

OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Thursday, 3 May 2007

The Council met at Three o'clock

MEMBERS PRESENT:

THE PRESIDENT

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

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

THE HONOURABLE ALBERT HO CHUN-YAN

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

THE HONOURABLE LEE CHEUK-YAN

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

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

DR THE HONOURABLE LUI MING-WAH, S.B.S., 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 CHAN YUEN-HAN, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE BERNARD CHAN, G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHAN KAM-LAM, S.B.S., 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, J.P.

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

THE HONOURABLE WONG YUNG-KAN, J.P.

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

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

THE HONOURABLE LAU CHIN-SHEK, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LAU KONG-WAH, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MIRIAM LAU KIN-YEE, G.B.S., J.P.

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

THE HONOURABLE CHOY SO-YUK, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE ANDREW CHENG KAR-FOO

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE LI FUNG-YING, B.B.S., J.P.

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

THE HONOURABLE ALBERT CHAN WAI-YIP

THE HONOURABLE FREDERICK FUNG KIN-KEE, S.B.S., J.P.

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

THE HONOURABLE VINCENT FANG KANG, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE WONG KWOK-HING, M.H.

THE HONOURABLE LEE WING-TAT

THE HONOURABLE LI KWOK-YING, M.H., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE JOSEPH LEE KOK-LONG, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE DANIEL LAM WAI-KEUNG, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE JEFFREY LAM KIN-FUNG, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE ANDREW LEUNG KWAN-YUEN, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE ALAN LEONG KAH-KIT, S.C.

THE HONOURABLE LEUNG KWOK-HUNG

DR THE HONOURABLE KWOK KA-KI

DR THE HONOURABLE FERNANDO CHEUNG CHIU-HUNG

THE HONOURABLE CHEUNG HOK-MING, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE WONG TING-KWONG, B.B.S.

THE HONOURABLE RONNY TONG KA-WAH, S.C.

THE HONOURABLE CHIM PUI-CHUNG

PROF THE HONOURABLE PATRICK LAU SAU-SHING, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE ALBERT JINGHAN CHENG

THE HONOURABLE KWONG CHI-KIN

THE HONOURABLE TAM HEUNG-MAN

MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

DR THE HONOURABLE YEUNG SUM

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

THE HONOURABLE MA LIK, G.B.S., J.P.

PUBLIC OFFICERS ATTENDING:

THE HONOURABLE RAFAEL HUI SI-YAN, G.B.S., J.P.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

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

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY

THE HONOURABLE WONG YAN-LUNG, S.C., J.P.

THE SECRETARY FOR JUSTICE

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

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

DR THE HONOURABLE SARAH LIAO SAU-TUNG, J.P.
SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND WORKS

THE HONOURABLE FREDERICK MA SI-HANG, J.P.
SECRETARY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND THE TREASURY

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

THE HONOURABLE AMBROSE LEE SIU-KWONG, I.D.S.M., J.P.
SECRETARY FOR SECURITY

DR THE HONOURABLE YORK CHOW YAT-NGOK, S.B.S., J.P.
SECRETARY FOR HEALTH, WELFARE AND FOOD

THE HONOURABLE DENISE YUE CHUNG-YEE, G.B.S., J.P.
SECRETARY FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE

PROF LAU SIU-KAI, J.P.
HEAD, CENTRAL POLICY UNIT

CLERK IN ATTENDANCE:

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

PURSUANT TO RULE 8 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE, THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE, THE HONOURABLE DONALD TSANG YAM-KUEN, ATTENDED TO ADDRESS THE COUNCIL AND TO RECEIVE QUESTIONS.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Members will please remain standing while the Chief Executive enters the Chamber.

(After the Chief Executive had entered the Chamber and all Members had taken their seats, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung remained standing, holding a placard)

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): President, I

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, why do you have to behave like this every time?

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Mr TSANG, I gave him a letter when he went to the church, but he did not reply

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, this is the Chief Executive's Question and Answer Session, please sit down.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): The priest said he would reply but three weeks have passed and he has not done so. The letter is about Hau Tak Shopping Centre, The Link REIT incident

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, please sit down.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Second, it is about minimum wage and maximum working hours, he also did not reply

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, if you do not sit down, I would have to say that you are contravening the Rules of Procedure. You had better sit down.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): I now have to contravene the Rules of Procedure. I wish, I wish, I wish Secretary Rafael HUI would not say that I am "making girl friends". It should be the Chief Secretary

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): You are deliberate. This is not right, do you know?

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): I just want the wage earners of Hong Kong to see that this can be easily broken this is the rice bowl of Hong Kong people

(Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung broke some rice bowls and plates)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Right, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, I am warning you.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): the rice bowls you mentioned they can all be broken

(Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung continued to break some rice bowls and plates)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, I have to ask you to leave the Chamber.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): President, I will now leave the Chamber because this is a solemn protest. I believe everybody will think that this is funny

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Even if you want to protest, you should do so in a protest setting. You are now contravening the Rules of Procedure. Clerk, please help Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung leave.

(The Clerk walked to Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung)

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Mr TSANG, I congratulate you, you may be better than Mr HO You do not have to ask me, I will leave. This is a formal protest, you do not have to ask me to leave because I think I have the responsibility to protest

(Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung picked up the broken rice bowls and plates)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): This is a formal meeting of the Legislative Council, everybody must observe the Rules of Procedure, otherwise, you will have to leave.

(Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung disregarded the President's advice and continued to shout aloud)

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): you are better than Mr HO, you are lucky, but if you still do not set a minimum wage and a maximum number of working hours, you will not be that lucky on 1 May next year. I will approach Mr HO tomorrow. Today, I approach you. (*Laughter*) I hope that you will watch out

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, do not speak that much, leave the Chamber.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): particularly about the Hau Tak Shopping Centre incident

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, please leave.

(MR LEUNG Kwok-hung turned to leave the Chamber but he continued to shout aloud)

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): you are a Catholic, the priest gave you the letter but you refused to take it (*Laughter*)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Sorry about that, Chief Executive.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): The Chief Executive will now address the Council.

CHIEF EXECUTVE (in Cantonese): Madam President, this is my first meeting with Members in the Legislative Council since my election as the Chief Executive of the third term. I sincerely wish that in the days to come, our work will have the support of you all, and we will make concerted efforts for the well-being of the people.

Today, I would like to outline to Members the reshuffle of the portfolios of Policy Bureaux and the work to be launched by us in the next two months.

Since its inception on 1 July 2002, the Accountability System of Principal Officials has been generally accepted by the public. However, to bring out the best of the system, it has to be put into practice and be subject to review.

Sometime ago, I asked the head of the Central Policy Unit, Prof LAU Siu-kai, together with Secretary Michael SUEN and Secretary Denise YUE, to conduct an in-depth study on a reshuffle of the portfolios of the Policy Bureaux and make recommendations. The purpose of this exercise is twofold. First, to rationalize the distribution of responsibilities between Policy Bureaux, in particular, to put related responsibilities under one single bureau to help optimize the synergy. This will also help the Government to sharpen its focus on important and complex issues. Second, this will better facilitate the Chief Executive in implementing the priority policy initiatives pledged during the Chief Executive Election to meet the opportunities and challenges of Hong Kong ahead.

After deliberations and discussions with colleagues, and subject to the principle of minimal change, I intend to expand the present 11 Policy Bureaux into 12 and redistribute the responsibilities of various Policy Bureaux within a certain limit. I emphasize here that the reshuffle will have no effect on the structure and responsibilities of each of the existing departments. In other words, the impact of this reshuffle will only be limited to the officials in the bureaux.

Upon reorganization, the 12 Policy Bureaux will be as follows:

- (1) Civil Service Bureau
- (2) Commerce and Economic Development Bureau
- (3) Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau
- (4) Development Bureau
- (5) Education Bureau
- (6) Environment Bureau
- (7) Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau
- (8) Food and Health Bureau
- (9) Home Affairs Bureau
- (10) Labour and Welfare Bureau
- (11) Security Bureau
- (12) Transport and Housing Bureau

Let me briefly outline the idea behind the reorganization of the Policy Bureaux. The responsibilities of three Policy Bureaux will remain unchanged, and they are the Civil Service Bureau, the Security Bureau and the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau.

Moreover, the responsibilities of two Policy Bureaux will see some slight adjustments. The Education and Manpower Bureau will be relieved of the "manpower" portfolio and will focus more on education policy. The Constitutional Affairs Bureau will, in addition to its existing portfolio, take over "human rights" from the Home Affairs Bureau and will be renamed the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau.

