

# OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Friday, 15 July 2011

The Council continued to meet at Nine o'clock

## MEMBERS PRESENT:

THE PRESIDENT

THE HONOURABLE JASPER TSANG YOK-SING, 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

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

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

DR THE HONOURABLE MARGARET NG

THE HONOURABLE JAMES TO KUN-SUN

THE HONOURABLE CHEUNG MAN-KWONG

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

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

THE HONOURABLE WONG YUNG-KAN, S.B.S., 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 ANDREW CHENG KAR-FOO

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

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE VINCENT FANG KANG, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE WONG KWOK-HING, M.H.

THE HONOURABLE LEE WING-TAT

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE CHIM PUI-CHUNG

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

THE HONOURABLE KAM NAI-WAI, M.H.

THE HONOURABLE CYD HO SAU-LAN

THE HONOURABLE STARRY LEE WAI-KING, J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE LAM TAI-FAI, B.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHAN HAK-KAN

THE HONOURABLE PAUL CHAN MO-PO, M.H., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHAN KIN-POR, J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE PRISCILLA LEUNG MEI-FUN, J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE LEUNG KA-LAU

THE HONOURABLE CHEUNG KWOK-CHE

THE HONOURABLE WONG SING-CHI

THE HONOURABLE WONG KWOK-KIN, B.B.S.

THE HONOURABLE IP WAI-MING, M.H.

THE HONOURABLE IP KWOK-HIM, G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MRS REGINA IP LAU SUK-YEE, G.B.S., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE PAN PEY-CHYOU

THE HONOURABLE PAUL TSE WAI-CHUN, J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE SAMSON TAM WAI-HO, J.P.

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

THE HONOURABLE LEUNG KWOK-HUNG

THE HONOURABLE TANYA CHAN

THE HONOURABLE ALBERT CHAN WAI-YIP

THE HONOURABLE WONG YUK-MAN

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

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

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

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

**PUBLIC OFFICER ATTENDING:**

THE HONOURABLE MRS CARRIE LAM CHENG YUET-NGOR, G.B.S., J.P.  
SECRETARY FOR DEVELOPMENT

**CLERKS IN ATTENDANCE:**

MS PAULINE NG MAN-WAH, SECRETARY GENERAL

MISS ODELIA LEUNG HING-YEE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

MRS JUSTINA LAM CHENG BO-LING, ASSISTANT SECRETARY  
GENERAL

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Good morning, Members. Council shall now continue with the motion debate on "Perfecting Harbourfront Planning and Management in All Districts of Hong Kong".

## **MEMBERS' MOTIONS**

### **PERFECTING HARBOURFRONT PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT IN ALL DISTRICTS OF HONG KONG**

#### **Continuation of debate on motion which was moved on 14 July 2011**

**SECRETARY FOR DEVELOPMENT** (in Cantonese): President, good morning. As the last motion debate on "Bidding Farewell to the Legislative Council Building" to be held later does not require attendance of public officials, I am deeply honoured to be the last public official who speak in the last meeting of the Legislative Council held in this Building.

As the Antiquities Authority and the public official in charge of heritage conservation policies in Hong Kong, I am also glad to see that this declared monument will later be converted into the Court of Final Appeal Building, so that this historic architecture shall continue to bear witness to Hong Kong's development and service the people. Upon the relocation of the Court of Final Appeal, the vacated Former French Mission Building will become another focus of the "Conserving Central" initiative. The Legislative Council Building is not alone in bearing witness to Hong Kong's development; it is also joined by the subject of today's motion debate — the Victoria Harbour and its harbourfronts.

To me, this last motion debate attended by Member and public officials in the Legislative Council Building is particularly meaningful because the original motion proposed by Prof Patrick LAU as well as the amendments proposed by the four Members are all in line with the Government's stance. There is no need for any argument. The reason is simple; we all agree that harbourfront planning and management in all districts of Hong Kong must be perfected. I firmly believe that it is also the common aspiration of the people at large. Although some Members have used expressions that are rather critical in the preamble of their amendments, such as "plans only one step ahead", "a lack of foresight", "failing to progress with the times", "lack overall planning and management" and "overall planning for the development of harbourfront land is still inadequate", I

think they are all well-intended criticisms. As a matter of fact, our work in the past was inadequate because we lacked a clear position on harbourfront development. As Miss Tanya CHAN has said, we must identify clear objectives for every initiative we make and hence, the policies and measures that follow will be more reasonable. In the past, the Victoria Harbour was regarded as a readily available source of land supply through reclamation. We had no idea when the final shoreline on both sides of the Victoria Harbour would emerge. As such, no major effort had been made on harbourfront planning, management and beautification. But the situation has changed completely. After the dispute surrounding the legal case of the Victoria Harbour in 2004, the SAR Government made a high-profile statement that there would be no further reclamation on both sides of the Victoria Harbour upon completion of the last reclamation project in Central and Wan Chai to cater for the construction of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass. For the same reason, the "zero reclamation" approach is also adopted for the Kai Tak Development Area. In other words, the final shoreline on both sides of the Victoria Harbour will soon appear before our eyes. That is also why we must, as suggested by today's motion, perfect the planning and implementation for harbourfront beautification.

The subject of Prof Patrick LAU's motion covers major initiatives of the present and the future on harbourfront development. I am also happy to have this opportunity to give Members of the Legislative Council an overall briefing on the work undertaken in the past, initial results achieved so far, as well as the challenges ahead.

The Victoria Harbour is Hong Kong's symbol as well as our most precious public natural resources. We strive to protect, conserve and enhance the harbourfront on both sides of the Victoria Harbour. In his policy addresses for 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, the Chief Executive had stressed repeatedly that we must beautify the Victoria Harbour and create a world-class harbourfront area on both sides of the harbour. As a matter of fact, the Development Bureau has a set of clear strategies on harbourfront development. We strive to promote the enhancement of the harbourfront and improve its accessibility. Through effective allocation of resources and subject to the actual circumstances of the harbourfront sites, we would gradually construct various harbourfront promenades on both sides of the Victoria Harbour for public enjoyment. Our vision is to create a vibrant, green, accessible and sustainable harbourfront.

Suggestion is made in both the original motion and the amendments that we can make reference to appropriate overseas experience. Undoubtedly, by making reference to overseas experience in harbourfront development, we can learn from their merits to overcome our shortcomings, so as to perfect our harbourfront enhancement initiatives. Whenever I conducted an overseas duty visit in the past few years, I would incorporate harbourfront planning and management into the programme. The places I visited which have harbourfront, harbourfront or even riverfront planning include the Sydney Harbour and Melbourne's Yarra River in Australia, the Wellington harbourfront and Auckland harbourfront in New Zealand, riverfronts on both sides of the Thames in London, Han River and Cheonggyecheon in Seoul, Marina Bay in Singapore, Tokyo Bay in Japan, Oslo's harbourfront in Norway, as well as Battery Park City in New York which Prof Patrick LAU has visited recently. The former Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) and my colleagues of the Harbour Unit in the Development Bureau have also visited many overseas cities including Liverpool, London, Singapore, Sydney, San Francisco and Vancouver to study their harbourfront developments, and conduct exchanges with local authorities and persons responsible for harbourfront development.

