of professionals may be lacking in the DC before appointing the appropriate persons to it. Take Central and Western District as an example, I remember clearly that in the last term, I ran in the election at the Peak area for an elected seat and I beat Mr LEUNG Wing-on who was an accountant. Later on, the Government appointed Mr YOUNG Siu-chuen who was also an accountant. He later took the position of Chairman of Finance Committee in the Central and Western DC. I found that he was very competent. Certainly, I have no idea whether he will be appointed again. He does not belong to the Liberal Party. He does not belong to any political party, and he is independent. From that example, I reckon that appointment is practicable. Accountant YOUNG Siu-chuen is very industrious. He attended every meeting and provided a lot of opinions. The Democratic Party and the DAB also have good comments on him. I find that such kind of operation is very nice.

Of course, I believe there are also other examples, as Mr Albert CHAN said, that some DC members did not speak during meetings over the past few years. These examples may exist. Under the circumstances, I definitely agree to asking the Government not to appoint these people. When the Government appoints members again this time, it, of course, has to see whether the original appointees have made any contribution to the DCs over the past few years. In

terms of contribution, it does not necessarily refer to casting of votes in favour of which side, contribution of opinions also counts. And these opinions can also be classified into whether they are substantive, favourable to the operation of DCs, and whether they are good.

Madam President, I also notice that a lot of members appointed by the Government have to sponsor certain activities of DCs (it is still a trend at present). The democrats may not have much interest in this practice. They have never done so and will not do so either. In fact, the Government, or may be District Officers, will tend to suggest appointing certain people. The behaviour of these people may be viewed differently by Members of the Democratic Party. Apart from tendering the allowances as sponsorship, they will additionally sponsor activities during the Mid-Autumn Festival, Chinese New Year and other local activities. Do you think it is necessary for the Government to have such kind of appointed members to play such roles? The Government may think that it is necessary. Some appointed members indeed have contributed both their money and efforts, and the amount of their sponsorship could be more than their allowances and remuneration.

Therefore, from the angle of the people's livelihood and the angle of district affairs, I absolutely think that the participation of a small number of appointed members will not cause any problem. However, I also absolutely agree with the democrats that from the angle of the DC as a political institution, there are some problems. They have to ask why the government-appointed members do not have to run in the election. The election process is rather difficult and taxing. And the candidate may have to spend \$30,000 to \$40,000 before he can get the seat. How could these people join the DCs without running in the election? Besides, they are also very concerned about another point. Appointed members may be politically inclined to one side which would suffice to affect the result of the election of chairman. I think the Government should pay attention to this point.

By and large, there are 102 appointed members at present. Mr Howard YOUNG mentioned earlier that the Liberal Party had done some rough statistics and found that only 30-odd appointed members have political affiliation, while the others have no such affiliation. Of course, the democrats may not agree with that. They reckon that independent members may be the invisible members of other political parties. In fact, there are also a lot of invisible

democrats in DCs. After calculation, we find that among those members returned by DC elections, some are democrats, while some belong to other political parties. Mr Howard YOUNG further said a moment ago that among the appointed members, five became chairmen. In my opinion, appointed members can play their roles in various aspects indeed.

In conclusion, concerning the views aired by Members in the debate, I opine that what the Government has to consider is how it can cut some appointed seats. And most importantly, it has to consider whether those appointed members have made any contribution to DCs in the past. The Liberal Party supports the continued appointment of these appointed members.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak?

MR FRED LI (in Cantonese): Madam President, the speech of Mr James TIEN is simply spectacular — he simply mixed up everything to defend the appointment system of DCs.

Our debate is on the appointment system of DCs, not the 500 statutory bodies or advisory committees, please do not mix them up, because the job of a DC member is highly politicized. A DC member's job involves politics at the district level. I have been a DC member for nine years, as I have been working on the DC much longer than Mr James TIEN has. Most members of the Democratic Party have been fighting a tough battle in different districts, and they could get a seat in the DC only with the support of their voters. DC is absolutely not a place where only cultural and recreational activities are paid for, or it is an organization providing professional advice, as it is euphemistically claimed. Just now some colleagues have asked, "What professional advice has been provided?" When there is a need for professional advice, co-opted members can be elected to specific committees. For instance, an Environmental Improvement Committee may invite some experts to take part in some kind of discussions or some doctors to talk about issues at the district level. A Health Affairs Committee may invite some doctors to talk about SARS and the measures to be taken to improve the hygiene of the district. Why should we run in the DC elections? A DC member represents residents in a specific district, he is elected by those people and his duty is to convey opinions of the district

concerned, not to organize cultural and recreational activities and provide professional advice.

The DCs have to elect 20-odd members to sit on the Election Committee. Everybody could see that all of these 20-odd DC members have nominated Mr TUNG in the Election Committee. Who are they? One should know at one glance! Most of them are political party members, "pro-China" people and leftists.

Moreover, if there are government-appointed members on the DCs, the leftists or DAB members may be able control the DCs. Many stealth DAB patrons are out there, and those co-opted members are their men, because these people are the ones who choose the co-opted members, therefore they will definitely select the younger generation of the DAB as their co-opted members, then the co-opted will run in the next term.

All of these are so obvious to the eye. Please do not try to fool other people with these tricks! These are all politicized, one person is passing the seat onto another, and the root of the problem is the appointment of these people by the Government. These people control the DCs, therefore they will find some new blood as co-opted members, so as to pass it on from one generation to another. Each year, a large amount of money will be allocated to their sister groups, such as this association and that federation, to subsidize their activities under whatsoever auspices, while the intention is simply to enable their own candidates to socialize with as many voters as possible and to pave the way for their election campaigns in the future.

All of these are groundwork in layers, they are so meticulous and deep. The Liberal Party can never achieve this far, only the DAB can make it. For that reason, you are counted out in this respect. I am sorry, I have to say it in this way. You people really look dumb by saying that you provide professional advice and participate in the work in a professional way, but the fact is that you can have no share at all, and you are also counted out from the selection of co-opted members. You are just bystanders. You people are really too naïve. Sometimes, I think the Liberal Party behaves naively at the DC level. I really respect one of the members of the Liberal Party, who is a Kwun Tong DC member, and he is really a naïve person. He could do a lot of things, I really admire him. However, he has no share when he sees other people sharing the loot. He just makes the contribution in terms of money and efforts to accomplish his job, I really respect him.

However, is the DC really like this? No. You are just living in another world, you have not seen the real world of the DAB. It makes use of the DC to carry out its own groundwork at the district level. All of these tasks are done simply for the sake of placing their own agents and underpinnings who seem to represent different sectors in the Legislative Council. The Democratic Party would do the same, but the Democratic Party relies on elected DC members to act on our behalf, not to wait for appointment nor give the government a "flirting glance" for exchange of more appointments by the Government in times of a shortage of their own men in certain districts. Now that it is so obvious that whichever district has more members from the democratic camp, more royalists would be appointed in order to strike a balance and to have their men take up the posts of chairman, deputy and chairman of various committees. Subsequently, they may even take up the posts of the co-opted members, and the annual funding would go to their "offspring" organizations. All this is so very obvious. This is the case in many DCs. With the exception of a small number of DCs, no balance can be struck no matter how many pro-China members are appointed because elected members account for the majority. This is very clear.

I am only telling Members the truth. Should Members forget that, I can remind you that our Secretary, Secretary Dr Patrick HO used to be an appointed member of the defunct Urban Council and had been working with us for some time. I do respect him, but the question remains that every member should convey views of the people. Secretary Dr Patrick HO was a member of the last Provisional Urban Council and we had worked together for some time.

I hope Mr James TIEN will understand these facts. As a political party, the Liberal Party, the DAB and the Democratic Party, the purpose of setting up a political party is not to talk of anything under the sun or to host parties, this should not be the case; the purpose is to bring the partly ideology and belief into play at different level of councils through elections: To bring them into play at the DC level, at the Legislative Council level, but not to wait for appointment. A political party needs election, it has to participate in elections, to seize the power and to rule by means of election, right? This is crystal clear, not to wait for appointments.

We are debating the appointment system of DCs, not the appointment system of the Housing Authority, not the appointment system of the Urban Renewal Authority, nor the appointment system of those 500 bodies, as those

bodies have very little significance in terms of politics. Members of the Election Committee will not be returned by those bodies or organizations, and not a single Member of the Legislative Council is returned by those bodies. Since one Member of the Legislative Council will be elected by the DCs, therefore it involves the sharing of political loot. Those 500 statutory bodies do not serve such a political function, therefore I have to make that very clear. Please do not mix up everything.

I so submit.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak?
Secretary for Constitutional Affairs.

(Mr Albert HO raised his hand to indicate a wish to speak after a long time)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Excuse me, Secretary. Mr Albert HO, next time if you wish to speak, please raise your hand quickly to indicate your wish.

MR ALBERT HO (in Cantonese): Madam President, I am not going to repeat certain views, but I wish to share with Members an interesting issue with regard to the difference in mentality between appointed members and elected members.

The speech delivered by Mrs Selina CHOW is a very good reminder to set us thinking and tell us where the difference lies. What is so rare about that? It is because Mrs Selina CHOW is elected by the Wholesale and Retail Functional Constituency (FC), and at the same time, she has accepted the Government's appointment to hold certain public offices. One of her comments impressed me most. She said that with regard to her appointment to the Hong Kong Tourism Board, she had made contribution in terms of both money and efforts. If she had to declare interest, the one who benefited would be the authorities. I am sorry I have to say this, since I feel that she thought she had put aside her self-esteem and nobility in offering a helping hand. The Chief Executive regarded her important and considered her capable, and since she gave a helping hand, therefore she was due some thanks. This is exactly the mentality of an appointee.

However, I believe if Mrs CHOW runs in the election, she will not say these words to her constituents. I have no idea which constituency she would choose for next year's election and whether she would choose the direct election or the Wholesale and Retail FC election, but in the end, she has to have the ballots and voters who vote for her. If she says such words to her constituents, I would congratulate her, because all the hardship is over, and the result is very clear.

Therefore, where does the difference lie? Madam President, that is, the significance of election does not only rest with the fact that it give us a chance to experience a process which allows us to understand better the situation of our voters, the situation of the election, the reality and popular sentiments: The most important thing is to make us being humble, to let us know where the power comes from, and to enhance our understanding on a regular basis, so that we would not forget it. A successful person may think that he is high above the masses. This is one of the most important meanings of election.

I understand without doubt that Mrs CHOW is not an arrogant person, but sometimes when she speaks, she will reveal a little bit of this mindset unintentionally. Elected members will not say such things and will not think in such a way, because we know that we have to seek the affirmation and support of our voters on a regular basis. This has made direct elections that much valuable.

With regard to the issue of DC elections, I have heard many colleagues such as Mr HUI Cheung-ching and Mr NG Leung-sing say that since the DC was only an advisory body, why should we be that fussy about the issue and talk about what direct election, this and that? Honestly, if they keep on bearing in mind that the DC is only an advisory body, then a lot of people would not be that keen to support the idea that even DC members should "align" from the three-tier councils. Of course, the DC is not as simple as a consultative organ, I will not repeat the powers of DC members just now mentioned by my colleagues.

A council is a council, the feature of a council is that there are members on the council, and they should discuss business. What is the meaning of business discussion? As far as the duty of members to discuss business and its process are concerned, members have to exercise their political insight to find out the aspirations and needs of the sector or district they represent. To adopt public opinions as the basis and to make an appropriate political judgement with their own political ideologies. All these are jobs of every council member.

Members are definitely not experts. If one says that only the experts could tackle problems, then how many experts should be appointed? Should we appoint an expert on crocodiles to find ways to take care of that crocodile? This is definitely not the case. Very often, the most important thing about a member is that he knows that he should seek expert advice and to keep tab on the popular pulse before making a judgement. This is of the utmost importance.

Mr James TIEN and some other Members said that we should look at some so-called no-man's land: Central has no inhabitants. These words are really hilariously funny, it is simply astonishing. They should teach the Canadian and Australian people to ask their own council to hire someone to take care of their primeval forests and deserts, because those places are uninhabited. For that reason, no voter understands how the deserts should be managed and how the forests should be managed. Should this be the case?

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr HO, please face the Chair when you speak.

MR ALBERT HO (in Cantonese): I was just looking around. (*Laughter*)

For a member of a constituency, it is his duty to understand the environment of the constituency and to do his job properly. This is the obligation of a member. For example, if the scope of duty of a Central and Western DC member is Central, then he should shoulder the heavy responsibility. He has to spend a lot of time dealing with the transport issue of Central and find out all the double yellow lines in Central as well as places for off-loading. He should make a lot of efforts to understand all of these issues, shouldn't he? All of these jobs must be done. I think Mr James TIEN should know these things, because he used to be a DC member, and he should have gone out to find out these things in person. There are really many things to be done. They have to know where the buses come in and whether certain bus routes can be cut. In my constituency, the Tuen Mun DC used to suggest the addition of bus routes to Central, but what did the Government tell me? The Government told me that the Central and Western DC had objected to that idea due to the traffic jam in Central. In this case, they are doing their jobs.

Madam President, the work performance of an elected member is measured by the voters through a fair system of election. This is the fairest way

and this is the quality assurance of a system. Mr HUI Cheung-ching said earlier that one should not consider all appointed members are pro-government and consider the people their enemies. However, I wish to tell him that if a government habitually adopts unfair measures in order to secure its own power through the appointment of some members on the one hand, while this government constantly acts against the aspirations of the people on the other, then it will not be difficult for the people to find that those appointees are always antagonistic to public interest, and even if the result is not intended, they will become enemies of the people.

For that reason, I hope Members will not approve of the appointment system so that no more false public opinion would be created. What you are doing will get the Chief Executive into trouble. Please do not say that it is the Chief Executive who gets you royalists into trouble, in fact you are the ones who get the Chief Executive into trouble.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak?

MR ANDREW CHENG (in Cantonese): Madam President, in the night on 23 November when votes were being counted, I went to the polling station (Mr LAU Kong-wah was also there) to watch the voting results of Mr LAU Kong-wah and Miss HO Suk-ping, my party comrade. There was this most memorable moment when it was two to three o'clock in the morning, a resident who supported none of the two candidates came before me after he had learnt that Mr LAU Kong-wah had been defeated and said, "I am really happy! But Andrew CHENG, don't you be happy. I am not saying that you guys would necessarily do better, I just don't want LAU Kong-wah to win, that's why I voted for HO Suk-ping."

This is really a nail hit on the head, which shows that the democratic camp should hold the victory this time around with great circumspection. A lot of people reminded us that the so-called victory this time around was actually the victory of the people, not the victory of the democratic camp. The essence of a democratic election is not necessarily to pick the most capable and meritorious by means of a democratic election system, but at least it could kick those unsatisfactory elements out. This is the appeal of a democratic system.

Madam President, I began to work as a district board (DB) member in 1994, so it has not been a long time since. I have just been in office for several terms, but a number of Members here in this Chamber have been DC/DB members for many terms. I believe everybody will understand that the DC has changed completely from the old role as a neighbourhood and local constable, to its role to date with this term of DC from 23 November onwards. A lot of friends and relatives overseas used to know nothing about DC elections; they did not know Andrew CHENG was a DC member and they knew nothing about DC members in the past. However, they have learnt that from this term on. After 1 July, they knew that DC elections would be held on 23 November and many people went to the polling stations and cast their votes. The people have a feeling that under the existing political system of Hong Kong, the DCs would play an important part because as far as politics are concerned, many people find the royalists so detestable and unsatisfactory and the administration of Mr TUNG Chee-hwa so disappointing that they have to strike home a clear message by means of the ballots. From its past role of a trivial advisory or district body, the DC has transformed into a weighty and serious political body.

The DAB handed out a leaflet during the elections. It touched me deeply on reading it. The leaflet stated that the DAB considered social harmony was of the utmost importance, and to make 6 million Hong Kong people laugh heartily was of the utmost importance. After reading it, my first response was that the DAB did not only wish to make 6 million Hong Kong people laugh heartily, but also to make TUNG Chee-hwa laugh heartily by the time he saw the royalists had secured a stronghold in the councils. This is exactly the question mentioned by Mr LEE Cheuk-yan a moment ago. If TUNG Chee-hwa is required to declare his interest, it is definitely the political interest in this respect he has to declare. TUNG Chee-hwa has fished countless political gains under this appointment system. In the DCs, if there is a discussion topic concerning dissatisfaction with TUNG Chee-hwa, the royalists would, with the help of stealth royalists and appointed members, act as the defenders of the diffident administration of TUNG Chee-hwa.

For that reason, I hope the President will understand why we are so disgruntled with the appointment system in today's debate. It is because the name of the man in charge of the appointment is called TUNG Chee-hwa; because the man in charge of the appointment, who is the so-called the monarch behind this royalist party, is a man who only takes one-sided views, ignores public opinions, carries out policies feebly and understands nothing about public opinions. I find it most ironical after watching the news just now. Today,

Chinese President HU Jintao met with Edmund HO after meeting TUNG Chee-hwa. The Chinese President urged TUNG Chee-hwa repeatedly that he should open his ear and meet with people's organizations; but he praised Edmund HO with a profusion of four-character Chinese proverbs, so much so that Edmund was simply superhuman. TUNG Chee-hwa must have started to find himself in crisis as far as his politics and governance were concerned.

Earlier Mr Martin LEE said that if TUNG Chee-hwa failed to apprehend and pay attention to today's debate in this Chamber, just think about it: At this critical moment that in this December, the generally critical moment for him to appoint DC members, he had just met with the Chinese President and was told that he should do this, and then a lot of good suggestions have been made in today's Council debate; then, the TUNG's administration is really hopeless if he simply turns a deaf ear to all this.

Madam President, another point is that very often, some Members are quick to say that not all of the 1.06 million ballots are necessary for democracy. Right, we have not said that all of the 1.06 million ballots are in support of the democrats, they came from different sources. However, I hope that they (in particular the royalists and the DAB) would pay attention to the polling situation in those constituencies where the DAB confronts the Democratic Party or the pan-democracy camp, it is so obvious to everybody. Why? It is because voters are of the opinion that as far as your political ideology and your connection with TUNG Chee-hwa are concerned, you would give your full support to the Government regardless it is right or wrong, as long as it is proposed by the Government. The legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law is a typical example. Voters are of the opinion that if they keep on supporting your party and TUNG Chee-hwa, the appointment system would continue, then the aspiration of voters and a brand new outlook of the DCs and groundbreaking development of democracy would be distorted. What would it be, if not this?

A large number of Members of the Legislative Council are returned by elections. Unfortunately, the separate voting system prevents the passage of this motion. For that reason, the separate voting system and the appointment system are obstacles standing in the way of the development of democracy in Hong Kong; unchanged, as long as it remains, I believe the development of democracy would just like a stone dropped into the sea.

With these remarks, Madam President, I support the motion.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak? Is it really no Member wishes to speak?

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

SECRETARY FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): Madam President, the District Council Election 2003 was held on 23 November. The turnout rate and the overall turnout are higher than those of all previous elections; the number of elected seats and that of candidates are also the highest.

This election saw the extensive support and active participation by the people of Hong Kong. The entire election also proceeded in a fair, open, impartial and orderly manner. This shows Hong Kong people's concern about public affairs and their civic-mindedness and will surely produce a positive impact on the Government's efforts to promote community development and the work District Councils (DCs) in the future.

In the next four years, the Government will work closely with the new-term DCs. It is hoped that all DC members can do the most they can in district affairs, and that we can all join hands to further improve our district work.

Dr YEUNG Sum has moved a motion on appointed membership for the new term. I shall make several points in response here.

To begin with, in any DC, all of its members, be they elected, appointed or ex officio, do share a common mission, that is, the mission of doing a good job in district affairs and provide services to the people at the district level. Second, the composition of the new-term DCs is clearly set down in law, and the relevant ordinance was scrutinized and enacted by the Legislative Council long ago.

The present system of appointed membership for DCs is implemented by virtue of section 9 and Schedule 3 of the District Councils Ordinance (the Ordinance). Section 9 of the Ordinance provides that DCs shall be composed of elected members, appointed members and ex officio members who are Chairmen of Rural Committees.

Section 11 of the Ordinance further provides that the Chief Executive may appoint members of DCs, and that the number of appointees shall not exceed the number specified in Schedule 3 of the Ordinance. As set down in Schedule 3, the second-term DCs shall in total comprise 400 elected members, 27 exofficio members and not more than 102 appointed members. This is the maximum number of appointed members set down in the Ordinance, and the Chief Executive must consider the original intent of appointed membership and other general appointment criteria every time when he makes an appointment.

Before the enactment of the Ordinance, the Government conducted in 1988 a review of district organizations and also an extensive consultation exercise. The opinions collected during the review indicated that many people supported the retention of a certain number of appointed members in DCs.

After thorough consideration, the Government decided that roughly one fifth of the seats in each DC should be reserved as appointed seats. The proposal at that time was based on two considerations; first, the system of appointed membership can offer a channel through which people who keep an interest in district affairs and who possess the necessary abilities and experience can serve the community; second, appointed members can help reflect the views of various sectors in the district and contribute to discussions on district affairs.

Past experience shows us that the professional expertise and various different views brought by appointed members to DCs can actually make discussions in DCs more comprehensive and fuller. This is a form of contribution to the work of DCs.

Regarding the general criteria and considerations applied on the making of appointments, and also the specific appointment arrangements for the new term of DCs, the Secretary for Home Affairs will give a separate reply later on.

As for the way forward of the system of appointed membership in the long term, the SAR Government has made an undertaking to conduct a review of the composition, role and functions of DCs after the election this year. During the review, we will also study the system of appointed membership. And, in the course of this review, we will consult the public widely.

Madam President, there are divergent views on this issue in society, and even in the Legislative Council, individual Members have expressed a wide spectrum of opinions today. For this reason, we are of the view that before any thorough consideration and comprehensive consultation, it is inappropriate to jump to any conclusion on the system of appointed membership or make any decision in haste. We maintain that it is more prudent to address this issue together with other matters during the review on DCs, for this will ensure that members of the public will have more time to conduct thorough discussions.

With these remarks, Madam President, I oppose the motion.

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): Madam President, on 23 November this year, more than a million citizens cast their votes in the District Council (DC) Election. The unprecedented high turnout rate indicates that the public attaches great importance to our DC.

Secretary Stephen LAM has already spoken on the motion moved by Dr YEUNG Sum today. I will now state the stance of the Government in the light of the views presented by Members on the criteria and procedure of appointing members of DC.

DCs are comprised of elected members, appointed members and ex officio members, who together form an indispensable part of all DCs. Be they elected members, appointed members or ex officio members, they are all serving the community, our good partners. In the next four years, District Officers of the 18 districts will co-operate fully with them to serve the community, to build a more pleasant and harmonious community.