Regarding the current portfolios of the Environment, Transport and Works Bureau and the Health, Welfare and Food Bureau, our past experience tells us that they are indeed overwhelming. Therefore, I will let the reorganized Environment Bureau focus on environmental protection and energy policy, and sustainable development will also be incorporated into it. As for the Food and Health Bureau, it will focus on the three key portfolios of food safety, health and environmental hygiene. "Welfare" policy will be merged with "labour" and "manpower" to form a new Labour and Welfare Bureau to better co-ordinate the related policies.

Also, there is the Development Bureau which I have mentioned in public. It stems from the existing Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau upon reorganization. The Development Bureau will be tasked with spearheading infrastructure development while looking after the heritage conservation in connection with development to ensure close co-ordination between the two.

The Development Bureau will also be responsible for all matters relating to planning, land, housing and urban redevelopment and renewal policies.

As for the last three Policy Bureaux, the first is the Transport and Housing Bureau which is responsible for sea, land and air transport and logistics and housing policies. The Commerce and Economic Development Bureau is responsible for commerce and industry, technology, tourism, creative industries, consumer protection and competition policy. Apart from the present district administration and cultural and recreational matters, the Home Affairs Bureau will also take on two policy areas of "social enterprise" and "legal aid".

Regarding the specific ideas and details of the reorganization, my colleagues will explain fully to the Constitutional Affairs Panel as soon as possible.

Madam President, I very much hope that Members will understand that I can only put forward proposals on the reorganization of the Policy Bureaux to the Legislative Council in accordance with my platform proposed during the election after I have been appointed the third-term Chief Executive. I cannot do that earlier. I have tried my best to do it quick. Documents on the reorganization arrangement will be distributed to Members after the Question and Answer Session, and the related consequential technical legislative amendments and amendments to the affected subsidiary legislation resulting from this reorganization will also be tabled to the Legislative Council later. I wish Members will support my proposals, so that I can honour my pledges to the people.

My proposals do not involve changing the accountability policy which has served us well. Rather, they are limited adjustments to the establishment, in line with the progress of public aspirations and for effective implementation of the administration agenda of the third-term SAR Government. We plan to have the new governing team sworn in in accordance with the reorganization arrangement on the eve of the start of the third-term government, that is, 1 July 2007, for the implementation of the new governing structure.

In the coming two months, the Government will launch new initiatives. First is follow-up work for the Action Agenda for China's 11th Five-Year Plan (FYP). Since the announcement of the Action Agenda of the Economic Summit on China's 11th Five-Year Plan early this year, the Financial Secretary has started planning the related work and progress. In the next two months, the

Financial Secretary will focus on introducing and launching practicable actions in relation to finance, logistics, trade and professional services. If discussions with the sectors are necessary, we will follow up, and if studies with the Mainland are necessary, we will arrange for discussions.

The second task to be taken forward is social enterprises. Social enterprises are one of my key pledges to improve the people's livelihood. I will initiate related work as soon as possible, and will ask the Home Affairs Bureau to organize a summit on social enterprises to be presided over by myself.

Madam President, this year marks the 10th anniversary of Hong Kong's reunification. In the past decade, Hong Kong people have experienced ups and downs, with moments of joy and agony. It is only with the past in mind that we can move forward. Therefore, I had reflected on the lessons drawn from the past decade and put forth my election platform, using "I'll get the job done" as my pledge to show that I will face the challenges in the next five years courageously. Nonetheless, for me to really "get the job done", apart from my own efforts, I need the support and co-operation of all Members here. It will not work without either party. From the bottom of my heart, I wish we can work together for a brighter decade to come.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): The Chief Executive will now answer questions raised by Members. A Member whose question has been answered may, if necessary and for the purpose of elucidation only, ask a short follow-up question.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): *President, Chief Executive, be it three Secretaries of Departments or a score of bureaux, the core of the accountability system should be democratic universal suffrage. Just now, the slogan chanted by the people outside is: "Dual elections by universal suffrage in 2012. We do not want a tour in the garden by the Chief Executive". May I ask the Chief Executive, since the people firmly ask for a democratic political system and dual elections by universal suffrage, and you said during the election that you would "play a big game", how are you going to do that? You earlier said "concerted efforts", I really hope to make concerted efforts with you, Chief Executive, join hands to move forward and push for dual elections by universal suffrage in 2012. However, are you really going to do that, or just as the people said, you are only leading us on a tour in the garden?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): Mr TO, I pledged during the election that I would fully address the problem of dual elections by universal suffrage during my term, and this pledge has the people's endorsement. I truly feel that people now have high hopes for this pledge of mine. They hope that the Government and the Legislative Council can display sincerity and the greatest tolerance, so as to come to a consensus with the people to identify the real option for dual elections by universal suffrage. I think this is the responsibility history has given to me as the Chief Executive, and also the responsibility given to all Members.

The issue of political reform has tortured this community for two decades. I myself deeply believe that a full stop should be put to it. This is my heartfelt wish, and I believe it is also the heartfelt wish of the people — I very much hope that this is the heartfelt wish of every Hong Kong resident and every Member. I sincerely wish that we together can soon come up with a fundamental option for dual elections by universal suffrage. Regarding my plan, I explained that clearly during the election. I wish this summer, as a result of such long discussions, discussions by the Commission on Strategic Development in particular, we can produce several options which at the moment are much discussed in the community and which may lead to universal suffrage for a territory-wide consultation. I hope, by the end of the year, we can come up with a mainstream option for some issues. I think this is the most practical and realistic approach. However, in this process, we need efforts from Members, and there must be tolerance and compromise before results can be achieved.

I think this is the historical responsibility given to me by society. Of course, neither would I relinquish nor procrastinate. I truly wish to resolve this matter soon.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): *President, just now, I paid special attention to the Chief Executive's reply, and he did not mention a year. To fundamentally resolve the problem of dual elections by universal suffrage, does it mean that we have to proceed in a gradual and orderly manner and wait until 2047 before we can have dual elections by universal suffrage, claiming all along that this is still the way to fully resolve the problem of dual elections by universal suffrage? Can the Chief Executive make a pledge to the people that 2012 is the year for us to implement dual elections by universal suffrage with concerted efforts?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): When I said fundamental, that is not simply a slogan, not simply a year, it includes the design for universal suffrage.

For universal suffrage to develop from now to a roadmap leading to the ultimate goal, there needs be a timetable for universal suffrage, including a year. I very much believe that among the options under discussion, some are pointing to 2012 as the destination. Apart from giving a timetable, I wish to tell the people how this goal can be achieved and what the design is.

Mr TO, simply naming a year is outdated; it is not respected by the people. What is most important is that a practical option be presented for implementation. We really have to be sincere and pragmatic. I wish to achieve this goal soon. To achieve dual elections by universal suffrage requires overall arrangement. A thorough arrangement includes the presentation of design, roadmap, timetable and the 2012 timetable which you said earlier.

MR BERNARD CHAN (in Cantonese): *Chief Executive, when you mentioned earlier the new three Secretaries of Departments and 12 Directors of Bureaux, you said welfare policy and labour policy will be amalgamated. At present, among various welfare policies, for example, the services for the elderly and people with disabilities are closely related to health policy, and under the Labour Department and the Social Welfare Department, there are different services for employment and self-reliance. As a result of the reorganization which you mentioned earlier, the relevant work may somehow lack co-ordination. For the other related advisory bodies, such as the Rehabilitation Advisory Committee and the new Family Commission which you once said would be established, which new Policy Bureau will overlook them?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): Regarding family services, they will be handled by the Home Affairs Department. There is one point I would like to explain to Members. Any changes in system, structural changes in particular, cannot be perfect. This is particularly so for if we set up one bureau for each policy area, by my calculation, we need 23 bureaux. For example, tourism requires one bureau, culture requires another, sports requires one. Of course, environmental protection also needs a bureau, so does heritage conservation. If we separate them, over 20 bureaux are required according to my calculation. However, be at ease, our bureaux are not simply modern government structures; they are not just vertical structures, we are in fact adopting a matrix system. In other words, we have our own mechanism, the Government has an internal mechanism. Whenever an incident involving different departments occurs, for example, the important policy area of elderly services, we will not allow oversight or omission in such services because of limitations in our structure.

In the regular meetings and meetings which are held daily or weekly, we will surely identify ways to make such services more complete under these mechanisms.

I hope Members will not worry. We will pay attention. Because our resources are limited, we do not wish to expand the government structure indefinitely. Within limitations, we hope to try our best to deliver all services well and implement them.