Moreover, under the leadership of Prof LAU, a delegation of nine Members of the Legislative Council conducted an overseas duty visit to harbourfront areas in the United States and Canada in April this year. In the morning of last Saturday, Prof Patrick LAU had generously shared with members of the Harbourfront Commission (HC) as well as government representatives including myself the major findings of the visit. Here, I would like to extend my thanks to Prof LAU again.

I think it is quite rare for Honourable Members, government officials or members of the HC to conduct overseas duty visits on just one single subject in order to gain the relevant experiences. That also reflects the importance we attach to harbourfront development in Hong Kong. Nonetheless, we must be aware that not every successful story overseas can be applied directly to Hong Kong. When perfecting our harbourfront development policies, we must also duly consider the unique features of our own Victoria Harbour, as well as the characteristics of various districts in Hong Kong. Hence, I completely agree with Prof LAU's stance as stated in the motion that we should make reference to "appropriate" overseas experience.

After years of hard work, we have formulated forward-looking overall planning strategies for harbourfront enhancement. Based on the 22 action areas along the Victoria Harbour proposed by the former HEC, this set of strategies will be taken forward on short, medium and long-term bases having regard to the actual circumstances of each individual project. In fact, the Town Planning Board (TPB) has promulgated its Vision Statement for the Victoria Harbour as early as 1999, namely, "To make Victoria Harbour attractive, vibrant, accessible and symbolic of Hong Kong — a harbour for the people and a harbour of life." Subsequently in 2003, the Planning Department completed the Planning Study on the Harbour and its Harbourfront Areas to translate the Vision Statement into a planning framework, and formulated the Harbour Planning Framework. With increasing concerns over reclamation in the Victoria Harbour from various sectors in the community and their changing aspirations on harbourfront planning, the Government set up the former HEC comprising members from different sectors in 2004 to re-formulate the Harbour Planning Framework from both the strategic and district perspectives.

From the strategic perspective, the former HEC formulated the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs) and Harbour Planning Guidelines (HPGs) in 2005 and 2007 respectively to provide guidance on the sustainable planning, preservation, development and management of the Victoria Harbour and its harbourfront. The HPPs and HPGs are now widely adopted by the Government and the industry. At present, the HC continues to make reference to the relevant guidelines when reviewing various harbourfront development projects.

From the district perspective, we have initiated various reviews and studies on issues like planning, design, land use or construction of harbourfront developments, taking into account the development situation of each district so as to perfect harbourfront planning. Generally speaking, for new harbourfront areas such as the New Central Harbourfront, such district studies will focus on overall planning, layout and design. As for developed harbourfront areas, the studies will focus on enhancing the existing harbourfronts and improving their accessibility and connectivity. Also, long-term development plans will be formulated for individual potential areas, which also incorporate elements of harbourfront enhancement.

Great importance is attached by Honourable Members to public engagement. In fact, the HC, from its composition to mode of operation, epitomizes a high degree of public engagement. The Commission is widely



represented, comprising mostly non-official members including 12 representatives nominated by professional institutes, civic and environmental groups and the business sector, as well as eight individuals. Senior officials from six departments which play important roles in harbourfront matters also join the Commission. The Commission's meetings would be open to the public. The agendas, discussion papers and records of meetings would also be made public through its website. HC Members can select topics on their own, convene working groups and organize various activities. The Harbour Unit of the Development Bureau will provide the necessary support.

Moreover, in the spirit of planning with the people, a series of public engagement activities will be organized in the course of district harbourfront studies to collect views and forge consensus. This will in turn help enhance the quality and acceptability of harbourfront planning, and better cater for the characteristics of individual districts. We will solicit views from different stakeholders through an open and transparent engagement process with inclusive participation, such as by conducting site visits, brain-storming sessions, questionnaire surveys, public forums, and so on. This approach has been adopted for the completed Hung Hom District Study and Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront, as well as the ongoing Hong Kong Island East Harbourfront Study.

Regarding the suggestion about design competitions in the original motion, this has always been a subject of concern for Prof LAU. He always encourages us to adopt this approach more often. In fact, we are happy to adopt this approach, particularly in collaboration with the District Councils. For example, the North Point Harbour Conceptual Design Competition and Eastern Harbourfront Street Furniture Design Competition were organized by the Eastern District Council in 2009 and 2010 respectively. When undertaking harbourfront planning, the Government will make reference to outstanding designs and concepts in the relevant harbourfront design competitions. In fact, relevant department are exploring how some of the winning designs can be incorporated into the design of the temporary harbourfront promenade at Hoi Yu Street.

Earlier this year, a Victoria Harbour icon design competition was co-organized by the Development Bureau, the Civil Engineering and Development Department and the HC for the creation of a unique and dedicated icon for the Victoria Harbour. Nearly 900 entries were received, and the winning entry was announced at the prize presentation ceremony held on 4 July.

This winning icon — President, this is not a prop; I merely want to put this winning icon for the Victoria Harbour on display — will be used for the Harbourfront Signage Scheme currently under planning, which will be implemented in six pilot districts, namely, Central and Western, Wan Chai, Eastern, Yau Tsim Mong, Kowloon City and Kwun Tong. The signage will be used to guide locals and tourists to nearby harbourfront promenades and open spaces with a view to improving harbourfront accessibility.

In terms of the planning and implementation of harbourfront developments, the HC has been playing a pivotal role. The Harbour Unit of the Development Bureau also assumes the role of a co-ordinator and a facilitator. As I am also the Vice-Chairman of the HC, allow me to briefly report the work of the HC so far since its establishment a year ago.

The HC was established in July 2010 to succeed the former HEC to advise the Government on harbourfront planning, design, management and other related matters with the objective of fostering and facilitating the development on both sides of Victoria Harbour. Since its establishment, the HC has held discussions on a wide range of topics on the harbourfront. Separately, three task forces have been set up under the Commission to monitor the implementation of harbourfront enhancement projects. Meanwhile, on the basis of the enhancement suggestions for the 22 action areas I mentioned earlier, the task forces will continue to take forward various enhancement projects and put forth new ideas and recommendations.

Although the HC is an advisory rather than statutory body, significant achievements have been made. In July 2010, the Chief Secretary for Administration issued a general circular to bureaux and departments to appeal for their action in fully consulting the HC when planning and developing harbourfront projects. Various bureaux and departments have duly complied with the requirement stipulated in this circular. Since its establishment, the HC and its task forces have received requests from bureaux and departments for views on 31 different harbourfront projects under their respective purviews. Perhaps I can use this point to address the concern expressed by Mr WONG as to whether various government departments are still going their own ways. The answer is in the negative because the Chief Secretary for Administration has already ordered that harbourfront work must be co-ordinated. In addition, we are really glad to see that an increasing number of proponents or groups of private projects have, on their own initiative, submitted their harbourfront projects to the

HC for views. The reason is simple, because most of the projects submitted to the HC would have to go through the TPB at a later stage. Therefore, many private developers hope to get the seal of approval from the HC in order to establish the merits of their projects and designs.