As in the past, the Government will appoint capable individuals experienced in district affairs as appointed members of DCs. The appointees are usually persons who have established good relationships with locals and have made contribution to district affairs, such as promoting the Clean Hong Kong campaign, promoting district hygiene, civic education, local economy, tourism and so on. We also hope that, through the appointment system, DCs can include members of different sectors, including both the grassroots and professionals.

In appointing members of DCs, the Government will take into account the overall interest of the community. The conduct, capability, professional

qualifications and public service records of the individual, as well as his/her enthusiasm in serving the community will all be considered. Moreover, participants of the 2003 DC election will not be considered for appointment, and the Government has never promised to offer any appointment to anyone before the DC elections.

The Home Affairs Bureau, Home Affairs Department and District Officers of various districts will identify the suitable candidates through our district network. After careful consideration and taking into account the actual situation of individual districts, we will recommend the suitable candidates to the Chief Executive. The result will be gazetted once a decision is made.

The legislative intent of the District Councils Ordinance is that DCs should be comprised of elected members, appointed members and ex officio members. Moreover, appointed members should assume the same roles, rights and obligations as elected members and ex officio members do. They are also serving the community. That is why they are also entitled to the right to elect and being elected as the chairmen and deputy chairmen of DCs. Since the election of chairmen and deputy chairmen of DCs will be held in January, the arrangements for appointment of DC members will be completed as soon as possible so that the operation of DCs will not be affected.

Madam President, I so submit.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr YEUNG Sum, you may now reply and you have eight minutes 28 seconds.

DR YEUNG SUM (in Cantonese): Madam President, first of all, I wish to thank the 30 Members who have spoken. I did not quite expect this motion debate to cause sparks flying off in all directions. It has been a heated debate which is seldom seen recently. Perhaps Members are under the effect of the 1 July march. This, perhaps, has to do with the 1 July effect.

Mr NG Leung-sing has asked a question. He asked why the Democratic Party had to bring up an old issue. He said that this had been an old topic of debate discussed over and over again. He asked whether we had been too carried away by our victory this time around and were therefore speaking

nonsense. In fact, I must make it clear again for the record that this so-called victory of the Democratic Party is only the victory of the people. Although the Democratic Party has 79%.....

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr NG Leung-sing, do you have a point of order?

MR NG LEUNG-SING (in Cantonese): Right, a point of order. It seems what I heard Dr YEUNG Sum quote in his speech is not what I have said.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr NG Leung-sing, you can clarify what has been misunderstood in your speech later, after Dr YEUNG Sum has spoken.

Dr YEUNG Sum, please continue with your speech.

DR YEUNG SUM (in Cantonese): Thank you, Madam President. In fact, one of the reasons, or even the major reason for the success rate of 79% achieved by the Democratic Party this time is that voters are dissatisfied with the "royalists" and they have cast the so-called "protest votes" in English. They are dissatisfied with the royalists and the governance by Mr TUNG, therefore they supported the pro-democracy camp and the Democratic Party. Another reason is that we have learned from our experience in 1999 and improved our work at the district level. However, in the final analysis, the major factor is the record turnout rate. Generally speaking, a high turnout rate is favourable to the pro-democracy camp.

The Government always says that constitutional development should be gradual and orderly and even our leader in the Central Authorities has also said on television today that it has to be gradual and orderly. However, the case with the District Councils (DCs) is one of gradual retrogression. The British Hong Kong Government abolished the appointed seats as early as 1994, but they were restored in 1997. Therefore, basically that is not gradual and orderly progress according to the Basic Law, but rather, a contravention of the Basic Law and deviation from the principle of orderly and gradual progress because that is gradual and orderly retrogression. Therefore, we should not say that the present calls for democracy are a violation of the Basic Law. In fact, it is

precisely the restoration of those appointed seats by the Government that has really destroyed the fundamental principle of gradual and orderly progress as stated in the Basic Law.

Mrs Selina CHOW and Mr James TIEN have spoken at length, asking why we have belittled the advisory bodies and many people who are serving society. They have devoted a lot of time and given a lot of professional advice to serve society. In fact, we are not having a discussion on advisory bodies today. There are more than 500 advisory bodies in Hong Kong and many professionals and members of the public are serving society through this channel. It is mainly the restoration of and increase in appointed seats in the DCs that we want to pinpoint. This is basically unacceptable because this is already out-of-date. Apart from calling this gradual and orderly retrogression, this is also out-of-date.

The Democratic Party will not consider the appointees enemies. Mr HUI Cheung-ching asked why we had to be so at odds with appointed DC members and regard them as enemies? This is not the case. Democratic Party members are co-operating well with appointed DC members in many districts. Take Central and Western District as an example, Mr IP Kwok-him has already pointed out that we are quite co-operative with some appointed DC members. We co-operate with whoever we can and will not consider appointed DC members enemies simply because of ideology. We have never done so, nor is this the style of our party. We are very pragmatic and put the work in the districts foremost in our mind.

Are the DCs a purely consultative framework? Please look up the Basic Law. The DCs are no longer just a consultative framework. DC members can become members of the Election Committee because some of them are among the 200 people forming a portion of the members of the Election Committee. DC members can elect Legislative Council Members and they can also elect the Chief Executive through the Election Committee. Therefore, why should it be said that the DCs are just a consultative framework? This is no longer the case. In fact, the Chief Executive should avoid arousing suspicions and should refrain from appointing DC members. He has to table a bill as soon as possible to abolish the appointment system because he is appointing his voters.

Of the 102 appointed DC members, 30% of them had political affiliations. Last time, 13 of them were from the DAB, 11 from the HKPA and nine from the Liberal Party. They already accounted for 30% of the 102 appointees. This

group of people are empowered to elect members of the Election Committee and the Chief Executive, yet these people are appointed by the Chief Executive and he is appointing people who will vote for him. If he can be a little more impartial, he should avoid arousing suspicions by tabling an electoral bill as soon as possible to abolish this arrangement of appointing DC members. If so, I will consider the Chief Executive shrewd. Otherwise, he is in fact doing favours to his own clique and being his own King Maker, selecting a group of people who will put him on the throne. May I ask how a civilized society can accept such a practice? We must bear this in mind not to say that the DCs are purely a consultative framework anymore? They are not. If we say so, then we are not well-versed in the law, nor have we read the Basic Law and we have also turned a blind eye to the reality. In particular, I have to state clearly that the Chief Executive should take the initiative of tabling a bill to change this arrangement. Basically, the appointed seats and ex officio seats in DCs should be abolished.

The last time we met with the Chief Executive because he had to prepare the policy address. On behalf of the Democratic Party, we requested the Chief Executive to abolish the appointed seats. He said he would consider this. He said that he wanted to take on board some professionals, but these people did not want to take part in elections, nor do they have the time or the inclination to do so, that there were matters relating to personal character — the Chief Executive did not mention personal character — but they wanted to serve society, therefore they were appointed. In fact, of these 102 persons, if we set 30% as the ceiling for the number of appointed members that come from the three "royalist" political parties, then the Government has in fact subsidized members of these parties to run in elections because soon these people will represent their political parties and run in elections. For four years, they have received subsidies from taxpayers for the purpose of running in elections. If the Chief Executive wants to subsidize the "royalists" to run in elections, OK, then please state it clearly from the outset by saying, "I support him, I am grooming political talents because he supports me, has the same beliefs as I do and is like a member of my cabinet". Please state it clearly, and unequivocally. However, the Chief Executive has not done so but merely says that these professionals want to serve society, yet for all sorts of reasons, they do not want to run in elections, so we should not waste them. However, this is not the truth.

Can the Chief Executive tell me openly and clearly whether he is subsidizing some people to run in elections through this system and basically, these people are members of pro-government political parties? If anyone

accuse me of lying, please present the facts. Furthermore, often the Government is trying to achieve a fallacious balance. In some councils, the pro-democracy camp has achieved fairly good results in elections, so the Government appoints some pro-government people to check them and prevent them from being elected chairmen. These two points are both facts, not fabricated by me. If I know nothing about this, I would just say nothing. The Democratic Party opposes appointed seats mainly because this violates the principle of equality. Why can professionals or the learned enjoy this kind of political right? How can we still accept such a viewpoint? Even my students cannot accept this. Even university students think that everyone is born equal. I do not know why he still has such a concept. Everyone is born equal, so why are professionals entitled to one more vote? How can they become DC members without running in elections? How can they enjoy the gains without pain and become public servants? This should not be allowed because everyone should have equal opportunities. Why should professionals enjoy privileges? Please enlighten me.

Therefore, according to the principle of fairness, the Democratic Party cannot accept the existence of ex officio and appointed seats in DCs. Basically, our stance is that the Basic Law should be amended and electoral legislation should be amended to abolish ex officio and appointed seats. However, before any amendment is made, I think that the law has still to be adhered to. Miss Margaret NG has stated clearly that one person should be appointed to each district. I believe this is allowed by the law and, at the same time, consistent with the public aspiration democracy, that is, to appoint the least and minimal number of DC members. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr NG Leung-sing, do you want to clarify the part of your speech which has been misunderstood?

MR NG LEUNG-SING (in Cantonese): Yes. Thank you, Madam President, for allowing me to clarify the part of my speech which has been misunderstood by Dr YEUNG Sum. Perhaps he wants me to clarify this here. I did not say that the Democratic Party had reopened a past subject. As regards the point about speaking nonsense, I have only said that euphoria can easily cause the person concerned to speak nonsense. I have also said that we should not forget that not long ago, the Member concerned also played a part in electing an appointed member as a DC chairman.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Dr YEUNG Sum be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Dr YEUNG Sum rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr YEUNG Sum has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for three minutes.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr David LI, Miss Margaret NG, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Mr SIN Chung-kai, Dr LAW Chi-kwong, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Michael MAK and Dr LO Wing-lok voted for the motion.

Mr Kenneth TING, Mr James TIEN, Dr LUI Ming-wah, Mrs Selina CHOW, Mr HUI Cheung-ching, Mr CHAN Kwok-keung, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr Howard YOUNG, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Timothy FOK, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Henry WU, Mr LEUNG Fu-wah and Mr IP Kwok-him voted against the motion.

Dr Eric LI and Mr LAU Ping-cheung abstained.

Geographical Constituencies and Election Committee:

Ms Cyd HO, Mr Albert HO, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, Mr Martin LEE, Mr Fred LI, Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr Andrew WONG, Dr YEUNG Sum, Mr LAU Chin-shek, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Andrew CHENG, Mr SZETO Wah, Mr Albert CHAN, Mr WONG Sing-chi, Mr Frederick FUNG and Ms Audrey EU voted for the motion.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Miss CHOY So-yuk, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Dr David CHU, Mr NG Leung-sing, Mr YEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr Ambrose LAU and Mr MA Fung-kwok voted against the motion.

THE PRESIDENT, Mrs Rita FAN, did not cast any vote.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 26 were present, eight were in favour of the motion, 16 against it and two abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections and by the Election Committee, 28 were present, 17 were in favour of the motion and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, she therefore declared that the motion was negatived.

NEXT MEETING

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): It is now 10 minutes to midnight. I wish to thank Members for their co-operation, which has enabled us to finish all items on the Agenda before midnight.

I now adjourn the Council until 2.30 pm on Wednesday, 10 December 2003.

Adjourned accordingly at nine minutes to Midnight.

Appendix I**WRITTEN ANSWER****Written answer by the Secretary for Home Affairs to Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong's supplementary question to Question 1**

As regards appointments to advisory and statutory bodies, we undertook to provide a full list of members of the Election Committee who have been appointed to advisory and statutory bodies as supplementary information.

In the main reply, we informed the Legislative Council that based on rough estimation, there were some 390 Election Committee members appointed to advisory and statutory bodies. Upon detailed verification, the actual figure as at 3 December 2003 was 357. The full list showing the names and appointment details is listed in the Annex.

The reasons for the reduction in number are manifold. Firstly, upon our checking, many Election Committee members have informed us that they are not serving advisory and statutory bodies as government appointees, but as elected, nominated, ex officio or co-opted members. Secondly, the Election Committee was constituted on 14 July 2000. Many Election Committee members were appointed to advisory and statutory bodies before they were returned to the Election Committee. If they had not been reappointed after the establishment of Election Committee, it would not be appropriate to include these members as part of our answer since they were not Election Committee members at the time they were appointed. Last but not least, a handful of Election Committee members have passed away in the past year or so, hence their particulars have been excluded.

As for the question on the appointment authority, Members may wish to note that the Home Affairs Bureau does not have a full record of such information. In this connection, we need to liaise with all bureaux and departments so as to obtain the relevant information, and we will provide them to Members as soon as practicable.

Election Committee Members Serving in Advisory and Statutory Bodies (position as at 3 December 2003)
選舉委員會成員在諮詢及法定組織服務的情況（截至 2003 年 12 月 3 日）