MR BERNARD CHAN (in Cantonese): *Chief Executive, you mentioned earlier social enterprises are a key area. Right now, the bulk of social enterprises may have been promoted by NGOs in the community, and seems mainly to be related to the Health, Welfare and Food Bureau. However, the Chief Executive stated earlier that social enterprises will be put under the Home Affairs Bureau. Will there be a co-ordination problem, I wonder?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): Regarding social enterprises which I am now referring to, in the past, they were targeted at some underprivileged groups which might be people with physical or intellectual disabilities. For the social enterprises which we now refer to, the area and concept have been expanded to address some needy unemployed. What is the best way to employ such manpower resources? I think the district-based approach will be better. Of course, the final option will only be arrived at after studies by the summit and deliberations with the people and experts concerned. In particular, we have to consider all this together with the enterprises and NGOs, and also the opinions of local bodies. We will implement only the best option. However, I hope to use the district as the core. Actually, we can now see that the unemployment rates in some districts in Hong Kong are higher than the general unemployment rate, for example, various districts like Yuen Long and North District. This is something we all know. How better can we handle this? If the core of the movement is the Home Affairs Department, with the respective District Officers as persons in charge, I think it will be more appropriate. However, this must be carried out together with the other bureaux and experts, including those who will join the social welfare sector in the future. The Bureau responsible for social welfare will also be involved.

MR LAU CHIN-SHEK (in Cantonese): *Sometime ago, the Secretary of the Commission on Poverty (CoP), Mr Stephen FISHER, stated that he would soon*

table a report on the CoP but the CoP's continued existence or otherwise would be decided by the new-term Government. During the election, the Chief Executive over and again stressed that the wealth gap problem was very serious and had to be tackled seriously. This is also the public's concern. Can the Chief Executive tell us whether the CoP will continue to operate? If so, how will it operate? What concrete measures are there to solve the wealth gap problem? If not, what is the reason?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): First is the wealth gap problem. I think this is an important part of the five key areas for my next-term Government.

How can this problem be tackled? Now, the lead work has commenced. The CoP has done something. It has formulated some plans. The topic of social enterprises which I referred to is also a core subject pulled out of the CoP's recommendations for work.

It is my strong wish that with regard to poverty alleviation, there will be a social policy in the future to sustain work in this area. Moreover, at the district level, we will continue to follow up these initiatives as a matter of policy. Where necessary, we can reorganize the CoP, otherwise, we will formally turn these recommendations of the CoP into policies for implementation, and allocate them to each Bureau.

Our ultimate objective is not to say what will become of the CoP. The most important point is whether or not poverty alleviation can be achieved, especially increasing job opportunities, lowering the unemployment rate and raising the income of the grassroots. I consider this the most important objective of our work.

If there is such a need, I think the CoP can continue to operate. However, at the moment, I very much hope that after receiving the report, it can be turned into various feasible options for onward referral to the Policy Bureaux for serious attention.

Regarding social enterprises which I referred to earlier, I will tackle the issue personally. I wish to start work in this respect before July. I would not say that in future, there is absolutely no need for a tasked commission to be established, but I strongly wish to take this forward with a new mindset, in a practical and pragmatic manner.

MR LAU CHIN-SHEK (in Cantonese): *Is the Chief Executive telling us that the CoP will cease operation in the new-term Government and the Chief Executive himself will take up this task? Can we communicate with you direct on issues in this connection?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): With respect to the report of the CoP, I have to go through it later before deciding how various initiatives can be implemented. Right now, the Financial Secretary is working on it and will pass the "ball" once he completes it. I very much hope that after receiving this "ball", I can consider whether appropriate arrangements can be made for the initiatives. If necessary, particularly if special studies are required, we will conduct follow-up studies. If we have to resort to the setting up of commissions, we will not rule out this possibility. However, I think we have now come to the stage where we have to be pragmatic to implement the initiatives. It is my strong desire that arrangements can be made for all recommendations to be implemented in each and every Bureau. However, we will continue to effect co-ordination. I can tell you I will get myself involved, at least with regard to promoting considerations in relation to social enterprises.

MR DANIEL LAM (in Cantonese): *Chief Executive, the Government has just launched a transport expenses support scheme to subsidize low-income earners of four remote areas in the New Territories. The Heung Yee Kuk considers this a good measure by the Government and would like to express our gratitude. May I ask the Government, since it now has a handsome surplus, if the Chief Executive will extend this support scheme to the 18 districts territory-wide, turning it into a long-term poverty alleviation programme?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): This subsidy scheme has a special purpose, which is to specifically assist residents of areas remote from the urban area to look for jobs, so that while they are job-hunting, they can overcome difficulties in this regard. This is a short-term measure. At this point, we neither intend to turn it into a long-term policy nor extend it territory-wide because it is only applicable to the remote areas.

MR DANIEL LAM (in Cantonese): *May I ask the Chief Executive whether or not casual workers will benefit from this scheme?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): As regards the details, I believe whoever meets the requirements, lives in the remote areas with an income within the limit will surely benefit from the scheme. We will treat permanent workers and casual workers alike.

MR TAM YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): *President, Chief Executive, I would like to ask about some recent incidents concerning The Link REIT. Ever since the acquisition of shopping malls of the Hong Kong Housing Authority by The Link REIT, we discover a feature, that is, the number of bistro cafes and small shops in the shopping malls of public housing estates has declined, while a lot of large-scale, high-end chain stores have been brought in. The owners of the original shops feel that rent has gone up a lot while residents say that dining has become more expensive. There have been many opinions and several high-ranking managers of The Link Management have been replaced. Under such circumstances, some people worry that under the new leadership, profits will again be the prime goal and rents may then escalate, thus prompting more opinions among the people. May I ask Mr TSANG, given the present circumstances, if the Government has summed up experience and considered or taken any measure to appease residents and the general public? Do you regard the present emergence of The Link REIT a success or a failure? What are your views? I would like to know.*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): We must understand that what The Link REIT owns now are commercial operations — management of shops, management of carparks, these are all commercial operations. Actually, we can see that facilities under The Link REIT are still taking care of the needs of estate residents, and since The Link REIT has to make money, it has to provide services in accordance with commercial principle. In other words, its facilities and improvements must meet the needs of local residents. If it goes against residents' needs, it will not be able to do business and make money. We see that findings of the several consumer surveys conducted by The Link Management recently indicate that most respondents are satisfied with the renovated shopping malls and the arrangement of bringing in new commercial tenants. In fact, we are now making use of this opportunity of bringing in The Link REIT to renovate all the facilities so as to better meet and accommodate residents' aspirations. This seems to be the result of our recent survey.

In addition, the current prices of commodities are generally accepted by residents. Of course, individual commercial tenants, for example, some of

those who have been operating old shops, are impacted by market changes. They surely have their own difficulties, and I can understand that. When the Government launches any privatization project in future, it will certainly consider past experience, and we definitely have to seriously study The Link REIT experience. If we are to launch privatization projects again, I will definitely get the stakeholders involved, including the users, the patrons and the affected tenants, in finding out the best and the most balanced option.

MR TAM YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): *I would like to follow up. Of course, regarding the process of privatization in future, there is experience worth summing up by the Government, but talking about this actual situation, although it was said earlier that some people appreciated such reforms, public opinion, residents in the community, and residents around the estate shopping malls actually are not too happy with the present operation. Some people pointed out that to really address the problem of The Link REIT, the only way is for the Government to buy back some shares or "dilute" the ownership mix a bit, diversifying the stakeholders before the present situation can be avoided. Has the Government considered this?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): What we want to do now is to privatize some shopping malls of public housing estates, which is a desirable option. On the one hand, we can help the Hong Kong Housing Authority solve its financial problems, and on the other, the facilities can be renovated and management of these commercial facilities made more flexible. Mr TAM, please remember these are commercial operations, they are commercial facilities, we cannot interfere too much with their operations. Why can the Government buy back facilities in these housing estates under certain circumstances? It is the same case with Pacific Place where the rent has also increased, but are we adopting the same approach?

We must consider these problems. What is involved is not commercial operation on *ex gratia* ground, rather, they are shops opened after commercial bidding. I myself am very careful with any exercise of nationalization. I think these problems can be considered only when very important public interests are involved. Also, what I want is a small government, not a big government. I am aware of the opinions in this respect. Some people consider that this is effective and can prevent existing facilities from being abused. I will carefully consider any opinion but for nationalization procedures, I will be very careful, very prudent. I resist that very much.