Since its establishment, the HC and its task forces have received requests for views on a total of 12 private projects. Of the 43 government and private projects submitted to the HC or its task forces for views, 24 were supported by the HC, 15 have yet to reach the final stage after initial views given, and four were opposed by the HC. I firmly believe that the four projects opposed by the HC (including those from the Government) will not proceed in their original form as they would have to take into consideration the HC's views.

The suggestion for establishing a statutory body to co-ordinate and implement harbourfront development has been mentioned in both the original motion and the amendments. Recently, some HC members representing non-official organizations have also raised the relevant issues for discussion. My attitude towards this matter is understanding, open or even supportive. In this connection, I would like to quote a passage from the report of recommendations made by the Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront (TGMMH) under the former HEC. This passage is entitled "Aspirations for a Statutory Harbourfront Authority" (and I quote):

"As Task Group Members have observed, the ability to combine advocacy with execution as well as the flexibility to operate without the constraints of bureaucracy are conducive to bringing about holistic, integrated and responsive changes to the management of the harbourfront. For the same reasons, Hong Kong has seen the need to establish independent statutory authorities in the management of key public assets, such as public hospitals and lately, the West Kowloon Cultural District. However, in the course of its deliberations, the TGMMH recognized that a major challenge in our harbourfront enhancement work at present lies in the effective resolution of conflicts between various government objectives and mandates and some incompatible land uses of harbourfront sites inherited from the past, including some in private ownership. This main consideration justifies TGMMH's above recommendations in moving forward on the basis of the existing institutional, policy and resource framework, under the championship of a non-executive Harbourfront Commission backed up by high-level steer and resolve within the Administration to address the needed resolutions. TGMMH however recommends that in the longer run the aspiration

for an independent, statutory authority, supported by its own executive and dedicated funding, to plan, design, operate and manage the harbourfront should be re-visited to enhance public involvement, vibrancy and timely response to public needs." (End of quote)

Although the then report of the former HEC suggested that it was a matter to be re-visited in the longer run, I have already activated the review process. In the coming 12 months, the Development Bureau will continue to explore the matter in collaboration with the HC, and hold further discussions at its subsequent meetings. Of course, we will listen to the views expressed by the public and other relevant stakeholders, including the valuable views expressed by Honourable Members in this debate.

Another focal point of the motion is to adopt the public-private partnership (PPP) approach in harbourfront development. I am delighted to hear Mr KAM Nai-wai's call that we should be bold and original in this regard. I hope that we will not be criticized later on for whatever "collusion". In this respect, the Government has all along worked closely with the former HEC and the current HC to explore ways to facilitate the wider application of PPPs. Through this approach, we aim to capture the creativity and professional knowledge of the private sector for more innovative design options and management model which is flexible and allows more sustainable development. As such, a vibrant, green, accessible and sustainable harbourfront can be created for public enjoyment. It is worth mentioning that when we talk about the private sector in PPPs, non-profit-making organizations and social enterprises are also included.

Currently, we are also exploring the possibility of developing Sites 4 and 7 of the New Central Harbourfront (in whole or in part) by PPP as a pilot project for developing our harbourfront through this novel collaboration approach. With the support of the HC, we have commissioned an independent consultant to conduct a study on the feasibility of developing these two sites by PPP. A market sounding exercise was completed at the end of June, and the views of the private sector on the development of these sites by PPP are now being analysed.

Another pilot site or potential harbourfront site which can be developed by PPP is located in the Eastern District. I reckon Mr WONG Kwok-hing might have heard about it when he served in the Eastern District Council. We plan to develop the proposed temporary harbourfront promenade site at Hoi Yu Street in Quarry Bay, the two adjoining sites which are currently zoned "Other Specified

Uses" annotated "Cultural and/or Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses", and the nearby site above the Eastern Harbour Crossing Tunnel Portal by way of PPP. We will consider the options recommended in the Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study of the Planning Department when this project is taken forward in future. The study is expected to be completed by the end of this year.

In addition, we also plan to develop Sites 1 and 2 of the New Central Harbourfront by PPP. But as works associated with the construction of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass will be carried out at part of Sites 1 and 2 up till July 2015, the development of these two sites will take some time to materialize.

I know some Members and the community at large may have different views or concerns about PPP, particularly on the issues of continuous monitoring and public engagement. The Administration is also gravely concerned about this matter. We have all along emphasized that there will be community involvement throughout the different stages of the PPP process from planning, design, development to management and operations of the harbourfront. We must also ensure that the public purpose is achieved, including the point raised by Mr KAM Nai-wai in his amendment about ensuring that harbourfronts are accessible and the public can freely enjoy harbourfronts without unreasonable restrictions. Let me use the development of Sites 4 and 7 of the New Central Harbourfront as an example. We hope that by adopting the PPP approach, it will not only establish the financial viability of the development project to attract private sector participants, but also ensure that it will meet a wide array of social objectives as drawn up by the HC. We also intend to establish a continual monitoring system with some form of public participation, such as the setting up of an advisory committee, to ensure that the sites are being developed and managed in the best public interest.

Sustainability is not only required for the environment, but also the mode of financial operation. We are now exploring the use of the PPP approach to develop harbourfront sites. One of the objectives is that alternative capital and recurrent funding would be brought by the PPP approach to the future benefit of the harbourfront, without being over-reliant on the Government for capital or recurrent funding. Nevertheless, regardless of whether the traditional approach of publicly-funded operation or the PPP approach is adopted, or in respect of considering the establishment of a statutory body in the long run, the Administration will work towards the objective of achieving a sustainable mode

of financial operation, and adopt flexible arrangements to cater for different characteristics of individual harbourfront sites or projects.

I concur with Miss Tanya CHAN's view as stated in her amendment that in the course of harbourfront planning and management, appropriate consideration must be given to the needs of various industries. In fact, port operations, particularly those at container terminals and several public cargo working areas in Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing to the west of the Victoria Harbour, are still very important to Hong Kong's economic development. Waterborne transport is also an important factor. Harbourfront sites are a pre-requisite for Hong Kong's shipping industry or even operations in the cargo working areas. While the creation of an accessible harbourfront is being taken forward, we must also consider the actual operational needs of the industries. But by saying so, I do not mean that we will do nothing about harbourfront sites already provided with facilities. It is just that we must co-ordinate and co-operate with the industries when enhancing these harbourfront projects and conducting long-term planning studies. For example, in the course of relocating the Kwun Tong Public Cargo Working Area for the construction of a harbourfront promenade in Kwun Tong, we have taken into consideration the needs of various industries, particularly the waste recycling industry, so that the relocation exercise was conducted in two phases. Complementing measures have also been taken by the Marine Department when tendering out the berths. Let me cite another example: the Western Wholesale Food Market which is of concern to several Members including Mr IP Kwok-him. When contemplating enhancement proposals to the wholesale food market, government departments must consider how to enhance the four vacant piers at the market as well as the harbourfront site off the piers. In this regard, we will continue to consult operators in the wholesale market as well as other relevant stakeholders to ensure that the day-to-day operation of the wholesale market and the operators will not be affected by the proposals.