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
1	Mr	Apps Victor Stanley		Manpower Development Committee	人力發展委員會	Member	15-Oct-02	14-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
2	Mr	Au Wai Hung Anthony	區煒洪	Appeals Board (Education)	上訴委員會（教育事宜）	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
2	Mr	Au Wai Hung Anthony	區煒洪	Employees Retraining Board	僱員再培訓局	Member	1-Nov-99	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局局長
2	Mr	Au Wai Hung Anthony	區煒洪	Citizens Advisory Committee on Community Relations of the ICAC	廉政公署社區關係市民諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
2	Mr	Au Wai Hung Anthony	區煒洪	Curriculum Development Council	課程發展議會	Member	1-Sep-98	31-Aug-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局局長
2	Mr	Au Wai Hung Anthony	區煒洪	Small and Medium Enterprises Committee	中小型企業委員會	Member	15-Dec-00	14-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
2	Mr	Au Wai Hung Anthony	區煒洪	Environmental Impact Assessment Appeal Board Panel	環境影響評估上訴委員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
3	Ir	Blake Ronald James	詹伯樂	Provisional Construction Industry Co-ordination Board	臨時建造業統籌委員會	Member	28-Sep-01	27-Sep-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及工務局局長
4	Mr	Bradley Mark John		Appeal Board (Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation)	上訴委員會（旅館業）	Member	1-Nov-00	31-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
4	Mr	Bradley Mark John		Appeal Board (Clubs (Safety of Premises))	上訴委員會 (會社 (房產安全))	Member	1-Nov-00	31-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
4	Mr	Bradley Mark John		Appeal Board (Bedspace Apartments)	上訴委員會 (床位寓所)	Member	1-Dec-00	30-Nov-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
5	Mr	Brooke Charles Nicholas	蒲祿祺	Board of Review (Inland Revenue Ordinance)	稅務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
5	Mr	Brooke Charles Nicholas	蒲祿祺	Standing Commission on Civil Service Salaries and Conditions of Service	公務員薪俸及服務條件常務委員會	Member	1-Aug-00	31-Jul-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
5	Mr	Brooke Charles Nicholas	蒲祿祺	Board of Directors of the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation	香港科技園公司董事局	Member	7-May-01	30-Jun-05	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技局局長
6	The Hon	Chan Bernard Charnwut	陳智思	Council of the Lingnan University	嶺南大學校務會	Treasurer	22-Oct-01	21-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
6	The Hon	Chan Bernard Charnwut	陳智思	Insurance Advisory Committee	保險業諮詢委員會	Member	15-Sep-98	14-Sep-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
6	The Hon	Chan Bernard Charnwut	陳智思	Fight Crime Committee	撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-05	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
6	The Hon	Chan Bernard Charnwut	陳智思	Standing Committee on Disciplined Services Salaries and Conditions of Service (SCDS)	紀律人員薪俸及服務條件常務委員會	Chairman	4-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
6	The Hon	Chan Bernard Charnwut	陳智思	Community Investment and Inclusion Fund Committee	社區投資共享基金委員會	Vice Chairman	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
6	The Hon	Chan Bernard Charnwut	陳智思	Task Force on Employment	就業專責小組	Member	21-Oct-02	21-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
6	The Hon	Chan Bernard Charnwut	陳智思	Committee on Financial Assistance for Family Members of Those Who Sacrifice Their Lives To Save Others	向捨身救人者家屬提供經濟援助委員會	Member	11-Feb-02	10-Feb-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
7	Mr	Chan C Ronnie	陳啟宗	Council of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	香港科技大學校董會	Member	5-Sep-94	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
8	Mr	Chan Chit Kwai Stephen	陳捷貴	Environmental Campaign Committee	環境保護運動委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
8	Mr	Chan Chit Kwai Stephen	陳捷貴	District Fight Crime Committee, Central & Western	中西區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-92	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
8	Mr	Chan Chit Kwai Stephen	陳捷貴	Area Committee, Mid-Levels	半山分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
8	Mr	Chan Chit Kwai Stephen	陳捷貴	Liquor Licensing Board	酒牌局	Member	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
8	Mr	Chan Chit Kwai Stephen	陳捷貴	District Fire Safety Committee, Central & Western	中西區防火委員會	Member	1-May-98	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
9	Mr	Chan Cho Chak John	陳祖澤	Council of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	香港科技大學校董會	Chairman	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-06	Chief Executive	行政長官
9	Mr	Chan Cho Chak John	陳祖澤	Advisory Committee on Corruption of the ICAC	廉政公署貪污問題諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
10	Mr	Chan Chung Ling	陳松齡	Chinese Language Interface Advisory Committee	中文界面諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jun-01	31-May-05	Director of Information Technology Services	資訊科技署署長
11	Ms	Chan Hang Kwai	陳杏葵	Hong Kong Arts Development Council	香港藝術發展局	Member	1-Jan-98	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
12	Mr	Chan Kam Cheung Paul	陳錦祥	Education Scholarships Fund Committee	教育獎學基金委員會	Member	21-Sep-03	20-Sep-06	Chief Executive	行政長官
12	Mr	Chan Kam Cheung Paul	陳錦祥	Football Betting and Lotteries Commission	足球博彩及獎券事務委員會	Member	1-Aug-03	31-Jul-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
12	Mr	Chan Kam Cheung Paul	陳錦祥	Action Committee Against Narcotics	禁毒常務委員會	Member	1-Jan-97	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
12	Mr	Chan Kam Cheung Paul	陳錦祥	Committee on the Promotion of Civic Education	公民教育委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-05	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局局長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
12	Mr	Chan Kam Cheung Paul	陳錦祥	Administrative Appeals Board	行政上訴委員會	Member	15-Jul-03	14-Jul-06	Chief Executive	行政長官
13	The Hon	Chan Kam Lam	陳鑑林	Hong Kong Housing Authority	香港房屋委員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
13	The Hon	Chan Kam Lam	陳鑑林	Board of the Urban Renewal Authority	市區重建局董事會	Non- executive Director	1-May-01	30-Apr-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
13	The Hon	Chan Kam Lam	陳鑑林	Task Force on Employment	就業專責小組	Member	21-Oct-02	21-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
13	The Hon	Chan Kam Lam	陳鑑林	Area Committee, Kwun Tong West	觀塘西分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
14	Mr	Chan Kam Lam Richard	陳金霖	Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning)	上訴委員會（城市規 劃）	Member	1-Oct-00	30-Sep-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
14	Mr	Chan Kam Lam Richard	陳金霖	District Fight Crime Committee, Tsuen Wan	荃灣區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
14	Mr	Chan Kam Lam Richard	陳金霖	Area Committee, Tsuen Wan Central	荃灣中分區委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Elected from amongst members	成員之間互 選產生
15	Mr	Chan Kin Por	陳健波	Insurance Advisory Committee	保險業諮詢委員會	Member	15-Sep-02	14-Sep-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
15	Mr	Chan Kin Por	陳健波	Advisory Committee on Travel Agents	旅行代理商諮詢委員 會	Member	1-Nov-03	31-Oct-05	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
15	Mr	Chan Kin Por	陳健波	Employees Compensation Assistance Fund Board	僱員補償援助基金管 理局	Member	7-Aug-02	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
15	Mr	Chan Kin Por	陳健波	Administrative Appeals Board	行政上訴委員會	Member	15-Jul-00	14-Jul-06	Chief Executive	行政長官
16	Mr	Chan King Sang Edward	陳景生	Pharmacy and Poisons Appeal Tribunal	藥劑業及毒藥上訴審 裁處	Chairman	1-Feb-94	31-Jan-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
16	Mr	Chan King Sang Edward	陳景生	Noise Control Appeal Board Panel	噪音管制上訴委員會	Chairman	1-Feb-01	31-Jan-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
16	Mr	Chan King Sang Edward	陳景生	Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning)	上訴委員會 (城市規 劃)	Deputy Chairman	19-Dec-01	18-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
17	The Hon	Chan Kwok Keung	陳國強	Employees Retraining Board	僱員再培訓局	Member	1-Nov-00	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
18	Prof	Chan Lai Wan Cecilia	陳麗雲	Board of the Urban Renewal Authority	市區重建局董事會	Non- executive Director	1-May-01	30-Apr-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
19	Dr	Chan Man Hung	陳萬雄	Hong Kong Arts Development Council	香港藝術發展局	Member	1-Jul-00	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
20	Mr	Chan Ming Leung	陳明亮	Safety Officer Advisory Committee	安全主任諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Commissioner for Labour	勞工處處長
21	Mr	Chan Mo Po Paul	陳茂波	Board of Review (Inland Revenue Ordinance)	稅務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jul-00	30-Jun-06	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
21	Mr	Chan Mo Po Paul	陳茂波	Transport Advisory Committee	交通諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
22	Mr	Chan Mou Keung Haydn	陳茂強	Area Committee, Causeway Bay	銅鑼灣分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-97	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
22	Mr	Chan Mou Keung Haydn	陳茂強	District Fight Crime Committee, Wan Chai	灣仔區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
23	Ir	Chan Pak Fong	陳伯芳	Engineers Registration Board	工程師註冊管理局	Member	16-Jul-98	20-Sep-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
24	Mr	Chan Pun	陳彬	Disciplinary Tribunal Panel (Electricity)	紀律審裁委員會 (電 力)	Member	28-Jul-03	27-Jul-06	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
24	Mr	Chan Pun	陳彬	Electrical Safety Advisory Committee	電氣安全諮詢委員會	Member	6-Apr-00	5-Apr-04	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
25	Dr	Chan Shu On Cecil	陳樹安	Council of the Hong Kong Baptist University	香港浸會大學校董會	Member	1-Jan-97	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
26	Ms	Chan Siu King Cammy	陳少琼	Innovation and Technology Fund (Foundation Industries) Projects Vetting Committee	創新及科技基金（基礎 工業）項目評審委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-04	Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Technology (Communications and Technology)	工商及科技 局常任秘書 長（通訊及科 技）
26	Ms	Chan Siu King Cammy	陳少琼	Basic Law Promotion Steering Committee	基本法推廣督導委員 會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
27	Ir Dr	Chan Siu Kun Alex	陳兆根	Town Planning Board	城市規劃委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
28	Mr	Chan Tung	陳東	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
28	Mr	Chan Tung	陳東	District Fight Crime Committee, Sham Shui Po	深水埗區撲滅罪行委 員會	Member	1-Apr-93	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
28	Mr	Chan Tung	陳東	Area Committee, Sham Shui Po South	深水埗南分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
28	Mr	Chan Tung	陳東	District Fire Safety Committee, Sham Shui Po	深水埗區防火委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
29	Mr	Chan Wai Lun	陳偉麟	Hong Kong Productivity Council	香港生產力促進局	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
29	Mr	Chan Wai Lun	陳偉麟	Employees' Compensation Insurance Levies Management Board	僱員補償保險徵款管 理局	Member	1-Jul-01	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
29	Mr	Chan Wai Lun	陳偉麟	Occupational Deafness Compensation Board	職業性失聰補償管理 局	Member	1-Jun-01	31-May-06	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
29	Mr	Chan Wai Lun	陳偉麟	Area Committee, Sha Tin West Two	沙田西二分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
30	Mr	Chan Wan Sang	陳雲生	Area Committee, Tuen Mun South East	屯門東南分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-93	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
30	Mr	Chan Wan Sang	陳雲生	District Fight Crime Committee, Tuen Mun	屯門區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-93	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
31	Dr	Chan Yau Hing Robin	陳有慶	Council of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	香港科技大學校董會	Member	1-Aug-99	31-Jul-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
32	Dr	Chan Yee Shing	陳以誠	Medical Council of Hong Kong	香港醫務委員會	Member	24-Jan-02	23-Jan-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
32	Dr	Chan Yee Shing	陳以誠	Occupational Therapists Board	職業治療師管理委員 會	Member	3-Jul-02	2-Jul-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
33	Mr	Chan Yuek Sut Joseph	陳若瑟	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團（建築物）	Member	1-Dec-00	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃 地政局副秘 書長（規劃及 地政）2
33	Mr	Chan Yuek Sut Joseph	陳若瑟	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
33	Mr	Chan Yuek Sut Joseph	陳若瑟	District Fight Crime Committee, Southern	南區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
33	Mr	Chan Yuek Sut Joseph	陳若瑟	Area Committee, Wong Chuk Hang & Stanley	黃竹坑及赤柱分區委 員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
34	The Hon	Chan Yuen Han	陳婉嫻	Vocational Training Council	職業訓練局	Member	1-Jul-03	30-Jun-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
34	The Hon	Chan Yuen Han	陳婉嫻	Citizens Advisory Committee on Community Relations of the ICAC	廉政公署社區關係市 民諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
34	The Hon	Chan Yuen Han	陳婉嫻	Disaster Relief Fund Advisory Committee	賑災基金諮詢委員會	Member	7-Nov-00	30-Jun-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
35	Prof	Chang Song Hing	張雙慶	Council of The Chinese University of Hong Kong	香港中文大學校董會	Member	5-Sep-00	4-Sep-06	Elected by Assembly of Fellows of United College	由聯合書院 院務委員會 選舉產生
36	Ms	Chau Chuen Heung	周轉香	Citizens Advisory Committee on Community Relations of the ICAC	廉政公署社區關係市 民諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-99	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
36	Ms	Chau Chuen Heung	周轉香	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團（建築物）	Member	1-Dec-00	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃 地政局副秘 書長（規劃及 地政）2
36	Ms	Chau Chuen Heung	周轉香	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
36	Ms	Chau Chuen Heung	周轉香	District Fight Crime Committee, Islands	離島區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-95	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
36	Ms	Chau Chuen Heung	周轉香	Area Committee, Lantau	大嶼山分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-93	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
36	Ms	Chau Chuen Heung	周轉香	District Fire Safety Committee, Islands	離島區防火委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
37	Mr	Chau How Chen	周厚澄	Citizens Advisory Committee on Community Relations of the ICAC	廉政公署社區關係市 民諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
37	Mr	Chau How Chen	周厚澄	Committee on the Promotion of Civic Education	公民教育委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長
37	Mr	Chau How Chen	周厚澄	Hong Kong Sports Development Board	香港康體發展局	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
37	Mr	Chau How Chen	周厚澄	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
37	Mr	Chau How Chen	周厚澄	Basic Law Promotion Steering Committee	基本法推廣督導委員 會	Member	1-Jan-98	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
37	Mr	Chau How Chen	周厚澄	Committee on Financial Assistance for Family Members of Those Who Sacrifice Their Lives To Save Others	向捨身救人者家屬提 供經濟援助委員會	Member	11-Feb-02	10-Feb-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
37	Mr	Chau How Chen	周厚澄	Community Sports Committee	社區體育事務委員會	Member	1-Oct-03	31-Mar-05	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
38	Mr	Chau Yin Ming Francis	周賢明	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團（建築物）	Member	1-Dec-03	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃 地政局副秘 書長（規劃及 地政）2
38	Mr	Chau Yin Ming Francis	周賢明	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
38	Mr	Chau Yin Ming Francis	周賢明	District Fight Crime Committee, Sai Kung	西貢區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-91	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
38	Mr	Chau Yin Ming Francis	周賢明	Area Committee, Tseung Kwan O South	將軍澳南分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
39	Mr	Chen Darwin	陳達文	Social Welfare Advisory Committee	社會福利諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jun-98	30-Nov-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
39	Mr	Chen Darwin	陳達文	Hong Kong Arts Development Council	香港藝術發展局	Chairman	1-Jul-02	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
40	Ms	Chen Sheau Ling Cecilia Daisy	陳小玲	Citizens Advisory Committee on Community Relations of the ICAC	廉政公署社區關係市 民諮詢委員會	Co-opted Member	1-Jan-98	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
40	Ms	Chen Sheau Ling Cecilia Daisy	陳小玲	Appeal Board (Amusement Game Centres)	上訴委員會（遊戲機中 心）	Member	30-May-98	29-May-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
40	Ms	Chen Sheau Ling Cecilia Daisy	陳小玲	Women's Commission	婦女事務委員會	Member	15-Jan-01	14-Jan-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
41	Mr	Cheng Chun Ping	鄭俊平	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
41	Mr	Cheng Chun Ping	鄭俊平	District Fire Safety Committee, Tai Po	大埔區防火委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
42	Mr	Cheng Hoi Chuen Vincent	鄭海泉	Board of the Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation	九廣鐵路管理局	Member	16-Nov-97	15-Nov-04	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
42	Mr	Cheng Hoi Chuen Vincent	鄭海泉	Standing Committee on Directorate Salaries and Conditions of Service	首長級薪俸及服務條 件常務委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
42	Mr	Cheng Hoi Chuen Vincent	鄭海泉	Board of Trustees of the Lord Wilson Heritage Trust	衛奕信勳爵文物信託 受託人委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
42	Mr	Cheng Hoi Chuen Vincent	鄭海泉	Independent Commission on Remuneration for Members of the ExCo and the Legislature of the HKSAR	香港特別行政區行政 會議成員及立法會議 員薪津獨立委員	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
43	Dr	Cheng Hon Kwan	鄭漢鈞	Transport Advisory Committee	交通諮詢委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-97	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
44	Mr	Cheng Huan	清洪	Criminal and Law Enforcement Injuries Compensation Boards	暴力及執法傷亡賠償 委員會	Member	19-Jun-01	18-Jun-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
45	Prof	Cheng Kai Ming	程介明	Police Children's Education Trust Management Committee	警察子女教育信託基 金管理委員會	Member	1-Jul-03	30-Jun-05	Principal Assistant Secretary (Security) E	保安局首席 助理秘書長 E
45	Prof	Cheng Kai Ming	程介明	Police Education and Welfare Trust Management Committee	警察教育及福利信託 基金管理委員會	Member	1-Jul-03	30-Jun-05	Principal Assistant Secretary (Security) E	保安局首席 助理秘書長 E
45	Prof	Cheng Kai Ming	程介明	Citizens Advisory Committee on Community Relations of the ICAC	廉政公署社區關係市 民諮詢委員會	Chairman	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
45	Prof	Cheng Kai Ming	程介明	Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Qualifications	師訓與師資諮詢委員 會	Chairman	1-Jun-02	31-May-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
46	The Hon	Cheng Kar Foo Andrew	鄭家富	Task Force on Employment	就業專責小組	Member	21-Oct-02	21-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
47	Mr	Cheng King Man	鄭景文	Area Committee, Sai Kung	西貢分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
48	Dr	Cheng Lee Ming	鄭利明	Advisory Committee on Code of Practice for Recognized Certification Authorities	認可核證機關業務守 則諮詢委員會	Member	1-Feb-03	31-Jan-04	Director of Information Technology Services	資訊科技署 署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
49	Mr	Cheng Wai Chee Christopher	鄭維志	Exchange Fund Advisory Committee	外匯基金諮詢委員會	Member	10-Dec-01	9-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
49	Mr	Cheng Wai Chee Christopher	鄭維志	Town Planning Board	城市規劃委員會	Member	1-Apr-96	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
50	The Hon	Cheng Yiu Tong	鄭耀棠	Honours Committee	授勳評審委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
50	The Hon	Cheng Yiu Tong	鄭耀棠	Task Force on Employment	就業專責小組	Member	4-May-98	21-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
51	Prof	Cheung Bing Leung Anthony	張炳良	Consumer Council	消費者委員會	Member	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
51	Prof	Cheung Bing Leung Anthony	張炳良	Standing Commission on Civil Service Salaries and Conditions of Service	公務員薪俸及服務條 件常務委員會	Member	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
52	Mr	Cheung Chi Wing	張志榮	Area Committee, Lantau	大嶼山分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
53	Mr	Cheung Hok Ming	張學明	Antiquities Advisory Board	古物諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
54	Dr	Cheung Kwok Wah	張國華	Advisory Management Committee of the Hong Kong Teachers' Centre	香港教師中心諮詢管 理委員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Permanent Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 常任秘書長
54	Dr	Cheung Kwok Wah	張國華	Committee on Home-School Co-operation	家庭與學校合作事宜 委員會	Chairman	1-Sep-03	31-Aug-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
55	The Hon	Cheung Man Kwong	張文光	Education Commission	教育統籌委員會	Member	1-Jan-93	30-Jun-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
56	Mr	Cheung Wah Fung Christopher	張華峰	District Fight Crime Committee, Sham Shui Po	深水埗區撲滅罪行委 員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
57	The Hon	Cheung Yu Yan Tommy	張宇人	Hong Kong Housing Authority	香港房屋委員會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
57	The Hon	Cheung Yu Yan Tommy	張宇人	ICAC Complaints Committee	廉政公署事宜投訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
57	The Hon	Cheung Yu Yan Tommy	張宇人	Standing Committee on Disciplined Services Salaries and Conditions of Service (SCDS)	紀律人員薪俸及服務 條件常務委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
57	The Hon	Cheung Yu Yan Tommy	張宇人	Liquor Licensing Board	酒牌局	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
57	The Hon	Cheung Yu Yan Tommy	張宇人	Area Committee, Aldrich	愛秩序分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
58	Ms	Chiang Lai Wan Ann	蔣麗芸	Council of the City University of Hong Kong	香港城市大學校董會	Member	2-Apr-98	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
58	Ms	Chiang Lai Wan Ann	蔣麗芸	Sir Edward Youde Memorial Fund Council	尤德爵士紀念基金理 事會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-05	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
58	Ms	Chiang Lai Wan Ann	蔣麗芸	Water Pollution Control Appeal Board Panel	水污染管制上訴委員 會	Member	1-Feb-01	31-Jan-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
58	Ms	Chiang Lai Wan Ann	蔣麗芸	Administrative Appeals Board	行政上訴委員會	Member	15-Jul-03	14-Jul-06	Chief Executive	行政長官
59	Dr	Chiang Lily	蔣麗莉	Council of the Lingnan University	嶺南大學校務會	Member	22-Oct-03	21-Oct-06	Chief Executive	行政長官
59	Dr	Chiang Lily	蔣麗莉	Registration of Persons Tribunal	人事登記審裁處	Adjudicator	1-Jun-99	31-May-05	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
59	Dr	Chiang Lily	蔣麗莉	Council for Sustainable Development	可持續發展委員會	Member	1-Mar-03	28-Feb-05	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
60	Dr	Chiu Hin Kwong	招顯洸	Council of the Hong Kong Baptist University	香港浸會大學校董會	Member	1-Jan-99	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
61	Ms	Chiu Siu Ping	趙少萍	Chinese Medicine Council of Hong Kong	香港中醫藥管理委員 會	Member	13-Sep-02	12-Sep-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
62	Mr	Choi Chun Wa	蔡鎮華	Construction Industry Training Authority	建造業訓練局	Member	5-Sep-03	4-Sep-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
62	Mr	Choi Chun Wa	蔡鎮華	Pneumoconiosis Compensation Fund Board	肺塵埃沉着病補償基 金委員會	Member	1-Jan-98	31-Dec-03	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
62	Mr	Choi Chun Wa	蔡鎮華	Safety Officer Advisory Committee	安全主任諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-99	31-Dec-04	Commissioner for Labour	勞工處處長
62	Mr	Choi Chun Wa	蔡鎮華	Occupational Safety and Health Council	職業安全健康局	Member	22-Aug-98	21-Aug-04	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
62	Mr	Choi Chun Wa	蔡鎮華	Provisional Construction Industry Co-ordination Board	臨時建造業統籌委員 會	Member	28-Sep-01	27-Sep-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
63	Dr	Choi Kin	蔡堅	Board of Review (Inland Revenue Ordinance)	稅務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jul-02	30-Jun-05	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
63	Dr	Choi Kin	蔡堅	Medical Council of Hong Kong	香港醫務委員會	Member	24-Jan-99	23-Jan-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
63	Dr	Choi Kin	蔡堅	Pharmacy and Poisons Board	藥劑業及毒藥管理局	Member	2-Jan-97	1-Jan-04	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
64	Mrs	Chong Yuk Tak Fun Alice	張郁德芬	Vocational Training Council	職業訓練局	Member	1-Jul-02	30-Jun-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
64	Mrs	Chong Yuk Tak Fun Alice	張郁德芬	Registration of Persons Tribunal	人事登記審裁處	Adjudicator	1-Mar-94	29-Feb-04	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
65	Mr	Chow Charn Ki Kenneth	鄒燦基	Board of Review (Inland Revenue Ordinance)	稅務上訴委員會	Member	1-Mar-96	31-Dec-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
66	Mr	Chow Chun Fai	仇振輝	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
66	Mr	Chow Chun Fai	仇振輝	Area Committee, Mong Kok	旺角分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
67	Mr	Chow Kwong Fai Edward	周光暉	Advisory Committee on Human Resources Development in the Financial Services Sector	財經界人力資源諮詢 委員會	Member	1-Jun-00	31-May-04	Secretary for Financial Service and the Treasury	財經事務及 庫務局局長
68	The Hon	Chow Liang Shuk Yee Selina	周梁淑怡	Hong Kong Tourism Board	香港旅遊發展局	Chairman	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-05	Financial Secretary	財政司司長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
68	The Hon	Chow Liang Shuk Yee Selina	周梁淑怡	Airport Authority	機場管理局	Member	1-Jun-99	31-May-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
68	The Hon	Chow Liang Shuk Yee Selina	周梁淑怡	Film Services Advisory Committee	電影服務諮詢委員會	Member	1-May-98	30-Apr-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
68	The Hon	Chow Liang Shuk Yee Selina	周梁淑怡	Tourism Strategy Group	旅遊業策略小組	Member	1-Sep-00	31-Aug-04	Commissioner for Tourism	旅遊事務專員
68	The Hon	Chow Liang Shuk Yee Selina	周梁淑怡	Film Development Fund Projects Vetting Committee	電影發展基金審核委員會	Member	1-Jan-99	30-Apr-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技局局長
69	Mr	Chow Wing Shing Vincent	周永成	Public Service Commission	公務員敘用委員會	Member	1-Feb-98	31-Jan-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
69	Mr	Chow Wing Shing Vincent	周永成	Council of the City University of Hong Kong	香港城市大學校董會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
69	Mr	Chow Wing Shing Vincent	周永成	Council of the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts	香港演藝學院校董會	Member	1-Jan-93	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
69	Mr	Chow Wing Shing Vincent	周永成	Trade and Industry Advisory Board	工業貿易諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jul-00	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技局局長
70	Prof	Chow Wing Sun Nelson	周永新	Equal Opportunities Commission	平等機會委員會	Member	1-Aug-03	31-Jul-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
70	Prof	Chow Wing Sun Nelson	周永新	Governing Committee of the Beat Drugs Fund Association	禁毒基金會管理委員會	Member	3-May-96	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
70	Prof	Chow Wing Sun Nelson	周永新	Committee on Bilingual Legal System	雙語法律制度委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
71	Mr	Choy Chung Foo	蔡中虎	Hong Kong Export Credit Insurance Corporation Advisory Board	香港出口信用保險局諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
71	Mr	Choy Chung Foo	蔡中虎	Advisory Committee on Human Resources Development in the Financial Services Sector	財經界人力資源諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jun-00	31-May-04	Secretary for Financial Service and the Treasury	財經事務及庫務局局長
72	Mr	Choy Kan Pui Alex	蔡根培	Area Committee, Sha Tin West Three	沙田西三分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
73	The Hon	Choy So Yuk	蔡素玉	Environment and Conservation Fund Committee	環境及自然保育基金 委員會	Member	1-Aug-02	31-Jul-04	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
73	The Hon	Choy So Yuk	蔡素玉	Council for Sustainable Development	可持續發展委員會	Member	1-Mar-03	28-Feb-05	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
73	The Hon	Choy So Yuk	蔡素玉	Area Committee, North Point East	北角東分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
74	The Hon	Chu Yu Lin David	朱幼麟	Hong Kong Housing Authority	香港房屋委員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
74	The Hon	Chu Yu Lin David	朱幼麟	Council of the Hong Kong Baptist University	香港浸會大學校董會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
74	The Hon	Chu Yu Lin David	朱幼麟	Hong Kong War Memorial Pensions Advisory Committee	香港太平洋戰爭紀念 撫恤金顧問委員會	Chairman	1-Sep-99	31-Aug-05	Permanent Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局常任 秘書長
75	Mr	Chua Hoi Wai	蔡海偉	Liquor Licensing Board	酒牌局	Member	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
76	Mr	Chua Sek Chon Peter	蔡錫聰	Pharmacy and Poisons Board	藥劑業及毒藥管理局	Member	2-Jan-02	1-Jan-04	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
76	Mr	Chua Sek Chon Peter	蔡錫聰	Area Committee, North Point West	北角西分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
77	Mr	Chung Shu Kun Christopher	鍾樹根	Fish Marketing Advisory Board	魚類統營顧問委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
77	Mr	Chung Shu Kun Christopher	鍾樹根	Marine Fish Scholarship Fund Advisory Committee	海魚獎學基金顧問委 員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
77	Mr	Chung Shu Kun Christopher	鍾樹根	Appeal Board Panel (Toys and Children's Products Safety)	上訴委員團(玩具及兒 童產品安全)	Member	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
77	Mr	Chung Shu Kun Christopher	鍾樹根	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
77	Mr	Chung Shu Kun Christopher	鍾樹根	District Fight Crime Committee, Eastern	東區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
77	Mr	Chung Shu Kun Christopher	鍾樹根	Area Committee, Chai Wan (Yee Wan)	怡灣分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
78	Mr	Chung Shui Ming	鍾瑞明	Hong Kong Housing Authority	香港房屋委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
78	Mr	Chung Shui Ming	鍾瑞明	Council of the City University of Hong Kong	香港城市大學校董會	Treasurer	1-Jan-99	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
79	Mr	Chung Wai Ping	鍾偉平	District Fight Crime Committee, Tsuen Wan	荃灣區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
79	Mr	Chung Wai Ping	鍾偉平	Area Committee, Tsuen Wan East	荃灣東分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
79	Mr	Chung Wai Ping	鍾偉平	District Fire Safety Committee, Tsuen Wan	荃灣區防火委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
80	Mr	Cook Barrie	高保利	Council for Sustainable Development	可持續發展委員會	Member	1-Mar-03	28-Feb-05	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
81	The Hon	Eu Yuet Mee Audrey	余若薇	Board of Review (Inland Revenue Ordinance)	稅務上訴委員會	Deputy Chairman	3-Jan-95	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
81	The Hon	Eu Yuet Mee Audrey	余若薇	Operations Review Committee of the ICAC	廉政公署審查貪污舉報諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
81	The Hon	Eu Yuet Mee Audrey	余若薇	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團(建築物)	Chairman	1-Dec-00	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃地政局副秘書長(規劃及地政) 2
81	The Hon	Eu Yuet Mee Audrey	余若薇	Panel of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Witness Protection Review Board	廉政公署保護證人覆核委員會小組	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
81	The Hon	Eu Yuet Mee Audrey	余若薇	Estate Agents Authority	地產代理監管局	Member	1-Nov-02	31-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
82	Mr	Fan Chor Ho Paul	范佐浩	Air Pollution Control Appeal Board Panel	空氣污染管制上訴委員會	Member	1-Feb-01	31-Jan-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及工務局局長
82	Mr	Fan Chor Ho Paul	范佐浩	Registration of Persons Tribunal	人事登記審裁處	Adjudicator	1-Jun-99	31-May-05	Secretary for Security	保安局局長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
82	Mr	Fan Chor Ho Paul	范佐浩	Noise Control Appeal Board Panel	噪音管制上訴委員會	Member	1-Feb-01	31-Jan-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及工務局局長
82	Mr	Fan Chor Ho Paul	范佐浩	Football Betting and Lotteries Commission	足球博彩及獎券事務委員會	Member	1-Aug-03	31-Jul-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
82	Mr	Fan Chor Ho Paul	范佐浩	Environment and Conservation Fund Committee	環境及自然保育基金委員會	Member	1-Aug-94	31-Jul-04	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
82	Mr	Fan Chor Ho Paul	范佐浩	Award Council of the Hong Kong Award for Young People	香港青年獎勵計劃理事會	Chairman	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局局長
82	Mr	Fan Chor Ho Paul	范佐浩	Chinese Medicine Council of Hong Kong	香港中醫藥管理委員會	Member	1-Sep-03	12-Sep-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
83	Dr	Fang David	方津生	Medical Council of Hong Kong	香港醫務委員會	Member	1-Mar-89	23-Jan-06	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
84	Ms	Fei Barbara	費明儀	Hong Kong Arts Development Council	香港藝術發展局	Member	1-Jan-96	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
84	Ms	Fei Barbara	費明儀	Board of Trustees, Hong Kong Jockey Club Music and Dance Fund	香港賽馬會音樂及舞蹈信託基金受託人委員會	Member	1-Jul-96	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局局長
85	Ms	Fei Fih	費斐	Hong Kong Arts Development Council	香港藝術發展局	Member	1-Jul-00	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
86	Mr	Fok Chun Wan Ian	霍震寰	Award Council of the Hong Kong Award for Young People	香港青年獎勵計劃理事會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局局長
87	Mr	Fong Kam Hung	方錦鴻	District Fight Crime Committee, Islands	離島區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-95	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
87	Mr	Fong Kam Hung	方錦鴻	Area Committee, Lamma	南丫分區委員會	Member	1-Oct-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
87	Mr	Fong Kam Hung	方錦鴻	District Fire Safety Committee, Islands	離島區防火委員會	Member	15-Dec-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
88	The Hon	Fung Kin Kee Frederick	馮檢基	Task Force on Employment	就業專責小組	Member	21-Oct-02	21-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
89	Mr	Fung Man Ching	馮文正	Education Commission	教育統籌委員會	Member	13-Jan-03	31-Dec-03	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
89	Mr	Fung Man Ching	馮文正	Advisory Management Committee of the Hong Kong Teachers' Centre	香港教師中心諮詢管 理委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Permanent Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 常任秘書長
90	Mr	Fung Man Yu	馮萬如	Clothing Industry Training Authority	製衣業訓練局	Member	5-Sep-01	4-Sep-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
91	Mr	Fung Yat Chu John	馮一柱	Citizens Advisory Committee on Community Relations of the ICAC	廉政公署社區關係市 民諮詢委員會	Co-opted Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
92	Mr	Hau Shui Pui	侯瑞培	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
92	Mr	Hau Shui Pui	侯瑞培	District Fight Crime Committee, Kwun Tong	觀塘區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-95	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
92	Mr	Hau Shui Pui	侯瑞培	Area Committee, Ngau Tau Kok & Lok Wah	牛頭角及樂華分區委 員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
92	Mr	Hau Shui Pui	侯瑞培	District Fire Safety Committee, Kwun Tong	觀塘區防火委員會	Member	18-Dec-98	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
93	Mr	Heung Cheuk Kei Daniel	香灼璣	Antiquities Advisory Board	古物諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
93	Mr	Heung Cheuk Kei Daniel	香灼璣	Chinese Temples Committee	華人廟宇委員會	Member	1-Jun-00	31-May-06	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長
93	Mr	Heung Cheuk Kei Daniel	香灼璣	Committee on the Promotion of Civic Education	公民教育委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-05	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長
94	Mr	Hiew Moo Siew	邱戊秀	District Fight Crime Committee, Sai Kung	西貢區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-97	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
94	Mr	Hiew Moo Siew	邱戊秀	Area Committee, Sai Kung	西貢分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
94	Mr	Hiew Moo Siew	邱戊秀	District Fire Safety Committee, Sai Kung	西貢區防火委員會	Member	1-Dec-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
95	The Hon	Ho Chun Yan Albert	何俊仁	Area Committee, Tuen Mun South West	屯門西南分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
96	Ir Dr the Hon	Ho Chung Tai Raymond	何鍾泰	Gas Safety Advisory Committee	氣體安全諮詢委員會	Member	1-Sep-97	31-Aug-05	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
97	Mr	Ho Hon Kuen	何漢權	Football Betting and Lotteries Commission	足球博彩及獎券事務 委員會	Member	1-Aug-03	31-Jul-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
97	Mr	Ho Hon Kuen	何漢權	Ping Wo Fund Advisory Committee	平和基金諮詢委員會	Member	8-Sep-03	7-Sep-05	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長
98	Dr	Ho Hung Sun Stanley	何鴻燊	Tang Shiu Kin and Ho Tim Charitable Fund Management Committee	鄧肇堅何添慈善基金 管理委員會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Director of Social Welfare	社會福利署 署長
99	Mr	Ho King On	何景安	Advisory Management Committee of the Hong Kong Teachers' Centre	香港教師中心諮詢管 理委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-04	Permanent Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 常任秘書長
100	Mr	Ho Sing Tin Edward	何承天	Antiquities Advisory Board	古物諮詢委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
100	Mr	Ho Sing Tin Edward	何承天	Hospital Authority	醫院管理局	Member	1-Dec-02	30-Nov-04	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
100	Mr	Ho Sing Tin Edward	何承天	Board of Trustees of the Lord Wilson Heritage Trust	衛奕信勳爵文物信託 受託人委員會	Member	11-Feb-93	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
101	Prof	Ho Yan Ki Richard	何炘基	Hong Kong Committee for Pacific Economic Cooperation	太平洋經濟合作香港 委員會	Member	1-Apr-96	31-Mar-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
101	Prof	Ho Yan Ki Richard	何炘基	Small and Medium Enterprises Committee	中小型企業委員會	Member	15-Dec-00	14-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
102	Mr	Hoo Alan	胡漢清	Appeals Board (Education)	上訴委員會（教育事 宜）	Chairman	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
102	Mr	Hoo Alan	胡漢清	Law Reform Commission of Hong Kong	香港法律改革委員會	Member	1-Sep-99	31-Aug-05	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
102	Mr	Hoo Alan	胡漢清	Basic Law Promotion Steering Committee	基本法推廣督導委員會	Member	12-May-01	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
103	Mr	Hu Shao Ming Herman	胡曉明	Employees Retraining Board	僱員再培訓局	Member	22-Nov-97	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局局長
103	Mr	Hu Shao Ming Herman	胡曉明	Hong Kong Sports Development Board	香港康體發展局	Vice Chairman	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
103	Mr	Hu Shao Ming Herman	胡曉明	Hong Kong Sports Institute Trust Fund Committee of Trustees	香港體育學院信託基金受託人委員會	Member	6-May-03	31-Mar-04	Hong Kong Sports Development Board	香港康體發展局
103	Mr	Hu Shao Ming Herman	胡曉明	Task Force on Employment	就業專責小組	Member	4-May-98	21-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
103	Mr	Hu Shao Ming Herman	胡曉明	Environmental Impact Assessment Appeal Board Panel	環境影響評估上訴委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
104	Mr	Huang Lester Garson	黃嘉純	Nursing Council of Hong Kong	香港護士管理局	Member	3-May-02	2-May-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
104	Mr	Huang Lester Garson	黃嘉純	Council of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	香港科技大學校董會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
104	Mr	Huang Lester Garson	黃嘉純	Transport Advisory Committee	交通諮詢委員會	Member	1-Oct-99	30-Sep-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
105	The Hon	Hui Cheung Ching	許長青	Hong Kong Export Credit Insurance Corporation Advisory Board	香港出口信用保險局諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jul-03	30-Jun-05	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
105	The Hon	Hui Cheung Ching	許長青	Small and Medium Enterprises Committee	中小型企業委員會	Member	15-Dec-00	14-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
106	Mr	Hui Chiu Ming	許超明	District Fight Crime Committee, Yau Tsim Mong	油尖旺區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
107	Mr	Hui Chun Fui Victor	許晉奎	Hong Kong Sports Development Board	香港康體發展局	Chairman	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
107	Mr	Hui Chun Fui Victor	許晉奎	Hong Kong Sports Institute Trust Fund Committee of Trustees	香港體育學院信託基金受託人委員會	Chairman	6-May-03	31-Mar-04	Hong Kong Sports Development Board	香港康體發展局
108	Mr	Hui Hon Chung Stanley	許漢忠	Council of the Lingnan University	嶺南大學校務會	Member	22-Oct-01	21-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
108	Mr	Hui Hon Chung Stanley	許漢忠	Aviation Advisory Board	航空諮詢委員會	Member	1-Sep-99	31-Aug-05	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及勞工局局長
108	Mr	Hui Hon Chung Stanley	許漢忠	Vetting Committee of the Professional Services Development Assistance Scheme	專業服務業發展資助計劃評審委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
109	Mr	Hui Kam Shing	許錦成	Area Committee, Chuk Yuen	竹園分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
109	Mr	Hui Kam Shing	許錦成	District Fight Crime Committee, Wong Tai Sin	黃大仙區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-95	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
110	Mr	Hui Koon Man Michael	許冠文	Hong Kong Tourism Board	香港旅遊發展局	Member	1-Nov-01	31-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
111	Mr	Hui Man Bock Bernard	許文博	Architects Registration Board	建築師註冊管理局	Chairman	26-May-03	16-May-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
112	Mr	Hung Bing	洪炳	Area Committee, Tsim Sha Tsui	尖沙咀分區委員會	Vice Chairman	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
113	Mr	Hung Chao Hong Albert	洪祖杭	Football Betting and Lotteries Commission	足球博彩及獎券事務委員會	Member	1-Aug-03	31-Jul-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
113	Mr	Hung Chao Hong Albert	洪祖杭	Hong Kong Sports Development Board	香港康體發展局	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
113	Mr	Hung Chao Hong Albert	洪祖杭	Major Sports Events Committee	大型體育事務委員會	Vice Chairman	1-Oct-03	31-Mar-05	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局局長
114	Mr	Hung Cho Sing Crucindo	洪祖星	Film Services Advisory Committee	電影服務諮詢委員會	Member	1-May-98	30-Apr-04	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
115	Dr	Hung Wing Tat	熊永達	Country and Marine Parks Board	郊野公園及海岸公園委員會	Member	1-Sep-99	31-Aug-05	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及工務局局長
115	Dr	Hung Wing Tat	熊永達	Noise Control Appeal Board Panel	噪音管制上訴委員會	Member	17-Feb-89	31-Jan-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及工務局局長
115	Dr	Hung Wing Tat	熊永達	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團（建築物）	Member	1-Dec-03	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃地政局副秘書長（規劃及地政）2
116	Mr	Ip Kwok Chung	葉國忠	District Fight Crime Committee, Yau Tsim Mong	油尖旺區撲滅罪行委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
116	Mr	Ip Kwok Chung	葉國忠	Licensing Appeals Board	牌照上訴委員會	Chairman	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
116	Mr	Ip Kwok Chung	葉國忠	Area Committee, Tsim Sha Tsui	尖沙咀分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
117	The Hon	Ip Kwok Him	葉國謙	Hong Kong Housing Authority	香港房屋委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
117	The Hon	Ip Kwok Him	葉國謙	Action Committee Against Narcotics	禁毒常務委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
117	The Hon	Ip Kwok Him	葉國謙	Standing Committee on Disciplined Services Salaries and Conditions of Service (SCDS)	紀律人員薪俸及服務條件常務委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
117	The Hon	Ip Kwok Him	葉國謙	Area Committee, Kennedy Town	堅尼地城分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
118	Mr	Kam Pok Man	甘博文	Council of the Lingnan University	嶺南大學校務會	Member	22-Oct-99	21-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
118	Mr	Kam Pok Man	甘博文	Corruption Prevention Advisory Committee of the ICAC	廉政公署防止貪污諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-99	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
118	Mr	Kam Pok Man	甘博文	Travel Industry Compensation Fund Management Board	旅遊業賠償基金管理委員會	Member	15-Oct-01	14-Oct-05	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
118	Mr	Kam Pok Man	甘博文	Licensing Appeals Board	牌照上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
119	Mr	Kan Chi Ho	簡志豪	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團(建築物)	Member	1-Dec-03	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃地政局副秘書長(規劃及地政) 2
119	Mr	Kan Chi Ho	簡志豪	Area Committee, San Tsuen	新鑽分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
120	Mr	Kerr Keith Graham		Provisional Construction Industry Co-ordination Board	臨時建造業統籌委員會	Chairman	16-Sep-02	15-Sep-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及工務局局長
121	Mr	Ko Chun Wa	顧振華	Area Committee, Ngau Tau Kok & Lok Wah	牛頭角及樂華分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-97	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
122	Mr	Ko Kam Chuen Stanley	高鑑泉	Hong Kong Tourism Board	香港旅遊發展局	Member	16-Jul-03	15-Jul-06	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
122	Mr	Ko Kam Chuen Stanley	高鑑泉	Council of the Open University of Hong Kong	香港公開大學校董會	Deputy Chairman	20-Jun-02	19-Jun-06	Chief Executive	行政長官
122	Mr	Ko Kam Chuen Stanley	高鑑泉	Innovation and Technology Fund General Support Programme Vetting Committee	創新及科技基金一般支援計劃評審委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-04	Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Technology (Communications and Technology)	工商及科技局常任秘書長(通訊及科技)
122	Mr	Ko Kam Chuen Stanley	高鑑泉	Hong Kong Logistics Development Council	香港物流發展局	Member	10-Dec-01	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
122	Mr	Ko Kam Chuen Stanley	高鑑泉	Trade and Industry Advisory Board	工業貿易諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jul-00	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技局局長
123	Ms	Ko Po Ling	高寶齡	Equal Opportunities Commission	平等機會委員會	Member	20-Dec-99	19-May-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
123	Ms	Ko Po Ling	高寶齡	District Fight Crime Committee, Kwun Tong	觀塘區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
123	Ms	Ko Po Ling	高寶齡	Area Committee, Sze Shun	四順分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
124	Mr	Kung Lin Cheng Leo	孔令成	Ocean Park Corporation Board	海洋公園公司董事局	Member	1-Jul-03	30-Jun-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
124	Mr	Kung Lin Cheng Leo	孔令成	Council of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	香港科技大學校董會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
124	Mr	Kung Lin Cheng Leo	孔令成	Prisoners' Education Trust Fund Investment Advisory Committee	在囚人士教育信託基 金投資顧問委員會	Member	1-Dec-01	30-Nov-04	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
125	Mr	Kuok Hoi Sang	郭海生	Appeal Board Panel (Builders' Lifts and Tower Working Platforms (Safety))	上訴委員團(建築工地 升降機及塔式工作平 台(安全))	Member	14-Oct-03	13-Oct-06	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
126	Ir	Kwan Chi Ping Edgar	關治平	Construction Industry Training Authority	建造業訓練局	Chairman	5-Sep-03	4-Sep-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
126	Ir	Kwan Chi Ping Edgar	關治平	Independent Police Complaints Council	投訴警方獨立監察委 員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
126	Ir	Kwan Chi Ping Edgar	關治平	Engineers Registration Board	工程師註冊管理局	Member	21-Sep-01	20-Sep-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
126	Ir	Kwan Chi Ping Edgar	關治平	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團(建築物)	Member	1-Dec-00	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃 地政局副秘 書長(規劃及 地政) 2
127	Prof	Kwan Chi Yee	關之義	Chinese Medicine Council of Hong Kong	香港中醫藥管理委員 會	Member	13-Sep-99	12-Sep-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
128	Prof	Kwan Hoi Shan	關海山	Advisory Council on Food and Environmental Hygiene	食物及環境衛生諮詢 委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
129	Ms	Kwan Ko Siu Wah	關高荅華	Basic Law Promotion Steering Committee	基本法推廣督導委員 會	Vice Chairperson	1-Jan-98	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
130	Mr	Kwok Bit Chun	郭必錚	Area Committee, Sze Shun	四順分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-91	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
131	Mr	Kwok Lit Tung	郭烈東	Telecommunications Users and Consumers Advisory Committee	電訊服務用戶及消費 者諮詢委員會	Member	1-Oct-98	30-Sep-04	Director General of Telecommunication	電訊管理局 總監
131	Mr	Kwok Lit Tung	郭烈東	Committee on Home-School Co-operation	家庭與學校合作事宜 委員會	Vice Chairman	1-Sep-03	31-Aug-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
131	Mr	Kwok Lit Tung	郭烈東	Disciplinary Committee Panel (under Social Workers Registration Ordinance)	社會工作者註冊局-紀 律委員會備選委員小 組	Member	28-Aug-98	15-Jan-05	Social Workers Registration Board	社會工作者 註冊局
132	Mr	Kwok Ping Kwong Thomas	郭炳江	Council for Sustainable Development	可持續發展委員會	Member	1-Mar-03	28-Feb-05	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
132	Mr	Kwok Ping Kwong Thomas	郭炳江	Provisional Construction Industry Co-ordination Board	臨時建造業統籌委員 會	Member	28-Sep-01	27-Sep-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
133	Mr	Lai Daniel	賴錫璋	Advisory Committee on Code of Practice for Recognized Certification Authorities	認可核證機關業務守 則諮詢委員會	Member	1-Feb-00	31-Jan-04	Director of Information Technology Services	資訊科技署 署長
134	Mrs	Lai Ip Po Ping Fanny	黎葉寶萍	Air Transport Licensing Authority	空運牌照局	Member	1-Mar-01	31-Jul-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
134	Mrs	Lai Ip Po Ping Fanny	黎葉寶萍	Football Betting and Lotteries Commission	足球博彩及獎券事務 委員會	Member	1-Aug-03	31-Jul-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
134	Mrs	Lai Ip Po Ping Fanny	黎葉寶萍	Council of the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts	香港演藝學院校董會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
134	Mrs	Lai Ip Po Ping Fanny	黎葉寶萍	Committee on the Promotion of Civic Education	公民教育委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長
134	Mrs	Lai Ip Po Ping Fanny	黎葉寶萍	District Fight Crime Committee, Wan Chai	灣仔區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
134	Mrs	Lai Ip Po Ping Fanny	黎葉寶萍	Area Committee, Wan Chai	灣仔分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-97	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
135	Mr	Lai Kam Cheung Michael	賴錦璋	Disaster Relief Fund Advisory Committee	賑災基金諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
136	Mr	Lai Pui Wing	黎培榮	Sir David Trench Fund Committee	戴麟趾爵士康樂基金 委員會	Member	9-Jan-99	8-Jan-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
137	Ms	Lai Shuet Fun Adela	黎雪芬	Nursing Council of Hong Kong	香港護士管理局	Member	15-Jun-02	14-Jun-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
138	Mr	Lai Sze Nuen	黎時媛	Area Committee, Yau Ma Tei	油麻地分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
139	Mr	Lai Tak Chuen	黎德全	Area Committee, Tsuen Wan Rural	荃灣鄉郊分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-97	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
140	Mr	Lam Cheung Chi	林長志	District Fight Crime Committee, Sai Kung	西貢區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
141	Mr	Lam Hon Keung Keith	林漢強	Board of Management of the Chinese Permanent Cemeteries	華人永遠墳場管理委 員會	Member	4-Dec-97	3-Dec-03	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長
141	Mr	Lam Hon Keung Keith	林漢強	Social Welfare Advisory Committee	社會福利諮詢委員會	Member	1-Dec-00	30-Nov-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
141	Mr	Lam Hon Keung Keith	林漢強	Estate Agents Authority	地產代理監管局	Member	1-Nov-02	31-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
142	Mr	Lam Hong Wah	林康華	Area Committee, Sha Tin East Three	沙田東三分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
142	Mr	Lam Hong Wah	林康華	District Fight Crime Committee, Sha Tin	沙田區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
143	Mr	Lam Kin Fung Jeffrey	林健鋒	Hong Kong Export Credit Insurance Corporation Advisory Board	香港出口信用保險局 諮詢委員會	Chairman	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
143	Mr	Lam Kin Fung Jeffrey	林健鋒	Innovation and Technology Fund General Support Programme Vetting Committee	創新及科技基金一般 支援計劃評審委員會	Chairman	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-04	Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Technology (Communications and Technology)	工商及科技 局常任秘書 長(通訊及科 技)