MS MIRIAM LAU (in Cantonese): *President, Chief Executive, when you introduced the reorganized three Secretaries of Departments and 11 Directors of Bureaux earlier, you pointed out that one of the objectives was to bring related responsibilities under one single bureau. You set up a new bureau, namely the Transport and Housing Bureau, with the transport portfolio encompassing sea, land and air transport and logistics, then adding housing to it. May I ask the Chief Executive what related responsibilities there are for sea, land and air transport, together with logistics and housing?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): Ms LAU, I pointed out earlier that if all policies have to be rationalized and individual bureaux to be tasked with overseeing duties, we will need more than 20 bureaux. In other words, on the surface, such combinations may not have great connection. I only know that distributing them well is most important, so that each Director of Bureau is given enough work, and the workload among the 12 Bureaux must be even. It was after rationalization and adjustment, in-depth discussion and intense struggle that I finally considered that such an approach would be more appropriate. Members may remember that land transport and population distribution are related, but I do not want to argue — I do not want to argue because under certain circumstances, we have to make such arrangements due to workload consideration.

MS MIRIAM LAU (in Cantonese): *President, I believe the Chief Executive will remember that not long ago, we just had a Transport Bureau responsible for local transport, now, this Bureau is responsible for sea, land and air transport and logistics. I think the Chief Executive also understands that transport very often involves controversial issues, be it from residents or the sector. Moreover, regarding logistics, we are also facing many challenges, and a lot of work has to be done now and in future to strengthen our competitiveness. We not only have to work locally, but also overseas or on the Mainland. Not long ago, housing affairs were handled separately by one bureau, but now, you are putting a lot of portfolios together. I once heard the Chief Executive say that some bureaux used to be overtasked, having to take on a lot of work, but now, are you transforming a bureau which used to bear a lot of responsibilities into another bureau which has lots of work to do?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): Ms LAU, I would appreciate your understanding. I also hope to have more divisions but I think, what we want

now is when the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council gives the green light in future, it is only about the resources for the establishment of one bureau. If I set up more bureaux, I trust the outcome will be better and each and every Director of Bureau will welcome that more. I believe the workload for all Directors of Bureaux will be less, but I think we must strike a balance. Society nowadays is not as simple as it was in the past, so we have to make one bureau responsible for this. We did not have an Education Bureau but now, education has taken up one quarter of our resources. How can we not have one Principal Official to be responsible for this? Moreover, there are other large-scale development projects which have to be combined, and we have to make new arrangements for this. Therefore, we cannot employ a historical perspective to make decisions for the present new arrangements. However, I truly wish that you will accept that it is after thorough consideration that we came up with this arrangement to balance the distribution of workload.

What Ms LAU said is correct. I believe officials of this Transport and Housing Bureau will come to this Chamber of the Legislative Council frequently because the Bureau will be involved in the Question Time every week, with the two portfolios being key bread and butter issues. However, if we consider this with another mindset, this occasion with Members is an opportunity, so there is no harm in letting Members voice their opinions. That should be no big deal.
(Laughter)

MISS TAM HEUNG-MAN (in Cantonese): *Chief Executive, people in the business sector may discover today that assuming a high position in the public sector may see a brighter future than engaging in business activities, moneywise.*

For the Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation (KCRC) which experienced a mutiny last year, although profits have dropped 12.3%, the management is still given variable pay of more than 20%, that is, a pay rise. The performance of the former Executive Director of the Hong Kong Tourism Board was below par, but she was still given a bonus. As for the executive directors of many public organizations, their allowances and bonuses exceed thousands of millions of dollars. For example, the Chief Executive Officer of the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) gets \$10 million, and that of the Hongkong Electric Company Limited gets more than \$10 million. Well, recently, the same happens in the Applied Science and Technology Research Institute (ASTRI). It can be seen that the management of public organizations is a mess. May I ask the Government, under the circumstances of improper supervision of public organizations, if there is a mechanism to look into the strengthening of management of public

organizations and straightening out the overall structure of consultative and advisory bodies in order to make it more effective?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): Such statutory bodies of the Government are classified into several types. One type is modelled on commercial operations and the other is non-commercial operation, for example, the social welfare organizations, and the like. For organizations relating to social welfare and which are fully subvented by the Government, the pay policy we adopt is all along based on the standard of the SAR Government.

However, organizations adopting the commercial operation and commercial management approach and having to compete with the business sector for manpower resources must operate in accordance with the practice of the sector, and they are the KCRC and the MTRCL which the Member referred to earlier. They have adopted this operation approach. If the business sector implements a salary increase, these organizations will also make corresponding adjustments annually. However, Miss TAM, there is a merit in this, and that is, all adjustments are open. We will know if the salary they offer is higher than that of the business sector. If not, I very much believe that we should accept their stance, accept that they have an operational need to do so, otherwise, they will not get the manpower they need. They really have to adopt the so-called commercial approach to manage these organizations.

However, Miss TAM, in respect of management, we are always caught in the middle. For instance, in this Chamber, some Members keep telling us that such organizations have to be managed independently, that we should not interfere too much, but sometimes, they will say that we must operate and manage them. Here, we very often must strike a very good balance.

Every such statutory body has a management committee, a management board, and the management board has its statutory duties, setting out clearly what it should do. If there is no negligence of duties, I strongly believe that it should be allowed to continue operation. However, if there is really negligence, it may be due to loopholes in law or misappointment. In this regard, the Government of course has to conduct reviews, right?

MISS TAM HEUNG-MAN (in Cantonese): *I am grateful to hear the Chief Executive say that a balance has to be struck, that there is momentum to follow up.*

Theoretically, for many such public organizations, especially the board of directors, take the recent example of the ASTRI, members on the board of directors responsible for supervision very often do not attend meetings, so, they may not be aware of the actions of the management. Under such circumstances, how does the Government supervise the situation whereby members of the board of directors fail to turn up at meetings?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): I think all minutes of meetings of the board of directors are open, and the public can make their own judgement. If the Government has representatives — it may not be the representatives themselves, but their deputies who attend the meeting — but the most important thing is there are minutes of meetings which can reflect the situation.

I think the board of directors of the ASTRI made a rather prompt reply this time and acted expeditiously. It has taken a series of measures which it considers can effect improvement, making changes in accordance with the various recommendations of the Director of Audit. I believe it has done its part, has it not?

MISS CHAN YUEN-HAN (in Cantonese): *Chief Executive, you said earlier that the Government would reorganize the three Secretaries of Departments and the 11 Directors of Bureaux, and among them, I pay close attention to labour and welfare. I agree with the reorganization proposal you put forth just now. In the past, when the Government grouped labour and economy together, I had hopes for that but then, I found that it was not feasible because the economics portfolio could not take employment into account. In fact, a lot of things are related to welfare, therefore, we agree with your proposal that labour and welfare should be put together.*

However, just as the Chief Executive said earlier, during your term, one of the key tasks is to address the problem of disparity between the rich and the poor. I believe the Chief Executive knows very well that such disparity is caused by working poverty. To hundreds and thousands of people, no matter how hard they work, even working for 12 hours, their income is lower than CSSA payment. Given this, when appointing the relevant official, you will have to decide if he is well-versed in labour issues, if he understands the plight of the grassroots, and how he is going to solve the problems of working poverty, disparity between the rich and the poor and the issues of minimum wage and standard working hours.

Over a year ago, when you became the last-term Chief Executive, we had a thorough discussion. Now, President, I am putting my question. (Laughter) What kind of person will you appoint? If you appoint someone who is totally not versed in labour issues, someone who does not know what we had discussed before, he will have to familiarize himself again with our labour problems. It will soon be October 2007 when we will have to conduct an interim review. Unless the Chief Executive is going to stall Chief Executive, you said during the election that if that was not going to work, legislation would be enacted in October 2007. You need to identify someone who can carry on with your intention to get this job done. May I ask the Chief Executive, in making your appointment, if this will become a very important indicator? Is the Government determined to address working poverty, and the issues of minimum wage and standard working hours?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): Any person appointed as the Secretary for Labour and Welfare will have to honour the solemn pledge I made to the people in my political platform, particularly what I said in Chapter 2 of the political platform, that is, the various details I set out in the Chapter on job creation and poverty alleviation. No matter who is to become the Secretary, he has to do accordingly. The creation of this new Policy Bureau is in response to what I said then in the political platform, combining job creation and poverty alleviation in establishing this new Policy Bureau.

Therefore, I believe, Miss CHAN, you need not worry, I will of course be very careful in appointing this person. Temperament-, commitment-, (*laughter*) and knowledge-wise, this person must be well-verses in this respect, but what is most important is whether he can deliver. Just as you said, can he really conduct a proper review of minimum wage?