On the premise of appropriately considering the needs of various industries, we also need to provide high quality tourism facilities that are convenient and attractive to tourists so that a world-class harbourfront will be created on both sides of the Victoria Harbour. Over the past decade, the Tourism Commission has been carrying out various enhancement works in different harbourfront districts. A series of harbourfront enhancement and improvement projects has been completed in Lei Yue Mun, Tsim Sha Tsui, Sai Kung and Stanley. The enhancement project on both sides of the Aberdeen Typhoon Shelter is now underway. In addition, the Tourism Commission is

striving to take forward the New Cruise Terminal at Kai Tak. When completed, the cruise terminal will not only become Hong Kong's new landmark, but also provide a convenient location for locals and tourists to enjoy our ravishing harbour.

The Hong Kong Tourism Board has organized mega events on both sides of the Victoria Harbour time and again in order to increase the appeal and publicity of these events. These events will not only give participating tourists an opportunity to enjoy the beautiful scenery of the Victoria Harbour, but also enrich their travel experience in Hong Kong. Examples of such mega events include the Hong Kong Dragon Boat Carnival — I wonder if this is the event Miss Tanya CHAN and Mr Fred LI participated in recently — Hong Kong Wine and Dine Festival, Hong Kong's New Year Countdown Celebration, and so on. In addition, a brand new water event is now under planning. As mentioned by some Member — that should be Mr IP, an amateur sports association is actually planning to organize the cross harbour swim in the Victoria Harbour. The Government will actively support the re-introduction of cross harbour swim after taking into account the safety and needs of other harbour users, including vessels and participants of the swimming race. Recently, a suggestion has been made by the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) Authority to use part of the land in WKCD for temporary arts and cultures activities. We will be proactive in providing support.

Various suggestions have been made by Honourable Members, such as providing vessel berthing spaces, water sports rafts, and so on. These suggestions will impact on the connection between the harbour and harbourfront sites. The HC is now considering setting up a new, that is, the fourth task force to advise the Government on the connection between the harbour and harbourfront sites. The Administration will continue to work closely with the HC and hold further discussions on proposals having an impact on the harbourfront and harbourfront sites.

Regarding the suggestion in the original motion "to revitalize and develop afresh decommissioned old piers", I find the suggestion made by Mr WONG Kwok-hing in his amendment "to turn negative factors into positive factors" really worth noting. This can only be achieved successfully when we finally turn the liabilities of decommissioned and vacant piers into assets. Why do I say so? That is because I have an actual example on hand. In 2007, the Audit Commission pointed out in its Report No. 48 that four out of the five piers at the

Western Wholesale Food Market had been left vacant for years. It therefore requested that further efforts be made by government departments to improve the utilization of facilities in the wholesale market. Subsequently, the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) took the view that if there was no other feasible options, those piers should be demolished so as to avoid the need of spending additional resources on their maintenance. Hence, I think from the point of view of the PAC or its members, these vacant piers are liabilities. I think we must adopt a new mindset so that those facilities will not be regarded as liabilities. Instead, they should be treated as useful assets before we can do our job properly. Luckily, when the Subcommittee on Harbour Plan Review (the Subcommittee) under the former HEC was consulted by the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department on the proposal, the Subcommittee did not support the demolition of those four piers. The Subcommittee also suggested that the piers should be preserved and their revitalization and development for harbourfront enhancement purposes be studied. Taking into account the views of the Subcommittee, the Administration has not insisted on demolishing the piers. Instead, the Development Bureau is now working jointly with the relevant bureaux and departments to explore means to maximize and revitalize the use of these old vacant piers. Under another committed project for maximizing the use of piers, the eastern berth of Central Pier 8 will be developed into the long-term site of the Hong Kong Maritime Museum. The project is now underway.

Miss Tanya CHAN suggested in her amendment that effluent treatment and sewage systems should be perfected so as to improve the water quality of the harbour. Of course, that matter is not directly under the purview of the Development Bureau. But I also want to give Members a brief report. To further improve the water quality of the Victoria Harbour, the Government has further allocated about \$17 billion for the full-speed implementation of the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme (HATS) Stage 2A to treat the remaining untreated sewage, about 450 000 cubic metres a day, discharged from Hong Kong Island. In parallel, we have advanced the construction of some disinfection facilities to improve the water quality in the western part of the harbour and the beaches in Tsuen Wan. Since the commissioning of these facilities in March 2010, the seven beaches along the coast of Tsuen Wan have complied with the Water Quality Objective. Four of them have been re-opened to the public for swimming in June this year. Upon the completion HATS Stage 2A in 2014, the water quality of the Victoria Harbour is expected to see further improvement.



Our objective of enhancing the harbourfront is to improve its accessibility so that harbourfront promenades on both sides of the Victoria Harbour will be constructed gradually for public enjoyment. This point echoes the vision enunciated by Mr IP Kwok-him in his amendment for constructing uninterrupted harbourfront promenades on both sides of the Victoria Harbour. Some of the major developments highlighted by Mr IP such as revitalizing Western Wholesale Food Market and preserving Fenwick Pier in Wan Chai have already been included in various short, medium and long-term measures under the 22 action areas.

Notwithstanding our good intentions, it remains a long, continuous or even daunting task to build an uninterrupted harbourfront promenade. After all, the Victoria Harbour is not a blank canvas, and we must take into account existing harbourfront facilities, current development in the community, as well as the connection between the harbourfront and its ancillary facilities through the provision of transport infrastructure in future. Mr KAM Nai-wai and Mr WONG Kwok-hing have made suggestions about public facilities in harbourfront areas in their respective amendments. At present, as public facilities are provided in some harbourfront areas, it is not easy to build an accessible harbourfront promenade. Such issues have to be resolved on a case-by-case basis. In assessing whether it is necessary to set up government facilities in harbourfront areas, the Administration will first consider whether the facilities have to be set up at the harbourfront due to operational needs. If it is found that there is no need to set up the facilities at the harbourfront, we will explore the possibility of reprovisioning them to a non-harbourfront site, for example, the bus terminus at Shing Sai Road in Kennedy Town. For government structures which have to be located at the harbourfront because of a practical need, the Government will, where possible, consider setting them back, or reserving the part facing the harbourfront for use as a promenade. For example, the Central and Western District Promenade — Sheung Wan Section is built behind the Sheung Wan Stormwater Pumping Station. If, for operational and practical reasons, the facilities cannot be relocated or set back at the moment, we will explore the feasibility of improving the appearance of their exteriors and undertaking landscape works with a view to enhancing the harbourfront, for example, the proposed beautification works for the Marine Police Regional Headquarters and Marine Police Harbour Division Base at Sai Wan Ho.

The issue of private ownership of harbourfront sites has been mentioned in Mr KAM Nai-wai's amendment. I think Members would agree that compared to

the question of public facilities I just mentioned, the resolution of private ownership issues is even more challenging. We are glad to see that some of the owners and developers have co-operated with us wholeheartedly. For example, regarding the temporary promenade at Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay, with the collaboration of the New Hong Kong Tunnel Company Limited, a harbourfront land strip measuring 90 m long and six metres wide has been released to achieve connectivity of the promenade. If redevelopment is involved in such private developments mentioned above, the developer would often be willing to set back the buildings under its planning application so as to vacate harbourfront land for the construction of harbourfront promenade. The above example was the result of lengthy negotiations and the joint efforts of various parties. We will continue to seriously examine all feasible measures to see if favourable conditions can be created for the development of a continuous promenade.

