

OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Thursday, 12 July 2007

The Council continued to meet at
Nine o'clock

MEMBERS PRESENT:

THE PRESIDENT

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

THE HONOURABLE LEUNG YIU-CHUNG

THE HONOURABLE SIN CHUNG-KAI, S.B.S., J.P.

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

THE HONOURABLE WONG YUNG-KAN, S.B.S., J.P.

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

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

DR THE HONOURABLE YEUNG SUM, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LAU CHIN-SHEK, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LAU KONG-WAH, J.P.

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

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE ALBERT CHAN WAI-YIP

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

THE HONOURABLE WONG KWOK-HING, M.H.

THE HONOURABLE LEE WING-TAT

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

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

THE HONOURABLE ALBERT JINGHAN CHENG, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE KWONG CHI-KIN

THE HONOURABLE TAM HEUNG-MAN

MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

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

THE HONOURABLE ANDREW CHENG KAR-FOO

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

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

THE HONOURABLE VINCENT FANG KANG, J.P.

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE CHIM PUI-CHUNG

PUBLIC OFFICER ATTENDING:

THE HONOURABLE FREDERICK MA SI-HANG, J.P.

SECRETARY FOR COMMERCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

CLERK IN ATTENDANCE:

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

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): A quorum is not present now. Clerk, please ring the bell to summon Members to the Chamber.

(After the summoning bell had been rung, a number of Members entered the Chamber)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): A quorum is now present. The meeting now starts.

MEMBERS' MOTIONS

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Second motion: Developing co-operative relationship with the Mainland.

DEVELOPING CO-OPERATIVE RELATIONSHIP WITH THE MAINLAND

MR JASPER TSANG (in Cantonese): President, I move that the motion on developing co-operative relationship with the Mainland, as printed on the Agenda, be passed.

President, the principle of "one country, two systems" has been put into practice for a decade. Its implementation has indeed made many people of Hong Kong change their view on Hong Kong's co-operation with the Mainland. In the early stage after Hong Kong's reunification, concerning the "one country, two systems" arrangement, quite a number of Hong Kong people, including political leaders and even some senior officials of the SAR Government, thought not about the way to bring into full play the superiority of "one country, two systems" but how to resist or fight the threat it posed to Hong Kong.

From their point of view, they had no alternative but reluctantly accepted the "one country". As China had decided to resume its sovereignty over Hong Kong, any resistance would only be futile. They thus believed the maintenance of the "two systems" crucial. To be more accurate, "the system" of Hong Kong must be maintained and be protected against any threat or interference from that

"one country". Besides, "the system" of Hong Kong must be protected against contamination and erosion caused by "the system" of China. Therefore, at that time, isolation, precaution and resistance were considered crucial in the implementation of "one country, two systems". Some people did think this way back then.

Because of this, the First Chief Executive, Mr TUNG Chee-hwa, devoted a major section of his policy address each year to explaining clearly the need to step up co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland — Members may check it out. Despite the establishment of the Hong Kong Guangdong Co-operation Joint Conference at the senior level shortly after the reunification, it was palpable that insofar as co-operation between the two places was concerned, Hong Kong kept staying aloof as opposed to the enthusiasm shown by the Mainland. Anyway, we considered it a success if Hong Kong could be immune from the influence of the Mainland. In hindsight, we may perhaps ask ourselves frankly: Did quite a number of people hold this mentality at the early stage after the reunification?

However, President, the public is always the smartest, for they know that market force is irresistible. Though certain political leaders and officials held onto this mentality, we noticed that many Hong Kong people had already been capitalizing on the opportunities arising from "one country, two systems". The business sector, from small and medium enterprises to large developers, had already spotted the opportunities brought about by "one country, two systems" and entered the Mainland in succession for development. Long before the reunification, when China introduced reforms and adopted the open door policy, some Hong Kong people had already entered the Mainland for development. And after Hong Kong's reunification, they found that the environment was even more favourable.

The professionals started to set their eyes on the mainland market and examine how they should develop on the Mainland. The general public, as well as the grassroots, noticed that more and more people had turned to the Mainland for a wide range of activities and purchased property on the Mainland. Some elderly persons visited places on the Mainland, such as Shenzhen, frequently, which might nearly be regarded as their daily routine, for they considered they could enjoy the quality of living they desired over there.

The number of people working on the Mainland and purchasing property there was increasing. According to the figures recorded for last year, over 200

million person trips were made between Hong Kong and Shenzhen via all land control points, a daily average of 500 000 person trips. In respect of passenger vehicles, during the last year, the number of vehicles travelling between Hong Kong and Shenzhen exceeded 10 000 vehicles daily. Regarding marriage with mainlanders, of the number of marriages registered in Hong Kong in recent years, half of them were cross-boundary marriages between Hong Kong people and mainlanders. Therefore, Hong Kong's co-operation and integration with the Mainland is by now an inevitable trend.

President, the year 2003 was a fairly unforgettable year to many people. A series of memorable incidents which warranted reflections happened, but I believe we all agree that the following two incidents were on the list. The outbreak of the epidemic was one incident which had struck a chord in us of the importance of enhancing Hong Kong's co-operation with the Mainland, particularly on certain essential issues, such as quarantine measures. All of us came to realize the importance of fostering closer ties via a notification mechanism and a co-operation mechanism, where neither side should focus only on their own business.

On the other hand, in the same year, the Mainland/Hong Kong Closer Economic Partnership Arrangement, the so-called CEPA, was signed by Hong Kong and the Mainland, showing to the Hong Kong public that "one country, two systems" could actually bring about abundant new opportunities for the economic development of Hong Kong. Therefore, the year 2003 may be seen as a watershed. Now, 10 years after the reunification, I believe an overwhelming majority of the citizens of Hong Kong, including officials of the SAR Government, from the Chief Executive to Principal Officials, must have realized this point. The issue we are now facing is how to capitalize on the opportunities brought about by "one country, two systems", or, borrowing a line from leaders of the Central Authorities, how we can bring the superiority of "one country, two systems" into full play.

This is a fundamental change in mentality. People who used to follow the island mentality, desiring to isolate from, to resist and fight the so-called threat of "one country, two systems", have changed. They are now predominated by the mentality of capitalizing on and bringing into full play the superiority of "one country, two systems". Enhancement of the co-operative relationship with the Mainland is certainly a priority and pivotal issue.

However, today, when we discuss this co-operation issue, we have to clarify certain concepts. Take the expansion of the coverage of CEPA as an example. When the Chief Executive, Principal Officials and the business sector of Hong Kong went to the Mainland to explore business opportunities, some people thought that the SAR Government no longer knew how to uphold the competitive edge of Hong Kong, for the SAR Government would only appeal for favour from and rely on the Mainland. In the past, Hong Kong was superior. We enjoyed superiority over the Mainland. But it was no longer the case, and we had to rely on the Mainland, rely on the assistance of the Mainland and the Central Authorities. Some people even said that we had become a parasite to the Mainland.

Our society champions capitalism, believes in market economy and advocates free trading, it is bizarre that some people would hold this view. How can the development of business and trade relations and economic co-operation be branded as "an appeal for favour" or being a "parasite"? Naturally, we may ask what the objectives of the business sector of Hong Kong are to develop on the Mainland or open up business opportunities on the Mainland with the assistance of the SAR Government. In the first place, they are certainly doing this for their own interest. Many citizens of Hong Kong are enthusiastic, and they may truly wish that their investment made on the Mainland would help the development of the Mainland. However, if such investment can only help the development of the Mainland but is unfavourable and may incur loss to the investor, few people will be willing to do so.

The same applies to overseas investors doing business on the Mainland. Definitely, to facilitate infrastructure development and other development in China for the sake of promoting the spirit of internationalism is not the first thing on their mind. Economic benefits and commercial interests are their prime consideration, which is only natural. By the same token, when authorities of the Mainland consider opening up the market to accept investments and economic activities of Hong Kong, the authorities will certainly consider their own interest. However, if we believe in free trade and market economy, we should believe that these activities, which help to remove trade hurdles and liberalize the market, after all, would certainly bring mutual benefits.

Tariff exemption is granted to goods of Hong Kong exported to the Mainland. However, will the exemption merely benefit the businessmen of Hong Kong and the people of Hong Kong? Definitely not. Mainland residents

will be able to buy inexpensive goods, which will, at the same time, stimulate production on the Mainland, driving the mainland counterparts to enhance their competitiveness. When the services trade of Hong Kong can enter the mainland market, that is when the services trade market on the Mainland is opened up to Hong Kong, intermediaries and professionals in Hong Kong may access the mainland market. From the standpoint of Hong Kong, the arrangement will certainly offer new opportunities to the relevant industries, which is favourable to us. But is it unfavourable to the Mainland? In the short term, the relevant industries on the Mainland may be up against competition and threatened in some measure because of the arrangement. But this can certainly give impetus to their development and will absolutely be advantageous to the overall development of China. We are of course certain of this. How can this be perceived as appealing for favour from the Mainland, relying on the Mainland and being a parasite? Absolutely not.

We strongly believe that co-operative development of this type will bring mutual benefits, bringing the advantages of both sides to full play while supplementing each other's deficiencies and give play to the superiority of market liberalization. This is certain. For this reason, I think we must fathom this concept out. If we have already cast aside that isolation and wary mentality adopted at the early stage after the reunification, and if we really mean to embrace "one country, two systems" and capitalize on the prevailing new opportunities, I think all of us must get rid of these obstacles in thinking.

President, today, the Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development attends the debate of this motion on behalf of the Government, however, the scope of co-operation between the two places definitely is not confined to economic development. Earlier on, the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB) conducted a relatively comprehensive study, and the report is titled "From exploration to full co-operation — development of relationship between Hong Kong and the Mainland over the past decade after reunification and the way forward" ("從探索走向全面合作 — 回歸十年香港與內地關係的發展與前瞻"). In the report, we include studies on the development of co-operative relationship between Hong Kong and the Mainland on the political, economic and socio-cultural fronts. Conclusions have been drawn on the experience in the past decade, providing an analysis on the challenges and hurdles we may encounter in the near future. We have at the same time put forward 19 proposals for the reinforcement of the co-operative relationship.

Colleagues from the DAB will elaborate some of the proposals put forth in the report shortly. I hope Honourable colleagues will also give their valuable opinions. Thank you, President.

Mr Jasper TSANG moved the following motion: (Translation)

"That, as Hong Kong's relationship with the Mainland is increasingly close since its reunification with the Motherland, and experience has proved that enhancing co-operation between the two places can bring about a mutually beneficial and win-win effect, this Council urges the Government to continue to develop its co-operative relationship with the Mainland on all fronts, and set up a co-operation mechanism which is permanent and authoritative, covering more areas and levels, to undertake overall planning, co-ordination and policy formulation on important issues concerning co-operative development."

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

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Three Members will move amendments to this motion. The motion and the three amendments will now be debated together in a joint debate.

I will call upon Ms Emily LAU to speak first, to be followed by Ms Audrey EU and Mr Albert HO; but no amendments are to be moved at this stage by the three Members.

MS EMILY LAU (in Cantonese): President, rightly as Mr Jasper TSANG said just now, since it has been 10 years since the handover of sovereignty, this is the right time to sum up and see how "one country, two systems" and a "high degree of autonomy" have been implemented. I also heard Mr Jasper TSANG say that his motion does not focus on the economy alone, but I have no idea why the authorities..... We certainly welcome Secretary MA, but he had stayed at the meeting for long hours yesterday and here he comes again this morning. There should not be only one Secretary attending this meeting.

President, as I can see from the script of this meeting, the officer responsible for replying to the previous motion should be the Secretary for Home Affairs (that is, the younger brother of Mr Jasper TSANG), which has been written in the script. However, it turned out to be Stephen LAM. The change must have been made by the Government after the script was finalized. But why is Stephen LAM not attending today's debate? President, he is responsible for Mainland affairs. Yet, this is a matter for the authorities. I wonder if Secretary Frederick MA can give a response on behalf of the whole Administration on all fronts, just as Mr Jasper TSANG has said.

The motion moved by Mr Jasper TSANG states clearly that development on all fronts is required, so the amendment moved by me is only a small part of it. While he called for communication and co-operation with the Mainland, I raised the point that co-operation had been denied against our wish. President, not to mention co-operation, we are not allowed to even utter a sound. Why? Over the past decade, there has been no communication, no negotiation and no Home Visit Permits (HVPs). What is more ironic is that, while activities like the "Celebration of 1st July Reunification" have been organized recently, the Democratic Party suddenly announced that a number of its District Council members were not allowed to return to the Mainland. Is this the way to foster a good atmosphere? Is this the way to promote harmony? I therefore proposed an addition to Mr TSANG's motion, calling on our authorities and the Central Authorities to issue HVPs to all Hong Kong residents. People who return to the Mainland after committing offences should, of course, be arrested. If this is not the case, why would a Chinese national not issued with a HVP?

On the other hand, I also called on the Central Authorities to communicate with "the legislature and political parties in Hong Kong", and develop a "normal working relationship". President, what will be the result in the end? The SAR and the Mainland will have a normal relationship. Why is their relationship not normal at present? Because it is very difficult for any Legislative Council delegation to visit the Mainland. But is it entirely impossible? No, an exception was the visit led by Donald TSANG in 2005. Also, LAU Kong-wah had been so lucky to lead another delegation to the Mainland soon after he had returned, and he was even addressed as "Chairman Kong". The visit was followed by another delegation's visit, and that is all. CHOY So-yuk also wished to organize one, but she failed eventually. She asked me afterwards, "Since you are not going, shall we go by ourselves then?" I said, "Fine, just go

ahead. I don't want to stand in others' way." The visit, however, fell through. Therefore, this amendment has something to do with that of Ms Audrey EU's.

There are issues which we would like to discuss with the Central Authorities direct, but not via the authorities. Frankly speaking, excuse me, we but not the authorities are representatives of public opinion, so this legislature should be able to discuss with the Mainland. If even this legislature is unable to communicate..... Why did we leave the Chamber for some time during yesterday's meeting, President? It was because an Australian parliamentary delegation came to exchange views with us. This Australian delegation came to this Council and observed the meeting in the public gallery. They also dined upstairs and met with us in Conference Room A. Has any mainland delegation come so far? None at all. They have not taken even half a step into this building. This explains why a normal relationship cannot be built up. Therefore, we hope that this point can be included into the motion.

Yet, what is the framework that makes all these happen? It is "one country, two systems" and a "high degree of autonomy". Earlier on, Mr TSANG mentioned what we should do to resist. In fact, this is not a matter of how to resist. We are as tiny as a pea, whereas the Central Authorities are as gigantic as 10 pandas, so how can we resist them? The Central Authorities can easily crush us with one hand. Given that we are so tiny and fragile, it is hoped that freedom and the rule of law, for instance, which cannot be found on the Mainland, can be safeguarded by all means. President, this is necessary even if we are heading towards an all-front development. But what line should be drawn there? Simply give us a free hand and not to intervene in affairs that we have "a high degree of autonomy".

Turning to intervention, I moved a related motion last year. Although the motion was not passed, we all know that intervention can be found everywhere. Be it the election in March, the forthcoming election in November, the election to be held in September next year or any elections previously held annually, the then Xinhua News Agency or the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the SAR had definitely intervened by co-ordinating and rendering support in various affairs. This is precisely intervention and it has gone beyond the line. Furthermore, there are affairs concerning the Legislative Council. President, someone would ring up the Members or invite them to "tea" in Western District whenever important bills or

motions are discussed, in the hope of teaching them how to vote or "undergoing X-ray checks" for them. President, people from the Liaison Office, who have heavy commitments, had to have a say in someone tiny like me being elected Chairman of the Finance Committee. Sometimes, they even had a say in whether or not voting was required too. President, they have actually gone beyond the line.

So, once the line of "one country, two systems" becomes blurred, I think that the all-front development will be worrying. I have therefore proposed this amendment. However, President, I am worried that my amendment may not be passed. Sometimes, it is very strange to see Members from different political parties state very clearly, either in public or in private, that, "We strongly support your going back to the Mainland, and have conveyed to the Central Authorities that all of you should be able to return to the Mainland." Later on, I will listen to the insightful advice that these Members are going to give. Now that nine Members have pressed the button indicating their wish to speak, I hope that they will tell me why they have been saying one thing but doing another. It is our wish that HVPs will be issued so that we can return to the Mainland together. Even if we are issued with the HVPs, we may not be able to gain good credits. President, in the run-up to election, everything must be factored into the calculations. Why would they bother to "pay lip-service" if they are so calculative?

Mr Albert HO's amendment is even more sensational. He is really very patriotic and it is his wish to see prosperous development in China. He and I had jointly established the China Human Rights Lawyers Concern Group, hoping that China will enjoy the rule of law and democracy. Hence, Mr HO has moved an amendment to help promote development in the Mainland, which definitely echoes the remarks made by Mr TSANG concerning the development of the Mainland on all fronts..... I believe this is necessary in view of the need to converge with the international community. Given that Hong Kong has accumulated plenty of experience in this respect, I believe we are valuable.

I so submit.

MS AUDREY EU (in Cantonese): President, in the original motion, Mr Jasper TSANG mentioned that development "on all fronts" was desired and he went on

to say that "co-operative mechanism..... covering more areas....." has to be set up. When I saw these wordings, I thought his speech would focus on some practical issues. But it turned out that he only queried throughout his speech whether or not Hong Kong people's heart had reunited with China despite the decade-long reunification, and whether the mentality of isolation still prevailed. Also, he said that we should embrace one another sincerely. This is the core value stated by Mr Jasper TSANG in his speech just now.

As I listened to his speech, I thought that the DAB would surely support Ms Emily LAU's amendment, for if a full embrace was called for, how could certain people not be issued with HVPs which gave them access to the Mainland? Why does he not support Ms Emily LAU's amendment which allows communication in some measure between both sides and the development of a normal working relationship, thereby deepening the understanding between both sides? When it comes to embracing each other, in particular, it is unlikely that people will take the initiative to embrace the Government. It is only natural that the Government should take the initiative to embrace the people. I believe Members must understand this order of affair. Therefore, I hope that both the original motion and the amendments will be passed later on. For only by doing so can we uphold the spirit of the original motion proposed by Mr Jasper TSANG, that is, to achieve a genuine embrace and a genuine reunification.

Why do I propose an amendment to the original motion of Mr Jasper TSANG? For when I saw his motion, I thought he would only talk about some practical issues, and I thus proposed to amend his motion in two major areas. First, to change the word "authoritative" to "efficient", meaning effective, meaningful, concrete and fruitful. Why do I say so? For I find the word "authoritative" worrying. Perhaps because of my legal background, I am afraid the word may make people wonder whether this is a constitutional issue. As we are obviously talking about communication, co-operation and mutual benefits under "one country, two systems", why is this authoritative issue brought up out of thin air? Did he mean to create some peculiar legal problem under the constitution of "one country, two systems? So, if an effective co-operative mechanism that can serve the purpose of facilitating co-operation is what he meant, I think it would be more precise to use words like "efficient" or "effective", which can reflect the situation. That is why I have to propose an amendment on this.

Moreover, from my point of view, the so-called on-all-front co-operation between the two places should not be confined to the economy. I very much hope that this can provide a solution to many livelihood issues. Therefore, the other part of my amendment is focused on certain livelihood issues, particularly on those aspects which I have mentioned before, such as issues relating to immigration policy, environment, air quality and food safety. Co-operation in these aspects is badly wanting. Why do I say so?

First, it is about the immigration policy. Since the implementation of 24-hour clearance and the Individual Visit Scheme, movement of residents between the two places has become more rapid. We all know that 150 one-way exit permits are issued on a daily basis. Last year, 54 000 people entered Hong Kong on this permit. This policy is indeed causing far-reaching impact on Hong Kong in areas like population policy, demographic planning and manpower training, and so on. Certainly, politics-wise, there is no room for discussion in Hong Kong at present, for only the Mainland but not Hong Kong can make the decision. However, is negotiation simply out of the question? The issue, in actuality, has significant impact on the development of Hong Kong. So, concerning these issues, could there be co-operation in some measure between both sides?

Cross-boundary marriage between Hong Kong residents and mainlanders is another concern. In 2006, there were 34 500 such cross-boundary marriages. According to the latest figures provided by the Census and Statistics Department, 240 000 Hong Kong residents went to work in the Mainland, showing that the integration of the two places is advancing at flying speed. Moreover, we notice the recent influx of mainland pregnant women into Hong Kong to give birth. The Civic Party is particularly concerned about the fact that many mainland pregnant women, as well as the babies in their wombs, are actually Hong Kong residents because their spouses are Hong Kong residents, they should thus have the right of abode in Hong Kong. However, they are being discriminated against in their access to medical and health care services in particular. The arrangements are punishing to a certain extent, and the appointments they are offered are significantly belated.

Moreover, the recent death of a Hong Kong child boarding on the Mainland from electric shock exposes the problem that a large number of Hong Kong children are sent to boarding houses on the Mainland. In another incident, a 10-year-old girl, DAI Chi-gwan (戴紫珺), was found in Shenzhen

after missing for one day, revealing the problem that some 4 000 children travel across the boundary daily. Actually, there are many problems in this respect, so we have to face them squarely, and co-operation between the two places is required in solving these problems.

On 16 May, I posed a question to the Administration. I asked the Government what measures it had put in place to support families formed by Hong Kong residents and their mainland spouses in terms of housing, health care and child education. But according to the reply given by Secretary Dr York CHOW at the time, we can say that there is no such policy and no support measure at all. It is evident that the policies adopted in Hong Kong and the Mainland fail to cope with the extent and swiftness of the integration taken place over the past decade since the reunification. Later, Members from the Civic Party will explain in their speeches the various aspects of the problems raised by me.

Now, I would like to talk about food safety in particular. This is of course a very important issue, and Mr Alan LEONG will also refer to this later. Recently, many people query whether or not the Government should make new arrangements for pork supply. Could improvement be made in respect of co-operation in food inspection? All these are issues of grave concern to the people of Hong Kong.

Similarly, when it comes to environmental problems, the boundary between the two places will become ineffectual. Actually, many problems, be it related to water, air or waste recovery, and so on, are associated with the co-operation between the two places. Take air pollution as an example. A management plan on the air quality of the Pearl River Delta Region has now been put in place. But many options are still available for consideration. The development of renewable energy and wind power, which we often mention, is a case in point. Though Hong Kong has no capacity to consider developing wind power, how about the Mainland? With regard to natural gas, could natural gas stations or pipelines for shared use be established, so that Hong Kong can use cleaner energy?

Concerning emissions trading between the two places, as many Hong Kong people have set up factories on the Mainland, could these factories be included in the emissions trading scheme in addition to coal-fired power plants?

Could control over greenhouse gases and carbon dioxide be imposed? Though the Secretary may say that many mechanisms have already been put in place and many task forces are examining the issue when he speaks later, the problem is that these mechanisms and task forces are official institutions which the community has no right to participate despite the numerous views they hold. Take vehicles as an example. In Hong Kong, certain types of vehicles are now required to be replaced by Euro III or Euro VI models, but Guangdong Province has not gone that far. So, when those vehicles run on the roads in Hong Kong, they will cause pollution to Hong Kong. What should be done in that case? Regarding certain types of fuel being brought into Hong Kong that may cause more pollution, such as marked oil, could both sides make an effort in Customs control and air pollution?

Concerning the drugs issue which we discussed earlier on, it is said that at various train stations on the Mainland, Hong Kong people, the young people in particular, could obtain drugs very easily. That means the supply of drugs and narcotics are posing serious problem to those areas. Is it an issue which obliges the reinforcement of co-operation between the two places? Indeed, from my point of view, the many problems in this respect involve a lot of practical issues, which will affect the livelihood of Hong Kong people direct.

I propose an amendment to the original motion of Mr Jasper TSANG for I wish to give Honourable colleagues an opportunity to raise questions and give their views to the Government on areas of particular concern to them. I also hope that the co-operation between the two places will not be confined to the official level, but will include the participation of many organizations in the community. I hope Mr Jasper TSANG, the DAB in particular, will support all the amendments, for after studying Mr Albert HO's amendment in detail, I consider, from the stance of the Civic Party, that the content is in full compliance with the policy adopted by the State. As the call for development in democracy and the establishment of a law regime which respects judicial independence and protects the autonomy of the law profession, and so on, is a prime objective and a major premise which State leaders always include in their speeches. Hong Kong, being a corruption-free society and with its respect for the rule of law in particular, is crucial to the development of the Mainland.

The DAB always trumpets about their sense of patriotism. Since all these values are noble, if Hong Kong can put these noble values into practice, it may

influence the Mainland, and China can actually emerge as a superpower peacefully. Why this could not be done? I thus hope that the original motion and all the amendments will be passed later.

Thank you, President.

MR ALBERT HO (in Cantonese): President, after hearing Mr Jasper TSANG's speech just now, I fully agree to one point mentioned by him, and that is, Hong Kong should not adopt a mindset of isolation, wariness or resistance towards the integration between the two sides and the co-operation between the two systems after the reunification under the overriding principles and state policies of "one country, two systems" and a "high degree of autonomy". In fact, this has been the viewpoint of the Democratic Party and I also believe this is the standpoint of many democrats. Precisely because of this, the amendment I propose today should not be seen with dismay or even contempt, criticizing that it is a case of well water trying to encroach upon river water. In fact, the theory of "no intrusion on each other between well water and river water" is precisely a mentality of isolation and mutual resistance.