Moreover, minimum wage has exceeded the ambit of one Secretary, for it has reached the level of a pledge by the Chief Executive, which is not something that one person or half a person can accomplish. The whole society has to work together. This topic affects the business sector, the labour sector, Members of the Legislative Council. If that cannot be accomplished, I believe you, Miss CHAN, will not let me off, will you? (*Laughter*)

MISS CHAN YUEN-HAN (in Cantonese): *I very much hope It is the wish of the labour sector that the person eventually appointed by the Chief Executive is someone whom we can accept. We are worried that he is completely not versed*

in the issues and has to start from scratch. Chief Executive, when appointing this person, you do not have to come to the Legislative Council to consult us, for you make the decision by yourself. My voice does not represent myself, rather, the labour sector, including six members of the Labour Advisory Board and members of the industrial and commercial sector. It is strongly hoped

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): You should put your question instead of expressing your opinion.

MISS CHAN YUEN-HAN (in Cantonese): *I wish the Chief Executive can promise us that a person well-versed in labour issues will be appointed to tackle the problems. This shows whether or not the Government has the resolve to solve this problem.*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): I can only promise you that I will find a committed person, one who will deliver the pledge I made in the political platform to do this job. You need not worry. For example, Mr Matthew CHEUNG used not to work in the Labour Department, he only learned gradually after being posted to the Labour Department. In the first two decades of his career, he worked in other posts. Why can he learn it so well, to become such a favourite of yours, that you like him so much? (Laughter) This really proves that among those appointed by Donald TSANG, there is a chance that you will also consider that he is ideal. So, I strongly believe after a period of time, you will also think that this person I appoint in future is an ideal choice.

MR FRED LI (in Cantonese): *Chief Executive, I will first show you some vegetables. Today, I bought some vegetables and a mandarin from the market. These vegetables came from the Mainland. I specified I wanted vegetables from the Mainland, not local vegetables. However, even if they are local vegetables, I cannot tell.*

Chief Executive, I now put a very simple question to you. A lot of people always ask me, "What should they buy from the market to be safe?" Today, the FEHD said again the toxic content of scallops is 1 000 times in excess of standard. May I ask, for these vegetables and fruits from the Mainland, whether or not the Hong Kong Government has tested them, and whether the Government can guarantee that they are safe for consumption by the people?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): All those which can be imported into Hong Kong, bought through proper channels — I do not know where you bought your vegetables — (*laughter*) if they are bought through proper channels, they are generally safe.

However, it is impossible for the FEHD and the Centre for Food Safety to test each of the vegetables or each mandarin. Rather, they are tested in batches, by means of sample testing. This is a proven method. We of course cannot guarantee that each of the vegetables, each scallop or each mandarin does not carry unhealthy substances, but the most important thing is our system is clear. Once an irregularity is identified, everyone will know. I do not know why you still have to consume scallops, for we have asked the public to stay away from scallops for the time being, (*laughter*) but you still consume them. He treated you to scallops? Did he treat you? (*Laughter*) I beg your pardon, Secretary of Department. I cannot see why the Secretary of Department still has to treat you to scallops. (*Laughter*)

Nonetheless, after repeated incidents, our food safety has been enhanced substantially, in respect of system, operation, inspection and contact with the Mainland. But I dare not say it is perfect, for there is still a lot to be done. Regarding food safety, you all know that in future, our work is to lay down a safety standard for food. Moreover, we also have to formulate a registration system and inspection system for all importers, and to prevent the import of substandard food. These are the areas that requires further work. Then, there is law enforcement. We may have to make changes to legislation. All these will be handled one by one. However, so long as we co-operate in the process, and the people understand this system, I trust food safety in Hong Kong will be second to no other advanced cities in Asia. But there will be loopholes. We cannot test each of the vegetables or each item, but I believe, in general, our system is safe.

MR FRED LI (in Cantonese): *President, of course I understand. I believe I understand food safety more than the Chief Executive does. However, I wish the Chief Executive would understand that nowadays, our vegetables are brought into Hong Kong via Man Kam To, and out of five trucks transporting vegetables, three to four are not stopped for inspection, and the vegetables are transported directly to the markets. My vegetables were bought from an FEHD market, OK? They are not smuggled in. I do not know where they came from, but I bought them from a market managed by the Government.*

The problem is it is totally impossible for trucks to be stopped at Man Kam To for inspection because it is too outdated. The trucks now are very large. I wish the Chief Executive would understand that the Government can put it very nicely but in fact, it has been for a while, and the Government still cannot table its measures and legislation to the Legislative Council. We have pressed it many times. I hope that the Chief Executive can accord priority to it. My follow-up question is: Man Kam To is currently not able to check those trucks transporting vegetables, for it is totally outdated — I am talking about trucks transporting vegetables, not sports cars — can the Chief Executive respond by saying that some studies on Man Kam To will be conducted soon to improve measures for inspecting those trucks?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): What I said earlier was conducting sample testing. We cannot, and it is impossible for us to stop each truck for inspection. I would like to point out that if you want us to stop each truck for inspection, we cannot do that.

What we have now is not a problem of law, so please do not be confused. If resources are available, we can do that, but even with the resources, is that possible? In actual fact, can we do that? All our vegetables are imported, with the bulk being transported via the Mainland. At present, fresh fish and vegetables come in via Man Kam To. Under such circumstances, we cannot inspect each and every truck, rather, we will resort to sample testing, which is a safe approach. I believe you are not asking us to stop each and every truck, and then inspect each of them. This is not what you mean, I suppose? If so, Hong Kong people will be left with no vegetables for consumption. How many inspection officers will be sufficient?

Therefore, I am not saying that the current system is not good, but most importantly, how well do we utilize our own resources? How many people are there doing the job? Fred, no matter how many pieces of legislation are enacted, if we do not have enough resources, that will be useless. In other words, a lot of manpower is required, and when manpower is available, can that be done? We have to look at this from the practical point of view. The problem now is, for example, we inspect one truck out of three, or one out of five which is not enough. If we discover in respect of law, or if there are lots of tainted vegetables on the market, we will step up inspection. If we say this is not what is happening now, I strongly believe that resources are being used effectively. Nonetheless, let me tell you sincerely that I will find out whether

or not the samples we take now are sufficient, and whether or not there should be more inspections. We can take a further look in this regard.

PROF PATRICK LAU (in Cantonese): *President, the clash which broke out in Macao on May Day is more or less related to Hong Kong workers taking up illegal employment there.*

I am very happy that the Chief Executive said a Development Bureau would be set up soon, as a first step towards addressing the problem of long delays of works. The sector is very supportive. However, I would like the Chief Executive to explain further, how the actual operation of the structure of this Development Bureau being conceived can ensure that works will be commenced soon. Will it include cutting red tape, shortening the rigid and excessively long vetting procedure while approving private development projects?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): Our present vetting procedure is very strict. This is required by law, as well as by Members of the Legislative Council. Do you remember we have been criticized time and again for being too fast in granting approval, and for granting too many approvals? Do you remember that? Do you recall the LEUNG Chin-man incident?

Thus, we have to understand that a balance has always to be struck in regulation. The key duty of the Development Bureau is to co-ordinate with the parties as soon as possible with regard to government works, for example, land administration, planning, execution and tendering of works, so that policies in all respects can be rationalized and proceeded with quicker. This is the work of the Bureau. Moreover, with regard to private organizations, works relating to development can be responded to most promptly, but everything must be done in accordance with the law. Response of course has to be quick, but definitely not loose, and discretion must also be exercised with care.

PROF PATRICK LAU (in Cantonese): *President, I have to clarify. The LEUNG Chin-man incident is different from the speed in vetting. They do not have much relationship.*

However, I would also like to ask, I think in fact, without adequate understanding between the executive and the legislature now — just as the Chief

Executive said earlier that harmony is badly wanting — what magic has this Secretary to make the decision-making procedure of such large-scale works smoother? Unlike Miss CHAN Yuen-han, I would not be asking the Chief Executive who the Secretary will be, but I also wish that he will consider how this approach can be used to expedite these works at the executive and legislative levels.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): Of course, all our works have to be discussed thoroughly so as to take care of every aspect, and to be explained to Members in full detail. But this requires the co-operation of all parties. In my view, if we can make concerted efforts, and our objective is for Hong Kong to develop well and for the economy to continue to prosper, the SAR Government will definitely do all it can, and so will this Development Bureau. I also very much hope that in carrying out his work, especially in respect of matters relating to works, he will have the assistance and approval of Members of the Legislative Council and the Finance Committee.