President, we will, as always, continue to take in public views on harbourfront development with an open mind and strive to refine various measures for beautifying both sides of the Victoria Harbour, with a view to developing a more vibrant and creative harbourfront for public enjoyment.

Later, I will suitably respond to the points raised by other Honourable Members in their speeches.

Thank you, President.

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

**MR CHAN KAM-LAM** (in Cantonese): President, there are many harbour cities in the world, such as Singapore, Vancouver, Hamburg, Rotterdam and so on. All of them have put in place a comprehensive system to plan and manage their harbourfront areas. By contrast, the planning of our harbourfront area is mainly dominated by several districts in a fragmented way, without any comprehensive plans. This is really quite unimaginable as Hong Kong is, after all, a well-developed city with fairly satisfactory development.

According to the description of the Hong Kong Tourism Board of the Victoria Harbour in its promotional material, "Victoria harbour (is) ..... a jewel that people marvel at, no matter how many times they visit the city." I have to

add: "No matter from which place you look at the harbour, you would still feel the unique fascination." Many people go to the Hong Kong Island and travel along Tsim Sha Tsui East for the spectacular harbour view; yet few people know that the harbour view is more magnificent, especially if you catch it from Kowloon East when dusk falls.

There are many historical buildings along the shoreline of Kwun Tong in Kowloon East. With a long shoreline and being adjacent to Kai Tak New Development Area, Kwun Tong has enormous potential for development. If the Government has a better planning for development, it is believed that the commercial activities and tourism industry in the area can be benefited, and in turn, people's livelihood will be improved. It can also promote and support the development of the Kai Tak New Development Area. For that reason, the DAB has conducted a rather detailed study on the development of Kowloon East harbourfront and has consulted the residents and relevant local groups. We consider that the development of harbourfront should be well co-ordinated; while the public can use the harbourfront area, a tourism element should also be included, so that Kwun Tong harbourfront can have diversified development for tourism, as well as for leisure and recreational purposes; hence, people's livelihood can also be improved.

Conservation is another important element in harbourfront development. The Tin Hau Temple in Lei Yue Mun, as well as the Tin Hau Temple and Child-Giving Rock in Cha Kwo Ling have been frequented by tourists and local residents, given their long history and miraculous legends. If the Government can carry out conservation work on these historical structures and link them up, and with the complement of some other cultural establishments, the eastern section of Kwun Tong harbourfront can be developed into an area for cultural activities, sightseeing and conservation. This harbourfront promenade with special Chinese features will attract more overseas tourists.

The western section of Kwun Tong harbourfront can be developed into a recreational and yachting zone, but the relevant facilities are still inadequate. Phase I of Kwun Tong Promenade, completed last year, is welcomed by local residents and people in the vicinity. Discussion on the design of Phase II of the Promenade has just begun. Just now the Secretary mentioned that the cargo working area would be relocated in July and August this year, we hope the project would commence as soon as possible.

We note that Kwun Tong Promenade can be developed in conjunction with the adjacent Kai Tak Cruise Terminal. Recently, the DAB has announced its views on the Kai Tak Development project. We consider that monorail can be constructed to link up Kai Tak and Kwun Tong, so that the cruise terminal as well as the new development areas of Kai Tai and Kwun Tong can be linked together as one region, and Kai Tak can jointly develop with the neighbouring districts.

We also propose to change the existing usage of the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, which has a low usage rate, so that water sports activities can be held there and yachts can berth there. Currently, yachts over 100 feet can only berth at the Gold Coast, but the number of berths is very limited. We hope that the Government can revamp the planning of the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter in future.

At the same time, there are also other typhoon shelters in Hong Kong where the usage rates are rather low. For example, the usage rate of To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter is only 54% even in times of typhoons. We hope that the Government would discuss with the relevant departments to pool together all these typhoon shelters of low patronage, and effectively convert them to be water sports centres or other forms of facilities, with a view to bring new drive to Hong Kong's economy. Thank you President.

**MS STARRY LEE** (in Cantonese): President, after listening to the Secretary's response which lasts almost half an hour, I am happy to learn that the harbourfront development has made some progressive steps forward.

I was once a member of the first term Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC), later I also joined the Town Planning Board (TPB) and have been advocating the establishment of a new harbourfront in Kowloon. Though the progress has been slow, at least we have taken a step forward, and this is a good start. Just now, the Secretary has responded to Members about the progress and ideas of harbourfront construction in each district. Apparently, the Secretary shows great concern about harbourfront construction and she is very familiar with the issue. We are happy to learn about that.

Of course, we have another concern, that is, just now in the Secretary's speech — if I have not mistaken what she has said, the Secretary may correct me if I am wrong — in connection with the development in Kowloon West, the

Secretary only mentioned the Kai Tak Development, it seems that she has not mentioned other developments, such as the continuous harbourfront promenade that we have all along been advocating.

I remember that at the first meeting of the HEC, we had already discussed this question. Up till now and in connection with the Secretary's earlier response, I am really concerned that we do not know when residents in Kowloon West can have a continuous harbourfront promenade. Our proposal does not only cover Kowloon West, what I have been advocating is the construction of a new harbourfront promenade in Kowloon, which echoes with the promenade on Hong Kong Island over a distance.

To me, the ideal new harbourfront promenade in Kowloon starts from Sham Shui Po, cuts through Kowloon West, links up Tsim Sha Tsui, Hung Hom, To Kwa Wan, passes through the new zone and eventually arrives at Kwun Tong and Lei Yue Mun. I really hope that residents in Kowloon can have a continuous harbourfront promenade which faces apart with the harbourfront promenade on Hong Kong Island. I do not know if the Secretary can, in her response, tell me when my dream may come true.

Next, I would focus on discussing my idea or the findings of the survey conducted by the DAB earlier on the construction of a new harbourfront promenade in Kowloon.

I remember that I raised this issue in December 2009 at the motion debate on "Reviewing afresh the use of land at the Kowloon waterfront". At that time, I pointed out that in the past, the harbourfront construction in Kowloon was relatively slow and it seemed that the work had been ignored. I remember that the Secretary had explained in response that in view of the large area of land to be reclaimed on Hong Kong Island, plans had been drawn up with regard to the reclamation projects of the new Central harbourfront, new Wan Chai harbourfront or new North Point harbourfront. However, reclamation projects in Kowloon had come to a halt due to the lawsuit, and reclamation works had not been resumed since then. Many reclamation projects have been shelved as historically our harbour has been used as a working harbour. As a result, harbourfront construction in Kowloon was relatively slow.

What I wish to say is that I am aware of the situation, and I accept that we should adopt a step-by-step approach in constructing a continuous harbourfront

promenade. Nevertheless, 18 months have passed since the last discussion, what changes have taken place in the Kowloon harbourfront?