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
143	Mr	Lam Kin Fung Jeffrey	林健鋒	Transport Advisory Committee	交通諮詢委員會	Member	1-Oct-97	30-Sep-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
143	Mr	Lam Kin Fung Jeffrey	林健鋒	Port Operations Committee	港口行動事務委員會	Member	15-Feb-00	14-Feb-04	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
143	Mr	Lam Kin Fung Jeffrey	林健鋒	Hong Kong Committee for Pacific Economic Cooperation	太平洋經濟合作香港 委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
143	Mr	Lam Kin Fung Jeffrey	林健鋒	Appeal Board Panel (Toys and Children's Products Safety)	上訴委員會 (玩具及兒 童產品安全)	Member	1-Jul-93	31-Dec-03	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
143	Mr	Lam Kin Fung Jeffrey	林健鋒	Non-local Higher and Professional Education Appeal Board	非本地高等及專業教 育上訴委員會	Member	8-Dec-97	7-Dec-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
144	Mr	Lam Kin Lai	林乾禮	Consumer Council	消費者委員會	Member	1-Jan-98	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
144	Mr	Lam Kin Lai	林乾禮	Disciplinary Tribunal Panel (Electricity)	紀律審裁委員會 (電 力)	Member	28-Jul-03	27-Jul-06	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
144	Mr	Lam Kin Lai	林乾禮	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團 (建築物)	Member	1-Dec-00	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃 地政局副秘 書長 (規劃及 地政) 2
144	Mr	Lam Kin Lai	林乾禮	Electrical Safety Advisory Committee	電氣安全諮詢委員會	Member	6-Apr-00	5-Apr-04	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
144	Mr	Lam Kin Lai	林乾禮	District Fight Crime Committee, Central & Western	中西區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
144	Mr	Lam Kin Lai	林乾禮	Area Committee, Mid-Levels	半山分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
144	Mr	Lam Kin Lai	林乾禮	District Fire Safety Committee, Central & Western	中西區防火委員會	Member	1-May-98	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
145	Mr	Lam Kun So	林根蘇	Area Committee, Aldrich	愛秩序分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
145	Mr	Lam Kun So	林根蘇	District Fire Safety Committee, Eastern	東區防火委員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
146	Mr	Lam Kut Sing	林吉勝	Area Committee, Lantau	大嶼山分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-88	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
147	Mr	Lam Kwei Cheong	林貴昌	Area Committee, Wong Nai Chung	黃泥涌分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
148	Mr	Lam Kwok Cheong Alfred	林國昌	Town Planning Board	城市規劃委員會	Member	1-Apr-96	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
148	Mr	Lam Kwok Cheong Alfred	林國昌	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團（建築物）	Member	1-Dec-00	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃 地政局副秘 書長（規劃及 地政）2
148	Mr	Lam Kwok Cheong Alfred	林國昌	District Fight Crime Committee, Yuen Long	元朗區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
148	Mr	Lam Kwok Cheong Alfred	林國昌	Liquor Licensing Board	酒牌局	Chairman	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
149	Mrs	Lam Pei Yu Dja Peggy	林貝聿嘉	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
149	Mrs	Lam Pei Yu Dja Peggy	林貝聿嘉	Board of the Urban Renewal Authority	市區重建局董事會	Non- executive Director	1-May-01	30-Apr-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
149	Mrs	Lam Pei Yu Dja Peggy	林貝聿嘉	Equal Opportunities Commission	平等機會委員會	Member	20-May-96	19-May-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
149	Mrs	Lam Pei Yu Dja Peggy	林貝聿嘉	Elderly Commission	安老事務委員會	Member	30-Jul-97	29-Jul-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
149	Mrs	Lam Pei Yu Dja Peggy	林貝聿嘉	Kwan Fong Charitable Foundation - Kwan Fong Trust Fund for the Needy	群芳慈善基金會 - 群芳 救援信託基金	Member	28-Jan-88	27-Jan-04	Director of Social Welfare	社會福利署 署長
149	Mrs	Lam Pei Yu Dja Peggy	林貝聿嘉	District Fight Crime Committee, Wan Chai	灣仔區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-93	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
149	Mrs	Lam Pei Yu Dja Peggy	林貝聿嘉	Area Committee, Wan Chai	灣仔分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
149	Mrs	Lam Pei Yu Dja Peggy	林貝聿嘉	Women's Commission	婦女事務委員會	Member	15-Jan-01	14-Jan-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
149	Mrs	Lam Pei Yu Dja Peggy	林貝聿嘉	District Fire Safety Committee, Wan Chai	灣仔區防火委員會	Member	18-Dec-98	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
150	Ms	Lam Shuk Yee	林淑儀	Protection of Wages on Insolvency Fund Board	破產欠薪保障基金委 員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
150	Ms	Lam Shuk Yee	林淑儀	Committee on Financial Assistance for Family Members of Those Who Sacrifice Their Lives To Save Others	向捨身救人者家屬提 供經濟援助委員會	Member	11-Feb-02	10-Feb-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
151	Mr	Lam Wo Hei	林和起	Land and Building Advisory Committee	土地及建設諮詢委員 會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
151	Mr	Lam Wo Hei	林和起	Architects Registration Board	建築師註冊管理局	Member	26-May-03	16-May-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
151	Mr	Lam Wo Hei	林和起	Provisional Construction Industry Co-ordination Board	臨時建造業統籌委員 會	Member	28-Sep-01	27-Sep-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
152	The Hon	Lau Chin Shek	劉千石	Task Force on Employment	就業專責小組	Member	21-Oct-02	21-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
152	The Hon	Lau Chin Shek	劉千石	Manpower Development Committee	人力發展委員會	Member	16-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
153	The Hon	Lau Hon Chuen Ambrose	劉漢銓	Board of the Urban Renewal Authority	市區重建局董事會	Non- executive Director	1-May-01	30-Apr-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
153	The Hon	Lau Hon Chuen Ambrose	劉漢銓	Task Force on Employment	就業專責小組	Member	21-Oct-02	21-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
154	Mr	Lau Hon Keung Steven	劉漢強	Travel Industry Compensation Fund Management Board	旅遊業賠償基金管理 委員會	Member	15-Oct-97	14-Oct-05	Financial Secretary	財政司司長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
155	Mr	Lau Ka Men Stephen	劉嘉敏	Innovation and Technology Fund (Information Technology) Projects Vetting Committee	創新及科技基金(資訊 科技)項目評審委員會	Chairman	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Technology (Communications and Technology)	工商及科技 局常任秘書 長(通訊及科 技)
156	The Hon	Lau Kin Yee Miriam	劉健儀	Security and Guarding Services Industry Authority	保安及護衛業管理委 員會	Chairman	1-Jun-95	31-May-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
156	The Hon	Lau Kin Yee Miriam	劉健儀	Hong Kong Logistics Development Council	香港物流發展局	Member	10-Dec-01	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
156	The Hon	Lau Kin Yee Miriam	劉健儀	Hong Kong Maritime Industry Council	香港航運發展局	Member	1-Jun-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
156	The Hon	Lau Kin Yee Miriam	劉健儀	Hong Kong Port Development Council	香港港口發展局	Member	1-Jun-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
157	Mr	Lau Man Wai Joseph	劉文煒	Innovation and Technology Fund (Biotechnology) Projects Vetting Committee	創新及科技基金(生物 科技)項目評審委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-04	Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Technology (Communications and Technology)	工商及科技 局常任秘書 長(通訊及科 技)
157	Mr	Lau Man Wai Joseph	劉文煒	Employees' Compensation Insurance Levies Management Board	僱員補償保險徵款管 理局	Member	1-Jul-96	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
157	Mr	Lau Man Wai Joseph	劉文煒	Employees Compensation Assistance Fund Board	僱員補償援助基金管 理局	Member	1-Jul-97	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
158	The Hon	Lau Ping Cheung	劉炳章	Council of the City University of Hong Kong	香港城市大學校董會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
158	The Hon	Lau Ping Cheung	劉炳章	Board of the Urban Renewal Authority	市區重建局董事會	Non- executive Director	1-May-01	30-Apr-04	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
158	The Hon	Lau Ping Cheung	劉炳章	Vetting Committee of the Professional Services Development Assistance Scheme	專業服務業發展資助 計劃評審委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
159	Miss	Lau Pui King	劉佩琮	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
160	Prof	Lau Sau Shing Patrick	劉秀成	Antiquities Advisory Board	古物諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
160	Prof	Lau Sau Shing Patrick	劉秀成	Construction Industry Training Authority	建造業訓練局	Member	5-Sep-03	4-Sep-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
160	Prof	Lau Sau Shing Patrick	劉秀成	Hong Kong Housing Authority	香港房屋委員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
160	Prof	Lau Sau Shing Patrick	劉秀成	Town Planning Board	城市規劃委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
160	Prof	Lau Sau Shing Patrick	劉秀成	Operations Review Committee of the ICAC	廉政公署審查貪污舉 報諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
160	Prof	Lau Sau Shing Patrick	劉秀成	Architects Registration Board	建築師註冊管理局	Vice Chairman	26-May-03	16-May-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
160	Prof	Lau Sau Shing Patrick	劉秀成	Panel of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Witness Protection Review Board	廉政公署保護證人覆 核委員會小組	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
160	Prof	Lau Sau Shing Patrick	劉秀成	Board of Directors of the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation	香港科技園公司董事 局	Member	7-May-01	30-Jun-05	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技 局局長
161	Mr	Lau Wah Sum	劉華森	Board of the Urban Renewal Authority	市區重建局董事會	Chairman	1-May-01	30-Apr-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
162	The Hon	Lau Wai Hing Emily	劉慧卿	Task Force on Employment	就業專責小組	Member	21-Oct-02	21-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
163	Mr	Lau Wan Hei	劉運喜	Area Committee, Sai Kung	西貢分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
163	Mr	Lau Wan Hei	劉運喜	District Fire Safety Committee, Sai Kung	西貢區防火委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
164	The Hon	Lau Wong Fat	劉皇發	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
165	Ms	Law Elizabeth	羅君美	Environmental Campaign Committee	環境保護運動委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
165	Ms	Law Elizabeth	羅君美	Employees' Compensation Insurance Levies Management Board	僱員補償保險徵款管 理局	Member	1-Jul-01	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
165	Ms	Law Elizabeth	羅君美	Lord Wilson United World Colleges Scholarship Fund Council	衛奕信動聯合世界 書院獎學金基金理事 會	Member	1-Jul-98	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長
166	Mr	Law Kam Fai	羅錦輝	District Fight Crime Committee, Islands	離島區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
166	Mr	Law Kam Fai	羅錦輝	Area Committee, Lantau	大嶼山分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
167	The Hon	Lee Cheuk Yan	李卓人	Employees Retraining Board	僱員再培訓局	Member	1-Nov-95	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
168	Mr	Lee Chi Fung	李志峰	District Fight Crime Committee, Islands	離島區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-92	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
168	Mr	Lee Chi Fung	李志峰	Area Committee, Lantau	大嶼山分區委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
168	Mr	Lee Chi Fung	李志峰	District Fire Safety Committee, Islands	離島區防火委員會	Member	15-Dec-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
169	Mr	Lee Cho Jat	李祖澤	Antiquities Advisory Board	古物諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-99	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
170	Mr	Lee Joseph	李宗德	Environmental Campaign Committee	環境保護運動委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
170	Mr	Lee Joseph	李宗德	Security and Guarding Services Industry Authority	保安及護衛業管理委 員會	Member	1-Jun-01	31-May-05	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
170	Mr	Lee Joseph	李宗德	Innovation and Technology Fund (Foundation Industries) Projects Vetting Committee	創新及科技基金（基礎工業）項目評審委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-04	Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Technology (Communications and Technology)	工商及科技局常任秘書長（通訊及科技）
170	Mr	Lee Joseph	李宗德	Award Council of the Hong Kong Award for Young People	香港青年獎勵計劃理事會	Member	1-Feb-01	31-Jan-05	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局局長
170	Mr	Lee Joseph	李宗德	Commission on Youth	青年事務委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-05	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局局長
170	Mr	Lee Joseph	李宗德	Curriculum Development Council	課程發展議會	Member	1-Sep-01	31-Aug-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局局長
170	Mr	Lee Joseph	李宗德	Applied Research Council	應用研究局	Chairman	22-Feb-03	21-Feb-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology and Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology (Communications and Technology)	工商及科技局局長和工商及科技局常任秘書長（通訊及科技）
171	Dr	Lee Ka Yan David	李家仁	Chiropractors Council	脊醫管理局	Member	25-Apr-97	24-Apr-04	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
171	Dr	Lee Ka Yan David	李家仁	Registration of Persons Tribunal	人事登記審裁處	Adjudicator	1-Jun-99	31-May-05	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
171	Dr	Lee Ka Yan David	李家仁	Appeal Board Panel (Toys and Children's Products Safety)	上訴委員團（玩具及兒童產品安全）	Member	1-Jul-93	31-Dec-03	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及勞工局局長
172	Mr	Lee King Ting Frank	李敬天	Consumer Council	消費者委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
172	Mr	Lee King Ting Frank	李敬天	Telecommunications (Competition Provisions) Appeal Board	電訊（競爭條文）上訴委員會	Member	1-Nov-02	31-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
172	Mr	Lee King Ting Frank	李敬天	Board of Trustees, Hong Kong Jockey Club Music and Dance Fund	香港賽馬會音樂及舞蹈信託基金受託人委員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局局長
173	Ms	Lee Ming Pui Mavis	李明佩	Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) Appeal Board	安老院上訴委員會	Member	25-Apr-02	24-Apr-04	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
173	Ms	Lee Ming Pui Mavis	李明佩	Area Committee, Chuk Yuen	竹園分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
173	Ms	Lee Ming Pui Mavis	李明佩	District Fight Crime Committee, Wong Tai Sin	黃大仙區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
174	Dr	Lee Shau Kee	李兆基	Customs and Excise Service Children's Education Trust Fund Committee	香港海關人員子女教育信託基金委員會	Chairman	1-Aug-00	31-Jul-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
175	Mr	Lee Shiu Chuen Andy	李兆銓	Council of the Hong Kong Baptist University	香港浸會大學校董會	Member	1-Jan-96	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
175	Mr	Lee Shiu Chuen Andy	李兆銓	Board of the Urban Renewal Authority	市區重建局董事會	Executive Director	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
176	Prof	Lee Shiu Hung	李紹鴻	Prevention of Legionnaires' Disease Committee, Hong Kong	香港預防退伍軍人病症委員會	Chairman	15-May-02	14-May-05	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及工務局局長
177	Mr	Lee Tat Yan	李達仁	District Fight Crime Committee, Wong Tai Sin	黃大仙區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
177	Mr	Lee Tat Yan	李達仁	Area Committee, San Tsuen	新鑽分區委員會	Member	1-Jul-97	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
178	Mr	Lee Tsung Hei David Chris	李頌熹	Council of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University	香港理工大學校董會	Member	21-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
178	Mr	Lee Tsung Hei David Chris	李頌熹	Land and Building Advisory Committee	土地及建設諮詢委員會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
178	Mr	Lee Tsung Hei David Chris	李頌熹	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
179	Dr	Lee Tung Hai Leo	李東海	Tang Shiu Kin and Ho Tim Charitable Fund Management Committee	鄧肇堅何添慈善基金 管理委員會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Director of Social Welfare	社會福利署 署長
180	Mr	Lee Wai Man Maurice	李偉民	Board of the Urban Renewal Authority	市區重建局董事會	Non- executive Director	1-Dec-02	30-Apr-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
180	Mr	Lee Wai Man Maurice	李偉民	Women's Commission	婦女事務委員會	Member	15-Jan-01	14-Jan-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
181	Mr	Leong Kah Kit Alan	梁家傑	Water Pollution Control Appeal Board Panel	水污染管制上訴委員 會	Chairman	1-Feb-01	31-Jan-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
181	Mr	Leong Kah Kit Alan	梁家傑	Criminal and Law Enforcement Injuries Compensation Boards	暴力及執法傷亡賠償 委員會	Member	19-Jun-00	18-Jun-04	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
181	Mr	Leong Kah Kit Alan	梁家傑	Independent Police Complaints Council	投訴警方獨立監察委 員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
181	Mr	Leong Kah Kit Alan	梁家傑	Committee on Bilingual Legal System	雙語法律制度委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
181	Mr	Leong Kah Kit Alan	梁家傑	Applied Research Council	應用研究局	Director	22-Feb-00	21-Feb-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology and Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology (Communications and Technology)	工商及科技 局局長和工 商及科技局 常任秘書長 (通訊及科 技)
182	Mr	Leung Chi Kin Stewart	梁志堅	Estate Agents Authority	地產代理監管局	Member	1-Nov-97	31-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
183	Mr	Leung Chi Kong	梁志剛	Area Committee, Tseung Kwan O North	將軍澳北分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
184	Mr	Leung Hai Ming Raymond	梁海明	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團（建築物）	Member	1-Dec-00	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃地政局副秘書長（規劃及地政）2
185	Mr	Leung Kin Man	梁健文	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
185	Mr	Leung Kin Man	梁健文	Area Committee, Tuen Mun South West	屯門西南分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-93	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
185	Mr	Leung Kin Man	梁健文	District Fight Crime Committee, Tuen Mun	屯門區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-96	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
186	Mr	Leung Kwan Yuen Andrew	梁君彥	Board of Governors of the Prince Philip Dental Hospital	菲臘牙科醫院管理局	Chairman	1-Aug-01	31-Jul-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
186	Mr	Leung Kwan Yuen Andrew	梁君彥	Clothing Industry Training Authority	製衣業訓練局	Member	5-Sep-77	4-Sep-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局局長
186	Mr	Leung Kwan Yuen Andrew	梁君彥	Hong Kong Productivity Council	香港生產力促進局	Chairman	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
186	Mr	Leung Kwan Yuen Andrew	梁君彥	Vocational Training Council	職業訓練局	Member	1-Jul-98	30-Jun-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局局長
186	Mr	Leung Kwan Yuen Andrew	梁君彥	Steering Committee on the Development of the Fashion Industry	時裝業發展統籌委員會	Member	15-Dec-02	14-Dec-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技局局長
186	Mr	Leung Kwan Yuen Andrew	梁君彥	Labour Advisory Board	勞工顧問委員會	Member	1-Jan-93	31-Dec-04	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及勞工局局長
186	Mr	Leung Kwan Yuen Andrew	梁君彥	Textiles Advisory Board	紡織業諮詢委員會	Member	1-Apr-93	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技局局長
186	Mr	Leung Kwan Yuen Andrew	梁君彥	Task Force on Employment	就業專責小組	Member	4-May-98	21-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
186	Mr	Leung Kwan Yuen Andrew	梁君彥	Manpower Development Committee	人力發展委員會	Member	18-Jul-03	14-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
187	Mr	Leung Kwok Fai	梁國輝	District Fight Crime Committee, Sha Tin	沙田區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
188	Ir	Leung Kwong Ho Edmund	梁廣灝	Board of Review (Inland Revenue Ordinance)	稅務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jul-98	30-Jun-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
188	Ir	Leung Kwong Ho Edmund	梁廣灝	Council of the Lingnan University	嶺南大學校務會	Member	22-Oct-99	21-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
188	Ir	Leung Kwong Ho Edmund	梁廣灝	Administrative Appeals Board	行政上訴委員會	Member	15-Jul-03	14-Jul-06	Chief Executive	行政長官
188	Ir	Leung Kwong Ho Edmund	梁廣灝	Energy Advisory Committee	能源諮詢委員會	Member	15-Jul-96	14-Jul-04	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
189	The Hon	Leung Lau Yau Fun Sophie	梁劉柔芬	Steering Committee on the Development of the Fashion Industry	時裝業發展統籌委員 會	Member	15-Dec-02	14-Dec-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技 局局長
189	The Hon	Leung Lau Yau Fun Sophie	梁劉柔芬	Law Reform Commission of Hong Kong	香港法律改革委員會	Member	1-Sep-99	31-Aug-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
189	The Hon	Leung Lau Yau Fun Sophie	梁劉柔芬	Textiles Advisory Board	紡織業諮詢委員會	Member	1-Apr-89	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技 局局長
189	The Hon	Leung Lau Yau Fun Sophie	梁劉柔芬	Disaster Relief Fund Advisory Committee	賑災基金諮詢委員會	Member	28-Jul-98	30-Jun-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
189	The Hon	Leung Lau Yau Fun Sophie	梁劉柔芬	Women's Commission	婦女事務委員會	Chairperson	15-Jan-01	14-Jan-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
190	Mrs	Leung Ngai Mou Yin Justina	梁魏懋賢	Commission on Youth	青年事務委員會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-05	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長
190	Mrs	Leung Ngai Mou Yin Justina	梁魏懋賢	Social Workers Registration Board	社會工作者註冊局	Deputy Chairperson	16-Jan-98	15-Jan-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
190	Mrs	Leung Ngai Mou Yin Justina	梁魏懋賢	Committee on Financial Assistance for Family Members of Those Who Sacrifice Their Lives To Save Others	向捨身救人者家屬提 供經濟援助委員會	Member	11-Feb-02	10-Feb-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
191	Mr	Leung Siu Tong	梁兆棠	Advisory Management Committee of the Hong Kong Teachers' Centre	香港教師中心諮詢管 理委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Permanent Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 常任秘書長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
191	Mr	Leung Siu Tong	梁兆棠	Area Committee, Lantau	大嶼山分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
192	Prof	Leung Tin Pui	梁天培	Town Planning Board	城市規劃委員會	Member	1-Apr-96	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
192	Prof	Leung Tin Pui	梁天培	Radiological Protection Advisory Group	放射防護諮詢小組	Member	1-Jun-89	31-May-04	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
192	Prof	Leung Tin Pui	梁天培	Hong Kong Council for Academic Accreditation	香港學術評審局	Member	1-Oct-01	30-Sep-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
193	Mr	Leung Ying Piu	梁英標	District Fight Crime Committee, Kowloon City	九龍城區撲滅罪行委 員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
193	Mr	Leung Ying Piu	梁英標	Area Committee, Ho Man Tin	何文田分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
193	Mr	Leung Ying Piu	梁英標	District Fire Safety Committee, Kowloon City	九龍城區防火委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
194	The Hon	Leung Yiu Chung	梁耀忠	Area Committee, Kwai Chung (Central & South)	葵涌(中南)分區委員 會	Member	1-Apr-97	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
195	The Hon	Li Fung Ying	李鳳英	Equal Opportunities Commission	平等機會委員會	Member	20-May-96	19-May-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
195	The Hon	Li Fung Ying	李鳳英	Task Force on Employment	就業專責小組	Member	4-May-98	21-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
196	Dr the Hon	Li Ka Cheung Eric	李家祥	Deposit-taking Companies Advisory Committee	接受存款公司諮詢委 員會	Member	1-Jun-97	31-May-06	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
196	Dr the Hon	Li Ka Cheung Eric	李家祥	Independent Police Complaints Council	投訴警方獨立監察委 員會	Vice Chairman	1-Jan-96	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
196	Dr the Hon	Li Ka Cheung Eric	李家祥	Vetting Committee of the Professional Services Development Assistance Scheme	專業服務業發展資助 計劃評審委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
197	Mr	Li Ka Fai David	李家暉	Board of Review (Inland Revenue Ordinance)	稅務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
197	Mr	Li Ka Fai David	李家暉	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
197	Mr	Li Ka Fai David	李家暉	Review Body on Bid Challenges (under the World Trade Organization Agreement on Govt Procurement)	投標投訴審裁組織（根據世界貿易組織政府採購協定）	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-03	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技局局長
198	Dr the Hon	Li Kwok Po David	李國寶	Banking Advisory Committee	銀行業務諮詢委員會	Member	1-Dec-81	30-Nov-05	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
198	Dr the Hon	Li Kwok Po David	李國寶	Exchange Fund Advisory Committee	外匯基金諮詢委員會	Member	1-May-86	30-Sep-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
198	Dr the Hon	Li Kwok Po David	李國寶	Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Authority	強制性公積金計劃管理局	Non-executive Director	17-Sep-01	16-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
199	Mr	Li Sau Hung Eddy	李秀恆	Town Planning Board	城市規劃委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
199	Mr	Li Sau Hung Eddy	李秀恆	Commission on Youth	青年事務委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局局長
200	Mr	Li Tzar Kai Richard	李澤楷	Council of the City University of Hong Kong	香港城市大學校董會	Member	2-Apr-98	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
200	Mr	Li Tzar Kai Richard	李澤楷	Board of Trustees of the Lord Wilson Heritage Trust	衛奕信勳爵文物信託受託人委員會	Member	11-Feb-93	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
200	Mr	Li Tzar Kai Richard	李澤楷	Council of Advisors on Innovation and Technology	創新科技顧問委員會	Member	20-Apr-00	19-Apr-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
201	Mr	Li Tzar Kuoi Victor	李澤鉅	Land and Building Advisory Committee	土地及建設諮詢委員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
201	Mr	Li Tzar Kuoi Victor	李澤鉅	Commission on Strategic Development	策略發展委員會	Member	1-Feb-98	31-Jan-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
202	Mr	Li Tze Leung Brian	李子良	Consumer Council	消費者委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
202	Mr	Li Tze Leung Brian	李子良	Appeal Board Panel (Electricity)	上訴委員會（電力）	Member	28-Jul-03	27-Jul-06	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及勞工局局長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
203	The Hon	Li Wah Ming Fred	李華明	ICAC Complaints Committee	廉政公署事宜投訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
203	The Hon	Li Wah Ming Fred	李華明	Board of the Urban Renewal Authority	市區重建局董事會	Non-executive Director	1-May-01	30-Apr-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
204	Mr	Li Wei Jen Gonzaga	李唯仁	Hong Kong Port Development Council	香港港口發展局	Member	1-Jun-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
205	Mr	Li Wing Sang	李永生	District Fight Crime Committee, Islands	離島區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
206	Mr	Li Ying Sang Tommy	李應生	Endangered Species Advisory Committee	保護稀有動植物諮詢委員會	Member	1-Oct-01	30-Sep-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及工務局局長
206	Mr	Li Ying Sang Tommy	李應生	Chinese Medicine Council of Hong Kong	香港中醫藥管理委員會	Member	21-Jul-03	12-Sep-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
206	Mr	Li Ying Sang Tommy	李應生	District Fight Crime Committee, Central & Western	中西區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
206	Mr	Li Ying Sang Tommy	李應生	Area Committee, Chung Wan & Sheung Wan	中上環分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
207	Mr	Li Yiu Ban	李耀斌	District Fight Crime Committee, Tai Po	大埔區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-91	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
207	Mr	Li Yiu Ban	李耀斌	District Fire Safety Committee, Tai Po	大埔區防火委員會	Chairman	18-Sep-98	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
208	Mr	Liang Wan Sang Vincent	梁雲生	Committee on Bilingual Legal System	雙語法律制度委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
209	The Hon	Liao Cheung Sing Andrew	廖長城	ICAC Complaints Committee	廉政公署事宜投訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
209	The Hon	Liao Cheung Sing Andrew	廖長城	Pensions Appeal Panel	退休金上訴委員會	Convenor	8-Apr-02	7-Apr-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
209	The Hon	Liao Cheung Sing Andrew	廖長城	Council for Sustainable Development	可持續發展委員會	Member	1-Mar-03	28-Feb-05	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
209	The Hon	Liao Cheung Sing Andrew	廖長城	Disaster Relief Fund Advisory Committee	賑災基金諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jul-02	30-Jun-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
209	The Hon	Liao Cheung Sing Andrew	廖長城	Non-local Higher and Professional Education Appeal Board	非本地高等及專業教育上訴委員會	Chairman	8-Dec-97	7-Dec-03	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局局長
210	Mr	Lin Sun Mo Willy	林宣武	Clothing Industry Training Authority	製衣業訓練局	Member	1-Mar-94	4-Sep-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局局長
210	Mr	Lin Sun Mo Willy	林宣武	Hong Kong Productivity Council	香港生產力促進局	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
210	Mr	Lin Sun Mo Willy	林宣武	Aviation Advisory Board	航空諮詢委員會	Member	1-Dec-96	31-Aug-05	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及勞工局局長
210	Mr	Lin Sun Mo Willy	林宣武	Textiles Advisory Board	紡織業諮詢委員會	Member	1-Apr-94	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技局局長
210	Mr	Lin Sun Mo Willy	林宣武	Hong Kong Logistics Development Council	香港物流發展局	Member	10-Dec-01	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
210	Mr	Lin Sun Mo Willy	林宣武	Hong Kong Port Development Council	香港港口發展局	Member	1-Jun-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
211	Mrs	Ling Lee Ching Man Eleanor	林李靜文	Board of Governors of the Prince Philip Dental Hospital	菲臘牙科醫院管理局	Member	8-Aug-01	31-Jul-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
211	Mrs	Ling Lee Ching Man Eleanor	林李靜文	Medical Council of Hong Kong	香港醫務委員會	Member	1-Sep-03	31-Aug-06	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
211	Mrs	Ling Lee Ching Man Eleanor	林李靜文	Vocational Training Council	職業訓練局	Member	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局局長
211	Mrs	Ling Lee Ching Man Eleanor	林李靜文	Sir Edward Youde Memorial Fund Council	尤德爵士紀念基金理事會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-05	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
211	Mrs	Ling Lee Ching Man Eleanor	林李靜文	Standing Commission on Civil Service Salaries and Conditions of Service	公務員薪俸及服務條件常務委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
211	Mrs	Ling Lee Ching Man Eleanor	林李靜文	Hospital Authority	醫院管理局	Member	1-Dec-91	30-Nov-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
211	Mrs	Ling Lee Ching Man Eleanor	林李靜文	Panel of the Police Witness Protection Review Board	警方保護證人覆核委 員會小組	Member	9-Nov-00	8-Nov-04	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
212	Mr	Ling Man Hoi	凌文海	Area Committee, Tseung Kwan O South	將軍澳南分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
212	Mr	Ling Man Hoi	凌文海	District Fire Safety Committee, Sai Kung	西貢區防火委員會	Member	1-Dec-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
213	Mr	Liu King Tong	廖敬榮	Area Committee, Mid-Levels	半山分區委員會	Vice Chairman	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
214	Mr	Lo Chung Wing Victor	羅仲榮	Exchange Fund Advisory Committee	外匯基金諮詢委員會	Member	10-Dec-01	9-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
214	Mr	Lo Chung Wing Victor	羅仲榮	Council of the City University of Hong Kong	香港城市大學校董會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
214	Mr	Lo Chung Wing Victor	羅仲榮	Board of Directors of the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation	香港科技園公司董事 局	Chairman	7-May-01	30-Jun-05	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技 局局長
214	Mr	Lo Chung Wing Victor	羅仲榮	Council of Advisors on Innovation and Technology	創新科技顧問委員會	Member	20-Apr-00	19-Apr-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
215	Mr	Lo Man Tuen	盧文端	Area Committee, Chai Wan (Yee Wan)	怡灣分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
216	Mr	Lo Suk Ching	羅叔清	Basic Law Promotion Steering Committee	基本法推廣督導委員 會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
217	Dr	Lo Wai Kwok	盧偉國	Innovation and Technology Fund (Electronics) Projects Vetting Committee	創新及科技基金（電 子）項目評審委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-04	Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Technology (Communications and Technology)	工商及科技 局常任秘書 長（通訊及科 技）
217	Dr	Lo Wai Kwok	盧偉國	Engineers Registration Board	工程師註冊管理局	Member	20-Jul-00	20-Sep-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
217	Dr	Lo Wai Kwok	盧偉國	Area Committee, Sha Tin West One	沙田西一分區委員會	Member	1-Jul-97	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
217	Dr	Lo Wai Kwok	盧偉國	District Fight Crime Committee, Sha Tin	沙田區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
218	Dr the Hon	Lo Wing Lok	勞永樂	Medical Council of Hong Kong	香港醫務委員會	Member	24-Jan-99	23-Jan-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
218	Dr the Hon	Lo Wing Lok	勞永樂	Hong Kong Council on Smoking and Health	香港吸煙與健康委員會	Member	1-Oct-97	30-Sep-04	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
218	Dr the Hon	Lo Wing Lok	勞永樂	Action Committee Against Narcotics	禁毒常務委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
218	Dr the Hon	Lo Wing Lok	勞永樂	Independent Police Complaints Council	投訴警方獨立監察委員會	Vice Chairman	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
218	Dr the Hon	Lo Wing Lok	勞永樂	Advisory Council on Food and Environmental Hygiene	食物及環境衛生諮詢委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
219	Dr the Hon	Lui Ming Wah	呂明華	Innovation and Technology Fund (Electronics) Projects Vetting Committee	創新及科技基金（電子）項目評審委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-04	Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Technology (Communications and Technology)	工商及科技局常任秘書長（通訊及科技）
219	Dr the Hon	Lui Ming Wah	呂明華	Innovation and Technology Fund (Nanotechnology) Projects Vetting Committee	創新及科技基金（納米科技）項目審評委員會	Member	1-Jul-02	30-Jun-05	Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Technology (Communications and Technology)	工商及科技局常任秘書長（通訊及科技）
219	Dr the Hon	Lui Ming Wah	呂明華	Trade and Industry Advisory Board	工業貿易諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jul-00	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技局局長
219	Dr the Hon	Lui Ming Wah	呂明華	Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Authority	強制性公積金計劃管理局	Non-executive Director	17-Sep-01	16-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
220	Dr	Lui So Yee Lai Alice	呂蘇綺麗	Endangered Species Advisory Committee	保護稀有動植物諮詢 委員會	Member	1-Oct-00	30-Sep-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
220	Dr	Lui So Yee Lai Alice	呂蘇綺麗	Commission on Youth	青年事務委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-05	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長
220	Dr	Lui So Yee Lai Alice	呂蘇綺麗	Appeal Board Panel (Gas Safety)	上訴委員會 (氣體安 全)	Member	23-Aug-03	22-Aug-06	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
220	Dr	Lui So Yee Lai Alice	呂蘇綺麗	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團 (建築物)	Member	1-Dec-00	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃 地政局副秘 書長 (規劃及 地政) 2
220	Dr	Lui So Yee Lai Alice	呂蘇綺麗	District Fight Crime Committee, North	北區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
221	Mr	Lui Tim Leung Tim	雷添良	Immigration Tribunal	入境事務審裁處	Adjudicator	1-Dec-98	30-Nov-04	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
221	Mr	Lui Tim Leung Tim	雷添良	Registration of Persons Tribunal	人事登記審裁處	Adjudicator	1-Mar-99	28-Feb-05	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
221	Mr	Lui Tim Leung Tim	雷添良	Council of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	香港科技大學校董會	Treasurer	1-Jan-01	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
221	Mr	Lui Tim Leung Tim	雷添良	Standing Committee on Directorate Salaries and Conditions of Service	首長級薪俸及服務條 件常務委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
221	Mr	Lui Tim Leung Tim	雷添良	Joint Committee on Student Finance	政府助學金聯合委員 會	Chairman	1-May-99	30-Apr-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
221	Mr	Lui Tim Leung Tim	雷添良	Employees' Compensation Insurance Levies Management Board	僱員補償保險徵款管 理局	Chairman	1-Jul-01	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
221	Mr	Lui Tim Leung Tim	雷添良	Independent Commission on Remuneration for Members of the ExCo and the Legislature of the HKSAR	香港特別行政區行政 會議成員及立法會議 員薪津獨立委員	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
222	Mr	Luk Tei Lewis	陸地	Trade and Industry Advisory Board	工業貿易諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jul-02	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技局局長
223	Ir Dr	Luk Wang Kwong John	陸宏廣	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團（建築物）	Member	16-Jan-95	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃地政局副秘書長（規劃及地政）2
224	Ms	Lum Shun Sui Susie	林崇綏	Council of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University	香港理工大學校董會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
224	Ms	Lum Shun Sui Susie	林崇綏	Nursing Council of Hong Kong	香港護士管理局	Member	15-Jun-94	14-Jun-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
224	Ms	Lum Shun Sui Susie	林崇綏	Registration of Persons Tribunal	人事登記審裁處	Adjudicator	1-Jun-99	31-May-05	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
224	Ms	Lum Shun Sui Susie	林崇綏	Social Workers Registration Board	社會工作者註冊局	Member	16-Jan-98	15-Jan-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
224	Ms	Lum Shun Sui Susie	林崇綏	Elderly Commission	安老事務委員會	Member	30-Jul-01	29-Jul-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
225	The Hon	Ma Fung Kwok	馬逢國	Fight Crime Committee	撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-05	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
225	The Hon	Ma Fung Kwok	馬逢國	Estate Agents Authority	地產代理監管局	Member	1-Nov-00	31-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
225	The Hon	Ma Fung Kwok	馬逢國	Film Services Advisory Committee	電影服務諮詢委員會	Member	1-May-98	30-Apr-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
225	The Hon	Ma Fung Kwok	馬逢國	Film Development Fund Projects Vetting Committee	電影發展基金審核委員會	Member	1-Jan-99	30-Apr-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技局局長
226	Mr	Ma Lik	馬力	Board of Directors of the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation	香港科技園公司董事局	Member	7-May-01	30-Jun-05	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技局局長
226	Mr	Ma Lik	馬力	Basic Law Promotion Steering Committee	基本法推廣督導委員會	Member	1-Jan-98	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
227	Mr	Ma Yung Yi Lawrence	馬 壙宜	Steering Committee on the Development of the Fashion Industry	時裝業發展統籌委員 會	Member	15-Dec-02	14-Dec-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工 商 及 科 技 局 局 長
228	Dr	Mak Kin Wah	麥建華	Labour Advisory Board	勞工顧問委員會	Member	4-Apr-97	31-Dec-04	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經 濟 發 展 及 勞 工 局 局 長
229	Mrs	Mak Tang Pik Yee Agnes	麥鄧碧儀	Hong Kong Productivity Council	香港生產力促進局	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Financial Secretary	財 政 司 司 長
229	Mrs	Mak Tang Pik Yee Agnes	麥鄧碧儀	Innovation and Technology Fund General Support Programme Vetting Committee	創新及科技基金一般 支援計劃評審委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-04	Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Technology (Communications and Technology)	工 商 及 科 技 局 常 任 秘 書 長 (通 訊 及 科 技)
229	Mrs	Mak Tang Pik Yee Agnes	麥鄧碧儀	Innovation and Technology Fund (Information Technology) Projects Vetting Committee	創新及科技基金 (資 訊 科 技) 項 目 評 審 委 員 會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-04	Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Technology (Communications and Technology)	工 商 及 科 技 局 常 任 秘 書 長 (通 訊 及 科 技)
229	Mrs	Mak Tang Pik Yee Agnes	麥鄧碧儀	Lotteries Fund Advisory Committee	獎券基金諮詢委員會	Member	1-Sep-01	31-Aug-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛 生 福 利 及 食 物 局 局 長
230	Mr	Man Hon Ming	文 漢 明	District Fight Crime Committee, Southern	南區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民 政 事 務 總 署 署 長
230	Mr	Man Hon Ming	文 漢 明	Area Committee, Wah Fu & Pok Fu Lam	華富及薄扶林分區委 員會	Vice Chairman	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民 政 事 務 總 署 署 長
230	Mr	Man Hon Ming	文 漢 明	District Fire Safety Committee, Southern	南區防火委員會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民 政 事 務 總 署 署 長
231	Mr	Mok Charles Peter	莫乃光	Consumer Council	消費者委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Financial Secretary	財 政 司 司 長
231	Mr	Mok Charles Peter	莫乃光	Trade and Industry Advisory Board	工業貿易諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jul-00	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工 商 及 科 技 局 局 長
231	Mr	Mok Charles Peter	莫乃光	Appeal Board Panel (Consumer Goods Safety)	上訴委員團 (消費品安 全)	Member	20-Oct-99	19-Oct-05	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經 濟 發 展 及 勞 工 局 局 長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
231	Mr	Mok Charles Peter	莫乃光	Information Infrastructure Advisory Committee	資訊基建諮詢委員會	Member	18-Aug-98	31-Jul-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
232	Mr	Ng Cheung Shing	吳長勝	Vocational Training Council	職業訓練局	Member	1-Jul-00	30-Jun-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
232	Mr	Ng Cheung Shing	吳長勝	Innovation and Technology Fund (Information Technology) Projects Vetting Committee	創新及科技基金(資訊 科技)項目評審委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-04	Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Technology (Communications and Technology)	工商及科技 局常任秘書 長(通訊及科 技)
232	Mr	Ng Cheung Shing	吳長勝	Applied Research Council	應用研究局	Director	22-Feb-00	21-Feb-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology and Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology (Communications and Technology)	工商及科技 局局長和工 商及科技局 常任秘書長 (通訊及科 技)
233	Prof	Ng Ching Fai	吳清輝	Board of Directors of the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation	香港科技園公司董事 局	Member	7-May-01	30-Jun-05	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技 局局長
233	Prof	Ng Ching Fai	吳清輝	Basic Law Promotion Steering Committee	基本法推廣督導委員 會	Member	1-Jan-98	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
233	Prof	Ng Ching Fai	吳清輝	Council of Advisors on Innovation and Technology	創新科技顧問委員會	Member	20-Apr-00	19-Apr-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
234	Mr	Ng Jim Mi Jimmy	伍占美	Pilotage Advisory Committee	領港事務諮詢委員會	Member	1-Sep-02	31-Aug-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
235	Mr	Ng Kam Chun Stephen	吳錦津	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團(建築物)	Member	1-Dec-03	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃 地政局副秘 書長(規劃及 地政) 2