MISS CHOY SO-YUK (in Cantonese): *Chief Executive, earlier on, the Government competed with this Council on an initiative of energy saving. This Council won eventually. I invite hereby the Government to compete with us in other green areas (you have to admit that it is a fact, we did win the competition) (laughter), such as in green purchase, carbon dioxide emissions, and so on.*

The Chief Executive has just announced that an independent Environment Bureau would be established. This is indeed a good thing. I give my full support. As the saying goes, "a green job done means your job well-done". (Laughter) As a matter of fact, to get the job done, we need to do something for our environment. Our Bureau Director will have a lot to do in future. For instance, the scheme of control for the two power companies in 2008, the impact of LNG reception terminal of the CLP on our marine ecology, air pollution, refuse disposal, conservation, and so on, all these are issues to be resolved promptly. May I ask the Chief Executive what the areas this Bureau Director will work on in the coming year? What are the areas that you consider efforts will be badly needed and should be given priority?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): As regard the priorities on my environment portfolio, I have presented them in my election platform. Our prime objective — if you have read my platform, you would find that they have

been stated out clearly, and the Secretary for the Environment will have to act in accordance with the platform without deviation — the first thing is to resolve the air pollution problem, thereby upgrading the quality of our environment. Secondly, we will open up the electricity market, adjust downward the permitted rate of return of power companies, safeguard the interest of LPG product consumer, invest in infrastructure facilities and enhance the quality of life in Hong Kong. With regard to the initiative of bringing about again the blue sky as mentioned in the platform, Guangdong-Hong Kong co-operation would have to be stepped up.

Besides, on low ultra sulphur diesel sorry, it should be ultra low sulphur diesel (*laughter*), he should also make more efforts in setting down standards for both the industrial and commercial sectors. Work in respect of emissions from vessels and vehicles with idling engines has been set down. All the work will focus on those areas.

As regards competing with the Legislative Council, I always welcome the challenge. The contest last time did bring about some incentives. I am glad to congratulate the Legislative Council on achieving a saving as high as 20% last year. Despite its late start, it managed at least to fulfil the target and learn about the benefit. Last year, government buildings saved 11.7% in this regard. But please do not forget, the saving has been increasing during the past few years. In other words, on a yearly basis, the cumulative energy we saved was altogether 39% over the past three years while it was some 20% for the Legislative Council.

As for per capita power consumption, for the Government Headquarters, it is 3 811 kW, while it is 6 057 kW for the Legislative Council. We still have a considerable difference. However, as the Legislative Council Building is rather old, power saving would be much difficult. While it is good to have healthy competition in promoting environmental protection, I always welcome the challenge. If the Legislative Council agrees that we should take the lead in setting an example, I am more than willing to do so. Maybe I can ask our Secretary Dr Sarah LIAO to draw up the rules for the contest. (*Laughter*)

MISS CHOY SO-YUK (in Cantonese): *President, since it has been possible to achieve so much energy saving in government buildings, it proved that our criticism of your setting too low a target was correct. Let us talk about the priorities you have just mentioned. My question put to you was whether or not*

it is possible that in one year — I surely hope that the future Bureau Director can do it in one year — all the problems listed could be resolved. If it is true, it will be fantastic. But I think you will have difficulties in finding someone to resolve all these problems in one year. My question is in fact very simple. In the coming year, what areas do you think the Bureau Director should tackle? I am talking about two or three areas. I am not as greedy as to think that the Director can solve a lot of problems. If it were me, I do not think I can resolve all the problems in five years. However, I hope you can exert more efforts in these two years on one or two important areas. (Laughter)

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): My platform covers the work of the Government in the coming five years instead of the next. As for our plan in the coming year, my top priority is to identify a suitable person to take up the post. The Bureau Director will then put forward proposals, and such proposals will be publicized in the first policy address to be delivered by the Government in the coming term. We cannot reveal the priorities to be taken in the first year of the third-term SAR Government. I hope we can give you a full picture in the policy address to be delivered in October this year.

MS MARGARET NG (in Cantonese): *President, I would also like to ask a question about universal suffrage. Just now Mr James TO frankly asked the Chief Executive whether there would be universal suffrage in 2012. In response, the Chief Executive said that apart from talking about 2012, the most important thing was how to achieve the target. Besides, it would be outdated to simply talk about 2012. What I want to ask the Chief Executive is: You will be serving until 2012, if you are telling us that talking about 2012 is outdated, does it mean that so long as you are still our Chief Executive, we will not be able to see election by universal suffrage? What will you do five years later? Does it mean that you have put a full stop to this issue, even the Constitutional Affairs Bureau will no longer have to deal with any constitutional affairs? In other words, does it mean that the issue has been totally resolved after the completion of the Green Paper, so the Secretary for Constitutional Affairs will deal with mainland matters instead?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): I did not say that 2012 was outdated. I only said that if we simply take about 2012 without mentioning the design and roadmap, it would be outdated and not pragmatic enough. This is what I meant.

MS MARGARET NG (in Cantonese): *President, can the Chief Executive tell us honestly whether or not there will be universal suffrage in 2012? What are the factors determining whether or not there would be universal suffrage in 2012? Whether the year 2012 will be included in your agenda?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): First of all, I have repeated many times that it is not Donald TSANG who has all the say, but the people of Hong Kong. I very much hope that in this summer, we can prepare a Green Paper outlining all the options proposed by the public, including the one on 2012, for public discussion. After discussions and consultations, we hope to come up with a mainstream package which can really implement election by universal suffrage. I think it would be more important. What I want to say is, we should not simply stick to a date. We have to talk about how to implement the package and to deal with it in a pragmatic manner. If we do not want to be tortured by this issue any longer, we should not debate on a certain issue and a date, but to look at it as a whole.

MR LEE WING-TAT (in Cantonese): *Chief Executive, you know that 22 legislators of the pan-democrat camp have submitted for your reference a detailed package. I believe you have already read it. As such, I hope the Chief Executive will no longer say that what the 22 legislators talked about was merely a year. The detailed arrangement of electing the Chief Executive and the Legislative Council by universal suffrage was also included in the package.*

I am glad to hear that, according to the Chief Executive, the future decision on election by universal suffrage would rest with the public. I hope the Chief Executive can indeed explain to the public what he meant by the word "decision". From what I have heard at the meetings of the Commission on Strategic Development, when the three packages are presented for public consultation this summer, even if one of them wins 60% support from the public, it does not follow that the package will be submitted to the Central Government for discussion. According to you, even if one of the packages has the support of 50% or 60% of the public, some elements in other packages will be incorporated for presentation. What I want to know is: Firstly, how could this be called the public's decision? Secondly, Mr TSANG must take into consideration that the public would question the approach you adopted. After we have made the decision, if you mix and match the three different packages, it would mean that some elements from the two other packages which are not supported by the

people would be blended in with the preferred one. As such, could Mr TSANG explain your remark just now? What exactly did you mean by the word "decision" when you said that the decision on the package would rest with the public?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): What I mean is the public can decide whether or not to support a particular package. I believe for any package, if it involves an approval for political reform, the Basic Law has stipulated that it would be subject to the endorsement of a two-thirds majority of all Members of Legislative Council and the consent of the Chief Executive, as well as the approval of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress. The support from the three parties is required. However, most importantly, the package must have the support and consent of the public. As such, I stressed particularly this point during the election.

I very much hope some packages proposed can achieve this standard. The standard I am talking about is the majority support of the public. If the package is supported by 60% of the people and a two-thirds majority of all Members of the Legislative Council, then it is a very good one. However, failing this, the support would be inadequate. In fact, we did have some packages supported by 60% of the people, but it failed to get the support of the Legislative Council. If we could not get sufficient support from the Legislative Council, the package could not be passed. That is why we have to incorporate elements of different packages. We hope the package adopted can on the one hand get the support of Hong Kong people, while carrying the possibility of gaining a two-thirds majority support from Members of the Legislative Council, as well as being likely to get the approval of the Central Government on the other. Otherwise, the package will not be good enough.

I believe that after consultations, the mixed package would move towards this objective. I really hope there is an existing package that can satisfy such criterion, so that I need not work on this. Nevertheless, if no such package is in place, and it is also a constitutional requirement, then the SAR Government, in particular the Chief Executive, would have a responsibility that cannot be shirked. If I can think up a package that can meet all the requirements, then I should courageously propose something to achieve the objective.