Hong Kong people are Chinese nationals, having benefited from "one country, two systems". Each one of us should have a nationality concept and a sense of civic responsibility. We should not ask what the country and the Central Government can give Hong Kong. Instead, we should ask what Hong Kong can contribute to the country. In the past, we all thought that Hong Kong could only function as an economic city and Hong Kong's capitalistic free market operation experience could promote the economic reform and opening of our country or even serve as a platform for the economy of our country to converge with the global economy. No one will dispute that. But the question is: Is Hong Kong unable to make further contribution apart from those in economic aspects?

The amendment I propose today is precisely for the purpose of scrutinizing what Hong Kong can contribute to our country from all perspectives. In reality, we can see that in the past 25 years or a quarter of the past century after China's reform and opening, many institutions in the Mainland have in fact been formulated with reference to those in Hong Kong, be it legislation on financial and corporate management, land planning systems or even the delivery models and standards of various professional services. It is, of course, not a wholesale

transplant of Hong Kong's systems, but we can see that the precious experience of Hong Kong has been embedded into them.

DENG Xiaoping's public remarks in 1988 had attracted most attention. He said, "What will happen in the next 50 years?" I think he was referring to the 50 years after 1997. "Now we have a Hong Kong. We have to create a few more Hong Kong in the Mainland as China should further open up in order to achieve our goal of development." These were the remarks of DENG Xiaoping.

So, I put forth my views today because I hope that the Mainland can make reference to Hong Kong's experience in building a democratic system and the rule of law. These words are uttered not out of arrogance, inflation of ego or self-centredness. In our opinion, although the economy of our country is able to maintain a high growth rate at the present development stage, a lot of problems have also emerged, such as a widening wealth gap, corruption, collusion between business and the Government, and money politics. Obviously, there are lots of pressing issues in governance which should be resolved as a matter of urgency, in addition to a need for institutional improvements. And these are the aspects in which Hong Kong can provide its experience as reference for our country in its development.

Madam President, as Ms Audrey EU said just now, national development, democracy and the rule of law are the issues and targets often or frequently mentioned by our State leaders at important state meetings or in their speeches in the presence of foreign guests. Here I will not cite them in detail. Of course, questions such as how to implement these targets, what kind of timetable, what kind of roadmap and what kind of model should be adopted are still pending discussion to be initiated by the State leaders. But I believe people in the Mainland, be they intellectuals, the middle class, the grassroots who have encountered difficulties in living, or even the open-minded and advanced members in the party, all hope that political development will become an important item on the agenda or even an item accorded priority. Precisely because of this, we think it is a timely suggestion that Hong Kong's experience be drawn on.

I, of course, do not think that a small city like Hong Kong is so instrumental in terms of its influence. I am not politically naïve. The political strength of Hong Kong is not comparable or basically not proportional to that of

the Mainland. From the perspective of political reality, the so-called China factor had been a determining consideration in the past few decades before the reunification, not to mention the situation after 1997. At that time, the China factor was decisive. Even the proposal of Governor Mark YOUNG after the war was also aborted due to the disapproval of the Chinese Government. From the 1988 direct elections, we could see that the British Government had been trying its best in telling us that no proposal would be endorsed regardless of its merits unless it could converge with the Basic Law. This is a reality, no matter you like it or not. This is the reality. After the reunification, it has been clearly explained by the National People's Congress in its interpretation of the Basic Law that it is impossible to trigger the relevant mechanism under the Basic Law without the approval of the Central Authorities. This is the political reality, no matter you like it or not. We are all aware that the Central Authorities factor or the Beijing factor after the reunification is also a very crucial determinant. Despite that, Hong Kong people should continue to strive for our goal. We should continue to lobby the Central Authorities and reflect the public opinion. We are obliged to do so. And this is also an essential part of the democratization process, albeit this is the experience of Hong Kong as a part of China fighting for democratization.

Having discussed the issue for so long, I wish to point out one thing, that is, the Central Authorities and Hong Kong will influence each other although the Central Authorities play a decisive role. I also hope that the Central Government can publish a blueprint and agenda for democratization in the near future. Furthermore, it will, as it is in Hong Kong, allow all people in the country to discuss how to develop democracy, including such details as the model, roadmap and timetable to be adopted. To be pragmatic, I do not expect that the 1.3 billion people in the country as a whole will be given the right of "one person, one vote" over night. But this is a pressing issue which should be discussed by the country as a whole. If so, the Hong Kong experience may be of great reference value. Many people believe that the Hong Kong experience should not be taken lightly as this is also part of the experience of the country as a whole.

DENG Xiaoping had once said that China should adopt a free economy and open policy in order to bring wealth to various parts of the country. He maintained that some people should be allowed to get rich first before the others were helped to get rich as well. In fact, democratization may be one of such development strategies. In other words, given that Hong Kong, though not a very big city, has accumulated years of experience in striving for

democratization and laid a strong foundation for democratization with a good track record of governance, why can Hong Kong not be allowed to implement democracy first in order to stimulate the democratization of other parts of the country provided that they are also mature and well governed?

Of course, everybody knows that democracy means "one person, one vote". We need the complement of many other institutions, including a sound legal system and independent Judiciary. While it is important to provide a quality and autonomous legal professional service, it is also important to respect the professionalism and autonomy of the law profession. The foundation of our constitution will be flimsy in the absence of such a policy or prerequisite. So, I urge the mainland authorities to nurture more legal talents and respect the legal system as an important starting point. Thank you, President.

MR WONG KWOK-HING (in Cantonese): Madam President, I would like to express my views on the original motion from the perspective of the grassroots' livelihood. According to the original motion, the Government is urged to further develop its co-operative relationship with the Mainland on all fronts. In the wordings of the original motion, there are two major points which are worth mentioning in particular. The first is "co-operation mechanism". What kind of co-operation mechanism does it refer to? It refers to a permanent and authoritative mechanism, covering more areas and levels. Another point is that the Government should undertake overall planning, co-ordination and policy formulation on important issues concerning co-operative development. I think these two are very good proposals and would like to cite several personal examples and experiences in order to illustrate why these are crucial and necessary.

First of all, concerning the transportation infrastructure between the two places, I have recently paid a visit to the Lok Ma Chau Spur Line of the Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation and the Futian Control Point in order to observe the traffic there in a tour organized by the Legislative Council. We saw that the Lok Ma Chau Spur Line had been fully completed and was told that it would be opened on 1 July or in July. But to date, 12 July, the exact commissioning date is still pending. It is not certain whether the Spur Line will be opened by the end of July or August. It is said that the daily loss to be suffered by the Hong Kong side will amount to \$500,000 as long as the Spur Line is not opened. Why has the Spur Line yet to be opened even though

everything, except the northerly wind, is ready? In fact, concerning Lok Ma Chau and Futian Control Point, why has prior consensus between Hong Kong and the Mainland not been forged with a view to achieving a tacit understanding and a smooth connection with the Control Point? As Mr Jasper TSANG has pointed out, I think there is really a lack of an authoritative and permanent co-operative mechanism and there is a need for overall planning and co-ordination in this problem. As a result, what is originally feasible has turned infeasible, thus becoming a laughing stock.

Furthermore, the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, which was first initiated by the mainland authorities, has slid into the back seat because of the apathetic attitude of the high-ranking officials of the SAR Government. If the construction of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge had been commenced earlier, with the complement of the development of the western part of Guangdong Province and the further opening up of Guangxi Province, it would have been advantageous to Hong Kong in terms of exploring more business opportunities and creating more job opportunities. However, the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, though a good project, has been strewn with setbacks. In a Question and Answer Session held recently, the Chief Executive mentioned that military considerations might be involved in the construction of the infrastructure. We were shocked by such unexpected news. Why has such a good proposal been stalled for so long? Why has the Government failed to make overall planning at an earlier time? Where is our co-operation mechanism? Given that the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge has been delayed for so long and the landing point remains uncertain, how can it tie in with the further development of Lantau Island? This is the second example which is very conspicuous to us.

The third example is also an obvious problem illustrating why the two places are unable to further their amicable co-operative relationship. This is about vegetables and fruits exported to Hong Kong from Shenzhen. The Mainland has formulated a whole set of..... we have paid a visit to the Shenzhen Entry-Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau and learnt from a dialogue between us that the Mainland has formulated a system which is more comprehensive to perfect the inspection and quarantine system for vegetables and fruits exported to Hong Kong. Each consignment, under the new system, will be sealed by lead and each truck will be inspected before being allowed to pass the control point to Hong Kong. Unfortunately, however, measures of the SAR Government at Man Kam To cannot tie in with this. First, it is said that there is a lack of

relevant legislation; second, it is said that manpower is lacking. Is this not a laughing stock to the public? While the Mainland has implemented a whole host of measures for protecting the safe consumption of vegetables by Hong Kong people and the SAR Government has always reiterated that it is necessary to communicate with the Mainland, why has consensus not been reached at the earliest opportunity? After the Mainland has launched a set of improved policies and measures, the Hong Kong side is still slow in responding to the situation or even unaware of the situation. Meanwhile, the enactment of the food safety law has to be delayed for another year. What should we do?

So, even though Secretary Frederick MA is attending the meeting today, there are endless questions for him which are not expected to be fully answered and require inter-departmental discussions. I do not know whether today's original motion can be passed, but these questions have to be addressed.

Let me cite another example which is about the portability of welfare. In addition to the "fruit grant" which has been a controversial topic, there are various kinds of welfare which are all subject to the 240-day absence limit. Moreover, the relevant scheme has been extended to Guangdong and Fujian only. Why can the scheme not be further extended so that the recipients can choose a permanent residence anywhere in the whole country to spend their retirement years? All these problems should be dealt with. So, we very much hope that the SAR Government can listen to our voices and see the importance and necessity of issues raised in the original motion. Thank you, Madam President.

MR ANDREW LEUNG (in Cantonese): Madam President, 10 years after the reunification, the tie between Hong Kong and the Mainland is increasingly close, and their economic and social development is actually closely related. With regard to the motion proposed by Mr Jasper TSANG today, both the Federation of Hong Kong Industries (FHKI) and I considered it conducive to further discussion on the co-operative relationship between the two places among members of the public. It also offers a good opportunity for officials of the new term Government to expound on the future direction of its co-ordination and co-operation with the Mainland.

By sheer coincidence, the FHKI submitted a proposal "Supporting the Development of Hong Kong Industry in the Pearl River Delta (PRD)" to the Chief Executive last week, which sets out a number of recommendations to

strengthen the economic co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland. I also mentioned this proposal in the Chief Executive's Question and Answer Session last week, and we were so delighted to hear the Chief Executive state that consideration would be made of the pragmatic recommendations set out in the proposal with the officials concerned in a proactive manner.

Madam President, a total of four concrete recommendations have been made in the FHKI's proposal. Apart from the long-standing suggestion to build Hong Kong's brands; support the entry of Hong Kong industries into the mainland market; set up an Environmental Industrial Park for electroplating factories in the major cities in the PRD Region, and assist the industry support organizations in strengthening their support for manufacturers in the PRD Region, so as to help them upgrade their technology and design and move up the value chain, there is also the proposed establishment of a standing body to assist and co-ordinate matters relating to industrial development and Hong Kong manufacturers in the Mainland.

The industrial sector of Hong Kong has all along called on the Government to strengthen co-operation with the Mainland. This is not only because our industries have invested heavily on the Mainland, but more importantly, an inseparable relationship has been developed between the development of the Mainland (especially the PRD) and the economic development of Hong Kong. As I stated in my speech here last month on the resolution concerning the reorganization of Policy Bureaux, a total of 57 500 factories in the PRD Region are set up by Hong Kong manufacturers, and the majority of them are using producer services offered by Hong Kong companies. Since half of our Gross Domestic Product is contributed by the productivity of Hong Kong manufacturers in the PRD, the FHKI therefore proposed the setting up of a standing Hong Kong Industry Development Committee to promote the sustainable development of industries in Hong Kong, to co-ordinate the work of the bureaux concerned so as to minimize the possibility of conflicting policies or mismatch, and to plan and handle matters that may influence Hong Kong manufacturers' operation in the Mainland, with a view to arranging for plans, co-ordination and policies in a holistic manner. We think that this committee can be incorporated into Mr Jasper TSANG's proposed mechanism.

In recent years, policies formulated by either the State or various local governments to, say, perfect the industrial structure, tighten the environmental

requirements and impose restrictions on the so-called "two intensive and one high" industries¹, have been implemented in a very hasty manner. Many mainland manufacturers were caught by surprise when these policies were introduced. The development committee designed by the FHKI is mainly tasked to negotiate with the Guangdong Provincial Government and the relevant ministries and commissions of the Central Authorities to establish communication channels, through which the trade can have more opportunities to engage in talks and exchange views with the relevant parties at the earliest time possible in respect of the new policies and laws that may affect Hong Kong manufacturers' business operation in the Mainland. This will ensure smooth co-operation of the cross-boundary industries between Hong Kong and the Mainland, with a view to achieving sustainable expansion.

Given that the Guangdong Provincial Government has changed its policy on processing trade over the past year, many Hong Kong-owned enterprises engaging in processing with supplied materials wish to transform into "three foreign invested enterprises"² (FIE). However, since many of these manufacturers are small and medium enterprises, they have no idea how such transformation should start. In fact, in the middle of last year, the FHKI already conveyed to the relevant mainland authorities at all levels the trade's wish for various local authorities to establish one-stop service centres to handle the applications concerned, so as to expedite the vetting and approval of applications and the provision of policy guidance.

Recently, the FHKI learned that a trial run has been conducted by the customs authorities of Shawan, Shenzhen, whereby two factories have successfully transformed from factories for processing with supplied materials into FIE within a short time without suspension in production. We noted that this trial run is being examined by the Beijing Customs. Once approved, it can be implemented throughout Guangdong Province. However, the transformation of enterprises also involves other bureaux and ministries relating to trade, tax and even foreign exchange. The FHKI hopes that the SAR Government will help Hong Kong manufacturers communicate with the mainland authorities concerned, with a view to expeditiously identifying the simplest way of transformation at one stop.

¹ Industries that are capital-intensive, resource-intensive and high energy consuming.

² Namely equity joint venture, co-operative joint venture and wholly foreign owned enterprises.

At the end of last month, the Hong Kong Economic and Trade Office in Guangdong (GDETO) and the Dongguan Municipal Government jointly organized the "Driving Industrial Upgrade among Hong Kong-Dongguan Forum". The Dongguan Vice Mayor stated at the Forum that Hong Kong manufacturers should continue to make good use of the comprehensive support facilities provided by the local industries, face up to the policy adjustments in the Mainland's processing trade in a proactive manner, and seize every opportunity to upgrade themselves and transform towards high value-added industries. To this end, a task force has been established by the local municipal government to study the difficulties encountered by the enterprises and suggest solutions to them. He also stated that regular meetings would be held with representatives of Hong Kong's major trade associations and the GDETO to discuss problems arising in the course of transformation. In view of the fact that even a municipal government of the Mainland is so committed to helping the transformation of Hong Kong manufacturers, so the FHKI considered that more should be done by the SAR Government. Negotiations with the mainland departments should be made through a standing body so as to expedite the promotion of domestic sales, with a view to contributing to the economies of both the country and Hong Kong and achieving a win-win situation.

With these remarks, Madam President, I support the motion.

MR CHEUNG HOK-MING (in Cantonese): Madam President, the HKSAR Government has just organized a grand celebration of its 10th birthday. The experience of Hong Kong during the past decade is quite like the weather not long ago, when there was sunshine amid showers. Despite the ups and downs, we weathered the difficulties eventually. This reminds me of the proverb, "One has fallen and gotten back on his feet many times in the course of a decade".

Over the past 10 years, Hong Kong has been leveraging on the Mainland for support. There were actually plenty of chances for us to get back on our feet, which had enabled our economy to gradually overcome the economic hardships arising from the Asian financial turmoil and SARS. However, insofar as cross-boundary infrastructural co-operation between the Governments of Hong Kong and China is concerned, no breakthrough has been made to the less than satisfactory situation after all. Large-scale infrastructure projects

which we often mention, such as the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link and the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, are still on the drawing board with slow progress. This has really made me feel very disappointed.

I believe there can be no denying by the Governments of Hong Kong and China that the boundary control points between them are now the busiest in the world. As shown by the figures of Hong Kong's Transport Department in 2006, the average daily cross-boundary flow of people was about 440 000 person trips, which represented a significant increase of nearly 280 000 person trips when compared with the 163 000 person trips a decade ago. For vehicles, the average daily throughput of cross-boundary vehicles was 41 000 vehicle trips in 2006, which also represented an increase of 17 000 vehicle trips when compared with the 23 000 vehicle trips a decade ago. Furthermore, cargoes exported from the Pearl River Delta (PRD) via Hong Kong, amounting to about \$2,000 billion, also accounted for 39% of the total exports. Madam President, the above figures demonstrated that the flow of people and cargoes between the two places are skyrocketing.

I agree that, after the reunification, we now have better co-ordination and communication in respect of both places' infrastructural planning than that of the era of the British Hong Kong Government. However, when it comes to implementation, we are like a child learning to walk and every move is difficult. This may be attributable to the need for integration arising from the differences in culture and system between government officials of the two places. I therefore consider that it is now most imperative for the two Governments to seriously face the crux of the problem and join hands to find a win-win solution for this is the best strategy to promote cross-boundary infrastructural co-operation.

At present, not only is the cost of crossing the boundary high, the time required is excessively long too. It would therefore be a laudable measure if co-location of immigration and customs clearance can be implemented at the control points. On the 1 July just passed, State President HU Jintao officiated the opening of the Hong Kong-Shenzhen Western Corridor — the first boundary control point implementing the co-location arrangement. It signifies the development of more convenient and speedy flows of people and cargo between the two places. The DAB hopes that the authorities could expedite the pace of development by increasing the number of control points implementing the

co-location arrangement, expediting the integration with the Mainland by the establishment of an electronic platform for customs clearance, and introducing such measures as single clearance for the 16 customs authorities in the Pan-PRD Region. This will remove the obstacles in expeditious economic development of the two places, thereby creating an environment conducive to better economic and trade co-operation.

Madam President, insofar as hardware is concerned, the two Governments should expeditiously implement such large-scale cross-boundary infrastructure projects as the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link and the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, with a view to linking up the rail and land transport networks of the two places. The DAB opines that to achieve these ends, an inter-departmental co-ordination mechanism of a higher level should be established to formulate comprehensive development strategies for cross-boundary transport infrastructure with a forward-looking attitude and a new mindset for promoting regional development. Not only can it co-ordinate the relevant infrastructure projects in a more effective way, it can also examine different viable options for optimizing the existing mode of cross-boundary infrastructural development and advancing the planning lead time of the projects concerned, thus further enhancing our communication and co-operation with the State ministries or commissions responsible for transport infrastructure and governments of the neighbouring regions as well. Only through this can the sluggish development in large-scale cross-boundary infrastructure projects be improved.

Once the land transport connecting the two places is opened up, what follows is the integration of air service between the two places. This requires strengthened co-ordination and co-operation between Hong Kong and the five airports in the PRD Region, so as to promote the development of the aviation sectors of Hong Kong and China. It is also necessary to further optimize the current regional airspace design, standardize the interface and protocols of air traffic control systems, and establish additional air paths for civil aviation between the PRD and the northern and the eastern parts of the Mainland, with a view to enhancing the efficiency of air freight management in the Pan-PRD Region. Furthermore, co-ordination among different regional ports within the PRD Region would be improved to avoid duplication of infrastructure and wastage.

Madam President, next I wish to urge the SAR Government again to expeditiously implement another infrastructure project, the Eastern Corridor. In fact, a site at Liantang, the border of Shenzhen, has been reserved by the Shenzhen authorities a long time ago for the construction of a control point. Heung Yuen Wai of Hong Kong, on the contrary, still remains an abandoned lot to date. The SAR Government has stated time and again that it would take two more years before the relevant consultation and development planning could be completed. Given that we are now in an era of time being money, the SAR Government's conservative and backward mindset in planning will definitely make Hong Kong miss another chance of developing in tandem with the State. Therefore, the SAR Government must take proactive actions to expedite the development plan of the Eastern Corridor control point at full steam, so that it will come into operation at the earliest time and enable the eastern and western sides of Hong Kong and Shenzhen to genuinely achieve "connection to the West and expansion to the East", thereby promoting better development of the logistics industry in Hong Kong.

With these remarks, Madam President, I support the motion.

MR LAU WONG-FAT (in Cantonese): Madam President, it has been 10 full years since Hong Kong reunited with the Motherland. A few days ago, in Hong Kong, State President HU Jintao prompted Hong Kong to enhance its economic co-operation with the Mainland. Today, in this Council, a similar motion is proposed. But on second thought, this is indeed quite disappointing. The truth is that, in the past decade, the development of the co-operative relationship between the SAR Government and the Mainland obviously fell far behind the actual situation and did not correspond to the geographic proximity and constitutional relationship between the two places.

Why did this happen? What made this happen? I believe this situation should be attributed in large measure to the mentality of many Hong Kong people, government officials in particular. Undeniably, on 1 July 1997, Hong Kong reunited with China officially. However, certain officials on transition with the change of sovereignty still held onto the "Big Hong Kong" superiority complex, failing to convert and adapt to the new situation. I can say without hesitation that, for some time after 1997, the SAR Government had been staying aloof from co-operation with the Mainland, even trying to hide and dodge somehow. At that time, many mainland officials criticized the SAR

Government for being arrogant and holding high its nose, the criticism was not unjustified. In this way, we have missed many opportunities.

In hindsight, the knock-on effect of the financial crisis and the SARS outbreak, which had cooled down Hong Kong people who got carried away, made Hong Kong people more humble and down to earth. Without this, it remains most doubtful that the co-operative relationship between the two places will be steered in the right direction as it takes now.

Madam President, let bygones be bygones. We should now look forward to the future. Mr Jasper TSANG's urge on the Government to develop its co-operative relationship with the Mainland on all fronts carries significant meaning in reality.

We must advance at full speed and welcome this with open arms in order to recover our lost ground. Only through this can the economic development of Hong Kong be escalated to a new platform. Past experience, if not forgotten, is a guide for the future. Regarding the co-operation between the two places, we have to do away with the previous mentality and unite our mentality on a new front. Enhancing co-operative development with the Mainland is the guiding principle. Hong Kong, leveraging on the Mainland, enjoys an advantage that many other districts and countries envy. If we fail to fully capitalize on this advantage, but confine ourselves to our own restrictions, we are ruining ourselves.

In the inauguration ceremony of the SAR Government of the third term, the Chief Executive made this remark, he said, "I strongly believe that the next ten years will be a golden decade to be shared by the State and Hong Kong." I consider this remark most meaningful. Our country is on peaceful emergence, and this strong trend cannot be stopped. The dawn of the great age of China banks on the present. It is indisputable that our country will enjoy the golden decade in future. But whether Hong Kong can share this with our country, it depends on whether or not Hong Kong will let slip the opportunities. For this reason, I suggest that the Government should set up a department of higher level to specialize in studying and promoting co-operation with the Mainland on all fronts.

With these remarks, Madam President, I support the motion.

MR LEE WING-TAT (in Cantonese): President, I have been listening very attentively to Mr Jasper TSANG's remarks earlier. I believe there are certain principles that I and the Democratic Party must spell out.

First, we disagree with, and even oppose, the isolation or segregation mentality which breaks off our relationship with our country. Indeed, Mr Jasper TSANG is aware that we were the first group in the democratic camp to support the reunification. Our love of the country is much deeper than many people who turned patriotic overnight in the '80s and '90s and pledged their support to the Government. Some people may criticize us, this very group of people, for being "naive" and our affection for our nation too primeval. However, when we heard some critics say that we tried to isolate Hong Kong from our country, we were indeed saddened. For in our view, we have not taken this attitude. Had we adopted such an attitude, we would not have for any reason supported the reunification right from the early '80s. Besides, we were the forerunners in the democratic camp who supported the reunification back then.

In the past decade or two, our country has made remarkable development, heading for a well-off society which will grow more affluent in future. This is indeed our aspiration. Many people told me, perhaps some people have said on the radio before, that when they saw the economy of China fare well, the athletes of China win golden medals in the Olympics or the spaceship of China rocket into space, they would feel very proud. I too feel very proud. But I have to tell Mr Jasper TSANG, my senior at St. Paul's College, one thing. Actually, Chinese do not only feel proud because of the economic development and technological advancement of China. These are of course important, but sometimes, I think that if our country is recognized by the international community as a member of the global village who has a good economy, respects environmental protection and holds onto the so-called universal values, I will feel prouder. By then, I will be particularly proud of being a Chinese. If I see that demonstrations calling for the release of political dissidents by our country are no longer staged during visits of the State President to Sweden, the United States to exchange views and France, I will be extremely proud then.

Therefore, from our point of view, we surely support our country in achieving sound economic development, scaling new heights with interactive promotional efforts. However, we should not say, unilaterally or superficially, that good economic development means everything to the country. As State

President HU Jintao said, in future, the State will have to be people-based and aim for democracy and the rule of law.

What role can Hong Kong play? I think Hong Kong's role is not confined to the economic aspect. I believe the incumbent leaders of the State have many other considerations about the role of Hong Kong. Concerning certain institutions of Western societies, such as the rule of law, freedom or press freedom, and even democracy, it is difficult for the Mainland to copy and adapt within a short time. Therefore, Hong Kong is a good place where the Mainland can learn to master these institutions gradually by observing their operation in Hong Kong. Hence, we should not underrate the function of Hong Kong.

Concerning this issue, I think Members should consider it in a holistic manner. Some people say that the democratic camp dislikes China's intervention intensely. Actually, this is not a matter of likes or dislikes. If the intervention is good in nature, there is no reason we would not welcome it. However, we learnt from the news of the arrest of CHING Cheong and that many Hong Kong small businessmen investing in the Pearl River Delta or the Mainland had to pay ransom under duress owing to the inadequacies of the laws and regulations. With regard to the case of ZHOU Zhengyi, the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) of Hong Kong had indeed invited Mr ZHOU Zhengyi to provide information, but he was sentenced to imprisonment by the Mainland. He was arrested again after release and cannot be extradited back to Hong Kong so far. Actually, we should also consider these incidents.