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
235	Mr	Ng Kam Chun Stephen	吳錦津	Estate Agents Authority	地產代理監管局	Member	1-Nov-97	31-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
235	Mr	Ng Kam Chun Stephen	吳錦津	District Fight Crime Committee, Wan Chai	灣仔區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-93	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
235	Mr	Ng Kam Chun Stephen	吳錦津	Area Committee, Wong Nai Chung	黃泥涌分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
236	Mr	Ng Kum Chuen	吳錦泉	Area Committee, Lantau	大嶼山分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
237	The Hon	Ng Leung Sing	吳亮星	Hong Kong Housing Authority	香港房屋委員會	Member	1-Apr-96	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
237	The Hon	Ng Leung Sing	吳亮星	Council of the Lingnan University	嶺南大學校務會	Member	22-Oct-99	21-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
237	The Hon	Ng Leung Sing	吳亮星	Fisheries Development Loan Fund Advisory Committee	漁業發展貸款基金顧 問委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-03	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
238	The Hon	Ng Ngoi Yee Margaret	吳靄儀	Operations Review Committee of the ICAC	廉政公署審查貪污舉 報諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-97	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
238	The Hon	Ng Ngoi Yee Margaret	吳靄儀	Panel of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Witness Protection Review Board	廉政公署保護證人覆 核委員會小組	Member	9-Nov-00	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
239	Mr	Ng See Yuen	吳思遠	Film Services Advisory Committee	電影服務諮詢委員會	Member	1-May-98	30-Apr-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
239	Mr	Ng See Yuen	吳思遠	Film Development Fund Projects Vetting Committee	電影發展基金審核委 員會	Member	1-Jan-99	30-Apr-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技 局局長
240	Mr	Ng Tak Leung David	伍德良	Occupational Safety and Health Council	職業安全健康局	Member	22-Aug-01	21-Aug-04	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
241	Mr	Ng Wai Ming Patrick	吳惠明	District Fire Safety Committee, Sham Shui Po	深水埗區防火委員會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
242	Mr	Ng Yu Lam Kenneth	吳俞霖	Hong Kong Export Credit Insurance Corporation Advisory Board	香港出口信用保險局 諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
243	Mr	Ngai Kam Fai Danny	倪錦輝	Consumer Council	消費者委員會	Member	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
243	Mr	Ngai Kam Fai Danny	倪錦輝	Appeal Board Panel (Toys and Children's Products Safety)	上訴委員團(玩具及兒 童產品安全)	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
243	Mr	Ngai Kam Fai Danny	倪錦輝	Trade and Industry Advisory Board	工業貿易諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jul-00	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技 局局長
243	Mr	Ngai Kam Fai Danny	倪錦輝	Small and Medium Enterprises Committee	中小型企業委員會	Member	15-Dec-00	14-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
243	Mr	Ngai Kam Fai Danny	倪錦輝	Area Committee, San Tsuen	新鑽分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
244	Mr	Or Ching Fai Raymond	柯清輝	Council of the City University of Hong Kong	香港城市大學校董會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
245	Mr	Pang Cheung Wai Thomas	彭長緯	Environmental Campaign Committee	環境保護運動委員會	Member	1-Jan-98	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
245	Mr	Pang Cheung Wai Thomas	彭長緯	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
245	Mr	Pang Cheung Wai Thomas	彭長緯	Area Committee, Sha Tin West One	沙田西一分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
245	Mr	Pang Cheung Wai Thomas	彭長緯	District Fight Crime Committee, Sha Tin	沙田區撲滅罪行委員 會	Chairman	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
245	Mr	Pang Cheung Wai Thomas	彭長緯	District Fire Safety Committee, Sha Tin	沙田區防火委員會	Member	1-May-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
246	Mr	Pang Hang Yin Raymond	彭鏗然	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
247	Ms	Pong Oi Lan Scarlett	龐愛蘭	Pharmacy and Poisons Appeal Tribunal	藥劑業及毒藥上訴審 裁處	Member	14-Aug-03	13-Aug-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
247	Ms	Pong Oi Lan Scarlett	龐愛蘭	Hong Kong Council on Smoking and Health	香港吸煙與健康委員 會	Member	1-Oct-98	30-Sep-04	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
247	Ms	Pong Oi Lan Scarlett	龐愛蘭	Water Pollution Control Appeal Board Panel	水污染管制上訴委員 會	Member	1-Feb-01	31-Jan-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
247	Ms	Pong Oi Lan Scarlett	龐愛蘭	Action Committee Against Narcotics	禁毒常務委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
248	Mrs	Pong Tso Shing Yuk Alice	龐曹聖玉	Human Organ Transplant Board	人體器官移植委員會	Member	12-Nov-03	14-Feb-04	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
248	Mrs	Pong Tso Shing Yuk Alice	龐曹聖玉	Area Committee, Wan Chai Mid-Levels	灣仔半山分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
249	Prof	Poon Chung Kwong	潘宗光	Radiological Protection Advisory Group	放射防護諮詢小組	Chairman	1-Jun-89	31-May-04	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
249	Prof	Poon Chung Kwong	潘宗光	Veterinary Surgeons Board	獸醫管理局	Chairman	15-Sep-00	14-Sep-04	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
250	Mr	Poon Kwok Lim Steven	潘國濂	University Grants Committee	大學教育資助委員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
250	Mr	Poon Kwok Lim Steven	潘國濂	Estate Agents Authority	地產代理監管局	Chairman	1-Nov-03	31-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
251	Ir	Poon Lok To Otto	潘樂陶	Air Pollution Control Appeal Board Panel	空氣污染管制上訴委 員會	Member	1-Feb-95	31-Jan-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
251	Ir	Poon Lok To Otto	潘樂陶	Water Pollution Control Appeal Board Panel	水污染管制上訴委員 會	Member	1-Feb-97	31-Jan-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
251	Ir	Poon Lok To Otto	潘樂陶	Advisory Council on the Environment	環境諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-96	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
251	Ir	Poon Lok To Otto	潘樂陶	Council for Sustainable Development	可持續發展委員會	Member	1-Mar-03	28-Feb-05	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
251	Ir	Poon Lok To Otto	潘樂陶	Energy Advisory Committee	能源諮詢委員會	Chairman	15-Jul-00	14-Jul-04	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
251	Ir	Poon Lok To Otto	潘樂陶	Waste Reduction Committee	減少廢物委員會	Chairman	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
252	Mr	Pui Kwan Kay	貝鈞奇	Appeal Panel on Housing	上訴委員會（房屋）	Member	1-Apr-03	30-Jun-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
252	Mr	Pui Kwan Kay	貝鈞奇	Area Committee, Causeway Bay	銅鑼灣分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
253	Mr	Shi Kai Biu Simon	余繼標	Area Committee, Kwun Tong Town & Industrial Area	觀塘市中心及工業分 區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
254	Dr	Shih Tai Cho Louis	史泰祖	Medical Council of Hong Kong	香港醫務委員會	Member	24-Jan-00	23-Jan-06	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
255	Mr	Shum Choi Sang	岑才生	Area Committee, North Point West	北角西分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
255	Mr	Shum Choi Sang	岑才生	District Fire Safety Committee, Eastern	東區防火委員會	Member	27-Feb-98	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
256	Rev	Sik Chi Wai	釋智慧	Area Committee, Lantau	大嶼山分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
257	The Hon	Sin Chung Kai	單仲偕	Hong Kong Housing Authority	香港房屋委員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
257	The Hon	Sin Chung Kai	單仲偕	Advisory Committee on Travel Agents	旅行代理商諮詢委員 會	Member	1-Nov-02	31-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
257	The Hon	Sin Chung Kai	單仲偕	Council of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	香港科技大學校董會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
257	The Hon	Sin Chung Kai	單仲偕	Advisory Committee on Corruption of the ICAC	廉政公署貪污問題諮 詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
257	The Hon	Sin Chung Kai	單仲偕	Advisory Committee on Code of Practice for Recognized Certification Authorities	認可核證機關業務守 則諮詢委員會	Member	1-Feb-00	31-Jan-04	Director of Information Technology Services	資訊科技署 署長
257	The Hon	Sin Chung Kai	單仲偕	Area Committee, Kwai Chung (Central & South)	葵涌〔中南〕分區委 員會	Member	1-Apr-97	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
258	Mr	Sing Hon Keung	成漢強	District Fire Safety Committee, Sai Kung	西貢區防火委員會	Member	1-Dec-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
259	Prof	Sit Fung Shuen Victor	薛鳳旋	Antiquities Advisory Board	古物諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
259	Prof	Sit Fung Shuen Victor	薛鳳旋	Hong Kong Port Development Council	香港港口發展局	Member	1-Jun-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
260	Mr	Sit Kien Ping Peter	薛建平	Board of Review (Inland Revenue Ordinance)	稅務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
260	Mr	Sit Kien Ping Peter	薛建平	Immigration Tribunal	入境事務審裁處	Adjudicator	1-Nov-03	31-Oct-05	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
261	Ms	Siu Wing Yee Sylvia	蕭詠儀	Transport Advisory Committee	交通諮詢委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
261	Ms	Siu Wing Yee Sylvia	蕭詠儀	Appeal Board (Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation)	上訴委員會 (旅館業)	Member	1-Nov-02	31-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
261	Ms	Siu Wing Yee Sylvia	蕭詠儀	Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning)	上訴委員會 (城市規 劃)	Member	1-Oct-02	30-Sep-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
261	Ms	Siu Wing Yee Sylvia	蕭詠儀	Appeal Board (Clubs (Safety of Premises))	上訴委員會 (會社 (房 產安全))	Member	1-Nov-02	31-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
261	Ms	Siu Wing Yee Sylvia	蕭詠儀	Appeal Board (Bedspace Apartments)	上訴委員會 (床位寓 所)	Member	1-Dec-02	30-Nov-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
262	Ms	Siu Yuen Sheung	蕭婉嫦	Hong Kong Housing Authority	香港房屋委員會	Member	1-Apr-96	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
262	Ms	Siu Yuen Sheung	蕭婉嫦	Panel of Film Censorship Advisers	電影顧問小組	Member	1-Feb-93	31-Mar-04	Commissioner for Television and Entertainment Licensing	影視及娛樂 事務管理處 處長
262	Ms	Siu Yuen Sheung	蕭婉嫦	Area Committee, Hung Hom	紅磡分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
262	Ms	Siu Yuen Sheung	蕭婉嫦	District Fire Safety Committee, Kowloon City	九龍城區防火委員會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
263	Mr	So Chak Kwong Jack	蘇澤光	Council of the University of Hong Kong	香港大學校務委員會	Member	9-Dec-00	6-Dec-03	Council of the University of Hong Kong	香港大學校 務委員會
264	Mr	So Hoi Pan Edinson	蘇開鵬	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
264	Mr	So Hoi Pan Edinson	蘇開鵬	Small and Medium Enterprises Committee	中小型企業委員會	Member	15-Dec-00	14-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
264	Mr	So Hoi Pan Edinson	蘇開鵬	Area Committee, Kwai Chung West	葵涌 (西) 分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
264	Mr	So Hoi Pan Edinson	蘇開鵬	District Fight Crime Committee, Kwai Tsing	葵青區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
265	Mr	So Shiu Shing	蘇炤成	Area Committee, Tuen Mun South East	屯門東南分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-93	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
266	Prof	Sohmen Pao Anna	蘇包陪慶	Council of the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts	香港演藝學院校董會	Chairman	1-Jan-97	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
267	Mr	Suen Kai Cheong	孫啟昌	Council of the Lord Wilson Heritage Trust	衛奕信勳爵文物信託 理事會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
267	Mr	Suen Kai Cheong	孫啟昌	Area Committee, Causeway Bay	銅鑼灣分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
267	Mr	Suen Kai Cheong	孫啟昌	District Fight Crime Committee, Wan Chai	灣仔區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-92	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
267	Mr	Suen Kai Cheong	孫啟昌	Licensing Appeals Board	牌照上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
267	Mr	Suen Kai Cheong	孫啟昌	District Fire Safety Committee, Wan Chai	灣仔區防火委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
268	Mr	Sun Kai Lit Cliff	孫啟烈	Innovation and Technology Fund (Foundation Industries) Projects Vetting Committee	創新及科技基金(基礎 工業)項目評審委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-04	Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Technology (Communications and Technology)	工商及科技 局常任秘書 長(通訊及科 技)
268	Mr	Sun Kai Lit Cliff	孫啟烈	Gas Safety Advisory Committee	氣體安全諮詢委員會	Member	7-Jan-00	31-Aug-05	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
268	Mr	Sun Kai Lit Cliff	孫啟烈	Vetting Committee of the Professional Services Development Assistance Scheme	專業服務業發展資助 計劃評審委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
268	Mr	Sun Kai Lit Cliff	孫啟烈	District Fight Crime Committee, Kwun Tong	觀塘區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
268	Mr	Sun Kai Lit Cliff	孫啟烈	Area Committee, Kwun Tong West	觀塘西分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
269	Dr	Sun Tai Lun	孫大倫	Hong Kong Arts Centre	香港藝術中心	Chairman	1-May-00	31-Mar-06	Chief Executive	行政長官
269	Dr	Sun Tai Lun	孫大倫	Council of the City University of Hong Kong	香港城市大學校董會	Member	1-Dec-01	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
269	Dr	Sun Tai Lun	孫大倫	Advisory Committee on Travel Agents	旅行代理商諮詢委員會	Member	1-Nov-02	31-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
269	Dr	Sun Tai Lun	孫大倫	Advisory Committee on Post- retirement Employment	退休公務員就業申請 諮詢委員會	Member	15-Jul-01	13-Jul-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
269	Dr	Sun Tai Lun	孫大倫	Manpower Development Committee	人力發展委員會	Member	15-Oct-02	14-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
270	Ir	Szeto Ka Sing	司徒家成	Appeal Board Panel (Amusement Rides (Safety))	上訴委員團(機動遊戲 機(安全))	Member	12-Jan-02	11-Jan-05	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長
270	Ir	Szeto Ka Sing	司徒家成	Appeal Board Panel (Lifts and Escalators (Safety))	上訴委員團(升降機及 自動梯(安全))	Member	1-Dec-02	30-Nov-05	Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands	房屋及規劃 地政局局長
271	Prof	Tam Fung Yee Nora	譚鳳儀	Country and Marine Parks Board	郊野公園及海岸公園 委員會	Member	1-Sep-01	31-Aug-05	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
271	Prof	Tam Fung Yee Nora	譚鳳儀	Town Planning Board	城市規劃委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
271	Prof	Tam Fung Yee Nora	譚鳳儀	Ocean Park Corporation Board	海洋公園公司董事局	Member	1-Jul-03	30-Jun-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
272	Mr	Tam Ling Kwan	談靈鈞	Chinese Medicine Council of Hong Kong	香港中醫藥管理委員 會	Member	13-Sep-99	12-Sep-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
273	Prof	Tam Man Kwan	譚萬鈞	Community Youth Club Council	公益少年團理事會	Member	30-Oct-86	9-Nov-04	Deputy Secretary for Education and Manpower 3	教育統籌局 副秘書長 3
274	Prof	Tam Sheung Wai	譚尚渭	Ping Wo Fund Advisory Committee	平和基金諮詢委員會	Chairman	8-Sep-03	7-Sep-05	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長
274	Prof	Tam Sheung Wai	譚尚渭	Statistics Advisory Board	統計諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jun-98	31-May-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
275	Ms	Tam Siu Ying Iris	譚小瑩	Advisory Council on the Environment	環境諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-98	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
275	Ms	Tam Siu Ying Iris	譚小瑩	Planners Registration Board	規劃師註冊管理局	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-03	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
275	Ms	Tam Siu Ying Iris	譚小瑩	Appeal Panel (Estate Agents Ordinance)	上訴委員會(地產代理 條例)	Chairman	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands	房屋及規劃 地政局局長
276	Miss	Tam Wai Chu Maria	譚惠珠	Advisory Committee on Corruption of the ICAC	廉政公署貪污問題諮 詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
276	Miss	Tam Wai Chu Maria	譚惠珠	Airport Authority	機場管理局	Member	1-Dec-95	31-May-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
276	Miss	Tam Wai Chu Maria	譚惠珠	Board of the Urban Renewal Authority	市區重建局董事會	Non- executive Director	1-May-01	30-Apr-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
277	Mr	Tam Wai Ho Samson	譚偉豪	Hong Kong Productivity Council	香港生產力促進局	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
278	The Hon	Tam Yiu Chung	譚耀宗	Employees Retraining Board	僱員再培訓局	Chairman	1-Nov-95	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
278	The Hon	Tam Yiu Chung	譚耀宗	Standing Commission on Civil Service Salaries and Conditions of Service	公務員薪俸及服務條 件常務委員會	Member	1-Feb-96	31-Jan-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
278	The Hon	Tam Yiu Chung	譚耀宗	Elderly Commission	安老事務委員會	Chairman	30-Jul-97	29-Jul-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
278	The Hon	Tam Yiu Chung	譚耀宗	Manpower Development Committee	人力發展委員會	Member	15-Oct-02	14-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
278	The Hon	Tam Yiu Chung	譚耀宗	Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Authority	強制性公積金計劃管 理局	Non- executive Director	17-Sep-03	16-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
279	Mr	Tang Hing Ip	鄧慶業	District Fight Crime Committee, Yuen Long	元朗區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-96	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
280	Mr	Tang Ki Tat	鄧其達	District Fight Crime Committee, Yuen Long	元朗區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-88	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
281	Mr	Tang Kwok Kong	鄧國綱	District Fight Crime Committee, Kwai Tsing	葵青區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-96	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
281	Mr	Tang Kwok Kong	鄧國綱	Area Committee, Tsing Yi (South West)	青衣〔西南〕分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
282	Mr	Tang Leung Shun Gary	鄧良順	District Fight Crime Committee, Tuen Mun	屯門區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
282	Mr	Tang Leung Shun Gary	鄧良順	Area Committee, Tsuen Wan Central	荃灣中分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Elected from amongst members	成員之間互選產生
283	Dr the Hon	Tang Siu Tong	鄧兆棠	Antiquities Advisory Board	古物諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
283	Dr the Hon	Tang Siu Tong	鄧兆棠	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
284	Mr	Tang Wai Man Tony	鄧偉文	Immigration Tribunal	入境事務審裁處	Adjudicator	1-Dec-98	30-Nov-04	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
284	Mr	Tang Wai Man Tony	鄧偉文	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團（建築物）	Member	1-Dec-97	30-Nov-04	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃地政局副秘書長（規劃及地政）2
284	Mr	Tang Wai Man Tony	鄧偉文	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
284	Mr	Tang Wai Man Tony	鄧偉文	Asbestos Administration Committee	石棉行政管理委員會	Member	8-Mar-98	7-Mar-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及工務局局長
285	Miss	Tang Yin Ping	鄧燕萍	Disciplinary Committee Panel (under Social Workers Registration Ordinance)	社會工作者註冊局-紀律委員會備選委員小組	Member	16-Jan-01	15-Jan-05	Social Workers Registration Board	社會工作者註冊局
286	The Hon	Tien Pei Chun James	田北俊	Task Force on Employment	就業專責小組	Member	21-Oct-02	21-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
286	The Hon	Tien Pei Chun James	田北俊	Area Committee, Mid-Levels	半山分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
287	Mr	Tien Puk Sun Michael	田北辰	Employees Retraining Board	僱員再培訓局	Vice Chairman	1-Nov-00	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
287	Mr	Tien Puk Sun Michael	田北辰	Standing Committee on Language Education and Research	語文教育及研究常務 委員會	Chairman	7-Nov-00	30-Jun-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
287	Mr	Tien Puk Sun Michael	田北辰	Manpower Development Committee	人力發展委員會	Member	15-Oct-02	14-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
287	Mr	Tien Puk Sun Michael	田北辰	Board of the Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation	九廣鐵路管理局	Chairman	24-Dec-01	23-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
288	Mr	Tik Chi Yuen	狄志遠	Committee on the Promotion of Civic Education	公民教育委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長
288	Mr	Tik Chi Yuen	狄志遠	Council for the AIDS Trust Fund	愛滋病信託基金委員 會	Member	31-Mar-99	30-Mar-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
288	Mr	Tik Chi Yuen	狄志遠	Council for Sustainable Development	可持續發展委員會	Member	1-Mar-03	28-Feb-05	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
289	The Hon	Ting Woo Shou Kenneth	丁午壽	Council of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University	香港理工大學校董會	Member	1-Apr-95	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
289	The Hon	Ting Woo Shou Kenneth	丁午壽	Operations Review Committee of the ICAC	廉政公署審查貪污舉 報諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-99	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
289	The Hon	Ting Woo Shou Kenneth	丁午壽	Panel of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Witness Protection Review Board	廉政公署保護證人覆 核委員會小組	Member	9-Nov-00	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
289	The Hon	Ting Woo Shou Kenneth	丁午壽	Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Authority	強制性公積金計劃管 理局	Non- executive Director	17-Sep-03	16-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
290	Ms	Ting Yuk Chee Christina	丁毓珠	Chinese Temples Committee	華人廟宇委員會	Member	28-Jun-02	27-Jun-05	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長
290	Ms	Ting Yuk Chee Christina	丁毓珠	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
290	Ms	Ting Yuk Chee Christina	丁毓珠	Area Committee, Hong Shing	康城分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
291	The Hon	To Kun Sun James	涂謹申	Area Committee, Mong Kok	旺角分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
292	Mr	Tong Ka Wah Ronny	湯家驊	Board of Review (Inland Revenue Ordinance)	稅務上訴委員會	Deputy Chairman	3-Jan-95	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
292	Mr	Tong Ka Wah Ronny	湯家驊	Registration of Persons Tribunal	人事登記審裁處	Adjudicator	1-May-96	30-Apr-04	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
293	Mr	Tong Tai Wai Raphael	唐大威	Area Committee, Sai Ying Pun	西營盤分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
294	Mr	Tong Yat Chu Albert	唐一柱	Occupational Safety and Health Council	職業安全健康局	Member	22-Aug-95	21-Aug-04	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及勞工局局長
295	Dr the Hon	Tsang Hin Chi	曾憲梓	Manpower Development Committee	人力發展委員會	Member	20-Nov-02	14-Oct-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
296	Mr	Tsang Lai Keung	曾勵強	Personal Data (Privacy) Advisory Committee	個人資料(私隱)諮詢委員會	Member	1-Oct-02	30-Sep-05	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局局長
297	Mr	Tsang Yan Fat	曾恩發	Area Committee, Tsuen Wan East	荃灣東分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-90	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
298	The Hon	Tsang Yok Sing Jasper	曾鈺成	Council of the Open University of Hong Kong	香港公開大學校董會	Member	20-Jun-96	19-Jun-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
298	The Hon	Tsang Yok Sing Jasper	曾鈺成	ICAC Complaints Committee	廉政公署事宜投訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
298	The Hon	Tsang Yok Sing Jasper	曾鈺成	Disaster Relief Fund Advisory Committee	賑災基金諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
299	Mr	Tsao Wen King Frank	曹文錦	Hong Kong Maritime Industry Council	香港航運發展局	Member	1-Jun-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
300	Mr	Tse Wai Chuen Tony	謝偉銓	Town Planning Board	城市規劃委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
300	Mr	Tse Wai Chuen Tony	謝偉銓	Land and Building Advisory Committee	土地及建設諮詢委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
300	Mr	Tse Wai Chuen Tony	謝偉銓	Surveyors Registration Board	測量師註冊管理局	Chairman	8-Dec-02	7-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
300	Mr	Tse Wai Chuen Tony	謝偉銓	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
300	Mr	Tse Wai Chuen Tony	謝偉銓	Disciplinary Board Panel (Land Survey)	紀律審裁委員團(土地 測量)	Member	27-Jun-01	26-Jun-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
301	Mr	Tso Kai Lok	曹啟樂	Community Investment and Inclusion Fund Committee	社區投資共享基金委 員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
302	Prof	Tso Wung Wai	曹宏威	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團(建築物)	Member	1-Dec-00	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃 地政局副秘 書長(規劃及 地政) 2
302	Prof	Tso Wung Wai	曹宏威	Advisory Committee on the Quality of Water Supplies	水質事務諮詢委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
302	Prof	Tso Wung Wai	曹宏威	Area Committee, Sha Tin West Three	沙田西三分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
302	Prof	Tso Wung Wai	曹宏威	District Fight Crime Committee, Sha Tin	沙田區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
303	Mr	Tsoi Hak Kong Herbert	蔡克剛	Board of Review (Inland Revenue Ordinance)	稅務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jun-94	31-Dec-05	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
303	Mr	Tsoi Hak Kong Herbert	蔡克剛	Council of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University	香港理工大學校董會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
303	Mr	Tsoi Hak Kong Herbert	蔡克剛	Board of Review (Film Censorship)	審核委員會(電影檢 查)	Member	1-Apr-00	9-Nov-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
303	Mr	Tsoi Hak Kong Herbert	蔡克剛	Operations Review Committee of the ICAC	廉政公署審查貪污舉 報諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
303	Mr	Tsoi Hak Kong Herbert	蔡克剛	Standing Committee on Disciplined Services Salaries and Conditions of Service (SCDS)	紀律人員薪俸及服務 條件常務委員會	Member	21-Jun-01	30-Jun-05	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
303	Mr	Tsoi Hak Kong Herbert	蔡克剛	Panel of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Witness Protection Review Board	廉政公署保護證人覆 核委員會小組	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
304	Mr	Tung Chee Chen	董建成	Council of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University	香港理工大學校董會	Member	1-Apr-96	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
304	Mr	Tung Chee Chen	董建成	Hong Kong Logistics Development Council	香港物流發展局	Member	10-Dec-01	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
304	Mr	Tung Chee Chen	董建成	Hong Kong Port Development Council	香港港口發展局	Member	1-Jun-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
305	Mr	Wai Kwok Hung	韋國洪	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
305	Mr	Wai Kwok Hung	韋國洪	Area Committee, Sha Tin West Two	沙田西二分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
306	Mr	Wan Hok Lim	溫學濂	District Fight Crime Committee, Tai Po	大埔區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
307	Mr	Wan Tai Min Tommy	雲大棉	Customs and Excise Service Children's Education Trust Fund Committee	香港海關人員子女教 育信託基金委員會	Member	1-Aug-00	31-Jul-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
308	Mr	Wan Yuet Kau	溫悅球	Area Committee, Sai Kung	西貢分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
309	Mr	Wen Carson	溫嘉旋	Advisory Committee on Corruption of the ICAC	廉政公署貪污問題諮 詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-98	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
309	Mr	Wen Carson	溫嘉旋	Appeal Board Panel (Toys and Children's Products Safety)	上訴委員團(玩具及兒 童產品安全)	Vice Chairman	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
309	Mr	Wen Carson	溫嘉旋	Non-local Higher and Professional Education Appeal Board	非本地高等及專業教 育上訴委員會	Deputy Chairman	8-Dec-97	7-Dec-03	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
309	Mr	Wen Carson	溫嘉旋	Licensing Appeals Board	牌照上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
310	Ir Dr	Wong Chak Yan Greg	黃澤恩	Town Planning Board	城市規劃委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
310	Ir Dr	Wong Chak Yan Greg	黃澤恩	Registration of Persons Tribunal	人事登記審裁處	Adjudicator	1-Jun-99	31-May-05	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
310	Ir Dr	Wong Chak Yan Greg	黃澤恩	Land and Building Advisory Committee	土地及建設諮詢委員會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
310	Ir Dr	Wong Chak Yan Greg	黃澤恩	Engineers Registration Board	工程師註冊管理局	Member	11-Jul-96	20-Sep-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
310	Ir Dr	Wong Chak Yan Greg	黃澤恩	Liquor Licensing Board	酒牌局	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
311	Mrs	Wong Chang Gloria	張閻蘅	Equal Opportunities Commission	平等機會委員會	Member	20-May-03	19-May-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
312	Ms	Wong For Kam	黃火金	Area Committee, Aberdeen, Tin Wan/Shek Pai Wan	香港仔及田石分區委 員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
313	Mr	Wong Kine Yuen	黃建源	District Fight Crime Committee, Eastern	東區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
314	Dr	Wong King Keung Peter	黃景強	Appeals Board (Education)	上訴委員會 (教育事 宜)	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
314	Dr	Wong King Keung Peter	黃景強	Town Planning Board	城市規劃委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
314	Dr	Wong King Keung Peter	黃景強	Noise Control Appeal Board Panel	噪音管制上訴委員會	Member	1-Feb-98	31-Jan-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
314	Dr	Wong King Keung Peter	黃景強	Airport Authority	機場管理局	Member	1-Dec-95	31-May-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
314	Dr	Wong King Keung Peter	黃景強	Hong Kong Arts Development Council	香港藝術發展局	Vice Chairman	1-Jul-02	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
315	Mr	Wong Kwok Hing	王國興	Liquor Licensing Board	酒牌局	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
315	Mr	Wong Kwok Hing	王國興	Area Committee, North Point West	北角西分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
315	Mr	Wong Kwok Hing	王國興	District Fire Safety Committee, Eastern	東區防火委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
316	Mr	Wong Kwok Kin	黃國健	Labour Advisory Board	勞工顧問委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及勞工局局長
317	Dr	Wong Lung Tak Patrick	黃龍德	Appeal Board on Closure Orders (Immediate Health Hazard)	封閉令(對健康的即時危害)上訴委員會	Member	15-Nov-02	14-Nov-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
317	Dr	Wong Lung Tak Patrick	黃龍德	Hong Kong Advisory Council on AIDS	香港愛滋病顧問局	Member	1-Aug-02	31-Jul-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
317	Dr	Wong Lung Tak Patrick	黃龍德	HKSAR Passports Appeal Board	香港特別行政區護照上訴委員會	Member	7-Sep-98	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
317	Dr	Wong Lung Tak Patrick	黃龍德	Appeal Panel on Housing	上訴委員會(房屋)	Member	1-Apr-03	30-Jun-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
317	Dr	Wong Lung Tak Patrick	黃龍德	Area Committee, To Kwa Wan	土瓜灣分區委員會	Chairman	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Elected from amongst members	成員之間互選產生
318	Mr	Wong Man Chiu Ronnie	王敏超	Environmental Campaign Committee	環境保護運動委員會	Chairman	1-Jan-96	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
318	Mr	Wong Man Chiu Ronnie	王敏超	Environment and Conservation Fund Committee	環境及自然保育基金委員會	Member	1-Aug-96	31-Jul-04	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
318	Mr	Wong Man Chiu Ronnie	王敏超	Hong Kong Sports Development Board	香港康體發展局	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
318	Mr	Wong Man Chiu Ronnie	王敏超	Area Committee, Kwai Chung West	葵涌(西)分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
318	Mr	Wong Man Chiu Ronnie	王敏超	Area Committee, Ap Lei Chau	鴨脷洲分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
319	Ms	Wong Mo Tai	黃戊娣	Social Security Appeal Board	社會保障上訴委員會	Member	6-May-98	4-May-04	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
319	Ms	Wong Mo Tai	黃戊娣	Area Committee, Sha Tin East One	沙田東一分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
320	Mr	Wong San Samson	黃山	Antiquities Advisory Board	古物諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
320	Mr	Wong San Samson	黃山	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團（建築物）	Member	1-Dec-03	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃地政局副秘書長（規劃及地政）2
320	Mr	Wong San Samson	黃山	Drainage Appeal Board Panel	排水事務上訴委員備選小組	Member	1-Jun-01	31-May-04	Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands	房屋及規劃地政局局長
321	Mr	Wong Sau Ching	黃守正	Council of the Open University of Hong Kong	香港公開大學校董會	Member	15-Aug-01	19-Jun-06	Chief Executive	行政長官
322	Mr	Wong Shou Yeh David	王守業	Banking Advisory Committee	銀行業務諮詢委員會	Member	7-Apr-98	30-Nov-05	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
322	Mr	Wong Shou Yeh David	王守業	Board of Trustees of the Lord Wilson Heritage Trust	衛奕信勳爵文物信託受託人委員會	Member	1-Oct-95	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
322	Mr	Wong Shou Yeh David	王守業	Hong Kong Port Development Council	香港港口發展局	Member	1-Jun-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
323	Mr	Wong Siu Yee	王紹爾	Community Investment and Inclusion Fund Committee	社區投資共享基金委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
323	Mr	Wong Siu Yee	王紹爾	Area Committee, Ho Man Tin	何文田分區委員會	Member	1-Nov-94	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
323	Mr	Wong Siu Yee	王紹爾	District Fire Safety Committee, Kowloon City	九龍城區防火委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長
324	Miss	Wong Sui Ling Shirley	黃瑞玲	Nursing Council of Hong Kong	香港護士管理局	Member	1-Jan-96	31-Dec-04	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
325	Mr	Wong Tit Shing	黃鐵城	Appeal Board Panel (Toys and Children's Products Safety)	上訴委員團（玩具及兒童產品安全）	Member	1-Jan-98	31-Dec-03	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及勞工局局長
326	Mr	Wong Tsan Hung	黃燦鴻	Registration of Persons Tribunal	人事登記審裁處	Adjudicator	1-Nov-01	31-Oct-05	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
326	Mr	Wong Tsan Hung	黃燦鴻	District Fight Crime Committee, North	北區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-03	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
327	The Hon	Wong Wang Fat Andrew	黃宏發	Council of the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts	香港演藝學院校董會	Member	1-Jan-99	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
328	Mr	Wong Yan Lung	黃仁龍	Criminal and Law Enforcement Injuries Compensation Boards	暴力及執法傷亡賠償委員會	Member	19-Jun-03	18-Jun-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
328	Mr	Wong Yan Lung	黃仁龍	Appeal Tribunal Panel (Buildings)	上訴審裁團（建築物）	Chairman	1-Dec-00	30-Nov-06	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 2	房屋及規劃地政局副秘書長（規劃及地政）2
329	Mr	Wong Ying Ho Kennedy	黃英豪	Antiquities Advisory Board	古物諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-99	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
329	Mr	Wong Ying Ho Kennedy	黃英豪	Council of the Hong Kong Baptist University	香港浸會大學校董會	Member	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
329	Mr	Wong Ying Ho Kennedy	黃英豪	Citizens Advisory Committee on Community Relations of the ICAC	廉政公署社區關係市民諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
329	Mr	Wong Ying Ho Kennedy	黃英豪	Commission on Youth	青年事務委員會	Member	1-Apr-98	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局局長
329	Mr	Wong Ying Ho Kennedy	黃英豪	Appeal Panel (Estate Agents Ordinance)	上訴委員會（地產代理條例）	Member	1-Jan-99	31-Dec-04	Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands	房屋及規劃地政局局長
330	Mr	Wong Ying Wai Wilfred	王英偉	Public Service Commission	公務員敘用委員會	Member	1-Feb-02	31-Jan-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
330	Mr	Wong Ying Wai Wilfred	王英偉	Council of the Hong Kong Baptist University	香港浸會大學校董會	Deputy Chairman	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
330	Mr	Wong Ying Wai Wilfred	王英偉	Council of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	香港科技大學校董會	Member	1-Aug-96	31-Jul-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
330	Mr	Wong Ying Wai Wilfred	王英偉	Social Welfare Advisory Committee	社會福利諮詢委員會	Chairman	1-Dec-02	30-Nov-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
331	Prof	Wong Yuk Shan	黃玉山	Advisory Council on the Environment	環境諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
331	Prof	Wong Yuk Shan	黃玉山	Hong Kong Council for Academic Accreditation	香港學術評審局	Member	1-Oct-03	30-Sep-04	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局局長
331	Prof	Wong Yuk Shan	黃玉山	Curriculum Development Council	課程發展議會	Chairman	1-Sep-01	31-Aug-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局局長
332	The Hon	Wong Yung Kan	黃容根	Fish Marketing Advisory Board	魚類統營顧問委員會	Member	1-Jan-87	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
332	The Hon	Wong Yung Kan	黃容根	Marine Fish Scholarship Fund Advisory Committee	海魚獎學基金顧問委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
332	The Hon	Wong Yung Kan	黃容根	Fisheries Development Loan Fund Advisory Committee	漁業發展貸款基金顧問委員會	Member	1-Oct-98	31-Dec-03	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
332	The Hon	Wong Yung Kan	黃容根	Advisory Committee on Agriculture and Fisheries	漁農業諮詢委員會	Member	20-May-92	19-May-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及食物局局長
333	Mr	Woo Bun Roderick	吳斌	Board of Review (Inland Revenue Ordinance)	稅務上訴委員會	Member	1-Mar-96	31-Dec-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
333	Mr	Woo Bun Roderick	吳斌	Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Appeal Board	強制性公積金計劃上訴委員會	Member	25-Oct-99	24-Oct-05	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
334	The Hon	Wu King Cheong Henry	胡經昌	Council of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University	香港理工大學校董會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
334	The Hon	Wu King Cheong Henry	胡經昌	Ocean Park Corporation Board	海洋公園公司董事局	Member	1-Jul-99	30-Jun-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
334	The Hon	Wu King Cheong Henry	胡經昌	Environmental Campaign Committee	環境保護運動委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
334	The Hon	Wu King Cheong Henry	胡經昌	Action Committee Against Narcotics	禁毒常務委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
334	The Hon	Wu King Cheong Henry	胡經昌	Statistics Advisory Board	統計諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jun-00	31-May-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
334	The Hon	Wu King Cheong Henry	胡經昌	Board of Trustees of the Lord Wilson Heritage Trust	衛奕信勳爵文物信託受託人委員會	Member	1-Apr-97	31-Mar-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
334	The Hon	Wu King Cheong Henry	胡經昌	District Fight Crime Committee, Eastern	東區撲滅罪行委員會	Chairman	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總署署長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
334	The Hon	Wu King Cheong Henry	胡經昌	Area Committee, Hong Shing	康城分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
335	Mr	Wu Kwok Cheung	胡國祥	Municipal Services Appeals Board	市政服務上訴委員會	Member	1-Jan-00	31-Dec-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
335	Mr	Wu Kwok Cheung	胡國祥	Area Committee, Kwun Tong Town & Industrial Area	觀塘市中心及工業分 區委員會	Member	1-Jul-97	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
336	Miss	Wu Suk Ching Annie	伍淑清	Vocational Training Council	職業訓練局	Member	1-Jul-00	30-Jun-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
336	Miss	Wu Suk Ching Annie	伍淑清	Committee on the Promotion of Civic Education	公民教育委員會	Member	1-Apr-96	31-Mar-04	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長
336	Miss	Wu Suk Ching Annie	伍淑清	Hong Kong Committee for Pacific Economic Cooperation	太平洋經濟合作香港 委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
336	Miss	Wu Suk Ching Annie	伍淑清	Trade and Industry Advisory Board	工業貿易諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jul-00	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技 局局長
336	Miss	Wu Suk Ching Annie	伍淑清	Women's Commission	婦女事務委員會	Member	15-Jan-01	14-Jan-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
337	Dr	Wu Wai Yung Raymond	鄺維庸	Rehabilitation Advisory Committee	康復諮詢委員會	Chairman	1-Jan-92	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
337	Dr	Wu Wai Yung Raymond	鄺維庸	Hospital Authority	醫院管理局	Member	1-Apr-97	31-Mar-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
337	Dr	Wu Wai Yung Raymond	鄺維庸	Honours Committee	授勳評審委員會	Member	1-Mar-98	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
337	Dr	Wu Wai Yung Raymond	鄺維庸	Equal Opportunities Commission	平等機會委員會	Member	20-May-96	19-May-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
337	Dr	Wu Wai Yung Raymond	鄺維庸	Community Investment and Inclusion Fund Committee	社區投資共享基金委 員會	Chairman	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
337	Dr	Wu Wai Yung Raymond	鄺維庸	Elderly Commission	安老事務委員會	Member	30-Jul-97	29-Jul-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
338	Dr Sir	Wu Ying Sheung Gordon	胡應湘	Council of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University	香港理工大學校董會	Chairman	1-Apr-97	31-Mar-06	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
338	Dr Sir	Wu Ying Sheung Gordon	胡應湘	Hong Kong Logistics Development Council	香港物流發展局	Member	10-Dec-01	31-Dec-03	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
339	Mr	Yam Chi Ming Stephen	任枝明	Board of Review (Inland Revenue Ordinance)	稅務上訴委員會	Member	1-Nov-98	30-Jun-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
340	Mr	Yap Alfred Donald	葉天養	Dumping at Sea Appeal Board Panel	海上傾倒物料上訴委 員會	Member	1-Apr-89	31-Jan-04	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works	環境運輸及 工務局局長
340	Mr	Yap Alfred Donald	葉天養	Environmental Impact Assessment Appeal Board Panel	環境影響評估上訴委 員會	Member	1-Apr-01	31-Mar-04	Chief Secretary for Administration	政務司司長
341	Mr	Yau How Boa Stephen	邱浩波	Social Welfare Advisory Committee	社會福利諮詢委員會	Member	1-Dec-96	30-Nov-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
341	Mr	Yau How Boa Stephen	邱浩波	Advisory Committee on Social Work Training and Manpower Planning	社會工作訓練及人力 策劃諮詢委員會	Member	1-Nov-01	31-Oct-04	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
341	Mr	Yau How Boa Stephen	邱浩波	Legal Aid Services Council	法律援助服務局	Member	1-Sep-00	31-Aug-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
341	Mr	Yau How Boa Stephen	邱浩波	Post-Release Supervision Board	監管釋囚委員會	Member	30-Nov-02	29-Nov-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
341	Mr	Yau How Boa Stephen	邱浩波	Council on Human Reproductive Technology	人類生殖科技管理局	Member	11-Apr-01	10-Apr-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
342	Ms	Yeung Kam Chun	楊錦珍	District Fire Safety Committee, Kwun Tong	觀塘區防火委員會	Member	18-Dec-98	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
343	Mr	Yeung Kwok Keung	楊國強	Vocational Training Council	職業訓練局	Member	1-Jan-96	30-Jun-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
344	Mr	Yeung Kwok Ki Anthony	楊國琦	Labour Advisory Board	勞工顧問委員會	Member	12-Nov-99	31-Dec-04	Secretary for Economic Development and Labour	經濟發展及 勞工局局長
344	Mr	Yeung Kwok Ki Anthony	楊國琦	Equal Opportunities Commission	平等機會委員會	Member	20-May-03	19-May-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
344	Mr	Yeung Kwok Ki Anthony	楊國琦	Small and Medium Enterprises Committee	中小型企業委員會	Member	15-Dec-00	14-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
344	Mr	Yeung Kwok Ki Anthony	楊國琦	Vetting Committee of the Professional Services Development Assistance Scheme	專業服務業發展資助 計劃評審委員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
345	Mr	Yeung Wai Sing	楊位醒	District Fight Crime Committee, Eastern	東區撲滅罪行委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
345	Mr	Yeung Wai Sing	楊位醒	Area Committee, North Point East	北角東分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
346	Mr	Yeung Wai Tim Patrick	楊偉添	Hong Kong Tourism Board	香港旅遊發展局	Member	1-Jan-99	31-Dec-05	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
347	The Hon	Yeung Yiu Chung	楊耀忠	Education Commission	教育統籌委員會	Member	1-Jan-97	30-Jun-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
347	The Hon	Yeung Yiu Chung	楊耀忠	Independent Police Complaints Council	投訴警方獨立監察委 員會	Vice Chairman	1-Jan-01	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
347	The Hon	Yeung Yiu Chung	楊耀忠	District Fire Safety Committee, Sham Shui Po	深水埗區防火委員會	Member	1-May-98	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
348	The Hon	Young Howard	楊孝華	Vocational Training Council	職業訓練局	Member	1-Jul-03	30-Jun-05	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長
348	The Hon	Young Howard	楊孝華	Advisory Committee on Travel Agents	旅行代理商諮詢委員 會	Member	22-Sep-89	31-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
348	The Hon	Young Howard	楊孝華	Rehabilitation Advisory Committee	康復諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-98	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
348	The Hon	Young Howard	楊孝華	Standing Commission on Civil Service Salaries and Conditions of Service	公務員薪俸及服務條 件常務委員會	Member	1-Jan-02	31-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
348	The Hon	Young Howard	楊孝華	Tourism Strategy Group	旅遊業策略小組	Member	1-Sep-99	31-Aug-04	Commissioner for Tourism	旅遊事務專 員
348	The Hon	Young Howard	楊孝華	Area Committee, Wong Chuk Hang & Stanley	黃竹坑及赤柱分區委 員會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
349	Mr	Yu Kwok Chun	余國春	Council of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University	香港理工大學校董會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-06	Chief Executive	行政長官