This is the reason why we have to come up with a package with integrated and mixed elements. Our objective is not only to gain the support of the public,

but also to win a two-thirds majority support (40 votes) in this Chamber. However, most importantly, the package will not violate the principal provisions of the Basic Law. This is the basic principle I believe that is more important. If we have an existing package that is obviously supported by the general public and most likely to win a two-thirds majority support from Members of the Legislative Council, why should I have to work on other aspects? There would be no need for me to do any work.

I hope I have dispelled your doubts. What I am doing now is to come up with a package with elements that are supported by the public, the majority of Legislative Council Members and the Central Government. These are essential constitutional requirements. I believe that the support of the public is vital. Therefore, I emphasized and added this point on my own during the election. I believe this is very important.

MR LEE WING-TAT (in Cantonese): *Chief Executive, during the election, you kept emphasizing that public views were important in the constitutional debate. Do you not think that a better way of doing it is to let the public put forward a basic package, say package A, then to discuss it with 60 Members of all parties in the Legislative Council to find out if it is supported by them? If they do not support it, Members of political parties — though not all of them are returned by direct election — will be accountable to the public. If you are thinking this way, I would feel that you are at least heeding public opinions while lobbying Members who do not accept the package. If they do not accept, they can always negative the package. However, I hope you would not say that they do not support the package before any lobbying work is done, and extract some elements from the package to make a new one. Do you feel that this approach is addressing the issue from the prospective of the public and on the basis of public opinions?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): As a matter of fact, Mr LEE Wing-tat, I am doing exactly what you described just now. The purpose of outlining a few packages in the Green Paper is to galvanize public discussions, so that they can come up with a more comprehensive, acceptable package that merits support. Also, the package will enable me to lobby for the support of more than 40 Members in the Legislative Council. This is what I would do, and what I hope to do.

However, how can public discussions be galvanized? This is the purpose of publishing the Green Paper. I hope to list in the Green Paper various packages proposed in the community, including the one put forward by 20-odd legislators just mentioned. If the proposal was not put forward by 22 legislators, but by 40 legislators, then it would be a different story. Yet, it is not the case. We would certainly examine these views carefully, so as to be accountable to the public. Apart from allowing the public to look at a package seriously put forward by 22 Members, other Members can also propose other options which may win the support of 30 Legislative Council Members. Furthermore, such package may also be supported by these 20-odd Members. On this basis, my most important task is to arouse concern among members of the public, to focus their discussions on this issue. I hope that in autumn this year (following the discussions in summer), the SAR Government can be given sufficient information in identifying a more comprehensive package that will get greater support from the public and more likely to secure 40 votes. I also hope that I can get the support and approval of the Central Government for this package.

MR WONG TING-KWONG (in Cantonese): *Mr TSANG, in an interview with the media in January this year, you said that you hoped Hong Kong could become an international financial centre in the region. You also stated that, while New York and London were able to support a population of 10 million, why Hong Kong could not feed a population of 7 million. However, as to the question of whether or not we could support a population of 7 million by being a financial centre only, people have cast doubts on that lately.*

When you were in Beijing at the end of last year, Premier WEN indicated that the Central Government would actively implement policies conducive to the economic and social development of Hong Kong, particularly taking effective measures on construction, investment, trading and financial affairs, promoting co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland, consolidating our position as an international financial centre, trading centre and logistics centre. While the Government has paid special attention to financial affairs and the development of the shipping industry, the remaining issue would be development into a trading centre. What are the initiatives that Mr TSANG will take to consolidate our position as a trading hub, so as to tie in with the policy objectives of the Central Government in this regard? Can Mr TSANG on the one hand further consider diversifying our future economic development, while balancing development of various areas on the other?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): Mr WONG, we cannot push ahead our development in the primary, secondary and third sectors together for we have a small population, and we are also subject to the geographic constraints. Most importantly, our GDP *per capita* has reached US\$27,000. It would be very difficult for us to develop labour-intensive and land-intensive industries. Our direction has been very clear. We have to develop into a financial, trading and logistics hub. It would be more in line with our present development.

As to how to elevate our position as a trading centre, as you can see, the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau proposed to be set up in the reform this time will tie in with the efforts in this aspect. They can make overall consideration on our trading policy, not just on the trading front, but also on economic development. I strongly believe that this new organization will function positively in further promoting Hong Kong's development into a commercial centre.

Secondly, the State is supportive of us. As stated in the China's National 11th Five-Year Plan, Hong Kong is a trading centre. I strongly believe that there would be policies to tie in with the achievement of this objective.

Thirdly, let us not forget CEPA. It is still functioning and we have benefited from CEPA. We also hope to implement another measure in July this year to include in CEPA new service industries that are on course for development, in particular those in the professional sector. I believe these are very good approaches.

In addition, in the Action Plan promulgated in the Economic Summit on China's 11th Five-Year Plan early this year, a series of specific proposals on strengthening our status as an international financial centre have been highlighted, and they would be under the ambit of the new Commerce and Economic Development Bureau. Mr WONG, if we could proceed in accordance with these objectives set down, reflecting particularly the core work of the third-term SAR Government, I am sure that we can maintain our position in developing into a trading centre.

MR WONG TING-KWONG (in Cantonese): *The Chief Executive mentioned CEPA just now, but I do not think our small and medium enterprises (SMEs) can be greatly benefited by it. I wish the Chief Executive could elaborate further. In the coming years, how SMEs can be better benefited by the arrangement under CEPA?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): Mr WONG, we have launched some promotion drives on the Mainland, including those carried out in the Pan-Pearl River Delta Region and the emerging central China. We will focus efforts on leading SMEs and professional bodies to explore new business opportunities. I think it is the most pragmatic way. They need someone to open the door for them, providing information on seizing investment and business opportunities, introducing them to local officials, and gaining an understanding of the local situation, so as to gather market information. The SAR Government will go on working on these areas. The new bureau will certainly make this their key task. I will also continue to seek personal involvement.

MS AUDREY EU (in Cantonese): *President, Chief Executive, about the package for universal suffrage by 2012 as proposed by 22 Members of the democratic camp, will you give the undertaking of including it in the Green Paper for public selection?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): Yes.

MS AUDREY EU (in Cantonese): *Chief Executive, you may remember Miss CHOY So-yuk said earlier on that this Council had challenged you to a contest. I put a similar question to you in the last year Question and Answer Session on whether or not we could also engage you in a contest on the subject of political system. Regarding the package for universal suffrage put forward by 22 pro-democracy Members, do you think that it would be accepted by 60% of the public? Are you prepared for this challenge?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): Whether or not it is accepted by the public is a fact. There is no need for us to enter into a contest. However, with a good set of rules, we are sure that we can take on any challenge. But I am not sure whether or not it is a serious question in constitutional reform. I strongly believe that the public want to deal with this issue seriously. On energy saving, we can always have a contest. On the issue of constitutional reform, as the Chief Executive, I am sure that I have to be accountable to the public as the Legislative Council Members do. I am sure that if you can come up with a good model underpinned by mutual consensus and compromise, and if it is acceptable to the public, it will eventually be able to secure enough votes in the

Legislative Council and to win support from the Central Government, then we will succeed. Otherwise, problems will arise, and the public will be discerning enough to know who should bear the responsibility.

MS AUDREY EU (in Cantonese): *President, since the Chief Executive said*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Audrey EU, you have already asked a short follow-up. Please sit down.

MR CHEUNG HOK-MING (in Cantonese): *Chief Executive, in your opening remarks, you mentioned that we would be celebrating the 10th anniversary of the establishment of the Hong Kong SAR Government on 1 July this year. It is reported that the Hong Kong-Shenzhen Western Corridor will also be commissioned on 1 July, and the co-location arrangement will be implemented. It is in fact welcome by the people of Hong Kong.*

Yet, behind the happy scene, people are very worried that, subsequent to the commissioning of the Corridor, the considerable traffic flow generated would bring problems to our logistics industry and our economy, and inconveniences to those living in Tuen Mun, Tin Shui Wai and Yuen Long. May I ask the Chief Executive, given the robust economy and enormous surplus, if the Administration will consider buying back Route 3 to divert the traffic? In addition, has it considered the DAB's proposal of constructing the western by-pass and Lantau and Tuen Mun Links?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): I wonder if it is fashionable to nationalize everything. I was asked to acquire The Link REIT earlier, and now I have to buy a bridge. We have indeed so many things to buy. We hope that a lot of things can be privatized, so that we can develop the territory together with the private sector. As to whether or not the commissioning of the Western Corridor would cause traffic congestion in the Western New Territories, we have conducted a number of discussions in this Council. It is a matter that we are particularly concerned.