I once received a long letter from a friend, but I am not sure whether or not he is a delegate of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference. He wrote about the ZHOU Zhengyi incident and asked whether I thought ZHOU Zhengyi should stand trial here in Hong Kong. In fact, in Hong Kong, many listed companies are State assets, and even the major directors are those people. If this case, or these cases, is allowed to run its course, how can Hong Kong become an international financial centre? If, only because of this consideration, we are stigmatized as worrying about the intervention of the State and trying to isolate Hong Kong, I think this presumption of Mr Jasper TSANG is too harsh.

Recently, the Democratic Party has conducted a survey. Honestly, this survey certainly is not fully scientific, for it is difficult for us to approach our

mainland compatriots to do the survey. A group of proactive members from the Party wishes to gauge the views of our mainland compatriots on the institutions of Hong Kong. We are shocked by the findings of the survey. We only interviewed some people we knew were in Hong Kong on DIY tours from the Mainland at certain tourist spots. Among the interviewees, some 40% to 50% (45% to 50%) considered it suitable for Hong Kong to implement a democratic constitutional system. This finding is quite encouraging. They considered systems in Hong Kong worth learning. This viewpoint was supported by many, a high proportion, of these interviewees. Therefore, I think our mainland compatriots are in fact aware that certain things in Hong Kong are better than theirs in cities and villages on the Mainland, which is not surprising.

Hong Kong has its own course of development. In the '50s and 60's, some policemen did not pay when they bought fruits. But this situation is no longer found here now. What about the Mainland? Certainly, I am not referring to the buying of fruits; I mean the large number of corruption cases. The ICAC in Hong Kong is doing a good job, which can be an example to the Mainland, and this is not a problem.

I think, sometimes, we need not say that there are some superior institutions in Hong Kong now and force our country to follow us. This is perhaps the great banner held high by those proponents of theories of intervention and isolation. Indeed, if there is something good in a certain place, we should learn it. If there is something good on the Mainland, we should learn it. The other way round, if there is something good in Hong Kong, the Mainland should also learn it. If there is something good overseas, we should also learn it. But for the bad things overseas, we definitely should not copy.

Therefore, in all fairness, I hope that this viewpoint depicting in an exaggerating manner folks from the democratic camp as so-called isolationists will not spread continuously.

Thank you, President.

MR WONG YUNG-KAN (in Cantonese): President, regarding the motion "Developing co-operative relationship with the Mainland" moved by Mr Jasper TSANG today, in fact, my constituency has been establishing ties with the

Mainland since as early as the '50s and '60s. The regions that have established this kind of relationship include Hong Kong and Macao.

Members may well know that the Hong Kong waters are limited. The mainland authorities have been assisting Hong Kong fishermen to fish in the mainland waters, rendering them able to make a living, the industry to survive and the people of Hong Kong to have quality fish to eat. Similarly, the mainland authorities have set up a register to properly manage these fishermen, and dedicated specific authorities to help them solve problems relating to fishery workers, diesel fuel and sales of fishery produce. Hence, as far as my industry is concerned, communication between the two places has started since the '50s and '60s. From this we can certainly see that we have a better understanding of the development of Hong Kong society.

On the other hand, a lot has been done on food safety by our mainland counterparts. I remember when malachite green was first discovered in fish, the DAB and the New Territories Association of Societies went to Beijing and I personally wrote a letter to Mr DU Qinglin, the Minister of Agriculture. Ten days after receipt of my letter, he replied, agreeing with my viewpoint, that work on regulation of fish farms and control at-source have to be properly carried out, and he immediately sent several working teams to conduct investigation in the regions concerned to verify whether what we had claimed was true. However, Hong Kong has never, over the past 10-odd years, discovered problems relating to the use of medicine in aquaculture. This indeed serves to play an exemplary role to the Mainland, compelling the latter to step up their management standard for aquaculture in these few years. Since the establishment of the Centre for Food Safety by the Government, work has been done more systematically, not only because this involves food safety, but also the development of an industry.

Colleagues said just now that it is difficult for them to go to the Mainland. I remember the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) organized a government-led study visit, during which two Members here (including Mr Fred LI and I) both commended an aquaculture university. We went to see the development of the fishery industry in the Mainland, learning how the university helped the industry in conducting scientific research, including the culturing methods in the Mainland. I do not know whether this should be regarded as communication or reciprocity, except that as long as we do not understand, we have to observe more. I find this a very good approach. Moreover, communication and liaison between the mainland authorities and government departments in Hong Kong are more frequent now than in the past.

I echo Mr Jasper TSANG's view, that in the early days after the reunification, it was difficult to ask Hong Kong officials to go to the Mainland for communication. It was indeed very difficult to do so. The industry to which I belong often encounters this problem. Even if invitations were sent out, they were not accepted, not even those made to officer-grade officials. We had to rely on ourselves to liaise with the Mainland or invite mainland officials to come to Hong Kong. Relevant departments in Hong Kong, having learnt that mainland officials will come here, might meet them in the event venue, but this is not direct liaison.

However, this practice has begun to change in these few years. Mainland officials come to Hong Kong more frequently and Hong Kong officials also pay frequent visits to the north. They complement each other through exchange of views. I believe that this is conducive to the development of the industry and the people (including the food safety aspect). This has been a big step forward. I hope the community can see this side of the story.

Moreover, we have been proposing the idea of an agricultural test base to the Government in the past two years. In fact, the SAR Government has already done some work on this during this interim and is now discussing the matter with relevant departments on the Mainland. Meanwhile, the industry is also discussing this issue. It is hoped that through concerted efforts by all parties, those pig farmers who have surrendered their pig farm licences can continue as soon as possible their pig rearing businesses in the Mainland and plough back to Hong Kong society by supplying food produced under the supervision of the two governments to Hong Kong. I hold that this is the best approach because if we can do a good job of this, it will bring multiple benefits to the people of Hong Kong.

On 1 July, the 10th anniversary of our reunification, I know that it was the first time the AFCD has invited the Director of the Oceans and Fisheries Bureau to give a speech on fishery policy in the Mainland to a certain committee. It was the first time. At that time, a number of Members, including Mr Fred LI, Mr Vincent FANG and I, were present at the meeting. We were given a clear picture of the current practice on the Mainland. This is useful to colleagues and members of the public who were not very clear about the situation. They could at least know what it was all about, recognizing that there could be multiple approaches rather than giving the go-ahead or halt by superficial judgement. I thus hope that communication between the places can be more frequent particularly on certain subjects.

Sometimes, secondary and primary students would come to my office to interview me. The first question I put to them was on their views of the Mainland. Some of them were university students. They knew that I belong to the fishery industry. I told them that they had to go more often to the Mainland to gain a better understanding of our country, its development and what it has gone through, rather than judging matters from a single perspective. This is my personal view.

President, I so submit.

PROF PATRICK LAU (in Cantonese): President, in relation to developing the co-operative relationship with the Mainland, in the past year, we had an economic summit on China's 11th Five-Year Plan and the Development of Hong Kong, during which views were drawn from different sectors of society. I had a good communication in the focus group on professional services, from which I realized that Hong Kong has to make good use of the opportunity offered by the development of the Mainland and ride on this momentum to avoid being marginalized. It is very important that we can make use of the time, our advantageous location and the people.

I agree that the Government should develop and actively promote co-operation with the mainland authorities. This, on the one hand, can respond to the positioning of the Hong Kong strategy by the State in the 11th Five-Year Plan and enhance Hong Kong's competitiveness in the international arena and in the region, and on the other hand, this can facilitate exchanges of views on development between the Mainland and Hong Kong, enable a clear evaluation of our situation, enhance each other's advantages and continuously upgrade our strength.

Recommendations coming out of the Economic Summit on China's 11th Five-Year Plan and the Development of Hong Kong are a good start to let new elements continuously fuel the co-operation of CEPA. Last week, the Commission on Strategic Development (the Commission) published its Further Liberalization Measures in 2007, announcing further liberalization measures on services and trade in goods and an expansion of the scope of mutual recognition of professional qualifications. This precisely demonstrated not only the feasibility of interaction and co-operation, but also the importance for the Government to undertake overall planning, co-ordination and policy formulation on important issues.

As numerous such projects have been recommended, of which many require discussion with the mainland authorities to examine the legislative amendments together, the Government should assume a leading role not only as the authority to execute them, but also to co-ordinate, adjust and monitor the progress of the co-operation mechanism.

A good co-operative mechanism needs a channel to regularly absorb public opinions from the two sides. Instead of paying lip-service, follow-up actions also need to be taken. This kind of co-operation has been restricted to economic and other public affairs. I hold that the Government has been too passive, coupled with the fact that the vetting and approval procedures are too cumbersome and lacking in transparency, which have resulted in delay in progress.

Take town planning as an example, the Central Authorities have stressed in the 11th Five-Year Plan "the facilitation of a co-ordinated regional development" and "the promotion of a healthy development of cities". I hold that — I also mentioned this last year — the Hong Kong Government has not been proactive enough in complementing this, resulting in delay in the progress. The Government has been working on the report of the "Hong Kong 2030: Planning Vision and Strategy" for a long time. To date, it is still not yet released and is unable to keep up with the planning progress of Shenzhen. If we cannot do a good job in regional co-ordination as promulgated in the 11th Five-Year Plan, how can we not fall behind others? I thus agree very much that the Government should, as the motion has proposed, set up a co-operation mechanism which is permanent and covers more levels, and most importantly, make good use of it.

Returning to the professional sector, Hong Kong as an international financial, commercial and maritime centre has to be supported by diversified professional services of a high and international standard. Hong Kong's professional services sector — in particular the four sectors, namely, the legal, accounting, construction and related engineering trades and health care — holds a leading position in the region.

However, we cannot lower our guard because the development of the Mainland is advancing with each passing day and competition is becoming globalized. Not only should we keep up with our efforts, but also actively push forward for space for and tacit agreement on co-operation with the Mainland,

and further develop Hong Kong's professional services, for example, formulating measures to attract professionals to come and stay in Hong Kong and to foster them. This responds to an issue I mentioned before, that is, the overall image of our city. That is to say, to attract professionals to stay and work in Hong Kong and to attract overseas talents, we need to have a desirable city. To do so, our air quality, living environment and attractiveness of our city all need to be improved. We have to face this issue squarely and continue to publicize and promote the brand name of Hong Kong, in particular the high quality and professional ethics that have kept the competitive edge of our professional services.

Regarding construction and related engineering trades, to cope with the demand for urban construction and development in the Mainland, the Government should step up support for the sector in the Mainland, for instance, by choosing some secondary cities and providing them with "one-stop" integrated services, and publicizing and promoting Hong Kong's edge on construction and related service professions, so as to help them set up business in the Mainland and expand their market. Meanwhile, the Government should also promote co-operation in construction and related service professions of the two places so as to enhance, on the basis of advantage reciprocity, each others' competitiveness, develop together the potential in the Mainland, and open up the international market.

Summing up the reasons above, I agree that a permanent co-operative mechanism covering more levels be set up by the Government to complement the 11th Five-Year Plan, and to bring into full play the vital role of overall planning, co-ordination and policy formulation.

I so submit. Thank you, President.

MISS CHOY SO-YUK (in Cantonese): President, today, I will only express the views of the DAB on the enhancement of co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland in environmental protection.

Actually, when it comes to development in environmental protection, I believe even if I am allowed to speak for an hour, I will find it inadequate. However, given the time constraint, I will quickly state in brief the efforts we can make in several aspects.

In 1990, the Hong Kong-Guangdong Environmental Protection Liaison Group had already been set up, which was subsequently renamed to the Hong Kong-Guangdong Joint Working Group on Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection. The scope covered by the Joint Working Group includes air quality, specifications of diesel vehicles, forestry conservation, marine resources conservation, water quality maintenance, town planning, environmental protection of the Shenzhen Bay Port area and Dongjiang water quality. This is good. However, it has been 17 years since 1990. Over these years, I have only heard of two practical achievements. First, the two places have laid down the emission reduction target for 2010 after working on it for a decade. And recently, an initial agreement on the sewage disposal plan has been launched. As for other aspects, I do not see any efforts have been made.

In fact, just as I have said earlier, a lot can be done, which cannot be exhausted even if I go on for two hours. So, I will make it brief. Concerning air pollution, the two places should immediately review the standardization of air quality objectives and formulate common air quality objectives. At present, air quality is evaluated against different standards in the two places. Moreover, we have not conducted any interim review of the emission reduction targets for 2010. Hong Kong and the Mainland should conduct an interim review immediately and start drawing up the emission reduction targets for 2020 for the air pollution problem in the two places. There is also the issue of carbon dioxide. The two places have never included carbon dioxide in the joint effort in emission reduction. However, our country has taken the lead in signing the Kyoto Protocol. Given that, it is impossible that this major issue of carbon dioxide is not included in the joint emission reduction programme.

Moreover, on the reduction of vehicle emission, a lot has to be done too. For instance, we have to set a target year in which Euro IV vehicles will be used in both places. Could this be achieved in both Hong Kong and the Mainland in 2010? Concerning fuel standard, at present, ultra low sulphur diesel is used in Hong Kong, but when will the Mainland adopt this standard? The two places should hold discussions on restricting the number of vehicles and the possible measures in achieving this goal. Furthermore, regarding renewable energy, the Mainland has already set a clear target, as the Mainland has much greater potential than Hong Kong in developing renewable energy. However, Hong Kong has neither discussed the co-operation in this respect with the Mainland, nor about how renewable energy can be introduced into Hong Kong.

Take the desulphurization system as an example. Power companies in Hong Kong said that it would take eight to 10 years to establish such a system. However, in the Mainland, the establishment of certain flue gas desulphurization systems can be completed within a short time. Could we expedite the work in this respect? Concerning the emission reduction programme mentioned by me earlier, could we make a joint effort to promote it so that more power plants in the Pearl River Delta and the power companies in Hong Kong will respond to this programme more proactively? Definitely, the development of mass transit systems must be promoted to reduce air pollution. Dozens of things can be done simply on the alleviation of air pollution.

Concerning the maintenance of water quality, I hope that the mode of operation on the control of air pollution can be extended to water quality control. For instance, the two places may make joint efforts to combat the pollution problem along the river and the coast. We may set respective targets, particularly on the maximum transport capacity and pollution cap of the rivers. As in the case of air pollution, these arrangements should be extended to other areas.

The same problem is found in waste disposal. Actually, at present, owing to the Basel Convention, both parties are intent on developing environmental industries, for both parties have to handle a large amount of waste. However, the two places, so far, have not discussed the issue and come up with a more flexible and adaptable approach in complying with the Basel Convention, which has prevented us from promoting waste reduction all along. There is thus an urgent need to work on this. We must take actions.

I will now turn to laws on environmental impact assessment (EIA). At present, EIAs have to be conducted for large-scale projects in both the Mainland and Hong Kong, but the standards of EIA adopted by the two places are inconsistent. Indeed, standardization of EIA is necessary, which is also an objective the Mainland wishes to achieve as soon as possible. I hope the standardization work can be carried out expeditiously.

In talking about environmental protection, many Hong Kong people are often of the view that Hong Kong is doing a good job and that the Mainland is the major source of pollution. But this is a misconception. Actually, the Mainland is ahead of us in many aspects. Certainly, it is a separate issue

whether the relevant measures are implemented after all. However, a lot of laws and measures on the Mainland are worthy lessons for Hong Kong, which include measures on energy saving, greening work and environmental protection technologies. In fact, the Mainland adopts a higher standard of sewage treatment than Hong Kong, and clear criteria have been laid down for renewable energy. Ten cities in the Mainland, including Guangdong Province, are pioneers in computing Green GDP. Actually, the Mainland has ceased using polyfoam lunch boxes before we do. Laws on the conservation of old and valuable trees have also been laid down clearly on the Mainland. Indeed, in environmental protection, the Mainland is now pressing ahead and doing better than Hong Kong in terms of their determination and the approaches adopted. The question remains how the two places will seize the opportunity and co-operate.

President, I so submit.

MR LI KWOK-YING (in Cantonese): Madam President, on behalf of the DAB, I express our views on medical and health care. Medical and health care issues, which have always been our major concern, are closely related to the health of the people. As exchanges between mainlanders and Hong Kong people become increasingly frequent, the co-operation and development of the two places on medical and health care have drawn the attention of the community. Looking back on the past decade, the scope of co-operation and exchanges between the two places in health issues has been expanding, from clinical therapy to the prevention, care and control of infectious diseases, from basic medicine to technological research, and from Western medicine to Chinese medicine. Extensive links have been established on all these fronts, facilitating the opening up of more room for development and co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland.

Madam President, in the past decade, Hong Kong and the Mainland have made a lot of breakthroughs in the development of co-operative relationship in medical and health care. The co-operation between the two places in the prevention, care and control of infectious diseases is an obvious case in point. As pointed out by Mr WANG Liji, the Deputy Director of the Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macao Affairs Office of the Ministry of Health, in the past, the epidemic prevention system of the Mainland was built on the premise of

maintaining social stability, so certain serious infectious diseases would be treated confidentially in accordance with laws on infectious diseases. However, during the SARS epidemic in 2003, the Central Authorities, for the sake of the health of Hong Kong citizens, abandoned the established approach and broke away from the original statutory requirement by allowing departments responsible for health affairs to have direct communication with the relevant SAR departments, so that the SAR Government could have a better understanding of the epidemic on the Mainland.

In the past couple of years, Hong Kong and the Mainland have been spared of another blow by a SARS outbreak, but yet the co-operation between the two places on the prevention, care and control of infectious diseases has never stopped. To date, the Department of Health of Guangdong Province and the Department of Health of Hong Kong still hold regular meetings, and experts will meet at least once a year to introduce information on the prevention, care and control of prevailing infectious diseases. Moreover, the three places, namely the Mainland, Hong Kong and Macao, have reached an agreement and set up an emergency mechanism for the handling of contingencies related to infectious diseases. A joint contingency drill was conducted last year to put the emergency mechanism of the three places through the test. All the aforementioned measures allow experts of the three places to learn from each other and gain experience.

Definitely, the evolution and mutation of bacteria are fearful. To further enhance our capacity in dealing with infectious diseases, Hong Kong and the Mainland should be able to upgrade their capacity in disease prevention in the future. These efforts include the enhancement of studies on overall public health policies, undertaking of proactive assessments, prevention of endemic and infectious diseases, and improvement of reportable items, information reported and swiftness of notification. On the other hand, the co-operation between the two places can be expanded to more levels. For instance, an official notification system can be set up on pharmaceutical incidents, which can further enhance the co-operation mechanism between the two places on medical and health care.

In fact, the signing of CEPA is a confidence booster for the co-operation and development in medical services between Hong Kong and the Mainland. The arrangement will not only facilitate local medical professions in seeking development on the Mainland, but it will also be conducive to the enhancement

of the standard of medical services on the Mainland, producing the most desirable mutually beneficial and win-win effect. At the end of last month, the two places signed the supplement to CEPA to further lower the threshold for local medical professions to open practice on the Mainland. For instance, the investment requirement for Hong Kong service providers to set up medical institutions in the form of joint venture or co-operation on the Mainland is lowered substantially from not less than RMB 20 million yuan to RMB 10 million yuan. Moreover, Hong Kong medical practitioners who have obtained a medical practitioner's qualification certificate of the Mainland are allowed to open solo clinics on the Mainland under the same conditions as are applicable to mainland practitioners.

This is evident that the liberalization of market under the new phase of CEPA has provided more opportunities and room for development for local medical professionals. As the economy of the Mainland continues to thrive, the affluent group whose demand for quality medical services is burgeoning is expanding. At present, under the Individual Visit Scheme, a lot of affluent mainlanders are attracted by the medical services of the private sector to come to Hong Kong. Now that the threshold for entering the mainland market has been lowered, it will facilitate local medical professions and institutions in exploring the enormous medical service market on the Mainland. On the other hand, this will facilitate the introduction of quality medical technology and other concepts like medical management to the Mainland, giving impetus to the development of medical reform on the Mainland.

Certainly, to help local health care personnel to seek development on the Mainland, unilateral liberalization of the market is far from adequate, for the problems they encounter on the Mainland should be solved first. For instance, some local medical practitioners indicated that they did not know clearly the application procedures for practice on the Mainland, the application approval process was unduly long and that they could not adapt to the professional examinations which were conducted in Putonghua and simplified characters. In this connection, the SAR Government should act proactively to reflect the situation to the relevant health departments of the Mainland, so as to ameliorate the difficulties faced by local health care personnel.

In addition to exporting health care personnel and services to the Mainland, we can reinforce the development of Chinese medicine in Hong Kong through co-operation between the two places. In comparison with the

Mainland, the development of Chinese medicine in Hong Kong made a late start and no hospital has been established for the practice of Chinese medicine, which is unfavorable to local Chinese medical practitioners in carrying out clinical studies. On the contrary, Chinese medicine hospitals are found everywhere on the Mainland, and a number of these hospitals are general hospitals providing both Western and Chinese medical treatment. Moreover, while some brand new technology in Chinese medicine, such as acupoint injection and acupoint medical thread embedding, are widely used on the Mainland, Chinese medicine practitioners in Hong Kong are not allowed to use, and their means of treatment are restricted to medicines or acupuncture, the development of Chinese medicine in Hong Kong is thus confined. For this reason, we should more often learn from the experience of developing Chinese medicine on the Mainland, particularly in the co-operation between Chinese medicine and Western medicine, with a view to upgrading the professional standard of local Chinese medical practitioners and enhancing the local medical and health care system

Madam President, as the exchanges between Hong Kong people and mainlanders become increasingly frequent, more opportunities for co-operation between the two places in medical and health care have been created. The signing of agreements like CEPA, and so on, has also opened up more room for local medical and health care personnel to seek development on the Mainland. Definitely, when we provide quality services to our Motherland on the one hand, we should not on the other overlook the importance of drawing lessons from the development of Chinese medicine on the Mainland, bringing about a mutually beneficial and win-win result.

With these remarks, Madam President, I support the motion.

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): Madam President, it has been a decade since the reunification. A discussion on the co-operative relationship between Hong Kong and the Mainland today is appropriate and timely. I will talk about this topic from two aspects; first, on the medical development of Hong Kong and the Mainland, and second, on the general issues related to the topic.

First, let us look at it from the medical and health care perspective. We all know that the SARS outbreak in 2003 and the recent incidents in food safety have indeed shed light on the importance of exchange of information and intelligence on infectious diseases and guarding a common defence line, which

are absolutely essential. We have learnt a lesson from the SARS outbreak. We know that no place or country can be cut off from the global system of disease prevention. If one fails to deal with the incident in a practical and pragmatic manner, it would only result in disaster that is more serious.

Gladly, in the aftermath of the SARS outbreak, the management unit of the medical services of the Mainland had undergone a complete overhaul. The minister who covered up the epidemic was dismissed and Madam WU Yi, the Vice Premier, took up the post of the Minister of Health concurrently. However, does it mean that the medical problems of the Mainland have been solved? I believe it is not necessarily the case. In fact, the difficulty in medical reform now faced by the Mainland is much greater than that of Hong Kong. "If you can pay, you will be treated; if not, you will not be treated", this is not a new phenomenon on the Mainland.

Second, regarding the training, qualification accreditation and standard for specialties in medicine, the Mainland together with Hong Kong should strive for further development. Recently, the Hong Kong Academy of Medicine has signed an agreement with the Trade Union of Practitioners of the Ministry of Health of the Mainland, which seeks to provide mutual assistance and develop a specialist system on the Mainland. I believe this is a crucial link for the medical sector of Hong Kong in promoting co-operation with the Mainland, or contributing to the medical development of the Motherland.

Moreover, I would like to respond to the on-all-front co-operation with the Mainland mentioned in today's motion. The several topics we discussed today originated from this on-all-front co-operation. Just now, I have listened carefully to the remarks made by Mr Jasper TSANG in respect of his original motion. He pointed out a number of times that it was inappropriate to liken certain relationships between Hong Kong and the Motherland to appeals for economic favours, I very much agree with this point.

Concerning the relationship between Hong Kong and the Mainland, blood is always thicker than water. We all know that Dr SUN Yat-sen was one of the first batch of graduates of the School of Medicine of the University of Hong Kong. Though he studied medicine in Hong Kong, he remembered his Motherland at heart. He was crucial to the reform of the political framework of China at the time, the overthrowing of the Manchu government and the establishment of the Republic of China. And his base was in Hong Kong. Afterwards, there came the riots in Hong Kong, Macao and the Mainland, and

Hong Kong and the Mainland were linked as one, demonstrating once again the relationship between the two places on the political front. Then came the 1989 pro-democracy movement, and to date, Hong Kong is still striving for democracy. I believe we can all see from the historical perspective that Hong Kong cannot be separated from the Mainland after all.

If we hope that there will be new development in Hong Kong and the Mainland too, any measure hindering the on-all-front co-operation between the two places is inappropriate. Therefore, the amendments proposed by Ms Emily LAU, Ms Audrey EU and Mr Albert HO respectively bring to the fore the crux of enabling the on-all-front co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland.

I would like to talk about Mr Albert HO's amendment in particular. He proposed to "promote expeditious development in the country's constitutional democracy with Hong Kong's experience in practicing full democracy, and urges the Mainland to draw on Hong Kong's experience in the rule of law to establish a law regime which respects judicial independence and protects the autonomy of the law profession," which is very important. Anyone who is concerned about the well-being of the Mainland and the country will disagree with opinions that China is fully developed and that the Mainland is faultless.