Last time, I also mentioned that the greatest problem was the existence of private properties. I pointed out that if we were to build a continuous harbourfront promenade, we had to address many problems. I had done a stock-taking exercise, there are at least seven sewage treatment works and pumping stations in the region. Moreover, there are also many government premises, including the workshop of the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department; the Kowloon City vehicular ferry pier which has ceased operation but public access is forbidden; the sewage treatment works; vehicle examination centre; International Mail Centre — there are some progresses in this respect — and as many as 13 harbourfront sites which are either vacant or put to temporary uses. If the authorities really wish to build a new harbourfront promenade in Kowloon, I think what the Government can do is to deal with the above premises, which are mostly government premises, and inform the public of a concrete timetable to relocate these government premises, so as to return the harbour to the people.

Let us look at the paper submitted by the Government to the Legislative Council Subcommittee on Harbourfront Planning. The paper has listed short-term, mid-term and long-term enhancement of the harbourfront. Other than the arrangement we already know, that is, the relocation of the International Mail Centre and the MTRC Freight Yard, it seems that most government premises along the harbourfront will not be relocated. Hence, the dream of Kowloon residents for a harbourfront promenade which links up all districts can only be a distant dream. In this connection, if I have left out any information, or if the authorities actually have future plans, I hope the Secretary can let us know in her later response.

President, the demand of the people is actually very reasonable, they also understand that it is a huge task; what we ask for repeatedly is that we want to have a concrete timetable, so that we may know when we can have a new harbourfront promenade in Kowloon.

President, the last thing I wish to say is, apart from a continuous harbourfront promenade, I have all along been wishing that the Subcommittee on Harbourfront Planning or the Secretary .....

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Ms LEE, is there a problem with your microphone?

**MS STARRY LEE** (in Cantonese): I have put on the microphone, can you hear me?

**MR TAM YIU-CHUNG** (in Cantonese): Perhaps the microphone is not working.

**MS STARRY LEE** (in Cantonese): It does not matter if it is not working, I will continue with my speech. President, please give me some more time. *(Laughter)*

I have all along been thinking that the harbourfront of Hong Kong is lifeless without any vibrancy and vitality. I expect that the Government and the Subcommittee on Harbourfront Planning will, apart from constructing a continuous harbourfront promenade, also think about injecting vibrancy, vitality and all sorts of activities into these harbourfront promenades.

I always stroll along different harbourfront promenades, if you ask me to name the promenades that are relatively nice, and that people would like to go there by car for leisure, I would say the Gold Coast and the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade are the better ones. On Sundays, many special stalls will set up in the Gold Coast, which are great attractions to tourists. Of course, the beautiful hotel and beach also add to the attraction.

The other one is the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade, which is a bit remotely located. The problem of insufficient parking spaces has to be solved. In fact, many families go there during weekends and Sundays, parents bring their children to go there for cycling. Why do people go there? The key is the activity. For that reason, I hope the Secretary will solve the problem.

President, I so submit.

**MR LEE WING-TAT** (in Cantonese): President, regarding to the development of the harbourfront, this Council has discussed the issue many times, I just wish

to raise a few points. At present, the Secretary is proactively putting forward some rather pragmatic and viable proposals on the harbourfront development of the Victoria Harbour.

First of all, I hope that the plans of constructing respectively a continuous harbourfront promenade along the northern shore of Hong Kong Island and a continuous harbourfront promenade in Kowloon can be implemented in phase. I know that this is difficult, especially the fact that, as we have once discussed in the Panel on Development, some of the most beautiful harbourfront sites have been occupied by private developers for building residential flats, godowns or dockyards or other facilities, and it is impossible to change these historical developments.

I know that the Secretary had considered buying back these sites progressively by means of various options, such as land exchange, or developing these sites when necessary, so as to gradually improve the fragmented development of the harbourfront sites. In my view, we can discuss some of the proposals. At present, what is troubling the Secretary is that whenever such works are undertaken, there will be criticism of collusion between the Government and business. If the option of land exchange is to be adopted, the Secretary would definitely have to get public support and provide justifications. I will not immediately criticize the Secretary for colluding with the business sector, any criticism should be based on justifications.

The second point is about the public spaces owned by housing estates and the harbourfront promenade managed by non-governmental organizations. I would not say that such arrangements are definitely undesirable, but occasionally, some unhappy incidents will arise. Even if I do not use the term "confrontation", these incidents will still cause inconvenience to the public. The Times Square is a case in point, which has been discussed many times. Moreover, in Tsing Yi, a district I am familiar with, the harbourfront promenade is in fact very beautiful, and it is a good sitting out place for the public. However, once you enter the area under the management of the MTR Corporation Ltd, the security personnel will become very nervous. I am not sure if they become nervous because of my presence, I am not going to stage a protest there, I just take a walk along the promenade. The security personnel are also nervous about the activities of the residents. I think it is because their employer asks them to get their jobs done.



Therefore, if in future the Secretary considers handing over the management of the harbourfront promenades or other places to private companies, an agreement should be well prepared, and the Secretary should bear this in mind. The greatest criticism in the case of the Times Square is the low transparency of the management agreement. I once asked some organizations whether they could place something in the public space of the Times Square. In fact, they can do so, but they have to apply for permission and the application process is long. I had written to inquire about the appeal arrangement if I was unhappy with the decision. It seemed that I had to file the appeal to the Secretary's bureau, but the bureau told me that it had nothing to do with the case and asked me not to bother it any more.

Secretary, it was really agitating. Although I have complied with the procedure, I still have troubles in making enquiries to the bureau concerned. What chances do ordinary members of the public have in calling the Secretary or meeting the Secretary in front of Central Government Office? How can the public have the chance to complain to the Secretary of the difficulties they encounter in such matters that mean a lot to them? If I have to organize an event, and I do not know three weeks prior to that event if I am allowed to place something in the open space, that simply does not work. Therefore, if the Secretary is going to consider the so-called agreements in future, she has to make sure that it is clearly stated in the agreement that these private companies shall have no rights to carry out political sanction. In this way, these companies will not be allowed to ban public meetings and procession or political-sensitive activities. Moreover, if these companies disallow certain events, the provisions of the relevant appeal mechanism should be clearly stated. In the case of the 1 July march, the applicant had to appeal as the application was not approved by the police, and the appeal process was completed within two days. This arrangement is good, but the Lands Department takes much longer time to process the application. This is the second point.

Regarding the third point, I know that the Secretary has commenced harbourfront development in other places other than the Victoria Harbour, I think she should do so. Just now Ms Starry LEE mentioned that the Gold Coast is beautiful; I live in the Gold Coast and I always go jogging along the harbourfront. To me, half of the rent I paid is for the harbourfront. The place where I live is very near to the beach, I can go to the beach for jogging, reading books and sunbathing. To me, the beach is the most comfortable backyard of my home. When I jog along the Gold Coast, very often I would think of the business of the

Democratic Party, and solutions to many problems come to my mind as I jog. It is such a beautiful place for people, physically and mentally.