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
349	Mr	Yu Kwok Chun	余國春	Operations Review Committee of the ICAC	廉政公署審查貪污舉 報諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
349	Mr	Yu Kwok Chun	余國春	Panel of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Witness Protection Review Board	廉政公署保護證人覆 核委員會小組	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
349	Mr	Yu Kwok Chun	余國春	Trade and Industry Advisory Board	工業貿易諮詢委員會	Member	1-Jul-00	30-Jun-04	Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology	工商及科技 局局長
350	Mr	Yu Pang Chun	余鵬春	Hong Kong Tourism Board	香港旅遊發展局	Member	1-Nov-01	31-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
350	Mr	Yu Pang Chun	余鵬春	Small and Medium Enterprises Committee	中小型企業委員會	Member	15-Dec-00	14-Dec-04	Chief Executive	行政長官
350	Mr	Yu Pang Chun	余鵬春	Tourism Strategy Group	旅遊業策略小組	Member	1-Sep-02	31-Aug-04	Commissioner for Tourism	旅遊事務專 員
350	Mr	Yu Pang Chun	余鵬春	Copyright Tribunal	版權審裁處	Member	1-Dec-03	30-Nov-05	Chief Executive	行政長官
351	Mr	Yu Sau Ning Homer	余壽寧	Consumer Council	消費者委員會	Member	1-Jan-03	31-Dec-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
352	Dr	Yuen Chung Lau Natalis	阮中鑾	Appeal Board on Public Meetings and Processions	公眾聚會與遊行上訴 委員會	Member	22-Dec-95	21-Dec-03	Chief Executive	行政長官
353	Mr	Yuen Ka Chai Ronnie	袁家齊	Advisory Committee on Travel Agents	旅行代理商諮詢委員 會	Member	8-Jan-01	31-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
353	Mr	Yuen Ka Chai Ronnie	袁家齊	Travel Industry Compensation Fund Management Board	旅遊業賠償基金管理 委員會	Member	8-Jan-01	14-Oct-04	Financial Secretary	財政司司長
353	Mr	Yuen Ka Chai Ronnie	袁家齊	Tourism Strategy Group	旅遊業策略小組	Member	1-Sep-01	31-Aug-04	Commissioner for Tourism	旅遊事務專 員
354	Mr	Yuen Kee Tong Norman	阮紀堂	Registration of Persons Tribunal	人事登記審裁處	Adjudicator	1-Jun-99	31-May-05	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
355	Dr	Yuen Tsang Woon Ki Angelina	阮曾媛琪	Brewin Trust Fund Committee	蒲魯賢慈善信託基金 委員會	Member	16-Aug-03	15-Aug-06	Secretary for Education and Manpower	教育統籌局 局長