Anyone who has economic and trading ties, both official and private, with the Mainland knows that the greatest problem now faced by the Mainland is how to take a big step forward in reforming its institutional framework and legal system. If our Motherland, China, wants to take the centre stage in international politics, could it assume a significant role in the international arena by just focusing on economy and money? I believe this is a great problem which is worthy of deep thinking.

Without a solid foundation, the institutions, democracy and legal system of any country can hardly make continuous development. Everyone who loves China, who loves our Motherland, will admit that our country has to make progress. I believe Hong Kong, given its experience and mismatched status in history, will still have an impact on our Motherland. If we take these impacts negatively, we may consider them undesirable. However, if we put them in a positive perspective, every step taken by Hong Kong may bring about interaction from our Motherland.

The people of Hong Kong should hold onto and affirm the belief of being pragmatic, stating what is right and what is wrong as is the case. If we have to

guess the preference of the "Northern Overlord" and the authorities in Beijing and see whether they consider the proposal agreeable before we put forth any, it will not be helpful to our country. If what we do is only for the ruler of a certain time, or to enable him to advantage of his power to allow some distorted or unfair systems to continue to exist, we are doing a disservice to our country.

I believe, historically, Hong Kong has never been cut off from the Mainland, not even during the colonial era, and the people of Hong Kong love their Motherland. In the 1989 incident, over a million of people took to the streets. To date, many people still attend the candlelight vigil in memory of the 4 June incident, which is good evidence. I hope these actions will continue.

I so submit. Thank you, Madam President.

MR CHAN KAM-LAM (in Cantonese): President, it has been a decade since the reunification. Practice during the interim proved that the enhancement of co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland has brought about a mutually beneficial and win-win effect. In the following part of my speech, I will quote some figures to illustrate the trading co-operation between the two places and the achievements so made since the reunification, as well as the importance of this co-operation. Absolutely, the situation can be concluded in one line, "Together means mutual benefit, and divided is to the detriment of both sides."

At present, the Mainland is the largest trading partner of Hong Kong. In 2006, the total value of trade between Hong Kong and the Mainland amounted to \$2,349.1 billion, accounting for 46.4% of the total value of trade of Hong Kong. Reciprocally, Hong Kong is the third major trading partner of the Mainland, just after the United States and Japan, and its total value of trade accounts for 17.1% of the total value of trade of the Mainland.

In addition to tangible trade, development in cross-boundary tourism is also buoyant. The number of mainland visitors visiting Hong Kong, driven by the Individual Visit Scheme, increased rapidly to 13.6 million passenger trips in 2006, accounting for 54.4% of Hong Kong's total visitors. They have become the strongest impetus for the tourism industry in Hong Kong.

With regard to investment, Hong Kong being the largest external investor of the Mainland has brought to the Mainland capital, advanced technology

management and market information. As at the end of February 2007, the cumulative number of direct investment projects funded by Hong Kong on the Mainland was 271 800, with a contract sum of US\$613.1 billion, while actual investment exceeded US\$280 billion, accounting for more than 40% of the total foreign investment of China.

On the other hand, with the rapid economic development of the Mainland, which has increased its pace in going global, the Mainland has become the largest inward direct investor of Hong Kong. As at the end of 2005, the total value of stocks of direct investment made by the Mainland in Hong Kong was \$1,271.9 billion, 31.4% of the total value of stocks. I have cited these figures to tell Members that Hong Kong has a very close relationship with the Mainland.

On the finance front, Hong Kong is the venue of first choice to mainland quality assets seeking listing overseas. Hong Kong, by helping these mainland enterprises to dovetail with the international market and raise fund on the one hand, can consolidate its status as an international financial centre on the other. As at the end of February 2007, 368 mainland enterprises were listed in Hong Kong, accounting for 30% of the total number of companies listed in Hong Kong. These mainland enterprises, which have a market value of \$6,612,000 billion, constitute 50% of the total market capitalization and 60% of our market turnover. With an increasing number of mainland enterprises using Hong Kong as a listing platform, Hong Kong became the second largest capital formation centre worldwide in terms of initial public offering last year.

In fact, in the past two years, a number of mainland super-enterprises have sought listing in Hong Kong. This not only started the craze for subscription of new shares, but also exerted tremendous and substantial impact on the market values of Hong Kong stocks and its turnover rate, bringing about an early inundation of the Hong Kong stock market by a flood of "red shares". According to the computations of last year, more than \$300 billion were raised through initial public offering, of which 90% were new shares issued by mainland enterprises. Undeniably, local enterprises paled in comparison. At the same time, it is evident that mainland enterprises have gradually become a major driving force for the economic development of Hong Kong.

The aforementioned figures clearly reflect the reality that over the past decade, the Mainland has completely taken over from regions like Europe and

the United States as the largest trading partner of Hong Kong. The trading and investment relationship between the two places has grown closer. By capitalizing on the advantage of complementing each other's strengths while compensating for each other's weaknesses, it will not only bring more trading and investment opportunities to Hong Kong, but it will also be conducive to the economic development of Hong Kong.

According to a consolidated computation, the added value resulted from trading and economic co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland accounts for at least 30% of the GDP of Hong Kong, while the job opportunities created direct constitute at least 25% of the total job opportunities in Hong Kong. On the other hand, Hong Kong facilitates the Mainland in dovetailing with the international community, bringing in new elements to their systems, participating in the international market and raising its international economic status, thus bringing about the mutually beneficial and win-win effect.

Looking into the future, the relationship between the two places will only grow closer. In other words, the future development of Hong Kong hinges on the extent of its integration with the Mainland, subject to the successful achievement of complementing each other's strengths and compensating for each other's weaknesses. Last year, Hong Kong was included in the National 11th Five-Year Plan for the first time. It was a very good start. Moreover, Hong Kong's status as a financial centre was stated unequivocally in the National 11th Five-Year Plan. Therefore, the SAR Government should establish a standing mechanism with the counterpart of the Central Authorities to conduct regular studies on finance issues and formulate policies and measures to enhance co-operation between the two places in this respect. The two places should work on issues like encouraging more mainland enterprises to seek listing in Hong Kong, allowing the trading of financial instrument of Hong Kong on the Mainland via the introduction of depository receipt which can be traded in the mainland stock exchange, making joint efforts in launching China-related financial products like petroleum futures, A-Share futures and index, and so on. Besides, the Government should further encourage financial institutes in Hong Kong, such as banks, securities companies, fund management companies and insurance companies to expand their business to the Mainland and enjoy a wider scope of business. It should also allow more mainland banks, financial institutes and insurance companies to operate in Hong Kong, so that they may expand their business to the international arena. Furthermore, the investment limit and scope of the Qualified Domestic Institutional Investors Scheme should

be further liberalized, so that more mainland fund can flow into Hong Kong in an orderly manner, facilitating the Mainland in achieving its purpose of "flood discharge". Hong Kong should also strive to be a pilot point in the liberalization of RMB with a view to expanding RMB services operated in Hong Kong gradually, so that Hong Kong will subsequently become an off-shore centre of RMB.

Recently, the DAB has completed a proposal on petroleum futures, "Enhancing Hong Kong status to cope with the development of the country". In the proposal, the prerequisites for becoming a futures market, which a number of worldwide major futures markets possess, are set out. Actually, Hong Kong has all these conditions. We will submit this proposal to the SAR Government and a number of ministries and commissions. We hope they will make reference to the proposal, so that the gap in the financial development of Hong Kong will be filled.

Thank you, President.

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): President, the State President said in the function celebrating the 10th Anniversary of the Reunification that the principles of "one country, two systems", "Hong Kong people ruling Hong Kong" and a "high degree of autonomy" were very successful. Today, let us not talk about whether they are successful, but the close ties between China and Hong Kong and the intensity in the exchange and interaction between the people of the two places are very different from the situation in the past. This is undeniable and the present situation is really terrific.

Precisely for this reason, I believe the problems of the two places are no longer merely the problems of Hong Kong or the problems of China. The problems of Hong Kong will affect those of the Mainland and similarly, the problems of the Mainland will also have a bearing on those in Hong Kong. Therefore, we can by no means just think about the problems in Hong Kong selfishly and ignore those of mainland China. Similarly, it is not possible for us not to consider the problems of the Mainland because they will also affect Hong Kong. Let me use food safety as an example. If we do not have a sound food safety regime, not only will the food transported to us affect the health of the Hong Kong public, it will also affect the health of people on the Mainland. This is an undeniable fact.

This also applies to the issue of air quality mentioned by Ms Audrey EU. To take the Pearl River Delta (PRD) as an example, the pollutants there will drift to Hong Kong and to Tung Chung in particular. As much as 80% of the pollutants in Tung Chung originated from the PRD. As a result, Tung Chung is polluted and all residents in New Territories West are affected. However, President, we can imagine how seriously people are affected locally if the pollutants blown from the PRD to Tung Chung in Hong Kong account for as high as 80% of the pollutants? Therefore, I think these problems cannot be taken lightly. I hope the SAR Government can share our experience with the Mainland more frequently and assist it in putting in place well-developed regimes, so that be it in food safety or environmental and air pollution, a better job can be done and the people of the two places can lead a healthy life.

Apart from the problems relating to food, the environment and air, another problem is the so-called law enforcement problem mentioned by Mr Albert HO. In fact, as I said just now, the interaction and communication between the people of both places are now very intense and instances of Hong Kong people going to the Mainland to live there, do business or pursue studies have increased significantly when compared with the past. However, a lot of people have told us that they have to face one problem on going back to the Mainland, that is, they find it difficult to adapt to the state of rule of law on the Mainland. Why? Even though there are clear provisions in the laws of the Mainland, unfortunately, in the end, the rule by man still prevails. The Public Security Bureau will say that it is in the best position to interpret the law. In other words, it can do whatever it pleases.

President, recently, I received a complaint lodged by a Hong Kong citizen. He said that when he was on the Mainland, he lodged a complaint with the Public Security Bureau. The Public Security Bureau asked him if he wanted to lodge a complaint. He replied in the affirmative. The Public Security Bureau then said that if he complained any further, it would lock him up. Why? All he wanted to do was just to lodge a complaint, however, they said, "True enough, but whoever complains has to be locked up, so do you still want to lodge a complaint?" Of course, in the end, he dared not lodge any complaint because he did not know what would happen after he was locked up. Therefore, in fact, there is a sense of confusion and apprehension.

In addition, our container truck drivers also have to face one problem, that is, when their cargoes go through the Customs at the boundary, they are very fearful and there is no telling if they will be detained and they do not know when they can leave either. Concerning these problems, it is impossible to promote greater interaction between Hong Kong and the Mainland without a sound system underpinned by the rule of law and this will also pose major obstacles to the economy and people's lives.

President, lastly, I wish to talk about another problem, that is, in the past few years, the SAR Government has made a great deal of effort to assist many Hong Kong people in investing or living on the Mainland and assistance has been offered to many sectors, be it the medical or legal sector. However, President, there is one particular sector to which the Government has not paid any heed whatsoever. Which sector is it? It is the political sector, which the Government has ignored completely and to which it has offered no assistance.

President, why do I say so? We in the political sector are also working for the welfare of Hong Kong people and the well-being of society. We are not just focused on or confined only to Hong Kong. We also hope that the systems on the Mainland can be sound, so that not only can the livelihood of its people be protected, their freedoms of speech, association, in staging rallies and protests and in expressing their personal wishes can also be protected. It is our wish to promote the development in these two areas.

However, unfortunately, for more than a decade, many members of the District Councils or Members of the Legislative Council did not have the opportunity to go back to the Mainland to communicate or interact with the people or government officials on the Mainland or to express their different views. They did not have such an opportunity and even when officials or important figures came to Hong Kong, they did not communicate or have discussions with us. President, this is really a great pity. Since the Government has expended so much energy and resources and done so much to help so many sectors, why has it paid no heed to this particular sector?

President, I am really baffled because I do not believe that if people in our sector can go to the Mainland, they are capable of turning it upside down or turning the entire regime upside down. I trust we do not have such might. However, I believe that it is worthwhile for us to make reference to each other's

views. I am not saying that our views are always the best, however, at least, there will be interaction, communication and even understanding, President, will there not? However, if there is not even the opportunity to get to know each other, how can we do any of the foregoing things?

Therefore, I believe that the amendment proposed by Ms Emily LAU is also very important. Since the Government often says that it has to work on all fronts, why has it singularly left out this area? The subject of our discussion today is very good, and this is also the last debate in this Session. I hope very much that after the Government has formed its new team, there will be a new direction and new thinking. Since the Government has been talking about being pragmatic, about commitment, it should enable all sectors in all realms (including people in our sector) to have intense communication and interaction with mainland China.

President, I so submit.

MR JEFFREY LAM (in Cantonese): Madam President, this motion today is the last motion of this Session and this is also a good opportunity to draw a minor conclusion. As the representative of the business sector, of course, I am very much concerned about economic development and strengthening co-operation with the Mainland. I remember that in the Celebration of the 10th anniversary of the Reunification of Hong Kong with China, the State President, Mr HU Jintao, delivered a speech that set a clear direction for future development.

President HU mentioned "the four insistences" and the third among them is to insist on focusing our efforts on developing the economy and improving people's livelihood. He said, "As long as the SAR Government and the Hong Kong people work in partnership, give full play to their strengths, enhance economic co-operation with the Mainland, and adapt to accelerated economic globalization and the global industrial relocation, they can certainly ensure Hong Kong's sustained and steady economic growth and improve their well-being."

President HU also said in the fourth point that "Social harmony and stability are essential for maintaining a sound business environment, growing economy and improving people's life in Hong Kong.". I believe this is precisely what the Government must strive to do properly.

The development of our country is vigorous and Hong Kong must seize the opportunities that arise. Several days before the 10th anniversary of the reunification, Hong Kong was formally authorized to issue Renminbi-denominated bonds and Supplement IV to CEPA was signed. Under Supplement IV to CEPA, the number of service areas included is increased from 27 at present to 38. Not only were public utilities and social services for the elderly included, it was also agreed that co-operation in financial services and the conference and exhibition industry and the mutual recognition of professional qualifications would be enhanced. This will really offer more opportunities and advantages to the industrial and business sectors and to small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in developing the mainland market and enhance the attractiveness of Hong Kong to overseas investors.

Hong Kong businesses have been making investments and operating factories in the Pearl River Delta (PRD) for nearly three decades and they can be described as good partners. The Governments of the two places can in fact emphasize the fact that the PRD is the doorstep for overseas businesses to gain a foothold in the mainland market. At the same time, it is also the springboard for mainland companies to access the international market. Moreover, the four words "Made in Hong Kong" can be fashioned into a marque for high-quality products.

With the gathering pace of development, I believe that on the one hand, the Hong Kong Government has to convey the latest information relating to the Mainland to Hong Kong businesses (in particular, to SMEs), so that Hong Kong businessmen can have sufficient time to make deployments and arrangements; on the other hand, the views of Hong Kong businessmen should be conveyed to the relevant units on the Mainland, so that a channel characterized by high transparency and uninterrupted communication can be established. In this way, a win-win situation can certainly be created.

In order to promote new economic development, I think the investments in infrastructure in Guangdong and Hong Kong must also be complementary. Not only can this promote the flow of people and goods between the two places, more employment opportunities can also be generated. In fact, in the exchanges of people and goods between the two places, so long as we comply with the rules and regulations and have a clear conscience, there is no need to be constantly afraid of being detained when going through the checkpoints, nor is it necessary to be worried about one's goods being detained for days. I have entered and

exited the Mainland innumerable times and every day, my goods are transported from the Mainland to Hong Kong, yet the aforementioned situation has never occurred. I believe that as long as we comply with the law and follow our conscience when going about our business, there is no need to be worried about the occurrence of the foregoing situation.

After the Shenzhen-Hong Kong Western Corridor was commissioned, I have used it twice to access the area surrounding She Kou and the trip was much shorter than before. The co-location arrangement is also very convenient, so it is expected that the surrounding area will become prosperous. Therefore, I hope very much that the KCRC Lok Ma Chau Spur Line, the construction of which has already been completed, can be commissioned as soon as possible.

As regards the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link and the like, they have been discussed for many years, however, so far, no proposals of a more specific nature have been put forward. In the Question and Answer Session last week, the Chief Executive said that the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge project would be implemented in five years' time and progress on the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link would be made this year. I hope very much that the authorities can step up negotiation with the mainland side, so as to draw up a timetable on actual implementation.

Of course, in the course of carrying out fast-paced development, it is most imperative that the beautiful environment must not be sacrificed and pollution should be avoided. One of the sources of air pollution in Guangdong and Hong Kong is the emissions from factories in the PRD. As early as April 2002, the Hong Kong Government and the Guangdong Government reached a consensus to jointly reduce the emissions of four major pollutants to their levels in 1997. Many Hong Kong businesses have replaced their machines with environmentally-friendly ones and participated in the electricity allocation scheme to stagger the peak hours of electricity consumption and reduce emissions. However, no actual arrangement has been put in place for the emissions trading pilot scheme, so it is still not known whether the 10 power plants in the PRD will take part in the scheme. I very much hope that the Governments of the two places can follow up this issue closely and draw up a comprehensive plan properly, so as to avoid being all words but no action.

Madam President, it is said that unity vanquishes everything. As long as the two places can be united, there will be even more prosperous and stable

development. The Chief Executive has also said that the next decade would be a golden decade. I believe if only the two places can co-operate closely, every member of the public will get a share of the exquisite and golden yield.

Madam President, I so submit.

MR LEE CHEUK-YAN (in Cantonese): The last motion today is about "Developing co-operative relationship with the Mainland". The government official responsible for giving a reply is Secretary Frederick MA and this reflects one thing, that is, from the viewpoint of the SAR Government, it probably thinks that the relationship between Hong Kong and China is purely economic. I wonder if this is the case. If Members look at the amendments, they will find that the amendment proposed by Ms Audrey EU has to do with immigration policies, the environment, air quality and food safety; the issues mentioned by Ms Emily LAU is related to Home Visit Permits, whereas Mr Albert HO has raised matters such as the development of democracy and promoting the expeditious development of the country's constitutional democracy. I wonder if Secretary MA will respond to all of these aspects together later. It is possible that he will and he is also capable of responding to these various aspects. However, as a number of Honourable colleagues said, when talking about the relationship between Hong Kong and the Mainland, there is often too much emphasis on the economic relationship. I think that it is certainly an important aspect, however, it is not the only aspect.

When it comes to economic relationship, recently, people have been talking about CEPA very often. However, I hope that the four words "leveraging on the Mainland" can be removed from the SAR Government's vocabulary. We are talking about "leveraging on the Mainland" economically. I do not mean that we have nothing to do with the Mainland. This is not what I mean at all, nor am I a Hong Kong chauvinist. All I hope is just to..... If Hong Kong is a capitalist society, in fact, there is nothing we can rely on. Perhaps with globalization of the world economy, it is not possible to simply say that the economy of a place relies on another place because it is not possible to do so. Unless we have something to offer other people, we cannot rely on other people, nor is it right to do so.

If the development of a capitalist society has to rely on other people or on extending our hands to get something from other people, that is not right either.

Therefore, the choice of words should be words such as "complementary" or "mutually beneficial". It is only in this way that we can stand our ground in the face of globalization of the world economy. However, I myself think that nowadays, for some unknown reason, all of a sudden, the SAR Government has, in its use of words, been too..... please excuse me for saying so, but has it not been too "boot-licking"? The SAR Government says that it has to leverage on the country, and that means we have lost the most important thing. In other words, we have got to have our own advantages and there must be something in our own system with which we can make contribution to our country. There must be something in our economy with which we can make contribution to our country. It is only in this way that we can develop our economic relationship in a mutually beneficial way. I wonder if the SAR Government should also pay attention to this in the future and place greater emphasis on mutual benefits in our mindset.

In addition, Secretary MA, I wish to stress in particular that we can certainly see very often that CEPA has offered many business opportunities to the business sector as well as professionals in Hong Kong, however, there is the danger that Hong Kong will be hollowed out. Will all investments be diverted to the Mainland such that in the end, less investment will be made in Hong Kong? Consequently, the professionals and the business sector in Hong Kong can probably have a way out, however, if ordinary members of the public at the grassroots level want to find employment opportunities in Hong Kong, they can only turn to the retail and service sectors and cannot rely on any high-technology or high-value-added industry in Hong Kong. I very much hope that CEPA will develop continually, however, we must not forget that Hong Kong must also develop its own industries in order to help workers in Hong Kong.

Separately, President, I wish to talk about the issue of Home Visit Permits raised by Ms Emily LAU. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said just now that under CEPA, members of the business sector and professionals were allowed to go to the Mainland. If I elaborate his comment, he was asking why there was no CEPA for the political sector. If there were a CEPA for the political sector, it would be sensational. That means everyone will be allowed to go back to the country to take part in politics there and of course, that would not do. We are not asking that we be allowed to go back to our country to take part in politics there, are we? In fact, this is no big deal and the Home Visit Permits will only serve to normalize the relationship between the two places. Under the "one country, two systems" principle, Members of the Legislative Council of the SAR

are representatives of the public, however, they cannot go back to the Mainland and they cannot go back to their Motherland. I think this cannot possibly be, nor should such a situation arise. I hope that this aspect can be normalized.

However, I remember that on one occasion, Secretary Stephen LAM said here that..... the words he used at that time were to the effect that Members had to continue to make efforts. On why we cannot go back to our country, what he meant was that Members themselves should know full well. What I abhor the most is people saying that one should know full well. How do I know the reason? If it is not possible to discuss the problems openly, it will be very difficult to solve them and I think there is also no need to..... the Mainland has its own laws and systems and this we understand. If we go back to the Mainland and violate the system there, we know that we will be sanctioned by the system and the law on the Mainland. All Hong Kong people are aware of this. Why can we not have exchanges in this regard based on such an understanding?

Ever since our visit to Guangzhou in 2005, so far, there has not been any further indication. I think that this part of the relationship should be normalized and Home Visit Permits should be issued to us because 18 years is not a short time. I look forward very much to a breakthrough in this area.

In addition, I also agree very much with the comments made by Mr Albert HO. In fact, the development of democracy in Hong Kong now will serve as a showcase for the Mainland. Perhaps let us not talk about a showcase, rather, this will serve as an experiment because in the past, the SAR..... the Mainland itself is also experimenting how to implement capitalism. Nowadays, both sides are increasingly alike in economic terms, so politically, why can they not..... the 6.9 million residents in Hong Kong are now experimenting and in future, the 1.3 billion people on the Mainland can also develop democracy in the same way. Therefore, the development of democracy in Hong Kong is a pressing task. Thank you, President.

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

MR ALBERT CHENG (in Cantonese): Concerning this motion moved by Mr Jasper TSANG, initially, I thought that it had to do with economic and trade

co-operation, however, after listening to the speech delivered by Mr Jasper TSANG, I found that..... when I found that there were so many amendments, I wondered why a motion proposed by Mr Jasper TSANG on economic and trade co-operation would become so politicized. Mr Albert HO proposed an amendment and so did Ms Emily LAU. However, after listening to Mr Jasper TSANG's speech in moving his motion, I formed the view that ultimately, Mr Jasper TSANG's motion is also politicized. He talked about the problems relating to the "one country, two systems" principle after the reunification. The leadership in the Government at that time resisted any economic or trade co-operation with the Chinese side or with the Mainland. This being so, I think that since everyone has gone on to the political level, one cannot find fault with the amendments proposed by Ms Emily LAU and Mr Albert HO. I agree with Ms Emily LAU's comment that it is in fact inadequate to have only Secretary Frederick MA attending the meeting. When it comes to developing a co-operative relationship with the Mainland, particularly when the political level is involved, I do not think that it is Mr Frederick MA's cup of tea — even this cup of tea of mine has been spilt — other Bureau Directors and even the Secretaries of Departments should also attend the meeting.

On economic and trade co-operation between the two places, after listening to so many Honourable colleagues speak, I found that most of them have focused on the economic front. I agree with Mr Jasper TSANG's comment that in co-operating with the Mainland, there is in fact no need to belittle ourselves because we are not parasites at all. We are benefiting each other. When it comes to the Individual Visit Scheme, many people think that with so many mainlanders visiting Hong Kong under the Individual Visit Scheme, Hong Kong must have been benefited. However, the latest figures show that those by Hong Kong people visiting the Mainland — not necessarily for carnal pleasures — and the amount of money spent by them on the Mainland are far higher than those by mainlanders visiting Hong Kong under the Individual Visit Scheme.

I do not wish to talk about economic issues. Be it politics or people's livelihood, I think that when it comes to co-operation with the Mainland, after the reunification, although it is said that there is the "one country, two systems" principle, in fact, we are also part of China. We cannot just look at the co-operation with the Mainland to the neglect of the relationship between people.

I am happy to hear Ms Audrey EU mention issues such as pregnant women from the Mainland and medical services. All along, there is one thing that evokes a great deal of thoughts and feelings in me and it is also an enigma to me. Apart from being disallowed to apply for Home Visit Permits so that they can go back to the Mainland, most importantly, people in the pro-democracy camp or the opposition, who have all along been labelled as anti-China and causing chaos in Hong Kong, have campaigned for the right of abode of children born of Hong Kong people, which is an issue on which the Basic Law has laid down stipulations. They believe that children born of Hong Kong people on the Mainland should be entitled to the right of abode in Hong Kong, whereas those comrades who support the Government or are even regarded as patriotic and loving Hong Kong have shown an aversion for this group of compatriots.