However, the Gold Coast has the same problem as other harbourfront promenades other than the Victoria Harbour, that is, the shoreline is fragmented. The long stretch of promenade is cut off at Kadoorie Beach and Castle Peak Beach, so I have to go up to the carriageway and then go down to the beach, otherwise I have to knock at "Uncle Fat's" door before I can go elsewhere. All other stretches have the same problem, one has to go up to the carriageway before he can go elsewhere, causing great inconvenience. Of course, I have not mentioned the traffic problems, and these problems should also be dealt with.

I understand that the Secretary is now discussing with Tuen Mun District Board the possibility of linking up Castle Peak Bay ..... I am not only concerned about New Territories West, I know that at the harbourfront promenade in Sai Kung, there is a carpark at the rear section — I believe the Secretary knows which part I am referring to, the problem of the shoreline being truncated is not very serious, only a small section is involved. If every district — Tuen Mun, Tsuen Wan, Kwai Tsing, Sai Kung, Kowloon West, Kowloon East — can have a harbourfront promenade extending one to two kilometres, it will become part of the daily life of the people, and people can have the right to access to the promenade and enjoy the sea, I think this is very important.

Apart from showing concerns of the two sides of the Victoria Harbour, I hope the Secretary can, at the same time, commence work in these districts in a progressive manner, so that residents in all 18 districts can enjoy the harbourfront environment. This can be regarded as a benevolent policy to local residents, thank you President.

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

**MR ALAN LEONG** (in Cantonese): President, first of all, the Civic Party recognizes the efforts made by Secretary Carrie LAM in perfecting the territorial-wide harbourfront planning and management. The establishment of the Harbourfront Commission and the work it has accomplished in just one year well illustrate the efforts made by the Secretary. Nevertheless, in the long run, a

good harbourfront planning and management cannot simply rely on the personal commitments of the Secretary.

From the experience of harbourfront management in overseas countries, it seems that a statutory body must set up to strike the balance between the use of harbourfront lands and the revitalization of harbourfront areas to meet public aspirations, and the statutory body should also be vested with real power. According to the understanding of the Civic Party, the Secretary does not oppose this idea. As far as I remember, the Secretary has expressed her view of establishing a similar statutory body on different occasions — let us call this organization the Harbourfront Authority, as in the case of the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority — it seems that she also accepts this concept. Therefore, the Civic Party hopes that the SAR Government can also embrace the same vision as soon as possible.

The importance of establishing a statutory body is to avoid the implementation of different policies by different departments. Hence, the objective fact as depicted by Mr LEE Wing-tat or Ms Starry LEE just now will not exist, that is, if government departments follow different policies and fail to pool the wisdom of the masses in the planning process to make a balanced decision in a one-stop fashion, the development of the harbourfront will only be fragmented, with a power plant located in one place, and then a marine police headquarter in another place nearby. I believe that is why it is important to set up a statutory body to rationalize the entire harbourfront planning work. Moreover, with the establishment of the statutory body, a consistent harbourfront policy can be formulated to provide details of implementation and a vision.

President, another important reason for setting up a harbourfront authority or a similar statutory authority is that enhanced projects can be drawn up and, with reference to overseas experience, implemented with flexibility in consideration of the special characteristics of each project. We can then capitalize on each project and strike a balance between public participation and private development. Owing to all these reasons, the Civic Party opines that the setting up of a statutory body is the only option and we must work in that direction.

Recently, a delegation of Legislative Council Members led by Prof Patrick LAU visited several world famous harbour cities. Last Saturday, we had an unofficial exchange with members of the Harbourfront Commission. The

experience we gained from these activities tied in with my argument just now. When this statutory body has set the vision of planning and backed by a system framework, it can implement development projects with private sector participation which are acceptable to the public. In the concluding remarks made by Prof Patrick LAU, he mentioned the successful example of the Battery Park City in New York. Just now some colleagues are concerned about collusion between the Government and business or the criticism against some private development projects. In my view, if this statutory body has involved the public in the process of discussion, and has a high level of transparency, revealing to the people all the facts and striving to be fully accountable to the public in implementing a vision embraced by the public, such worries can readily be solved.

The Civic Party hopes that the Government can perfect the planning and management of Hong Kong's harbourfront, and we also hope that the Secretary will lay down the foundation for the future long-term development within her remaining term of office.

I so submit.

**MR WONG YUNG-KAN** (in Cantonese): President, in regard to the development of harbourfront promenade, I think we have to raise some questions. I joined this Council after the reunification of Hong Kong. At that time, there was heated debate among Members on the development of Kowloon East and Kai Tak, including the development of the Victoria Harbour. What should be the scope of reclamation? Should there be reclamation? I have once said that if reclamation continued, Victoria Harbour would become Victoria River. If Victoria Harbour became a river, the original scenery would be gone.

In the past, the Government only concerned about safety in carrying out reclamation work. Upon the completion of the reclamation works, the job was considered to be done. The sea off Kowloon West and the Hong Kong-Macau Ferry Terminal is especially rough. Sometimes even if the wind is not strong, the waves still rise to three feet high. As I have worked in a boat, I know the stormy waves do not come from the harbour, but generated from the vessels. However, the Government has not done anything — even if it has, it has done very little — to mitigate the stormy waves. I think the Government should learn from the lesson and address this problem. Otherwise, as some colleagues have

said, the sea is so rough that one will feel sick before sailing to the sea. If this situation continues, how can we develop water tours or water taxis? All these factors should be taken into consideration.

Since the reunification, the Government has also listened to a lot of views and has made some gradual improvements. The other issue I would like to mention is the "one-hour living circle" concept in the Mainland. How can we make Hong Kong, being a cosmopolitan city, attractive to tourists in various aspects? Apart from the Victoria Harbour, Kowloon West or Kowloon East, what other places are attractive to tourists? In fact, some hotels have now moved to areas in New Territories West or even New Territories East for development. In view of this situation and given that Hong Kong has many bays, the Government should, before the implementation of reclamation works in future, carry out more studies to protect the scenery of the harbour.

The "one-hour living circle" does not only target at Hong Kong people, we also want to attract more people from the Mainland or other places in the world to come to Hong Kong. A Member mentioned the Gold Coast earlier. I would like to mention other areas, namely Lok Ma Chau, Deep Bay and Lau Fau Shan. I do not support reclamation in these areas. If you want to know the best place for watching sunset, someone will definitely say Deep Bay. However, the place with exquisite scenery has surprisingly become a mosquito breeding ground. Even if you have applied mosquito repellents, your feet are still swollen after being bitten by mosquitoes. How then can people go there to watch sunset? In addition, there is a special scene created by the presence of oyster-culture racks. In the past, there were no such racks, I wonder why there are so many racks now, and these racks are not managed by anyone, they just lay around casually, and the number is getting more and more. Concerning these issues, should the Government consider doing something by paying more attention to the "people-oriented" concept in the course of development?

I believe the Secretary is also aware that during the outbreak of SARS, many people went to the New Territories or the countryside to, offensively speaking, avoid getting SARS. Therefore, I think the Government should also consider the development of the New Territories or the countryside.