According to our projection, the existing road network in the Northwest New Territories should be able to cope with the demand upto 2016. In

addition, I believe Mr CHEUNG also knows that we have a three-phase extension of Tuen Mun Road. After the widening works, the increased traffic flow brought by the Western Corridor would be alleviated. Apart from Tuen Mun Road, you also know that road improvement works are being carried out at Ping Ha Road and Tin Ha Road, connecting to the Shenzhen Bay Highway. All this will greatly improve the traffic flow in the western part of the New Territories.

I am prepared to look into other measures in collaboration with the Transport Department, including the initiatives just mentioned. However, concerning acquiring Route 3, this was suggested by some Members in the past, including Mrs Selina CHOW and other Members. In my opinion, this measure should only be taken when there is no alternative. Whenever we are talking about expanding our function in participating in commercial activities, we must think it over very carefully. I would follow up with colleagues in the Transport Department on the views just expressed.

MR CHEUNG HOK-MING (in Cantonese): *President, I only want to follow up the reply that he has just made.*

I stressed just now that all along the DAB has been advocating the need of building a western bypass and a Tuen Mun-Lantau Link for the long-term development of the Northwestern New Territories, yet the Chief Executive failed to give us any concrete response. The solution he mentioned just now was only piecemeal, not necessarily good on a long-term basis. I hope the Chief Executive can give us a realistic answer.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): I will realistically look into these options. We are not adopting a piecemeal approach. Our existing road network is fully able to cope with the demand upto 2016. As for the demand beyond 2016, we must continue to study it.

DR RAYMOND HO (in Cantonese): *The Chief Executive indicated that he would strengthen effective governance in the next five years, and would also reorganize his ruling team. However, at present, the public hold different views in many areas. They pay a lot of attention to matters such as environmental protection, conservation, employment, and so on. They also demand more*

consultations and a high level of transparency. Under the present situation, how can the Chief Executive ensure that the new ruling team can really get the job done? How are you going to equip them to prepare for the smooth launching of major infrastructure projects that you are taking a keen interest, and to make sure that they are acceptable to the public?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): During the election, I mentioned that I wish to adopt a bottom-up approach in the new governance. I hope that under the new policy, before any major infrastructure works or policy is launched, we can fully consult the public systematically in every step, looking into relevant issues with stakeholders, in particular professional bodies, with a view to solving the problems. I hope that this approach can get the support from the majority of Hong Kong people, so that when these proposals are tabled to the Legislative Council for approval, they will be mature options with little controversy. This is the only way to achieve this goal. I hope that in future, all our major projects are conducted in this manner. In other words, as far as public works projects are concerned, in respect of the kind of projects to be launched and the scale of the projects, we hope that discussions with stakeholders, local residents and professional bodies can held before any decision on the scope of the entire project is made. As for the amount of money to be spent on looking into the scope of the project and its design, we also have to consult the public. When the project is submitted to the Council, it will be an option that is more mature and accepted by the public. I believe this approach will not cost us more time, but then it is always the best way to get things done.

DR RAYMOND HO (in Cantonese): *President, I just asked the Chief Executive how he was going to equip his new ruling team. The silent majority seldom express their views, so how is your leading team going to gauge the opinion of the entire community, especially the silent majority? It is expected that in future, many projects may adopt the Public Private Partnership approach, how you are going to prepare your team to become conversant with this approach and implement major projects by means of these models?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): Currently, the mode adopted in engaging the public in discussions has been rather extensive. There is of course still room for improvement. The tender process of our projects is open. Before inviting tender, we consult the District Councils, relevant professional bodies

and the Legislative Council panel. These are all open processes. However, what is the best way to get the job done, Dr HO? We can not expect to have the ears of all 7 million people in Hong Kong, asking them to listen to every word we say and accept our proposal. We have to prepare for the worst scenario, that is, they pay no attention to what we say, but at the last moment, when we have to make a decision, they will voice their concerns if they do not like the idea. This is very often the case. However, so far as we work in good faith, and Members have done their job, these matters can be subject to discussions. At present, we are disseminating information to the public in the most advanced way. Even if only a few people raise objection in the end, we still have to face them positively and deal with them rationally. This is the only way. However, I can not promise that we would go ahead with the project only if we have got the support of all 7 million people in Hong Kong. In that case, we cannot get anything done.

MR FREDERICK FUNG (in Cantonese): *Ever since the election, there are three issues on the constitution that I am happy to hear them mentioned by the Chief Executive. The first one is that the legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law would not be dealt with for the time being. This I welcome and support. The second one is that a bottom-up approach would be adopted in consulting the public on the electoral package. I am also in support of that. The third one is about the question I am going to ask. In reply to the question raised by Ms Audrey EU, the Chief Executive indicated that the package proposed by 22 pro-democracy Members would be included in the consultation paper to be published. I want to know how it would be included. Is it going to be included in its entirety as one of the three options? Or is it going to be one of the dozens of options in the annex? What exactly is the format?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): We have not come to a decision yet. Apart from the discussion to be held by the Commission on Strategic Development in June, we also have another workshop to discuss the matter. After that, we will collate views from all sectors. I wish to propose three types of packages. The reason for suggesting three types is that three is a number to be easily dealt with. How can universal suffrage be achieved through these three packages by different ways? Which one of them is the clearest and most comprehensive? I hope we can proceed in this way. I do not know where to put the package proposed by 22 legislators at the moment, but I have given Ms

EU a promise and I promise you that it will certainly be included. As to where it should be placed, I will make a decision in due course.

MR FREDERICK FUNG (in Cantonese): *President, it is precisely my concern.*

President, each package would have its own characteristics. People who perceived the original idea, including myself, would have his or her considerations in mind. If you just take out element A from the package, or even point (1) or (2) from that element, then add in something from point (3) and (4) of other package, the package so formed may not be consistent in itself. The question I want to ask the Chief Executive is: Though the package proposed by 22 pro-democracy Members may appear to the Chief Executive a model not having enough representativeness or being alien, it may be extraordinary.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Please state your question directly.

MR FREDERICK FUNG (in Cantonese): *The Chief Executive called us the opposition camp in the past. It probably meant to show that he wanted to work together for social harmony. Would you consider including the whole package, making it one of the packages for consultation? In other words, would you consider it a formal package?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): I will look at this matter as a whole and will not break it down. However, there is one thing you should know. I can not tell at this moment whether or not it will become one of the three mainstream packages. The package needs to go through discussions in the community and the workshop, and then it will be considered by the Commission on Strategic Development. Besides, the Government will conduct an internal study, with a view to coming up with a package that will most likely to meet the requirements. The 22 Members play an important role, and they have their own credibility. Yet, not long ago, we had a package that commanded the support of 30-odd Members in 2005. At the end, it still failed to be passed in this Council.

As such, I strongly believe that I have to tell Members that there should be a few options that command support from more than 20 Members. I

am sure that there should not be only one model that is supported by 20-odd Members. Therefore, there must be a choice.

However, I am going to give my undertaking that the package submitted by 20-odd Members would be presented to the people of Hong Kong in its entirety — not just the one presented by them, but every single package will be treated the same way.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Last question.

MR HOWARD YOUNG (in Cantonese): *Chief Executive, following the economic upturn, the tax revenue of the Government has surged up to \$155.1 billion, the highest on record. The surplus announced by the Government recently is \$58.6 billion, some \$3 billion more than anticipated when the Budget was announced in February. This proves that there is ample room for the Government to return wealth to the people by reducing salaries tax.*

During the election for his second term, I remember the Chief Executive said that there was room for reduction of profits tax. I remember you were saying that should the financial and economic situation allow, salaries tax could be reduced to the level of 15%. May I ask the Chief Executive what plans he has to honour these undertakings?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): When the Financial Secretary prepares the Budget for the coming year, he will take into account the prevailing financial situation at the time and also the pledges of the Chief Executive made in the election platform before making any decision he deems appropriate. However, our policy of returning wealth to the people and storing it with them will remain unchanged.

MR HOWARD YOUNG (in Cantonese): *Will this be restricted to salaries tax and profits tax — it was what you have mentioned before — or will it apply to all kinds of government revenue items as a whole?*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): We have to leave it to the Financial Secretary. This is not an issue to be resolved by dialogue between you and me.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): We would like to thank the Chief Executive for giving replies to 19 questions raised.

Will Members please rise while the Chief Executive leaves the Chamber.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE (in Cantonese): Thank you, President. Thank you, Members.

NEXT MEETING

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now adjourn the Council until 11.00 am on Wednesday, 9 May 2007.

Adjourned accordingly at twenty-nine minutes to Five o'clock.