I really cannot see..... on being patriotic, what matters most is not the love for a Government or the support for a regime, but the love for the people. In particular, since we have already been reunited with the Motherland, we are all Chinese and to put it on an unpleasant note, all of us are brothers and blood is thicker than water. How can we reject each other? Therefore, on this issue of campaigning for the right of abode in Hong Kong and even on what we are discussing of late..... just now, Ms Audrey EU (I cannot remember if it was Ms Audrey EU or Mr Jasper TSANG) went on to talk about marriages between Hong Kong people and mainlanders. It was probably Mr Jasper TSANG who talked about this. Each year, there are 30 000 marriages and half of them are marriages between Hong Kong people and mainlanders. These people got married on the Mainland, but their wives cannot come to Hong Kong. Anyone who married a woman in the Philippines, Canada or Ethiopia in Africa can take her to Hong Kong immediately, so why should our Government discriminate against our compatriots on the Mainland? After getting married with a woman on the Mainland, why can we not take her to Hong Kong? This has spawned many social problems such as those relating to CSSA and single-parent families. If fact, there is a host of such problems.

The Members of the Legislative Council who supported the interpretation of the Basic Law back then — back then, I was not a Member of the Legislative Council and of course, I opposed the interpretation of the Basic Law and this is my position — on the issue of the right of abode in Hong Kong, someone said that 1.67 million people would come to Hong Kong. I wonder why the figure was 1.67 million, but not 1.69 million or 1.66 million. Did 1.67 million people

actually come to Hong Kong? Of course not. Now, they are not coming to Hong Kong anymore and some people have even gone back to the Mainland after getting their identity cards. At that time, I also asked who would come to Hong Kong. However, the question is: Why do we resent the prospect of mainlanders coming to Hong Kong? Recently, the Chief Executive, Donald TSANG, also said when meeting somebody that the population of Hong Kong ought to number 10 million people. If 1.67 million people had come, if 1.67 million people had been added to the present population of 7 million, there would have been 8.67 million people already and it would have been so much easier to attain the target of 10 million people.

I wish to come back to the co-operative relationship with the Mainland. It should not be confined to the economy or business and trade alone. I think that communication between people and mutual support and care matter a lot more than pecuniary relationships. If we only care about money and we develop co-operative relationships with the Mainland only on account of the money or the economic aspect, I think this is rather lower level and too utilitarian.

Therefore, I very much want to discuss this issue of the right of abode in Hong Kong. Concerning pregnant women from the Mainland whose husbands are Hong Kong people and who wanted to give birth to their babies here..... I think this is very interesting. In the Legislative Council, there is a Complaints Division and Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han and I were the roster Members. Someone told us that as long as one had money and could pay the deposit amounting to more than \$40,000, no matter if one was related to Hong Kong or not, one could still give birth to one's baby in Hong Kong. However, even if one's husband is a Hong Kong resident and the baby that one bears is Hong Kong people, it is still possible for one to give birth to one's child in Hong Kong, however, one has to pay the money, so both are treated equally. I think all of us really have to look into this point. If we really want to establish good relationships with the Mainland, the relationships between people should override any economic and pecuniary relationship. It is certainly important to be patriotic and there is now again talk of introducing national education. If we want to introduce national education, the first and foremost task is to establish that our communication with our compatriots on the Mainland and the relationships between people must override any civic education. I hope Members will consider this issue.

I so submit. Thank you, President.

MR SIN CHUNG-KAI (in Cantonese): On this motion, I am particularly interested in talking about Ms Emily LAU's amendment. There are nine Honourable colleagues from the Democratic Party in the Legislative Council and I am one of those who are allowed to go back to the Mainland. However, although one cannot apply the description "coming into centre stage thrice and falling off stage thrice" to another colleague of mine, Mr Fred LI, still, one can apply the description "confiscated twice, issued twice and permitted entry twice" to him, that is, his Home Visit Permit (HVP) was confiscated twice but it was also issued to him twice.

I remember that originally, the issue of the HVP had to do with the Hong Kong Alliance in Support of Patriotic Democratic Movements of China (the Alliance). In 1989, after the Alliance set in motion a series of events, a number of the Alliance's Committee Members and later on, the Honourable colleagues of the Democratic Party or its permanent members, were refused the issue of HVPs. Even if they already had HVPs, they were confiscated when they tried to clear the checkpoints.

I remember that in 1989 or 1990, there were rumours that Hong Kong was a subversive base and the Alliance was a subversive organization. It is probably due to such an identification of nature that the HVPs of some people were confiscated. However, if we look at the past 17 years in the context of this identification of nature, what was actually subverted? Please think about this objectively. All that the Alliance is capable of doing — the vice-Chairman of the Alliance, Mr Albert HO, is also in the Chamber now — is to organize one or two events each year at the most, one being the vigil in the evening of 4 June and the other being the rally prior to the vigil on 4 June. If this is considered subversion, the Alliance has been involved in subversion for 17 years but everyone can see how significant the result is. In fact, the role of the Alliance nowadays is just to relate Hong Kong people to the 4 June incident by organizing events to give people an opportunity to reflect on and remember what happened in 1989.

The amendment proposed by Ms Emily LAU today is premised on the principle of "one country, two systems" and it proposes that members of the public who are not allowed to go back to the Mainland, including those in the pro-democracy camp..... in fact, it does not matter whether they belong to the pro-democracy camp, all in all, Members or members of the public who cannot go back to the Mainland should be allowed to get back their HVPs and develop normal relationships.

I remember that about three years ago, the vice-President, Mr ZENG Qinghong, talked about the relationships with Hong Kong people and with the pro-democracy camp during his visit to Africa. At that time, he talked about one issue. To put it simply, it is about whether the relationship with the pro-democracy camp should be regarded as a conflict with the enemy or a conflict among the people? I ask the Secretary to read *On Contradiction* by Chairman MAO. He made it very clear and I heard him say in the television news report that it was a conflict among the people, not a conflict with the enemy. If it is a conflict among the people, to cite Mr Albert CHENG's words, we should think about how the relationships among the people can be fostered and improved, since we are in fact all citizens of the country.

Not granting HVPs is not conducive to the development of relationships, not to mention other kinds of development. There is a lack of understanding of even such a fundamental matter. When I went back to the Mainland for the first time, I was eight years old. I still remember that at that time, when I went through Lo Wu, I had to shout, "Down with American imperialism! Down with Japanese imperialism!" — Sorry, it should be "Down with American imperialism! Down with British imperialism!". In the course of the following four decades, seismic changes have occurred several times in China. Unfortunately, to the majority of Honourable colleagues, that is, to those from the Democratic Party and other Honourable colleagues, they could not feel their immediacy.

I wish to stress one point. Many of Honourable colleagues can watch the television or news reports, however, the feeling is different. It is possible to gain a certain degree of understanding of the developments on the Mainland through newspapers and the television, however, there is a lack of immediacy. As Mr Albert CHENG said, we may not be able to have exchanges like ordinary citizens and restrictions are imposed even on our having exchanges as ordinary citizens. In contrast, many mainlanders have come to Hong Kong to ask us about a lot of things and to understand a lot of things about us, however, we probably do not have too many opportunities to go back to the Mainland. In fact, such a state of affairs has reinforced the contradiction between the two sides.

If we want to talk about how to work for a better relationship and promote co-operation, the first basis is understanding and it is necessary for both sides to gain an understanding. The Mainland has to understand the contradictions and

problems in Hong Kong; similarly, people playing a part in politics or those who govern in Hong Kong have to gain a better understanding of the difficulties of the Mainland in coping with various matters and their perspective in looking at various issues, which is very different. If one can have a feeling of immediacy, it will serve to reduce the conflicts in relationship. When our State President was in Hong Kong, he said to us in an evening banquet that we had to step up the national education for young people. If you look at a survey conducted by an academic of the Hong Kong Baptist University, Michael DEGOLYER, you will find that regarding people who have resided in Hong Kong for a long time — or I should say people born in Hong Kong — their so-called identification with the country is still very weak, however, overall, the situation has improved significantly. In particular, to people who have come to Hong Kong for a long time, their identification with the country is very strong and that is most interesting.

Therefore, if we want to promote the 40-called national education, it is in fact necessary to normalize all sorts of relationships. I repeat: regarding the relationship between the pro-democracy camp and the Central Authorities, Mr ZENG Qinghong said that it was a conflict among the people. We should not be hindered by this kind of relationship. The Mainland should issue HVPs to our Honourable colleagues as soon as possible to enable them to gain first-hand understanding and personal appreciation, to let them understand the other side as well as the problems on the Mainland. It is only in this way that it will be possible to undertake what Mr Jasper TSANG mentioned, that is, overall planning, co-ordination and policy formulation. In fact, gaining an understanding is very important and this includes acquiring objective knowledge. However, feeling is also very important and without first-hand appreciation, things are very different.

President, I hope that next year, the majority of Honourable colleagues will have the opportunity to take part in the activities relating to the Olympic games and by that I mean taking part directly in the activities of the Olympic games as an ordinary citizen.

MR HOWARD YOUNG (in Cantonese): Madam President, the subject under discussion today is "Developing co-operative relationship with the Mainland" and the Liberal Party is of the view that generally speaking, in the decade after the reunification, be it in the social, economic or cultural realms, the interaction

between Hong Kong and the Mainland is increasingly extensive and intensive. To build on the past, the Liberal Party holds that it is only by constantly strengthening the co-operation with the Mainland on all fronts that we can create a better future, so we very much support the question under discussion today.

Madam President, today, I wish to focus on the co-operative relationship between Hong Kong and the Mainland in the sector represented by me, that is, the tourism industry. For instance, there are at present a total of five airports in Hong Kong and the Pearl River Delta (PRD) Region. We should step up co-ordination and co-operation and it is possible to further co-operate in the optimization of regional airspace design; the standardization of interface and protocols of air traffic control systems; and the establishment of additional flight paths for civil aviation, so as to reap mutual benefits and create a win-win situation for all.

In addition, the new stipulations added to the Supplement to CEPA will, starting from next year, enable Hong Kong travel agents to operate in the nine provinces of the Pan-PRD Region as sole proprietors, whereas in the past, it was only possible to do so in Guangdong. Under the former agreement, as I said just now, Hong Kong travel agents are allowed to set up businesses in Guangdong and last month, as a pilot scheme, several Hong Kong travel agents were permitted to operate tours to Hong Kong and Macao in the province. Originally, it was hoped that this arrangement could be implemented in June this year, however, so far, they have not received any document authorizing their business operation. The Liberal Party believes that when the SAR Government holds discussions with the Central Government on opening up more sectors in the service industry, it should try to lobby for the introduction of more facilitation measures, for example, streamlining application procedures and provision of "one-stop" services, so that the policy of allowing Hong Kong businesses to move into the Mainland and set up shop can be thoroughly implemented.

We think that it is only by bringing in more quality and reputable travel agents from Hong Kong to Guangdong or to other provinces and cities on the Mainland to operate tours to Hong Kong and Macao — in fact, our hope is not just to operate tours to Hong Kong and Macao, rather, we hope that Hong Kong can become a point of convergence for tours from the Mainland bound for all parts of the world and this is something travel agents in Hong Kong wish to see

dearly — that Hong Kong and Mainland travel agents can be encouraged to engage in healthy competition and co-operation on the basis of service quality, thus gradually eliminating the vicious competition using ultra low prices as the attraction. Moreover, visitors to Hong Kong will also be able to enjoy quality service.

Madam President, apart from the co-operation of the industry, the supervision in tourism by the Mainland and us and the co-operation between the two sides are indispensable. More than two months ago, the China National Tourism Administration announced eight regulatory measures that included a clamp-down on "zero-fare tours" through such approaches as covert operation and random inspection. The aim was to regulate the irregular conduct of mainland travel agents operating tours to Hong Kong and Macao. The Liberal Party highly supports these measures and believes that these measures are conducive to the healthy development of the tourism industry in both places.

However, so far, the specifics of the actual implementation of the relevant measures have yet to be disclosed. We found that often, after people at the higher level have discussed their intentions and the strategic arrangements, the discussion on the details will take a long time. If mainland travel agents violate the rules, how would the mainland side punish them? Will a fine be imposed, will the licence be suspended or will other penalties be imposed? We really do not know. Will it be necessary for the persons-in-charge of travel agents to assume legal responsibility? The Liberal Party hopes that the relevant mainland authorities will announce the details as soon as possible, so that the Hong Kong side can take complementary measures and solve the problems together.

Madam President, after talking about tourism, next, I wish to talk about the views of the Liberal Party on the several amendments today. Concerning Ms Emily LAU's proposal "to continue to develop its co-operative relationship with the Mainland on all fronts on the premise of 'one country, two systems' and 'a high degree of autonomy'", we agree with this point, however, her amendment also "urges the Central Government to..... with the Legislature and political parties in Hong Kong..... develop a normal working relationship". We have reservation about this latter view. This is because Ms LAU has always been wary of interference in the internal affairs of the SAR by the Central Authorities, so what sort of normal working relationship is she asking the Central Authorities to develop with the SAR, be it with political parties or with the legislature? Of course, Ms LAU probably has her own views, however, as

far as I understand it, the normal relationship between political parties on the Mainland is that all other parties have to follow the leadership of the Communist Party, whereas the NPC of the Central Authorities and the legislatures of various provinces or regions are subordinate to the Central Authorities. This being so, will people have the perception that a normal working relationship is one in which the Legislative Council is subordinate to the NPC? Therefore, I think that this point is not very clear and it is difficult to accept such a view.

Of course, the Liberal Party has great sympathy for Members who cannot get their Home Visit Permits, which is an issue raised by Ms LAU. We have also lobbied the senior level of the Central Authorities and suggested that they should be allowed to gain an understanding of the country. The Liberal Party has all along agreed that Members who do not hold Home Visit Permits should be given the opportunity to go back to the Mainland, so as to help them understand the development of the Motherland. However, if we want to prescribe an immigration policy for the Mainland so that the doors of the Mainland will be wide open and anyone can come and go freely, I am afraid it will be very difficult to do so.

Ms Audrey EU's amendment mentions issues such as the immigration policy, the environment and air quality. We believe that they are all reasonable and should be supported. As regards Mr Albert HO's amendment demanding that the Legislative Council urge the Mainland to draw on Hong Kong's experience in practising democracy, we think that this has violated the spirit of "one country, two systems" and "a high degree of autonomy". This is tantamount to "well water intruding upon river water" and a bad precedent may be set. Therefore, the Liberal Party does not agree with this amendment.

I so submit.

MR WONG TING-KWONG (in Cantonese): Madam President, the scope of the subject under discussion today is very broad and one fairly important aspect is people's livelihood and the economy, so I will express my views in this regard.

After the recent commissioning of the Western Corridor, there is now better co-ordination in infrastructure planning between the two places, however, this cannot satisfy the needs arising from development. I believe that the direction of the efforts made by the Governments of the two places is to consider

how to open up the transport arteries linking the Mainland and facilitate the movement of people and goods between the two places, thereby giving impetus to economic development.

At present, the construction of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge has yet to be finalized. The Chief Executive said in the Question and Answer Session of the Legislative Council last week that he hoped the project could be launched in five years. That means we may have to wait a few years more. However, we hope that we can hitch a ride on the wagon of the construction of the transport network in Guangdong and that the links between Hong Kong and other provinces can be articulated, thus making convergence possible. In view of this, apart from expediting the implementation and construction of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, the project of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link should also be launched as soon as possible, so as to build an intercity railway network and a highway network connecting Guangdong. More point-to-point through train services should also be developed, so that connections to the national high-speed railway network can be made in the form of dedicated corridors and integration with the transport arteries of the whole country can be effected, hence driving the development of logistics and other domains.

The construction of transport facilities must also be complemented by convenient customs measures. The Western Corridor commissioned in July adopted a co-location arrangement and this is a novel mode for future cross-boundary movement of goods. Meanwhile, it is also very pressing and important to develop the electronic customs clearance procedures of the two places. If the electronic platforms of the two places can be used to provide seamless customs services, so that clearance procedures can be sped up directly and the logistics bottleneck impeding the distribution of goods from the western ports to the Pan-PRD Region can be overcome, the shipment of products between the two places will certainly be even smoother. This will also enhance the flexibility of cross-boundary transportation, lower operating costs and lay a good foundation for enhancing the competitiveness of the logistics industry, so this move is mutually beneficial. However, we hope that the introduction of a "single clearance scheme for 16 customs authorities" in the PRD can be further expedited, so as to enable more ports to provide round-the-clock customs clearance.

Apart from promoting the logistics industry, another important issue is to assist professional services in developing on the Mainland. Supplement IV to

CEPA announced last month provides even more preferential treatment to the service industry in Hong Kong. Among them, Hong Kong doctors who have passed the licensing examination on the Mainland will be given treatment on a par with mainland doctors. In addition, the investment threshold for setting up medical institutions on the Mainland has been lowered from not less than RMB 20 million yuan to not less than RMB 10 million yuan. However, we know that it is very difficult for young doctors to pool together RMB 10 million yuan for setting up a clinic in the form of joint venture on the Mainland. Even if individual doctors can pass the licensing examination on the Mainland, as the regulations in various mainland provinces and municipalities are different, whether a private doctor will be allowed to practise will depend on the relevant local regulations.

Lowering the threshold is only one of the factors that will attract investments to the Mainland, however, it is also necessary to consider other factors. In fact, apart from the problem of mutual recognition of qualifications, the difficulty in applying for practice is also one of the problems confronting professionals in developing their businesses on the Mainland. As far as I understand it, the risks of setting up a clinic on the Mainland include a long wait in applying for a practice licence. Therefore, in order to implement and take forward CEPA, apart from lowering the capital requirement for Hong Kong professionals in registering to run their businesses on the Mainland, it is also necessary to streamline the relevant procedures for applying for permission to operate businesses. If the specifics are not dealt with properly, the effectiveness of implementing CEPA will be seriously curtailed and affected.

Apart from the service industry, manufacturing industry, capital raising and product development, it is also possible for Hong Kong and the Mainland to co-operate in the exhibition and trade sector. We propose that a location in the closed area in the North District of Hong Kong, where a large area of land will be made available on the opening up of the area, be designated for the establishment of an exhibition and sales venue for commodities from all parts of the world. Specifically, we can use Chau Tau at the boundary as the centre and remove the fences on the south side of the Shenzhen River and the Hong Kong side of the boundary but retain the fences located 3 km further south, this area between the boundary of the two places can be used for the development of an exhibition and sales venue for commodities from all parts of the world. This exhibition and sales city can be divided into a number of zones and internationally famous brands from various industries can be attracted to move in

and prominent members of overseas and mainland industries can also be encouraged to set up exhibition halls there. In this area, a novel mode of administration called "an SAR within the SAR" can be adopted and the Hong Kong side will only be in charge of managing people but not goods. In this area alone, mainland officers can come and go as they wish but they cannot enter Hong Kong territory located 3 km south of the Shenzhen River, whereas the Mainland will be in charge of managing goods but not people and all products for exhibition can enter the mainland side only in compliance with mainland rules and regulations.

Compared with the cyclical exhibitions held in the Convention and Exhibition Centre in Wan Chai and the Airport Expo, the exhibitions held at this global exhibition and sales venue are long-term and all-year-round in nature. Hong Kong has the conditions to become a platform of considerable scale for international trade in commodities and this global exhibition venue can bring together in Hong Kong commodities of different grades sourced from various parts of the world, so that it can become a place where commodities from our country and overseas converge. In this way, the process of transaction can be streamlined and the cost of transaction lowered.

With these remarks, Madam President, I support the original motion.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Even when under British rule, the links between China and Hong Kong were never severed. Since China was blockaded at that time due to its national policy, Hong Kong was mainly responsible for transporting to China supplies that could not otherwise be shipped to the country direct. Since the United States blockaded China and the Renminbi was not convertible, so it had to sell its goods to earn greenbacks in exchange for supplies or to keep as reserve.

This is no longer the situation nowadays and China is no longer a blockaded country. It is also a capitalist country, although China maintains that it is at the primary stage of socialism. In fact, that means it is at the primary stage of capitalism.

What is the interaction between China and Hong Kong about? Politically, it is about high-handedness, that is, the Communist Party dictates everything. As regards economic interaction, Hong Kong still had superiority

for a short time after the reunification because Hong Kong was the only place where capital could be raised, particularly because the ability of the Chinese to raise capital is terrific. Now, we have reached a new stage at which China has become a country that exports capital and it is buying things everywhere. Antony LEUNG has even done the country a service by recommending the stocks that our country should buy. Earlier on, I found that the prices of the stocks had plunged below their listed prices, so he has done it a service again.

What is the point I am trying to make? What are the links between China and Hong Kong that we are now talking about? In fact, it is about the connections in capital between Hong Kong and China. The capital in China consists mainly of the capital of the Communist Party. In addition, there are the capitals of the princelings. Concerning our two tunnels, even Mr Larry YUNG has asked the Hong Kong Government if it would buy them back and that he would not sell them to the Hong Kong Government unless it would also sell the Cross Harbour Tunnel to him. The daughter of the former Premier, Mr LI, said that she wanted to supply electricity to Hong Kong and the son of the former President, Mr JIANG, also said that he wanted to invest in the telecommunications industry here. Mate, all these do not matter anymore.

In the last two years, China has used Hong Kong as the base for listing privatized state assets. A number of consortia here have benefited from this effortlessly. LEE Shau-kee was able to reap a lot of gains, so much so that he could not help saying, "I have made tens of billions of dollars and it was really unwise of me to be involved in the real property business in the past." He also taught the public how to speculate on stocks and what stocks they should buy. He also introduced the state of the stock market in China to them. What phenomenon is this? This is the integration of capital, the integration of big capital. Things are always like this in politics. Now, this group of people has made money. In the past, they were only regarded as the sons of a concubine but this is no longer the case now. It turns out that they can also get a share of the milk and whoever nurses them, they regard her as mother. Such is the relationship between them.

Members have said a lot already and I definitely am not interested in querying anyones motive, however, I wish to relate a very simple story which I have related many times here. When the "Nine plus Two" arrangement was implemented, I remember that Mr ZHANG Dejiang came to Hong Kong after the SARS epidemic had ended. At that time, 500 000 people had taken to the

streets. After TUNG Chee-hwa had fielded questions in an interview on the Mainland, Mr ZHANG Dejiang talked about the "Nine plus Two" arrangement and he said that he was ZHANG Dejiang, Member of the Political Bureau of the CPC Central Committee, without mentioning that he was an official of Guangdong.

We know that the "Two" in the "Nine plus Two" arrangement refers to Guangdong and this story shows that in the whole scheme of things, first, since Hong Kong is a place and the regime in Hong Kong is controlled by rich people, if it is said that the co-operation between China and Hong Kong is beneficial to the grassroots in Hong Kong, this is really trying to deceive me. Our industries have been hollowed out because they have been relocated to the Mainland. Our environmental woes occurred because Hong Kong people bought diesel generators on their own on the Mainland to generate electricity. This is tolerated as long as they can afford it. If one operates electro-plating factories on the Mainland and the effluent flows to Hong Kong, what does that matter? Who will deal with such matters? I really cannot see that anyone will deal with them.

A lot of people tell us that if a pseudo-democratic proposal can be found for the political situation in Hong Kong as soon as possible, we will not be involved in self-attrition anymore and we can then see further development. Given the present state of China-Hong Kong relationship, oedema will definitely occur, just like the oedema in my legs, will it not? Because it is deformed and sickly.

I wish Members will enlighten me on this: Nowadays, we are talking about 23 000 points in the Hang Seng Index and everyone has struck it rich. If the bubble bursts in future, will anyone speak out here? Will anyone? Secondly, we are talking about China and Hong Kong joining hands, but have we considered the livelihood of the people in China and Hong Kong? Have they considered the Gini Coefficients of Hong Kong and China, which will climb higher and higher? Have they ever thought about how heavily our GDP depends on the money in this area? No one would talk about these things.

Therefore, my view is that it is wrong if someone tells us that if we do not support one-party dictatorship and do not support the rapid privatization of state assets under one-party dictatorship, it will be impossible to make Hong Kong prosperous. I believe that as a country, China should adopt the federal system.

With one-party dictatorship, there will eventually be trouble. When will trouble come? I do not know.

Therefore, I hope Members will heed this point.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, I would like to thank Mr Jasper TSANG for proposing today a motion on such an important subject, namely the co-operative relationship between the HKSAR and the Mainland. The cultures of the two places, though belonging to the same country, are diametrically different under two systems. Nonetheless, the trend towards integration between the two places has become inevitable, as exchanges between the people of the two places get more and more frequent. Attention must be paid to a number of issues, not only economic and political ones, but also bread-and-butter and social issues.

At present, the number of Hong Kong people residing in the Mainland on a long-term basis has, as revealed by statistics, risen from some 40 000 in 2001 to some 91 000 in 2005. Representing 1.7% of the total employed population, they are primarily working in the Mainland. In terms of cross-boundary employment, the relevant figure has also increased from some 97 000 in 1995 to some 228 000 in 2005, accounting for 7.2% of the local working population. The two figures combined, if the year of 2005 is taken as the basis for calculation, account for some 9% of the employed population. I believe the figure will break through 10% by 2007.

I strongly agree with Mr Jasper TSANG that co-operation between the two places can bring about a mutually beneficial and win-win effect. However, economic benefits aside, exchanges between the two places have also led to problems in all aspects, such as family problems, cross-boundary crimes, cross-boundary drug abuse, cross-boundary schooling, and cross-boundary retirement brought about by cross-boundary employment and marriages. In addition to people's basic necessities of life, that is, clothing, food, housing and transportation, their more deep-level requirements, such as cultural integration, social participation and certain basic human rights issues, are also involved. The issue of Home Visit Permits raised by Ms Emily LAU actually concerns basic human rights. As residents of the HKSAR, do we have the right to enter the Mainland? However, this issue, which involves basic human rights and needs, has yet to be resolved.