編號 No.	稱號 Title	英文姓名 Name in English	中文 姓名 Name in Chinese	諮詢或法定組織的 英文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in English	諮詢或法定組織的 中文名稱 Name of Advisory or Statutory Body in Chinese	職位 Office	首次獲委 任日期 First Appointment Date	任滿日期 Expiry Date	Appointed by	由誰委任
355	Dr	Yuen Tsang Woon Ki Angelina	阮曾媛琪	Ping Wo Fund Advisory Committee	平和基金諮詢委員會	Member	8-Sep-03	7-Sep-05	Secretary for Home Affairs	民政事務局 局長
355	Dr	Yuen Tsang Woon Ki Angelina	阮曾媛琪	Community Investment and Inclusion Fund Committee	社區投資共享基金委 員會	Member	1-Apr-02	31-Mar-05	Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food	衛生福利及 食物局局長
356	Mr	Yuen Yiu Chuen Andrew	袁耀全	Registration of Persons Tribunal	人事登記審裁處	Adjudicator	1-Jun-99	31-May-05	Secretary for Security	保安局局長
357	Mr	Yung Chi Ming	翁志明	District Fight Crime Committee, Islands	離島區撲滅罪行委員 會	Member	1-Apr-00	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長
357	Mr	Yung Chi Ming	翁志明	Area Committee, Cheung Chau	長洲分區委員會	Member	1-Apr-99	31-Mar-04	Director of Home Affairs	民政事務總 署署長