The diametrical difference between the legal systems of both places has led to a lot of conflicts. When we enter the Mainland for employment or establishing a family, a host of problems will arise simply due to the difference between the two legal systems. What can Hong Kong people do when they encounter problems in the Mainland? I raise this question simply because too many cases of injustice have occurred in the Mainland. President, I would like to introduce a book called *The petitioner*, which is a record of appalling cases of injustice with pictures and accompanying stories, for colleagues' reference. Members who have read the book will definitely feel extremely concerned. How can Hong Kong people enjoy their basic human rights protection under such a judicial system? Although the book covers tens of thousands, actually more than a million, petitioners, only 0.2% of the cases of injustice have finally been resolved. However, Ms Emily LAU does not even have a chance to make a petition.

Apart from the problems caused by the legal system, how do the authorities concerned assist Hong Kong people working in the Mainland in solving problems brought about by Hong Kong people who opt for cross-boundary employment, such as labour disputes or taxation problems?

In addition, there are also problems caused by cross-boundary families, from the problems of "keeping second wives" which were prevalent years ago to the right of abode issues which remain unsolved today. Marriages between mainlanders and Hong Kong people have also given rise to such problems as old men marrying young wives and domestic violence. Members should have noted a case that occurred earlier in which a mainland wife, who suspected her husband of having an affair, chopped him to death and leapt to her death afterwards. In a cross-boundary family tragedy occurred in Pok Hong Estate recently, a father threw his six-year-old daughter onto the street and then killed himself. As tragedies like these continue unabated, what can we do to improve the relationship of these families? Although the present ratio of marriages across the boundary represents 35% of the number of marriages registered in Hong Kong last year, we can almost describe ourselves as being totally helpless in the face of these problems. As regards pregnant women entering Hong Kong from the Mainland, an "across-the-board" approach has been adopted to discriminate against them. Actually, a considerable proportion of these cases are Hong Kong families, and yet we choose to punish them indiscriminately. I guess I need not mention the consequences here. We have actually pointed out clearly the dilemmas brought about by these cases in many other meetings.

In addition, the two places also have problems of crimes and drug abuse. According to official figures, the number of people going northward for drug abuse last year stood at 1 300, representing 11% of the total number of drug abusers, with the North District being the hardest hit. Compared with the corresponding period, the number of people arrested last year increased significantly by 2.5 times.

President, after speaking for such a long time, I really think that it is imperative for a platform to be set up to facilitate communication between the two places on joint planning and discussion of social and bread-and-butter issues. I has been told that our Hong Kong Economic and Trade Office in Guangdong has set up under it a standing committee to take care of the ties between the two places regarding social services. However, not only do I have no idea of the membership of the committee, I also have no idea of when meetings will be held and what will be discussed by the committee. Even I, as a representative of the social welfare sector, am not aware of the existence of such a mechanism. Neither do I know what functions such a mechanism is performing at the moment. For these reasons, I agree with Mr Jasper TSANG that it is imperative for us to establish some standing mechanisms. However, these mechanisms must be transparent and allow participation by the relevant bodies and organizations of Hong Kong and the Mainland. Should everything continue to be dealt with "under the table" in an obscure manner, it will be very difficult to promote co-operation between the two places. Thank you, President.

MS MIRIAM LAU (in Cantonese): Madam President, since Hong Kong's reunification with the Motherland, the Central Government has launched a series of policies and initiatives for the SAR, including the signing of CEPA and its supplements, the expansion of the Individual Visit Scheme, the relaxation of the scope of investment for QDII, the intensification of Renminbi services, and so on. These policies and initiatives have not only provided Hong Kong people with a lot of opportunities, but also played a considerable role in promoting the local economy, thus contributing to the prosperity of the territory.

Given these opportunities, and coupled with the Mainland's continued development, Hong Kong must strive to achieve continuous self-improvement and further upgrade its status as an international financial, trade and shipping hub for the purpose of reinforcing itself and contributing more positively to China's

economic development. Hence, it is imperative for Hong Kong to strengthen its co-operative relationship with the Mainland on all fronts and for Hong Kong and the Mainland to complement each other's strengths in order to achieve a win-win situation. Insofar as Hong Kong's shipping and logistics industries are concerned, this is not only a significant inspiration, but also the direction in which the industries must work hard in the future.

Over the past decade, the continued development of ports within the Pearl River Delta (PRD) Region, coupled with an indistinct division of roles, has contributed to competition within the region. If all places in the region continue to calculate for themselves without adopting a holistic approach such that new terminals continue to be built, not only overlapping of resources but also vicious competition will be resulted. As the saying goes: "Two dogs fight for a bone, and a third runs away with it." Not only will this do no good to the PRD Region as a whole, it will be detrimental to the country too. Furthermore, this might give the ports in other countries or regions an opportunity to take advantage of.

However, I believe this situation will be reversed because the Central Government has explicitly indicated in the National 11th Five-Year Plan its support for Hong Kong's logistics industry and Hong Kong's status as an international shipping hub. The Ministry of Communications has earlier proposed a series of initiatives to uphold the development of Hong Kong ports, including supporting enterprises operated by Hong Kong terminals to invest in construction of ports in the Mainland, supporting mainland shipping enterprises to develop second-tier transport and feeder transport linking mainland ports with containers in Hong Kong, and investing in the construction of high-level river fairway networks within the PRD Region. In other words, it is the hope of the Central Government that Hong Kong can become a central port to provide numerous small and medium-sized ports in the Mainland with international container transshipment services. At the same time, Hong Kong may make more use of the relatively low cost river trade to strengthen the competitive edge of its ports.

Given the Central Government's initiative to include the SAR in its national and regional planning, it is imperative for Hong Kong to make more effort in complementing and communicating with the Mainland in infrastructure

development in order to achieve mutual benefits. However, Hong Kong's progress in perfecting the development of cross-boundary infrastructure and expediting the preparation and construction of its connections with the transport infrastructure of its neighbours and the country as a whole has not been satisfactory. Actually, owing to the difference in the pace of economic development between Hong Kong and the Mainland, the SAR Government has been developing its infrastructure in accordance with the principle of "planning as required", while the Mainland has been adopting an "appropriate advanced planning" approach in synchronizing its economy and development.

In order to achieve a win-win situation, it is imperative for Hong Kong to adjust its pace in expediting the construction of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge while taking forward the construction of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link expeditiously, linking up with the national high-speed railway networks with the "dedicated corridor", and connecting with all the main arteries of communications of Guangdong Province as well as the entire country. In addition to integration at the cross-boundary infrastructure level, it is also essential for Hong Kong to continue to upgrade its customs clearance efficiency, strive for the implementation of co-location of clearance at more control points, allow more control points to provide 24-hour cross-boundary clearance, as well as expediting the construction of the Eastern Crossing (Liantang Control Point).

Madam President, as I stated at the beginning of my speech, it is imperative for Hong Kong to further upgrade its status as an international shipping hub to contribute more positively to the economy of the country. In terms of shipping, one of the advantages of Hong Kong lies in its provision of excellent complementary services for its shipping and logistics businesses, including a wide range of relevant support services such as freight forwarding, ship trade, maritime arbitration, ship financing, shipping insurance, and so on. In logistics, Hong Kong has logistics enterprises with rich experience in international markets and full knowledge of the global flow of logistics. It is therefore essential for Hong Kong to inject more resources to provide its shipping and logistics industries with concrete support services and complementary facilities so that the strengths of our shipping and logistics industries can be consolidated, thus enabling Hong Kong to fully utilize its strengths in these two areas to serve the country.

The rapid development of the economy of China will bring Hong Kong even more opportunities. Hong Kong must seize these opportunities and foster economic co-operation with the Mainland on all fronts in order to achieve a mutually beneficial and win-win situation.

Madam President, I so submit.

MR ALAN LEONG (in Cantonese): Madam President, although Hong Kong people or Hong Kong enterprises have never been "parasites", we must guard against becoming "parasites".

Some colleagues stated earlier that we should not adopt an attitude of relying entirely on the Mainland. Instead, we should play a role to foster a mutually beneficial and interactive relationship with China. Actually, there is absolutely no correlation between this discussion about "parasites" and the mentality of resistance against the Mainland. Given that Hong Kong is rooted in the divine land of our country, the future of Hong Kong and the Mainland are closely intertwined in politics, economy and the people's livelihood.

However, if the HKSAR is to make more contribution to the Mainland, it must strive to make continuous improvement, whether in the political, cultural or economic domains. It must continue to do so. Actually, we should keep guarding against asking the country what it can do for the HKSAR, but instead we should ask the HKSAR what it can do for the country.

Madam President, the Civic Party has always believed that co-operation between China and Hong Kong can absolutely not be focused merely on business and economic affairs. As pointed out in Ms Audrey EU's amendment, co-operation between China and Hong Kong has to be stepped up in a number of policy areas, such as immigration policies, air quality improvement, environmental conservation, food safety, and so on, for the purpose of enhancing the well-being of the people of the two places,

Let me cite food safety as an example. Over the years, Hong Kong people have always felt the importance of improving co-operation between the two places in food safety. I still recall that Hong Kong was embroiled in a food scare years ago. There were incidents of not only pork containing the bacteria

Streptococcus suis, but also fish containing malachite green and vibrio cholera and crabs containing antibiotics. Actually, what was most appalling to the people at that time was not the constant emergence of newly found harmful substances in food, but rather the absolute passiveness of the SAR Government in acquiring information on harmful food and its failure to take the initiative in appreciating the gravity of the developments.

We should be pleased that in recent years, we have seen the Central Government act more proactively in handling food safety problems obviously because, with the introduction of the 11th Five-Year Plan, attending to the people's livelihood and fostering harmony have become national policies. Furthermore, the Central Authorities have instructed local governments to step up monitoring of food quality. On the other hand, with the recent establishment of the Centre for Food Safety, the SAR has evidently become more active in monitoring the safety of imported food, acquiring information, and so on. If both China and Hong Kong can simultaneously raise their concern about food safety and make persistent efforts in rationalizing their food safety strategies, the people of both places will ultimately be benefited.

Madam President, since the middle of this year, the Mainland has started strengthening its inspection and quarantine management system for vegetables supplied to Hong Kong, including designating supply farms, implementing label identification and lead-seal control, and regularizing certification and voucher management. Moreover, the quarantine and seal identification measures for vessels carrying freshwater fish have also been stepped up. On the other hand, in an incident involving suspected contamination of eggs with Sudan Red at the end of last year, misunderstanding arose when the SAR Government conducted an investigation into the stock of eggs locally. However, from the efficiency demonstrated by the SAR in verifying with the Mainland the whereabouts of problematic eggs, we can see that communication between China and Hong Kong has been improved significantly.

Madam President, at a meeting held by the Panel on Food Safety and Environmental Hygiene of this Council the day before yesterday, the SAR Government indicated that, apart from the enactment of a food safety law, food importers would be mandated to register with the Government. We hope that, on the abovementioned basis, the SAR Government can expeditiously discuss with the mainland authorities to integrate such components as registration of importers, source control, procedures of recall from the market, and so on, in

formulating a comprehensive "from farm to table" food safety strategy so as to safeguard the safety of food supplied to Hong Kong more effectively.

Through the subject of food safety, we can easily find that co-operation between China and Hong Kong can absolutely be built on a more equitable, rational and mutually beneficial basis. Madam President, during the early period of the reunification, the SAR Government's attitude towards co-operation between China and Hong Kong was relatively passive for it merely sought to passively respond to mainland policies without taking any initiative to make co-operation proposals, not to mention fighting for the interests of Hong Kong people. However, as the ties between the interests of the two places get closer and closer, I believe the SAR Government will gradually come to realize the importance of taking the initiative. Hong Kong itself possesses the advantage of contributing to the Mainland. At the same time, it may capitalize on this advantage to uphold its own interest in interaction with China. On a number of bread-and-butter issues concerning the people of the Mainland and Hong Kong, the SAR Government should take a more active role in discussing with the Mainland to strive for regular co-operation in a more comprehensive manner so as to further upgrade the living quality of the people of both places.

Madam President, I so submit.

MISS CHAN YUEN-HAN (in Cantonese): As pointed out by a number of colleagues earlier, the question of debate today is very significant. I have been sitting here listening and would very much like to speak to express my views on this major topic. With the country's reform and liberalization, there have been increasing contacts between Hong Kong and the Mainland. Actually, the contacts were not attributed solely to the reunification, only that the pace of contact has been speeded up by the reunification. The premise at present is that the national plan to converge with the world has brought continued development. I think this is an important factor.

In the face of the present situation, this Council has, on numerous occasions, debated this subject, and I have delivered a number of speeches on this topic too. Very often, my speeches were primarily about how we could do better by making the pursuit of mutual benefits for the two places as our goal of development. This trend is actually not our subjective point of view. There is

indeed an objective need for both places to work closely. For instance, there was something wrong with the communication mechanisms of the two places during the outbreak of SARS in 2003. This is why I fully shared Mr Jasper TSANG's point when he mentioned the word "authoritative". Because of a lack of communication at that time, when things went wrong after the arrival of Prof LIU, Dr Margaret CHAN..... let us recount what happened back then. The matter was finally submitted to the Central Authorities and, with their assistance, a press conference was convened to resolve some of the troubles facing Hong Kong at that time.

Therefore, subjectivity is necessary. With the growing development of the country to converge with the world, we must do a good job of it in this respect. Furthermore, there is also an objective need to do so. Frankly speaking, our daily consumption includes Dongjiang water and food produced in the Mainland. In the event of a major epidemic outbreak, concerted efforts must be made to tackle the crisis properly. In recent years, I have seen a lot of improvement made by the government officials in Hong Kong. Nevertheless, efforts must continue to be made because certain problems, surely including the bread-and-butter and political issues, have yet to be tackled.

Anyhow, I still wish to express my great anxiety as the two places strive for full development to achieve a mutually beneficial effect. Judging from its present circumstances, I think that the SAR Government is doing considerably well in complementing the Mainland. Co-operation between the two sides have also increased in the past two years. However, how can individuals in different positions bring their advantages into full play? During the process, I think that both parties have to complement and co-operate with each other. At the same time, there is keen competition between them. What can we do if we cannot find our own footing? Frankly speaking, the Mainland has learnt a lot from Hong Kong in financial services. Some Hong Kong people have even returned to the country to render assistance without charging anything. During the process, it is evident that the development has been very rapid. A heated topic recently is: Will Hong Kong's stock market be overtaken by the Mainland in raising funds? Hence, if there is something New York should worry about, it might be the Mainland rather than Hong Kong.

In other words, insofar as individuals are concerned, the Mainland has been learning a lot from Hong Kong and, given its own development potentials, moving forward because of its determination to engage in full liberalization.

On the contrary, I am worried about the advantages possessed by Hong Kong today. While I agree that it is right for the Government to play a complementary and co-operative role in development, how can Hong Kong pursue its own development in the process? We debated this issue some time ago with Secretary Frederick MA in this Council. Though we have often talked about leading businessmen to visit the north and raising funds for the Mainland, have we ever thought of what the businessmen can bring back to Hong Kong? The Government must consider this.

To be frank, of the four major economic pillars we often talk about, namely logistics and finance, the logistics industry cannot develop further. I guess the President has also made frequent mention of this point here. With the developments on all fronts, our position has become increasingly weak. As for the remaining economic pillars, namely finance and tourism, I do not wish to dwell on them in detail. Strictly speaking, we are being surpassed by others. What remain to be developed are probably our services industries, which are considered by me our only strength. However, it will not work if we rely solely on the services industries. After all, individual development is allowed in China. Furthermore, there are simply too many talented people in China. Therefore, it is extremely easy for China to surpass Hong Kong. This is why I have often considered it worthwhile for the SAR Government, especially the new team of the Government, to consider how Hong Kong can develop its own unique economy, apart from co-operating and complementing the Mainland — we may, in the course of developing our individual potentials, in turn render assistance to the country.

Furthermore, I would like to raise another issue concerning food — it is related to pigs. I have already raised my question. At present, we basically rely on the Mainland for the supply of water, pigs, chicken, vegetables, and so on, because of the abundant supplies of fresh food in the Mainland. However, I would very much like to tell the Government that the problems we face at the moment concern global resources. With a population of 1.3 billion, China must care for its own people. Despite China's great care of Hong Kong by exporting more pigs to Hong Kong, I still feel that Hong Kong has to think for itself. Our present population of 7 million will reach 8 million in the future, and will even reach 10 million, as anticipated by the Chief Executive. Do we have our own agricultural produce? Do we have our own fishery produce? Mr WONG Yung-kan has dwelt on a lot in this respect. Very often, the Government chooses to rely on mainland supplies for convenience sake. At the same time,

the Mainland provides Hong Kong with everything it cares to ask. Sometimes, the Mainland would even accommodate us. Even though there are no pigs for consumption in the Mainland, the state would still accommodate us by supplying Hong Kong with even more pigs.

I think Hong Kong should cease to hold such an attitude. With an increasing shortage of resources around the world, Hong Kong cannot go without basic necessities for survival. It cannot rely on others on everything. Despite its exorbitant pork prices, the Mainland has still accommodated Hong Kong. Regarding this issue, I would like to raise the point that Hong Kong must be forward-looking. It has been predicted by quite a number of prophets that if resources of the world are allowed to be squandered and consumed in this way, we might end up depleting all our resources. Have we considered this?

Frankly speaking, on the one hand, I am convinced that we must strengthen our co-operation, communication and complementary efforts with the Mainland but, on the other hand, I consider it necessary for Hong Kong to develop its own unique economy. Even if Hong Kong plays a more active role as an intermediary as what it does today, I will not object. Furthermore, I consider it necessary to do so, for this is integral to our development. However, has the Government contemplated our future, and what about 10 years after? No prophecy. When I chatted with a businessman in the city during my visit to the United States in 2000, I consulted his view on the future of Hong Kong and China if they should continue to develop in the then manner. I was told that the period of development for China would last some 20 years. As it was 2000 at that time, this means that seven years have already passed. It is evident that losing our advantages are gradually eroding. How can we take forward our own development during the process? At the same time, how can we provide the country with better experience as we ride on the development of the country? I believe the relevant government officials must consider all these issues. Thank you, Madam President.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): President, it is remarkable for this question, namely the development of co-operative relationship between Hong Kong and the Mainland, to be raised at the last meeting of this Legislative Session.

I had a very strong feeling in the past, thinking that the so-called co-operative relationship had absolutely nothing to do with co-operation. What it really meant was the Central Government, as the dominant player, gave instructions for compliance by Hong Kong. Therefore, does this motion moved by Mr Jasper TSANG have anything to do with the appointment of the three Secretaries of Departments and 12 Directors of Bureaux? Or does it imply any changes in our co-operative relationship with the Mainland subsequent to the restructuring of the government team or is the Honourable Member trying to test the water? It is indeed very easy to give rise to such doubts.

President, co-operation must involve both parties. Anything involving co-operation must not rely solely on a subjective wish. Instead, numerous objective factors, including manpower, resources and capital, are involved. Should the Central Authorities adhere to the approach of isolation and suppression (particularly targeted at the democratic camp), it is no co-operation. This is at least how a fraction of people in Hong Kong feel. If this is the case, it might be necessary to add "the democratic camp is excluded from discussing this issue" to Mr Jasper TSANG's original motion. If all the people of Hong Kong are involved, there must be a comprehensive adjustment in policies, and consideration must be given to the objective factors in reality.

President, over the years, Hong Kong has persistently emphasized..... my most impressive memory is that TUNG Chee-hwa and Antony LEUNG often persuaded Hong Kong people to go northward for investment, saying we should seek business opportunities in the Mainland because of the lack of business opportunities here in Hong Kong. At that time, I voiced criticism of their approach on numerous occasions, for it seemed to me that they were telling Hong Kong people to commit suicide because of the enormous risks involved in investment in the north. The senior government officials in Hong Kong advocated with such great fanfare that it sounded like everyone going northward could pick up gold from the ground. Of course, there were a number of instances of successful investment. For instance, it was recently reported that property prices in Shenzhen had risen between 40% and 50% within a year or so. However, investment in the north involves a great number of objective conditions and factors. Unlike the previous comments made by Antony LEUNG and TUNG Chee-hwa, it is not that easy to achieve the goal.

Over the years, Hong Kong people going north for investment have contributed to two major sources of pollution, namely air pollution and water pollution. Sometimes, the causal relationship can be very interesting. While Hong Kong people make a lot of money by going north for investment, they end up doing damage to themselves. A great number of pollution problems are created by factories invested by Hong Kong businesses. Of course, a number of the problems are attributed to the projects carried out by the Mainland itself. Therefore, going north has indeed brought a lot of problems.

Furthermore, some Hong Kong people are going north not for investment, but for pleasure seeking, thus creating in Hong Kong numerous broken families. As the Hong Kong Government continues its way northward seeking opportunities, this approach has gradually turned the Hong Kong Government into a "lame duck".

It is saddening that, since the beginning of China's economic liberalization in the '80s, Hong Kong has for years been taking pride in itself as a self-proclaimed gateway to China. Back then, many of the investments and developments in the Mainland had to rely on the talents, resources and legal system in Hong Kong. But things are no longer the same. In a matter of a decade since the reunification, Hong Kong's role has changed from the gateway to China to someone who lives off inherited wealth and relies on the Central Authorities for special attention.

I am most saddened that we have seen a lot of strange problems during the outbreak of SARS. While many places in the Mainland received no attention at all from the Central Authorities, such a prosper and affluent place as Hong Kong had to, on the contrary, rely on the Central Authorities for special care, with carts of supplies transported to the territory by the Central Authorities. While many of the poverty-stricken and remote places in the Mainland were not given any supplies, Hong Kong was, on the contrary, given special attention by the Central Authorities. When I witnessed this phenomenon at that time, I really had the feeling that Hong Kong had been reduced to someone who lived off inherited wealth and all it knew was to beg for money from its grandpa with absolutely no dignity.

Therefore, Hong Kong's economic development is no longer confined to leveraging on the Motherland. Our relationship with the Mainland can indeed be described as reliance or total dependence. For the sake of their own

economic benefits, many businessmen have already returned to the embrace of the Central Authorities. They will only repeat the words of "Grandpa". Sometimes, they might even be more outspoken than "Grandpa". An economic relationship which has turned into a form of political reliance can indeed be described as a tragedy in which human dignity has been destroyed and lost.

Despite the prosperity enjoyed by Hong Kong economy and business interests, what a number of businessmen get in return is the loss of their souls. It is saddening to see such an obliteration of humanity.

President, regarding the issue of HVPs raised by Ms Emily LAU in her amendment, I as a member of the democratic camp have been holding a HVP for years. Each year, I would travel to many different places in the Mainland. I had visited Xinjiang, Beijing, Qingdao, Shanghai, and other places. Actually, in order to give members of the democratic camp a better understanding of the Motherland, the Central Authorities must issue HVPs to them expeditiously. You will feel very excited when you return to the Mainland and talk with the middle-rank mainland officials because they are 10 times more open-minded than senior officials in Hong Kong. When you talk with a mainland official, he will tell you how to do a good job of a certain task. However, when you talk with a senior official in Hong Kong, he will only explain to you why a certain thing must not be done. Therefore, if the Central Authorities wish to change the attitude of Members of the democratic camp towards the Motherland, the best way is to issue them with HVPs (*the buzzer sounded*).....

Thank you, President.

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

MRS SELINA CHOW (in Cantonese): First of all, I would like to thank Mr Jasper TSANG for giving us the opportunity of discussing such an important issue. Undoubtedly, I believe after Hong Kong has been reunited with China for 10 years, the co-operative relationship with the Mainland has become increasingly important, and it will also become more and more significant. Therefore, there is no time more suitable than the present to hold a debate on this topic.

However, when we talk about co-operation relationship, I believe we must make it clear that there are differences between co-operation and integration. Furthermore, regarding co-operation, parties with completely different viewpoints and perspectives may still consider co-operation. However, co-operation is absolutely not feasible in certain issues. What are such issues? It has been explicitly stipulated in the Basic Law that, under the guiding principle of "one country, two systems", socialist systems and policies will never be implemented in Hong Kong. In other words, the political systems and social systems of our country and Hong Kong are completely different. This is of course because we have very different histories and backgrounds; we have very different cultures; and our mindsets are also not quite the same. As such, the state has specifically made such arrangements.

Today, in listening to the speeches delivered by certain colleagues, I find they have forgotten this point. Why? For example, in Mr Albert HO's amendment, he said that we must influence the governance of our country, and how universal suffrage could be implemented. I believe this is not the duty of this Legislative Council in Hong Kong. Mr Albert HO might have spoken from his personal point of view, and considered this as his duty or the duty of the Hong Kong Alliance in Support of Patriotic Democratic Movements of China. But this is definitely not the duty of us Members of the Legislative Council, or this legislature.

Besides, I think it is very unfortunate for him to have adopted such an attitude. In fact, I am not just talking about the attitude of people from the pro-democracy camp or the opposition camp. Of course, on this issue, the attitude of the Central Authorities or the mainland authorities towards people from the pro-democracy camp or the opposition camp is also relevant. Certainly, there is always a two-way interactive dimension to such issues, and both sides should bear some responsibilities. However, very obviously, during the periods before and after the reunification, those people from the pro-democracy camp or the opposition camp in Hong Kong always held a hostile and sometimes critical attitude towards the mainland authorities — I dare not say all of them had acted that way, but some of them had obviously acted that way — that kind of suspicious, slogan-like name-calling practices had made those who had been living in the mainland environment with completely different political cultures unable to understand why Hong Kong people would have acted in that manner. When you communicate with anyone, you should treat your counterparts with politeness and courtesy. But very often, we can hardly see any politeness and courtesy.

Frankly speaking, it is still fine when the people are separated from each other on two sides of the boundary. As Ms Emily LAU has said, if we were in the Mainland, and she probably would not do that, if some of our Members should rush before certain officials of the Central Government and condemn them with a pointing finger, I believe the latter would definitely be at a loss of what to do. I think we cannot ignore such cultural and ideological differences as if they are non-existent. In fact, we have completely accepted the habits of many Hong Kong people. However, when we are in the Mainland, the local people will be at a loss as to what they should do in order to cope with such habits. Therefore, in adopting such ideological approaches or attitudes, I believe our colleagues from the pro-democracy camp should reflect on themselves to see whether they have really done something which is conducive to communication.

With regard to Ms Emily LAU's amendment, it "urges the Central Government to issue Home Visit Permits to those Hong Kong people who cannot return to the Mainland, including" . We from the Liberal Party in fact have always supported and hoped that the Central Government can invite our Members from the pro-democracy camp to visit the Mainland. I believe this is a fact known to Ms Emily LAU. We have discussed this from time to time. We felt that communication is good. However, as a matter of fact, regardless of which country we are referring to, all the countries do possess the absolute authority to exercise discretion over what kinds of people they would allow into their territories.

Some Hong Kong people are not allowed to go to the Mainland due to all kinds of reasons. Let us take the case of Falun Gong as an example. Falun Gong can conduct whatever activities in Hong Kong, but its existence is prohibited on the Mainland. So, can Falun Gong members in Hong Kong go to the Mainland freely? In this example, should we urge the mainland authorities to allow all Hong Kong people to go to the Mainland? This is the reason explaining why we cannot agree with Ms Emily LAU's amendment.

With regard to Ms Audrey EU's amendment, we find what she has said very reasonable; in particular, we must define the so-called "development on all fronts", as I have said just now. On the political front, if we advocate "one country, two systems", then we should skip discussing politics. But on other fronts such as people's livelihood, we may in fact explore some co-operative relationship. It is fine to have co-operation on various fronts. However, I

must make it clear that the Liberal Party does not agree with the Civic Party's view on the immigration policy. It does not mean that we will vote against its amendment. We will not because we think that Ms Audrey EU's amendment is reasonable in terms of identifying ways of co-operation.

However, we absolutely cannot agree with the Civic Party's viewpoint of allowing all the spouses of Hong Kong people who are married in the Mainland to move freely in and out of Hong Kong. We think this is not feasible. At the time of getting married, they were fully aware of the immigration policy of Hong Kong, that is, it is explicitly stipulated that they cannot move freely in and out of Hong Kong. And for Hong Kong people making the choice of looking for spouses and getting married in the Mainland, they have also known what kind of policy they would be facing. If we seek a change to the immigration policy, then we must secure the agreement of the vast majority of Hong Kong people. I believe this is still a very controversial issue. I do not believe we can say that, basing on our co-operative relationship, we can completely relax the immigration policy with immediate effect.

Thank you, President.

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

MR ABRAHAM SHEK: Madam President, the original motion under debate reflects a practical approach to the difficult issue of bringing about better co-operation between places, and I must say that this is likened to the biblical story of the return of the prodigal son. The father welcomed the lost son back with open arms and in a state of ecstasy. The problem comes not from father and son relationship, but rather from relationship among brothers. Why should the prodigal son be different and be even treated better than the others who had been filial and loyal? The story reflects the fact of human nature, and it is only through mutual respect and mutual trust could misunderstandings, be they real or imaginary, be eliminated or minimized. And then, co-operation and mutual appreciation could be nurtured.

The subject must be discussed under the concept of "one country, two systems". The "one country" aspect of the concept is accepted by every Chinese irrespective of his political belief, this is beyond any debate. It is the

"two systems" part which is creating problems. It is because by nature, the "two systems" are conflicting. To make this part work, it must depend on the people under the "two systems", particularly the favoured one, which is Hong Kong, to show understanding, compassion, toleration, consideration and adopt a sense of sharing and caring. The fact is that the "two systems" part reflects different values, different cultures, different attitudes, different outlooks and many many other differences. Even the spoken language is different.

In the '60s and the '70s, every one of us must remember that the affinity of the Hong Kong people and that of the mainlanders were at natural high. We cared for them, we sent a lot of things to them, we shared what little we had with them, and above all, we tried to understand them because they were living in a different political environment. Irrespective of the British colonial administration, the political boundary at Lo Wu failed to weaken our ethnic root being Chinese, for the majority of Hong Kong people came from the Mainland. Ten years on, despite the existence of Lo Wu and the return of sovereignty to China, bringing us back into one country, Lo Wu still exists as a physical boundary for the "two systems".

Now, we are one country, but somehow, our relationship has turned from blood and emotional relationship to material relationship. Possibly, this is the major source of problem for materialism breeds greed, materialism breeds conflicts and materialism breeds dislike and hatred. These are some of the issues which we must address.

On the "one country" level, our central leadership has bent over backward to help Hong Kong in the hours of need, in particular, raining economic favours upon us during the time when we were in trouble. We should be grateful. However, not only did we take such favours for granted, but also, because of this attitude, further misunderstanding was precipitated, thus further aggravating differences and preventing better co-operation, apart from economic co-operation. We are now more politically open and mature under the protection of the Basic Law, which is the greatest gift to the people of Hong Kong.

With the freedom we now have, and, taking into consideration the green paper which was tabled yesterday — it might not be perfect but it is a road to further democracy — I urge the people in Hong Kong, this Council in particular, to have more toleration. We should be the leaders to ensure that we can give

them better understanding and toleration, so that we can have better co-operation between the people of Hong Kong and the people on the Mainland.

Thank you, Madam President.

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

DR YEUNG SUM (in Cantonese): Madam President, first of all, I would like to thank Mr Jasper TSANG for making such a speech which in itself is like a review of the 10 years' history of Hong Kong since the reunification in this last motion debate in this Legislative Session. I have listened to his speech very attentively — frankly speaking, among the colleagues from the DAB, Mr Jasper TSANG's power of expression is relatively rare and far between — he has put forward two points: First, in the initial period after the reunification, many Hong Kong people, be they in the business sector or in the Government, basically all resisted the intervention from the Central Authorities or resisted "one country", or they might even go as far as saying that attempts must be made to prevent the Central Authorities from "contaminating" Hong Kong, and so on — these were wordings frequently used by political parties in debates. Secondly, he felt that Hong Kong is a capitalist society practising the principles of free economy, so why should the people resist opening up the economy to the Mainland or liberalizing Hong Kong to allow the mainland financial sector to enter Hong Kong? He raised a major question in this regard, and this is probably a question in terms of ideology or policy.

However, we may look at the issue from a more pragmatic perspective. Members may all still recall that, in 2003, a press report said that state leaders in the Central Authorities had issued the order that mainland officials were not allowed to interfere with Hong Kong in different aspects. Very obviously, during the initial period after the reunification, many local forces from different parts of China might have tried to interfere with Hong Kong in different aspects because they had been accustomed to the top-down approach, and this must have effected certain influence; otherwise, leaders of the Central Authorities would not have made such an explicit decision. In fact, regardless of whether we are referring to those from the pro-democracy camp or those who care about the future of Hong Kong, it is both reasonable and necessary for these people to raise questions regarding "one country", and hope that the "high degree of autonomy" of Hong Kong under the "two systems" can be preserved.

Madam President, I frequently come into contact with some consul-generals of foreign countries. I have asked them, in view of the large number of their nationals in Hong Kong, if they intend to set up head offices, which city, Hong Kong or Shanghai, they will suggest such companies to set up their respective head offices. Most consul-generals would say they preferred Hong Kong. I asked them why they opted for Hong Kong: While China was the second largest economic power in the world, and the development in Shanghai was very fast, why did they still put forward Hong Kong in their suggestion? The answer was, Hong Kong possessed several qualities that could not be found in mainland cities, namely, independent systems, the spirit of the rule of law, the free press, an open and pluralistic society and a mature market economy. Basically, such software so far still cannot be found in mainland cities. Madam President, these are the core values of Hong Kong. These are the core values of "high degree of autonomy" under the "two systems" in Hong Kong that the pro-democracy camp has been fighting so hard to defend for so many years.

Now, it has been 10 years since the reunification. Let us take this period as the time required for Hong Kong to gear in with the Mainland. Our achievement attained so far has been the result of the hard efforts made by many people in defending the core values of Hong Kong from different perspectives. I believe state leaders of the Central Authorities should be able to perceive this more and more clearly; otherwise, Premier WEN would not have reaffirmed Hong Kong as a significant financial city of China in his recent work report to the whole country. From this, we can see that the nature of Hong Kong's "high degree of autonomy" has enabled it to make great contribution to our country financially, politically and culturally.

Therefore, Madam President, I support the amendments proposed by Mr Albert HO, Ms Audrey EU and Ms Emily LAU because basically they all propose to, under the sovereignty of China, safeguard Hong Kong's "high degree of autonomy" which includes the rule of law, press freedom and free exchanges among the people, and so on. In fact, we in the pro-democracy camp, under the sovereignty of China, have never collaborated with foreign countries, nor have we received any financial assistance from overseas forces. I still remember a Mencius quotation, "Why should I bother to argue?" Are we not interested in enjoying some leisure time on our own? We all have our own families to take care of, why do we bother to involve ourselves in all such encumbrances in the politics? Apart from the fact that we all support the

reunification, we are also very eager to demonstrate to state leaders in the Central Authorities that Hong Kong is not just a financial city, but it is also a highly mature civil society. The success of Hong Kong has been built on some core values, namely a pluralistic society, open mass media, an independent judicial system and a mature market economy. If these are undermined in any way, the entire country could be in danger.

This explains why sometimes we in the pro-democracy camp insist on telling the truth, even though we know all too well that what we say may not be pleasing to their ears. Because we want state leaders to know explicitly that "one country" is of course the premise, but "two systems" are also very important.

We have been talking about "one country, two systems" for 10 years. Can we switch the subject matter, to discuss "two systems, one country" instead? In other words, both the Mainland and Hong Kong can have the opportunities to give full play to their respective advantages, and both systems of the two places are making good contribution to the country. Our country has already ascended to the international stage. Therefore, it must develop towards the rule of law, it must develop towards market economy, and it must develop in the direction of respecting the freedom and rights of the people, and it must develop its democratic political system. These are the areas in which the pro-democracy camp has to make efforts, and I hope Honourable colleagues can reconsider all these. We often say that "one country" is the premise, then is it necessary to sacrifice the "high degree of autonomy" under the "two systems" for the sake of "one country"? Since we have been discussing such issues for so long, why can we not discuss "two systems, one country" instead? "One China" will never be changed, and there can be no disputing it. We in the pro-democracy camp also oppose the independence of Taiwan, and we oppose the theory of "Two China's". Some years ago, we had an argument with LEE Teng-hui just because of the Diaoyutai Incident. Our basic stance is all too clear. Is it the right time now for Hong Kong to give full play to its "high degree of autonomy" under the "two systems", so as to complement the mainland system, so that Hong Kong can become the window of democracy on China, as well as the forerunner of the rule of law? I believe all these can bring good contribution to the development of the country as a whole. Thank you, Madam President.

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

MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG (in Cantonese): President, I have not taken part in the earlier part of the debate. I have only listened to some of the viewpoints expounded by Mr Jasper TSANG. I wish to share with you my feelings.

The pro-democracy camp does not resist the Central Authorities. The pro-democracy camp has always considered that both Hong Kong and mainland China are in the same boat sharing a common destiny because no matter what we have done in the past in Hong Kong, we have never forgotten our own country and that we have to promote the advancement of our country in our capacity as national subjects. We just wish to make progress together with our country, and also we only want to enjoy happy days together with the Chinese people.

The pro-democracy camp also does not resist reforms and opening up of China. The Chinese people have suffered enough. If our economy can be opened up, and if the people can share the happiness of economic development..... this had actually been the aspiration of countless revolutionary martyrs who struggled for China, and it is also the dreamed kingdom that has been pursued by many people of the pro-democracy camp in Hong Kong since their university days.

We just hope that China's reforms and opening up can eradicate corruption and bribery, and at the same time, establish a democratic system with the rule of law; that environmental protection efforts can be made, so as to hold ourselves accountable to our future generations; that people of different classes living in different places can also enjoy the fruits of reforms and opening up of the country, instead of seeing rich people becoming richer and poor people becoming poorer; nor do we wish to see that some of the people are allowed to get rich first while subjecting many others to greater poverty and humiliation.

Let us forget the older cases and just take a look at the scandal that happened in a brick factory in Shanxi, and you will know what I mean. When the country is undergoing reforms and opening up, in such a vast territory, there exist some child workers and labourers who work like slaves, then such a negative side of reforms and opening up must be removed incessantly. This illustrates our advocacy: That reforms and opening up should make people's happiness, or the happiness of the entire nation as the well-being to be pursued; that reforms and opening up should not just enable those tycoons to get rich first, and should not enable their children to go and study abroad, whereas school children living in the vast and remote mountainous regions have to worry that their schools might collapse, and that they do not have the money even for

textbooks required for their schooling. Such scenes are not pursued by us, and they are certainly not pursued by our friends from the DAB. We understand the history both sides have gone through, and we should also have respect and knowledge of the other side on issues of patriotism.

There are indeed many different ways of expressing our patriotic sentiments. However, there is a point we must learn from Chinese history: Do not blindly agree with others, and we must explicitly state our viewpoints on how our country can move forward progressively. This is a very important responsibility of a national subject.

Recently, I had read a commentary which proposed to rectify the verdict passed on the old master MA Yinchu, the population expert of China. At that time, MA Yinchu opposed the population policy of China. He thought that China cannot afford to have such a large population. But MAO Zedong's remark of "With more people, we can do better work" knocked down Mr MA Yinchu's viewpoint and made it completely worthless. At that time, even ZHOU Enlai advised MA Yinchu to comply with MAO, to review his own viewpoint and simply give in. If he accepted this, the issue would have concluded. However, Mr MA Yinchu refused to give in. He said the theory was correct and did hold water, so it should not be subject to any review. Even until his death, Mr MA Yinchu had not conducted any review of this incident. But the same happened to MAO Zedong who also insisted on his viewpoint of "With more people, we can do better work" even to his death.

What was the consequence eventually? The population of China had reached the point of explosion. The economy of China could not support the excessive size of the population. Now the "one-child policy" has to be implemented. But the "one-child policy" has brought about many social problems, even the problem of adequate provision for the ageing population of China, and the entire Chinese people have to pay a very long-term price for this. The unscrupulous suppression and refutation of a MA Yinchu viewpoint had brought about such a major disastrous consequence for the entire nation.....

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, I have listened to your speech for a long time. So far, your opinions are good, but our debate is on the co-operative relationship between Hong Kong and the Mainland. Can you please speak to the question?

MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG (in Cantonese): OK, President. What I want to say is, when we appreciate the achievement of China, or even when we appreciate the results of the co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland, we must have an honest heart to tell the truth, so as to enable such co-operation or even the affluence and prosperity of China and Hong Kong to develop on an even better road.

I even hope that the co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland will also give us the opportunity to return to our own country. One cannot say that, despite the co-operative relationship between the two sides, dissidents are still not allowed to return to our own country. This is not the way a civilized country should treat its own dissident nationals. Therefore, I very much hope that I can air the most significant feelings from the bottom of my heart: "One country, two systems" is accepted by everyone, but we must honestly and truthfully express our expectations of the country, and such expectations would not be suppressed.

DR RAYMOND HO (in Cantonese): Madam President, not too long ago, that is on the 29th of last month, the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR) signed Supplement IV to the Mainland/Hong Kong Closer Economic Partnership Arrangement (CEPA) with the Central People's Government to further intensify the liberalization of trade in services and strengthen the economic co-operation of the two places. According to Supplement IV, the Mainland will introduce 40 liberalization measures in 28 service areas, including the existing areas such as banking, convention and exhibition, medical services as well as 11 newly added areas such as social services, environmental services and public utilities. Both sides will enhance co-operation in financial services, convention and exhibition and in mutual recognition of professional qualifications.

Since the CEPA arrangements were made in June 2003, both sides have made substantial progress in co-operation in many economic sectors, including the professional services. The Ministry of Commerce made the specific arrangements after prolonged discussions had been held between the SAR Government and the mainland authorities. I also had the opportunity of participating in such meetings. However, for some professional sectors, there is still room for further enhancement of the co-operation efforts. Let us take the engineering sector as an example. In the 18 professional fields of the

engineering sectors, so far only the structural engineering field has made the arrangements for mutual recognition of professional qualifications. Yet, there is still room for improvement in the relevant arrangements. The structural engineers of Hong Kong may obtain the mainland professional qualifications through taking examinations, but they still cannot obtain the practice qualifications in the Mainland. Therefore, it is very difficult for them to start their business operations or find employment in the Mainland. One of the reasons is the excessively high thresholds. So even within another decade, the arrangements for mutual recognition of professional qualifications may not necessarily be extended to all the 18 professional fields of the engineering sector. So, we in the engineering sector really hope that more expeditious progress can be made in this regard. Therefore, I hope that the SAR Government can work at the government-to-government level to speed up the mutual recognition of professional qualifications, particularly in the engineering sector, so that more professionals in Hong Kong can benefit from CEPA arrangements. Since a new Secretary has assumed office now, we do have high expectations of him.

Apart from CEPA, Hong Kong has also reached the Pan-Pearl River Delta Regional Co-operation Framework Agreement with the nine Provincial Governments of Guangdong, Fujian, Jiangxi, Hunan, Guangxi, Hainan, Sichuan, Guizhou and Yunnan and the Special Administration Region of Macao (the "Nine plus Two" Agreement). The Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the whole region is estimated to exceed US\$1,000 billion by 2010, and it will grow to US\$2,000 billion by 2020. In other words, I think "Nine plus Two" will emerge as an important economic development region in future, not only in China, but it will also be important in the Asia-Pacific Region or Asia; and it could even become a very spectacular economic development region in the world in future. For this reason, Hong Kong should seize the opportunity to enhance the economic co-operation with its partners in the "Nine plus Two" Agreement. As such, Hong Kong must vigorously increase the momentum in launching cross-boundary infrastructure projects, particularly those transport networks connecting with the Mainland, such as the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link — the construction of the Hong Kong section still has not commenced — and the Eastern Corridor project, and so on, should be implemented expeditiously.

In studying and planning for infrastructure projects, Hong Kong should strengthen its information exchanges with the neighbouring regions, such as the

statistics and projected figures of economic growth rates, and the cross-boundary passenger and cargo flows, so that we would not make the same mistake as in the case of the West Rail (it was called the Northwest Rail then) in exaggerating the estimated figures of cargo flow, thus making the project a laughing stock of the world. In doing so, it will ensure that the planned infrastructure projects can serve the purposes according to realistic circumstances and are cost efficient. Besides, we should enhance our understanding of the characteristics of the Mainland in different aspects and scopes, including the different living habits, and so on. We should understand what kinds of differences there are, such as the vehicles in the Mainland are left-hand drive ones, and so on, and such differences could lead to many different problems, or they could, on the other hand, generate a lot of advantages. Therefore, it takes a very long time for the two sides to gear in, so that the designs of certain infrastructure facilities can cater to some specific needs as infrastructure facilities are meant to serve the needs of different aspects, including the needs and habits, and so on, of users. With regard to the gearing-in process, the policy address of about three years ago also mentioned specifically the integration of the two places. I agree very much to the content contained in it.

With regard to business and industrial development, Hong Kong's relationship with the Mainland has become increasingly close. It is estimated that Hong Kong enterprises have set up a total of 59 000 factories on the Mainland. Among them, 53 000 are established in Guangdong, mainly in the PRD Region. Such factories provide employment opportunities for 1.5 million Hong Kong people, whereas 10 million jobs have been created in Guangdong. This has injected great momentum into the economic development of the PRD Region, thus making Guangdong one of the most significant manufacturing bases of the world. In recent years, Guangdong Province has tightened up its environmental protection requirements, and this has subjected Hong Kong enterprises to a lot of difficulties. There are many professional enterprises and research institutes in local universities of Hong Kong which can offer them certain assistance in this regard. We hope that the Government can play the role of a bridge to link up the two sides in order to solve problems encountered there by Hong Kong industrialists.

Apart from co-operation in business and industrial sectors, the academic exchanges between Hong Kong and the Mainland are also on the rise, and the exchanges are becoming more and more frequent. In this regard, we hope that there can be even greater efficiency.

Madam President, the development of the co-operative relationship with the Mainland will be crucial to the future development of Hong Kong. The SAR Government must accord priority to this. I so submit. Thank you, Madam President.

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

MR LAU CHIN-SHEK (in Cantonese): President, earlier on, Miss CHAN Yuen-han said today's motion topic was very broad. I think I am going to narrow it down. My speech shall touch on one point only, that is, the issue of the Home Visit Permits (HVPs) mentioned in the amendments.

In May 2001, with a permit for Hong Kong and Macao compatriots to travel in the Mainland compatriot permit in my hands, I went to see my mother with whom I have not met for 11 years. I did not have the courage to inform her of my impending visit beforehand because I did not know whether the visit could be materialized or not. At the immigration control point at Tianhe, there were two passages: one for HVP holders, and the other for passport holders. I did not know which passage I should take. Eventually, I was led to a small room, where I waited for more than one hour. I was privately relieved that I had not notified my mother of my visit beforehand, or else the wait of more than an hour could be quite an ordeal to her.

Eventually, I could meet with my mother who was aged over 90; it had been such a long separation since we last met. I also know that, what I had obtained was just a compatriot permit, but what I needed was in fact a HVP. I also hope that my colleagues from the pro-democracy camp can be issued with either the compatriot permits or HVPs, so that they can travel in and out of the Mainland as freely as I can now. I had conveyed this idea on many occasions, both private and public ones, to Anson CHAN, Donald TSANG and Elsie LEUNG, and so on, who had assisted me, to the effect that, we hope all of us can go back to our own country. I believe this is also the aspiration of the vast majority of Hong Kong people.

I do not intend to discuss why some of our friends from the pro-democracy camp cannot be issued with HVPs. I do not intend to discuss who should bear

the blame. I just wish to say that, if we can visit our hometowns, our old homes and our own country, what would be our most profound feelings? When we look at China from where we are, we can see that some people are overjoyed at the country's present achievements, whereas some people may shed their tears in pain to grieve over the tragic predicaments of child workers at brick kilns in Shanxi. I think such incidents are real, and each and every one of them can wring our hearts.

We shall have even more feelings, that is, when we return to our hometowns, our old homes and our own country, regardless of whom we meet, be they our old classmates, our childhood friends or relatives or even some compatriots we do not know personally, we could not help asking: What kinds of happiness and sufferings they had undergone during all these years? What were the details of their struggles? Each person must have his or her very realistic story to tell. This is the situation of most people. I had once asked, "When we met a mainlander, what did his face look like?" It was like a poker. Everyone had a poker face then.

However, nowadays, when we take another look at their faces now, are there more smiles or are there more bitter looks? We find that all of us can experience it personally. If we can go in and out of the Mainland freely, there must be much less speculation and suspicion; instead, there would be enhanced understanding for all parties concerned. Regardless of whether you belong to the pro-Beijing camp, the pro-democracy camp or you are completely without any political affiliation, if you consider we are in the same big family with our mainland compatriots and the Central Authorities, then you must admit that there must be some family members who are more obedient and there must some who are naughtier. After all, they are all members of this big family, be they the obedient ones or the naughty ones. I just wish to explain one point, that is, even for naughty family members, still they should be allowed to go home.

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): If not, then I now call upon Mr Jasper TSANG to speak on the three amendments. He may speak up to five minutes.

MR JASPER TSANG (in Cantonese): President, as Ms Emily LAU might have realized, I always advocate exchange and communication. I do not support any attempt to block any colleagues of this Council from going to the Mainland to engage in any normal exchange activities. If Ms Emily LAU says that "I am saying one thing but doing another", then I can only say that "I can only say it, but I cannot do it" because I do not have the authority to issue HVPs. But, President, the amendment proposed by Ms Emily LAU today has far exceeded this scope. She requests "the Central Government to issue Home Visit Permits to those Hong Kong people who cannot return to the Mainland", and when she delivered her speech, she added the word "all" and I have been listening to her very attentively. She was saying that she wanted "all Hong Kong residents be allowed to go to the Mainland."

President, in this connection, I think, firstly, all the countries in the world have their own immigration control, and it is impossible to allow free access to everyone. Some may ask, "Then is it true that even their own nationals are not allowed?" Ms Emily LAU, please bear in mind, not all Hong Kong residents are nationals of China. This amendment is tantamount to asking China to allow whoever lives in Hong Kong free access to the Mainland, regardless whether they are Chinese nationals. This is the first point. But I think not a single country in the world can do this.

Secondly, please think about this carefully. If this is done, then we shall be losing the advantages under "one country, two systems". Because the SAR Government is responsible for immigration control in Hong Kong. Many people refused entry to the Mainland are allowed into Hong Kong; they are allowed to stay and live here and even become Hong Kong residents. However, once this line is cancelled, and if it is specified that everyone who can enter Hong Kong is automatically granted access to the Mainland, then it means that Hong Kong would have to adopt the same principles and policies as the Mainland in granting people entry into Hong Kong.

We all know that some people are not allowed to enter the Mainland — not just some of the Members of this Council — but Hong Kong may allow these people to live and work here. Do we want to break this? Therefore, regarding Ms Emily LAU's viewpoint of calling it normalization when everyone is allowed to go to the Mainland, I would invite her to reconsider it carefully. Is this really the "normalization" that we would like to see under the "one country, two systems"? Basing on this point, I cannot support this amendment proposed by Ms Emily LAU.