Appendix II**WRITTEN ANSWER****Written answer by the Secretary for Home Affairs to Dr YEUNG Sum's supplementary question to Question 1**

As regards the number of seats held by these Election Committee members and the number of Election Committee members receiving more than one appointment, the answers are set out as follows:

- (a) as at 3 December 2003, the 357 Election Committee members were holding 911 (out of about 8 000 seats) in advisory and statutory bodies, that is, about 11.4%^{Note}; and
- (b) as at 3 December 2003, 223 (out of 357) Election Committee members were appointed to more than one advisory and statutory body.

^{Note}

Upon detailed verification, the number of Election Committee members appointed to advisory and statutory bodies as at 3 December 2003 was 357 (instead of 390 as mentioned in the original reply).

Appendix III**WRITTEN ANSWER****Written answer by the Secretary for Home Affairs to Mr James TO's supplementary question to Question 1**

As regards whether at present there are any advisory and statutory bodies for which membership list is not to be disclosed, I now clarify as follows:

- (a) All membership lists of advisory and statutory bodies are open information. Members of the public could obtain such information through different channels. For example, through the website of different committees, bureaux or departments' websites, Gazette, Government press release, and the Civil and Miscellaneous List published by the Administration Wing, and so on.
- (b) Persons who submit their personal data to the "Central Personality Index" of Home Affairs Bureau are protected by the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance. However, their occupations/professions declared and service record in government committees may be disclosed for public information.
- (c) The Government's internal guidelines specifies that departments should notify individual persons concerned prior to disclosing information relating to their public service. This is to avoid the persons concerned being approached by the media without preparation thereby causing inconvenience. This procedure is not a statutory requirement. However, in considering that the information disclosure may cause inconvenience to the persons concerned, and in view of the courtesy required, we deem it appropriate to give a prior notice before disclosure.

Appendix IV**WRITTEN ANSWER****Written answer by the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands to Mr WONG Sing-chi's supplementary question to Question 3**

As regards the number of land resumption cases which involved violent confrontation, and measures to prevent such incidents, in the past five years, most clearances were conducted smoothly. There were three cases requiring the police to deal with incidents which involved some affected persons attempting to harm themselves or others.

In every clearance exercise, the Lands Department holds regular co-ordinating meetings, well before the clearance, with relevant departments such as the police, Housing Department and District Offices. This is to ensure that the clearance operation will be conducted in a smooth manner. Problematic cases will also be discussed at these meetings with a view to mapping out appropriate measures to handle them early.

Relevant departments also hold meetings with the clearerees to explain to them the clearance process, the compensation and rehousing arrangements as appropriate, and to listen to their needs. Other than the statutory compensation, the Government also provides various types of *ex gratia* allowances (EGAs) to eligible clearerees. These EGAs are normally paid to the clearerees well before the clearance day.

If the clearerees want to stay in the premises for a short period of time after the clearance date, the departments concerned will grant a grace period where appropriate to cater for the individual circumstances of the clearerees. Only when the clearerees refuse to vacate the site on the clearance day or at the end of the grace period, eviction (with minimum force) will be used as a last resort to evict the clearerees from the premises in a peaceful manner.

The measures outlined above are effective in preventing violent confrontations during clearance exercises.

Appendix V**WRITTEN ANSWER****Written answer by the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands to Mr Andrew WONG's supplementary question to Question 3**

As regards the waiting and hearing time for the cases referred to the Lands Tribunal and higher courts on appeal, in the past five years, the average waiting time of the 38 cases heard by the Lands Tribunal was some nine months. Their average hearing time at the Lands Tribunal was 6.5 days.

As regards the nine appeal cases, the average waiting time was some 13 months and their average hearing time was 1.6 days.

For the two cases heard by the Court of Final Appeal, the average waiting time was some nine months and the average hearing time was four days.

Appendix VI**WRITTEN ANSWER****Written answer by the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands to Mr IP Kwok-him's supplementary question to Question 3**

As regards the costs incurred by other departments which assist the Lands Department (LD) in land resumption, the departments which assist, where necessary, the LD in land resumption exercises and their respective roles are as follows:

- (a) Housing Department: it is responsible for the clearance of the sites, rehousing for eligible clearerees and granting of certain *ex gratia* allowances (EGAs) to eligible claimants;
- (b) Hong Kong Police Force: to maintain, where necessary, law and order in the resumption process;
- (c) Social Welfare Department: to provide assistance to affected persons requiring compassionate rehousing or other welfare assistance;
- (d) Home Affairs Department: to mediate, where necessary, when there are disputes between the Government and the affected land owners over resumption; and
- (e) Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department: to assist the processing of certain EGAs to eligible claimants.

The above work has been undertaken by the concerned departments as part of their normal scope of duties which mainly involve staff costs. There is no breakdown on the relevant staff costs of these departments. This is because such costs would be affected by factors such as whether the departments concerned are required to participate in the clearance exercises, and the number and complexity of the clearances.

Appendix VII**WRITTEN ANSWER****Written answer by the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands to Mr James TIEN's supplementary question to Question 3**

As regards the average waiting time of the 100 cases awaiting the Lands Tribunal's hearing, hearing dates for nine of them have been fixed. The average waiting time of these nine cases is some 14 months. As at 15 December 2003, the average waiting time of the remaining 91 cases is some 13 months.