President, I very much agree with Mr Albert HO's remarks. He said, the many aspects of development in Hong Kong, including our development in the political aspect, can become valuable reference in the development of our own country. I also agree with the words of Mr LEE Wing-tat from the Democratic Party. He said, as Chinese, we cannot only take pride in the fact that our country has become rich and is becoming more and more prosperous. We cannot only think in this way. He said that while we proudly possess the identity as Chinese, we should hope that our country can gain the respect of the peoples and governments of the world because it is internationally civilized, open, democratic and progressive. I absolutely agree with him on this point.

I very much agree with the remarks made by an academic from the Peking University. He said MAO Zedong had led the Chinese people to stand up and bid farewell to the days when we were under attacks, while Deng Xiaoping had led the Chinese people to become rich, and bid farewell to days of hunger. The leaders of this generation should lead the people to bid farewell to the days of being the target of criticisms. By "being the target of criticisms", we do not mean the verbal arguments with others. Instead, we mean we need to act in a dignified manner, so as to make the whole world respect us and refrain from criticizing us anymore. I very much agree with him on this point. This is also the target we shall strive to achieve.

However, President, in his amendment, Mr Albert HO said that we should promote the democratic development in China. But is it necessary for us to do that? The United States Government also wants to promote the democratic development in many countries, including China. Now, many Americans realize that if they actually do something to promote the democratic development in other countries, things will just happen to the contrary. This applies to the situation in China. You may say that we are not the United States, we are all Chinese people. However, sorry, we are now practising "one country, two systems". As Mrs Selina CHOW said earlier, this is one of the points relevant to that line of differentiation. Therefore, if we say that we have to promote the democratic development in China, I feel that we cannot support it.

With regard to Ms Audrey EU's amendment, we think there are absolutely no problems with it. If all she has added to the motion is just the word "efficient", I will agree with it completely. But she has deleted the word "authoritative". As some Members have said earlier, the word "authoritative"

means the authorities have obtained completely accurate information, so the conclusion reached should be respected. Secondly, it can be described as "authoritative" only when the authorities really have the capability of implementing their decisions. So, if "authoritative" is deleted, and if only being "efficient" is asked for, then even if all our mechanisms are reduced to some kinds of "chit-chat clubs", we can still be very efficient. Therefore, we cannot agree to the deletion of the word "authoritative".

SECRETARY FOR COMMERCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (in Cantonese): First of all, Madam President, I would like to thank 34 Members for their very impressive and sentimental speeches. Today's discussion actually covers the work of a number of Policy Bureaux. I promise to relay Members' views to my colleagues to let them know the matters discussed today.

The first government official on the list to appear before this Council today should be Secretary Stephen LAM. I am only the second on the list. I was invited to appear before this Council because Secretary Stephen LAM has to attend a number of events organized by the radio and District Councils today to explain the Green Paper on Constitutional Development published yesterday. This has absolutely nothing to do with the earlier suggestion by Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, that economic affairs are our highlight. As Members should be aware, Secretary Stephen LAM is a more suitable choice for reply because he is responsible for mainland affairs. However, as pointed out by me just now, the views expressed by Members are relevant to a number of government departments and Policy Bureaux, so I will certainly reflect Members' views to them.

The thrust of the motion proposed by Mr Jasper TSANG today is his hope for the SAR Government to continue to rationalize the co-operation mechanism and foster closer liaison between the Mainland and Hong Kong. The SAR Government's policy in this area is consistent with the direction proposed by the motion.

Over the past decade, with the rapid change in the global economic situation, both the country and Hong Kong have to face fierce competition resulting from globalization. In the meantime, Hong Kong actively seized the opportunities arising from the country's rapid economic development, endeavoured to rationalize the co-operation mechanism with the Mainland, and

maintain close liaison and co-operation with the Mainland in regional co-operation and such areas as economic and trade co-operation, finance, infrastructure, and so on, to bring into play the strengths of "one country, two systems" and "leveraging on the Mainland and engaging ourselves globally" so that the two places can work together for progress.

The SAR Government attaches great importance to its mutually beneficial and co-operative relationship with the Mainland. Mr Albert CHAN is not present here at the moment. I very much wish to let him know that I am strongly against his earlier comment in which Hong Kong is compared to a person who lives off inherited wealth. The Mainland and Hong Kong is now truly in a mutually beneficial and win-win situation. Therefore, I think Mr CHAN's comment is absolutely wrong. I hope he can hear these words of mine.

Owing to our emphasis on our co-operation with the Mainland, structural adjustment has been made. As Members should be aware, the Bureau taken charge of by Secretary Stephen LAM was formerly called the Constitutional Affairs Bureau. It is now formerly renamed as the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau, which will take charge of mainland affairs as well. As I have been instructed by him to say a few words about this, I must elaborate a bit. In order to enhance the effectiveness in co-ordinating liaison between Hong Kong and the Mainland for the purpose of co-ordinating exchange and co-operation with various provinces and regions in various domains, the SAR Government actually set up a Mainland Affairs Liaison Office under the former Constitutional Affairs Bureau in 1 April last year, and set up two Economic and Trade Offices in Shanghai and Chengdu respectively in September last year for the purpose of strengthening the SAR Government's office network on the Mainland. With the establishment of the third-term SAR Government, the Constitutional Affairs Bureau has also been renamed as the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau to more accurately reflect its work. I believe all Honourable Members will agree that the exchange between government officials and the Mainland has become increasingly frequent over the past decade. And Members should also have noted that there has been some improvement in our Putonghua. As everybody knows, effort must be made in language to facilitate communication between people.

After the reunification, the SAR has established regional co-operation mechanisms separately with different provinces and regions. They include the

Hong Kong/Guangdong Co-operation Joint Conference, the Pan-Pearl River Delta (PRD) Regional Co-operation, and the Economic and Trade Co-operation Conferences held with Beijing and Shanghai respectively.

In the area of Hong Kong/Guangdong co-operation, concrete results have been achieved in massive cross-boundary infrastructure and in such areas as co-operation at crossing points, cross-boundary flows of goods and people, green efforts, and so on.

In the area of Pan-PRD regional co-operation, last year the Chief Executive led a number of economic and trade delegations to visit four Pan-PRD provinces and regions. Our Economic and Trade Offices on the Mainland have also assisted in arranging delegations from the financial sector to visit Pan-PRD provinces and regions. I have personally visited two Pan-PRD provinces too. Since the commencement of the Pan-PRD regional co-operation in June 2004, the number of enterprises from Pan-PRD provinces and regions listed in Hong Kong has been increased from 71 to 100 in mid-2007.

On the basis of gradual and orderly progress, CEPA has managed to promote economic and trade co-operation and development between the two places and see gradual and firm expansion since its signing in 2003. With the full liberalization of trade in goods between the two places in 2006, the number of measures for liberalizing trade in services has continued to rise.

The SAR Government and the Central People's Government have just reached an agreement on 29 June on further expansion in liberalization of trade in services and economic co-operation under CEPA. This supplement to CEPA covers 40 liberalization measures in 28 services sectors, including 11 newly added sectors, such as social services, environmental services and public utility, to be effective from 1 January 2008. Furthermore, both parties will strengthen co-operation in such areas as finance, convention and exhibition and mutual recognition of professional qualifications. Several initiatives, such as those relating to exhibition, cultural services and social services for the elderly, will be implemented in Guangdong and Shanghai under pilot schemes.

Supplement IV to CEPA serves to enhance and broaden the opportunities for industries to enter mainland markets and enhance the attractiveness of Hong Kong to overseas investors.

The SAR Government will continue to work closely with the Mainland for the effective implementation of liberalization measures under CEPA. Through the CEPA Joint Steering Committee, the governments of both places have been maintaining close ties and conducting discussion on the further liberalization and implementation of CEPA. Furthermore, the SAR Government will strive to complement the Central Government authorities in studying ways to, under the framework of CEPA, facilitate trade and investment to provide Hong Kong industries with a better investment environment.

With the change in the operating environment of the PRD Region and the national policy adjustment in promoting industrial structural transformation, a number of mainland manufacturers are now facing challenges in upgrading and transfer, gradual expansion to places beyond the PRD and Guangdong Province, or development in the high valued-added and low consumption direction.

Against this background, the Chief Executive gave a brief introduction on the role the HKSAR can play in the transfer of industries when he attended the 4th Pan-PRD Regional Co-operation Frame Agreement in early June this year. In the year to come, the SAR Government will work with the Mainland, particularly the Pan-PRD Region, in promoting specific measures to enhance the exchange of information on the upgrading, transformation and transfer of industries between various places and the industries in Hong Kong. For instance, the requirements of manufacturers in different industries in Hong Kong will be reflected to the Mainland to enable the relevant authorities in various places to, in formulating policies and measures for attracting businessmen and soliciting investment, better cope with the needs of the investors in Hong Kong. We will also make use of a variety of channels, including utilizing the liaison mechanisms set up with individual provinces and municipalities, to collect information on investment opportunities in the Mainland, especially the Pan-PRD provinces and regions, for distribution to the industries in Hong Kong, and assisting the industries in enhancing communication with local governments. I am also thankful to Mr Andrew LEUNG for giving us advice in this area.

Just now, a number of Members also mentioned the issue of cross-boundary infrastructure. Since the reunification, the SAR and the Mainland have not only seen further economic integration, but also rapid growth in the flows of goods and people. It is imperative for us to further enhance our co-operation with the Mainland in cross-boundary infrastructure to cope with the

needs of the two places. In recent years, concrete progress has been achieved in this area.

For instance, the Hong Kong-Shenzhen Western Corridor mentioned by Members earlier was the first cross-boundary infrastructure linking the Mainland and Hong Kong by way of a sea channel project. With the complementary efforts and support of the Central Authorities, Guangdong Province and the Shenzhen Municipal Government, the Corridor already came into operation on 1 July. The new arrangement of co-location of clearance has also been implemented at the crossing to streamline customs clearance. The commissioning of the new Corridor is certainly helpful to further boosting the flows of goods and people across the boundary.

With regards to the Lok Ma Chau Spur Line, a matter of great concern to Mr WONG Kwok-hing, other Members have also mentioned relevant issues. The construction of the Lok Ma Chau Spur Line, as pointed out by Mr WONG Kwok-hing, has already been completed. We will continue to maintain close communication with the mainland authorities in the hope of expediting its commissioning.

China's railway network is now under rapid development, with such high-speed passenger railway lines as the Beijing-Guangzhou Passenger Line and its extension to Shenzhen and the Hangzhou-Fuzhou-Shenzhen Passenger Line under construction. Through the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link, Hong Kong will link up with these two passenger lines, thereby greatly enhancing its ties with major mainland cities, including Beijing, Shanghai, Changsha, Hangzhou and Nanjing, consolidating its position as a regional transport hub, and upgrading its strategic status as the southern gate providing access to and from the Mainland. The Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link will also be able to shorten the journey time between Hong Kong and Guangzhou from approximately 100 minutes now to within one hour. We are now carefully studying the project proposal submitted by the Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation in the hope that the Rail Link can be constructed expeditiously.

A number of Members have also mentioned the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge. The exact date of construction of the Bridge is dependent on the ultimate preference of various parties concerned with respect to the location of the boundary crossings and such issues as financing arrangements. In addition to the priority accorded to the Bridge by the three Governments of

Guangdong, Hong Kong and Macao, the Central Authorities have also set up the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Task Force to enhance the co-ordination of the project, which should be helpful to expediting its progress.

In order to actively respond to China's 11th Five-year Plan, the SAR Government convened an Economic Summit on "China's 11th Five-Year Plan and the Development of Hong Kong" in September last year. The four focus groups set up under the Summit presented on 15 January this year a practicable and forward-looking Action Agenda in which 50 strategic proposals and 207 proposals of concrete actions are made on ways for Hong Kong to upgrade its competitive edge in areas of strengths and complement China's development.

While the SAR Government has taken swift action to follow up the various proposals in the Action Agenda, various Policy Secretaries have also, under the co-ordination of the Financial Secretary, followed up the concrete actions taken in respect of various proposals. So far, the Government has actively taken forward 100 or so items expected to be implemented in the first half of this year.

Earlier, the Financial Secretary has on different occasions reported to the public the implementation of a number of proposals, and so I am not going to elaborate on the details here. The issuance of Renminbi bonds is one of the proposals. As regards the outstanding items, various departments are now further discussing the specific arrangements with the relevant organizations, including government departments in the Mainland. We are confident that, with the support and complementary efforts of the Central Authorities and the governments of various provinces and municipalities, these items will be implemented progressively.

Now I would like to say a few words on the amendments proposed by a few Members. Ms Emily LAU's amendment is about the issuance of Home Visit Permits. Madam President, as pointed out by the Government in response to a question raised by Ms LAU several weeks ago, we understand it is the unanimous hope of different political parties and groupings that they will have a chance to grasp the Mainland's development situation. For this reason, having regard to different circumstances, we have arranged for Members from different parties and groupings to meet with mainland officials and visit the Mainland

when the circumstances permit. The earlier remark made by Ms Emily LAU, that there was a lack of communication over the past decade is therefore incorrect. Ms Emily LAU, you should recall that the Chief Executive, the President, you and I visited Guangzhou and Zhongshan in the Mainland in July 2005. Hence, it is incorrect to say that there has been no communication over the past decade. There has indeed been communication, though the timing must be right. In a relatively recent example, the Security Bureau arranged in March this year for Members participating in the deliberation of the co-location bill and members of the relevant panel to visit the Hong Kong-Shenzhen Western Corridor in Shenzhen Bay. The possibility of making similar study tour arrangements in the future will depend on the situation at that time.

Most importantly, according to the principle of "one country, two systems", immigration control in the Mainland and the arrangement for issuing Home Visit Permits are taken charge of by the relevant authorities in the Mainland, not by the Hong Kong Government. Therefore, the SAR Government must respect the relevant system and arrangement. I hope Ms LAU is satisfied with this reply.

The amendment proposed by Ms Audrey EU's emphasizes the need for the SAR Government to foster a close relationship with the Mainland, especially on such issues concerning immigration policies, environment, air quality and food safety. These areas are actually matters of concern to all Hong Kong people. The SAR Government has been maintaining close ties with the relevant units in the Mainland in taking forward the relevant tasks.

In particular, I would like to say a few words on environmental protection because this is a matter of concern to many people. In the area of environmental protection, we have been working with the relevant departments of the Central Authorities and the Guangdong Provincial Government in taking forward the relevant tasks. For instance, in 2000, the Governments of Guangdong and Hong Kong set up the Hong Kong-Guangdong Joint Working Group on Sustainable Development & Environmental Protection under the Hong Kong-Guangdong Co-operation Joint Conference. Seven panels or task groups were also set up under the Joint Working Group to take charge of matters of mutual concern, including improving the regional air quality, the safety of potable water, the management of water quality of the Pearl River estuary, and so on.

In the improvement of the regional air quality, a consensus was reached between the Governments of Guangdong and Hong Kong in April 2002 to, with reference to the year 1997 as the benchmark, jointly reduce the total emissions of four major air pollutants in the PRD Region from 20% to 50% by 2010. The PRD Regional Air Quality Monitoring Network, set up in Guangdong as well as Hong Kong in November 2005, publish to the people of the two places the PRD Regional Air Quality Index on the Internet on a daily basis. On 30 January 2007, the Emissions Trading Pilot Scheme for Thermal Power Plants in the Pearl River Delta Region was jointly launched by both parties to enable thermal power plants in the two places to reduce pollutants by way of emissions trading.

Food safety is another issue of concern to Members. As Guangdong Province is the major source of food imports, the SAR Government and the Food and Drug Administration in Guangdong Province signed the Guangdong — Hong Kong Food Safety Exchange and Co-operation Framework Agreement in April last year to facilitate mutual exchange and co-ordination of information on incidents relating to food and public health which have aroused concern in the two places. Furthermore, a number of work meetings have been convened to explore ways to further rationalize the communication mechanism and deepen co-operation. During the past year, the two places conducted, according to the Agreement, a number of notification and feedback exercises involving more than 20 items, including red-yolk duck eggs, Turbot, toxic scallops, and so on, and given effect to the function of the communication mechanism.

In addition, we have actively worked with the Mainland entry-exit inspection and quarantine bureau to ensure monitoring at source food supplied to Hong Kong by such means as implementing new inspection systems jointly with Guangdong and Shenzhen authorities, enhancing arrangements for the transportation of leaf vegetables and freshwater fish, package labelling and affixing seal to transportation vehicles.

As regards Mr Albert HO's amendment, we must categorically state that, according to Articles 31 and 62 of the Constitution of China, the establishment of a special administrative region and its systems are to be affirmed by the National People's Congress and, according to the requirements of the Basic Law, a "high degree of autonomy" is practised by the SAR in exercising the administrative, legislative and judicial powers and the power of final adjudication conferred by the Central Authorities. We must develop, according to the Basic Law, a set of electoral system applicable to Hong Kong to ultimately achieve the goal of universal suffrage.

Under the Basic Law, the common law system has continued to be practised in Hong Kong.

Hence, both the electoral and legal systems of the SAR are different from those in the Mainland. Under the principle of "one country, two systems", the electoral and legal systems of the Mainland, which do not fall in the scope of the SAR's affairs, are established under the Constitution of China. We in Hong Kong can certainly communicate with the Mainland on various fronts. However, it is inappropriate for the systems practised in Hong Kong to be imposed on the Mainland. Nor will it be advisable to do so.

Madam President, against the background of globalization and the rapid growth of the country, Hong Kong must take further measures to foster closer exchange and co-operation with the Mainland to fully utilize the strengths enjoyed by the SAR under "one country, two systems" for Hong Kong to continue to prosper and consolidate its status as Asia's world city.

Since the reunification, the SAR Government has continued to actively propel the relevant work. We are now taking progressive steps to rationalize our internal co-ordination framework and our network of offices in the Mainland. Furthermore, we have set up co-operation mechanisms with such places as Guangdong Province, the Pan-PRD provinces and regions, Beijing and Shanghai, with a view to taking forward co-operation and exchange on all fronts on a mutually beneficial and win-win basis. The SAR Government has been maintaining close communication with the Central Government to, in accordance with the guiding principle of "one country, two systems" and the requirements of the Basic Law, endeavour to maintain Hong Kong's prosperity, stability and harmony. The motion proposed by Mr Jasper TSANG today has clearly reflected Members' emphasis and expectations for the SAR Government to further promote co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland. We will double our efforts to accomplish our work in this respect.

Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now call upon Ms Emily LAU to move her amendment to the motion.

MS EMILY LAU (in Cantonese): Madam President, I move that Mr Jasper TSANG's motion be amended.

Ms Emily LAU moved the following amendment: (Translation)

"To add ", on the premise of 'one country, two systems and a high degree of autonomy'," after "urges the Government to continue"; and to add "and urges the Central Government to issue Home Visit Permits to those Hong Kong people who cannot return to the Mainland, including Members of the Legislative Council and District Councils who belong to the democratic camp, and communicate with the Legislature and political parties in Hong Kong and develop a normal working relationship to enhance mutual understanding, so that the relationship between the HKSAR and the Mainland can be normalized," after "on all fronts,"."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Ms Emily LAU to Mr Jasper TSANG's motion, be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Ms Emily LAU rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Emily LAU has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for three minutes, after which the division will begin.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Ms Margaret NG, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Mr SIN Chung-kai, Ms LI Fung-ying, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Miss TAM Heung-man voted for the amendment.

Dr LUI Ming-wah, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr Howard YOUNG, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr Daniel LAM, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong and Mr KWONG Chi-kin voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert HO, Mr Fred LI, Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Dr YEUNG Sum, Mr LAU Chin-shek, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Albert CHAN, Ms Audrey EU, Mr Alan LEONG and Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung voted for the amendment.

Mr James TIEN, Mrs Selina CHOW, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Miss CHOY So-yuk and Mr TAM Yiu-chung voted against the amendment.

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

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, seven were in favour of the amendment and 14 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 11 were in favour of the amendment and eight against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, she therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

MS MIRIAM LAU (in Cantonese): President, I move that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of the motion on "Developing co-operative relationship with the Mainland" or any amendments thereto, this Council do proceed to each of such divisions immediately after the division bell has been rung for one minute.

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

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(No hands raised)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I think the question is agreed by a majority respectively of each of the two groups of Members who are present. I declare the motion passed.

I order that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of the motion on "Developing co-operative relationship with the Mainland" or any amendments thereto, this Council do proceed to each of such divisions immediately after the division bell has been rung for one minute.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Audrey EU, you may move your amendment now.

MS AUDREY EU (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr Jasper TSANG's motion be amended.

Ms Audrey EU moved the following amendment: (Translation)

"To delete "and" after "on all fronts," and substitute with "especially on issues concerning immigration policies, environment, air quality and food safety, and to"; and to delete "authoritative" after "permanent and" and substitute with "efficient"."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Ms Audrey EU to Mr Jasper TSANG's motion, be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(No hands raised)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I think the question is agreed by a majority respectively of each of the two groups of Members who are present. I declare the amendment passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Albert HO, as the amendment by Ms Audrey EU has been passed, I have given leave for you to revise the terms of your amendment, as set out in the paper which has been circularized to Members. When you move your revised amendment, you have up to three minutes to explain the revised terms in your amendment, but you may not repeat what you have already covered in your earlier speech. You may now move your revised amendment.

MR ALBERT HO (in Cantonese): President, it is now already 1.40 pm. I think there is no need for me to say too much. In fact, there is not any direct relationship between Ms Audrey EU's amendment and mine. I only added my amendment to Ms Audrey EU's, so as to supplement Mr Jasper TSANG's motion. Therefore, I think I need not explain in detail any further.

Mr Albert HO moved the following further amendment to the motion as amended by Ms Audrey EU: (Translation)

"To add "promote expeditious development in the country's constitutional democracy with Hong Kong's experience in practising full democracy, and urges the Mainland to draw on Hong Kong's experience in the rule of law to establish a law regime which respects judicial independence and protects the autonomy of the law profession," after "on all fronts,"."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That Mr Albert HO's amendment to Mr Jasper TSANG's motion as amended by Ms Audrey EU be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr Albert HO rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Albert HO has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute, after which the division will begin.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Ms Margaret NG, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Mr SIN Chung-kai, Ms LI Fung-ying, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Miss TAM Heung-man voted for the amendment.

Dr LUI Ming-wah, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr Howard YOUNG, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr Daniel LAM, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr WONG Ting-kwong and Mr KWONG Chi-kin voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert HO, Mr Fred LI, Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Dr YEUNG Sum, Mr LAU Chin-shek, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Albert CHAN, Ms Audrey EU, Mr Alan LEONG and Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung voted for the amendment.

Mr James TIEN, Mrs Selina CHOW, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Miss CHOY So-yuk and Mr TAM Yiu-chung voted against the amendment.

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

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, seven were in favour of the amendment and 14 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 11 were in favour of the amendment and eight against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, she therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Jasper TSANG, you may now reply and you have three minutes.

MR JASPER TSANG (in Cantonese): President, I am very lucky to have had the opportunity to propose this motion in the last time slot of this Legislative Session. I am very grateful to the more than 30 colleagues who have spoken to express their viewpoints one after the other during this debate lasting more than four hours.

President, usually hungry persons can get angry more easily. However, we can all see that, a moment ago, even when the debate was nearing the end, colleagues still remained rational in delivering their speeches. Even when they came to some emotional points, they were still very mild. In this Chamber, we would occasionally come across certain scenes characterized by fierce and threatening gestures, sarcasm and personal attacks. But such scenes rarely occurred this morning. Therefore, I must once again thank Honourable colleagues.

Ms Audrey EU said in the initial stage of this debate that when she first read our motion, she expected us to deal with some pragmatic issues. Although Ms EU had earlier on left the Chamber for some time, I hope she still knows that eight DAB Members have spoken and they have made many suggestions on different areas. I believe, insofar as Ms EU's standards are concerned, such suggestions could be considered pragmatic.

Although DAB had really conducted a lot of studies on the co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland, and our colleagues from DAB have been conducting such studies in a most conscientious manner, we cannot be left to do all this. Besides, we have never intended to cover everything in our discussion. Therefore, I am very glad that other Members have also conveyed their viewpoints. Although we may hold divergent opinions on certain political issues, I believe the Secretary — in spite of the fact that he is just a stand-in — will draw good reference from the speeches of several dozens of Members when the SAR Government strives to strengthen its co-operation with the Mainland in future.

President, the speeches delivered today have all illustrated one point, that is, we must strengthen our co-operation with the Mainland on all fronts. If this

is the only consensus among us, I think we should cherish most dearly. In short, we must strengthen the co-operation; we must be pragmatic, positive and proactive. Thank you.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Mr Jasper TSANG, as amended by Ms Audrey EU, be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(No hands raised)

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

END OF SESSION

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): As several Members have mentioned in their speeches in the debate, that today's meeting is the last one of this Legislative Session, and the first meeting of the next Legislative Session will be held at 11.00 am on 10 October when the Chief Executive will deliver his policy address.

Before I adjourn the meeting, I wish to inform Members that, though the Council will sit again in October, 30 meetings of various committees will be held from now to end of July. So, I believe, while there are relatively fewer meetings in August, meetings will also be held in September. But I hope everyone can find some time to take a good rest. I hope by the time I return, I can see all of you in high spirits and good physical conditions. Two Members

have been absent from today's meeting due to sickness. So, on behalf of all Members, I would hereby wish them a speedy recovery.

I now adjourn the Council.

Adjourned accordingly at sixteen minutes to Two o'clock.