Mr IP Kwok-him, my colleague from the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong mentioned revitalizing the fishing harbour or the pier. As we all know, the Government has already allocated

funds to construct a Fishermen Wharf or a harbourfront promenade in the Southern District (including Ap Lei Chau). However, many people asked us why the Government did not consider revitalizing the fishing harbour and turning it into a tourist spot for more visitors, or enabling the participation of local people in the project. I hope the Government can be more flexible when formulating some policies. When Aberdeen residents and Southern District Council members came to the Legislative Council for discussion, they had, time and again, requested for relaxation of the third-class vessel licences. If these issues cannot be properly addressed, and no policies are formulated to regulate the situation where dozens to 20 vessels occupy half of the area of Aberdeen waters, how can the areas be developed into a tourist spot?

Furthermore, regarding a few places in New Territories East, namely Tap Mun, Ko Lau Wan, Sham Wan, Wong Shek Pier, Kat O and Sha Tau Kok, the Government has done a good job in these places. Nevertheless, we notice a very weird phenomenon. While the piers of other places have been rebuilt, the most popular Tap Mun Pier has not been constructed with a shelter nor has it been beautified. Since the Government considers Tap Mun as a tourist spot, why does it not beautify the place?

I also hope that the Government can consider revitalizing some other places. Of course, the Secretary just mentioned that the auditing work by the Audit Commission may scare some people off. In fact, while the Audit Commission is doing its work, there are also many people who query why the pier has to be beautified. I think this is only the view of some people but not the majority. Therefore, I hope the Government can re-consider this issue.

Finally, I hope that in carrying out land development and reclamation works in the future, the Government would seriously consider whether the reclaimed land is just a piece of raw land, and the Government should study the methods of revitalizing the land. Thank you, President.

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

**MR CHIM PUI-CHUNG** (in Cantonese): President, although this topic is not related to my field, I also would like to say a few words. Hong Kong is surrounded by sea, and thus the sea is another kind of resources possessed by

Hong Kong. At present, most of the Mainland tours will pay a visit to the Repulse Bay beach, which is one of the scenic spots in Hong Kong. The tour guides will also show them the building constructed by Mrs Nina WANG.

This beach is one of major tourist attractions. In order to cater for the needs of tourists, I hope the Government can set up a coffee shop in the area, so that tourists can, after visiting other scenic spots like the Peak, take a rest in that place leisurely and enjoy the natural scenery. The coffee shop can provide a resting stop for tourists. A shopping area can also be provided where tourists can shop leisurely without being forced to buy things. I am not speaking for anyone. I know there was once a shopping centre, but it clashed with some policies of the Government and the problem remained unsolved for a long time. In fact, the Government can solve the problem like requiring a payment of deposit. In this way, the tourist industry in Hong Kong can be benefited and tourists can also have one more resting place.

In addition, the beach will always be affected by hygiene problem, but this problem is not unsolvable. As far as I know, many fishing vessels are being hired to clean up the sea. However, since that is a tourist spot, the Government cannot address the problem lightly; otherwise, people will have the impression that Hong Kong is not a "fragrant" harbour but a "foul" harbour. The Government should pay more attention.

Second, there is a floating restaurant in Aberdeen, and we know that the Government once intended to turn Aberdeen into a tourist spot. Regrettably, the policy was later scrapped. We should not procrastinate any further. Even though Hong Kong is a blessed place where tourists from the Mainland and various places in the world come here for shopping, we still have to put in our greatest effort to meet the needs of tourists coming from all parts of the world.

Third, we often notice that there is a lot of rubbish floating on the sea, though luckily this is only an occasional but not a regular situation. In fact, as a lot of people are now living on Comprehensive Social Security Assistance or other benefits, and we have once proposed a motion to arrange these people to take up some suitable jobs, they can participate in the work of harbourfront beautification and cleaning, so that Hong Kong can better meet the requirements of being a world-class tourist spot.

President, we understand that apart from New York and some other cities, the night vista of Hong Kong is well appreciated by tourists all over the world. Thus, we have to enhance the views on the two sides of the Victoria Harbour, so as to gain the admiration of tourists. President, we also understand that as Hong Kong is short of land, we have to carry out reclamation works in Central in the past in order to open up more land. I strongly believe that the Government will develop a leisure and sight-seeing promenade in Central in future. We also know that on important festive days during the year, hundreds of thousands of people will watch the fireworks and enjoy the night view on both sides of the Victoria Harbour.

The Hong Kong Government should also plan for better development of the areas around Chek Lap Kok. Of course, it must first get the understanding and support of the green groups. I strongly believe that apart from environmental protection, the green groups should also take into consideration the future development of the entire economy of Hong Kong. I think it is better for all parties to negotiate and arrive at an understanding first than having political problems later, as this will impose invisible pressure on the SAR Government. Although the tenure of each government is five years, this does not mean that Hong Kong will experience a complete change after five years with totally different policies. Therefore, the development of Hong Kong should be the top priority among all issues.

As we understand, Hong Kong is indeed short of land. Since there is not enough land, the Government should strive to improve the living environment of Hong Kong, so that the whole world will know that despite the high land premium and high rental, people of Hong Kong can still live comfortably.

President, as I just mentioned, if the Government has a good spirit of solidarity, and plans well in advance in respect of environmental protection, it will be conducive to the implementation of policies in future.

**MR JAMES TO** (in Cantonese): President, I will not repeat other colleagues' viewpoints. However, I would like to talk about some fine points of view and hope to give some advices to the Government.

First, since many colleagues have mentioned about the accessibility and connectivity of harbourfront, I am a little worried that our concept will eventually



become unitary. The Government may think that it has already done a good job by turning the harbourfront into a place for leisure walk. In fact, that is not enough.

Many Members, including me, have conducted on-site inspections and overseas duty visit to learn from overseas experience. We consider that diversity is most essential with regard to harbourfront development, so as to cater for different needs and attract more visitors. The harbourfront should not just be a place for people to walk their dogs, a dating place for couples or a playground for children. These are only the needs of some people, but not everyone. Some young people may want to play skateboard and bounce high and low in front of the sea. Of course, this may clash with other usages. However, do not forget that we can designate an area specifically for such kind of facility. Therefore, harbourfront development cannot be unitary.

Just now, Mr KAM Nai-wai especially reminded the Secretary that she could be bolder in planning. She is afraid that in doing so, people will criticize the Government for colluding with the business sector. Nonetheless, our eyes are clear. We will see who has won the bid and what they would do after they have been awarded the bid. In case there is a possibility of collusion, we will take a number of factors into consideration before making a decision, such as the amount of profits generated, whether a high-rise building will be built to reap tens of billions of dollars, whether the operators have a sense of exclusivity and whether the best ambience can be created. People will judge with reasoning and common sense. They will not jump to the conclusion that there is collusion between the Government and business when they see a high-class restaurant operating in the area. The Secretary needs not worry too much about this. Frankly speaking, if even you have such worries, I am really scared, as you are renowned for being a "good fighter". If even you have such worries, it is unlikely that other Secretaries would dare to go ahead.

Therefore, I think diversification and innovation are very important. Even if a certain activity will only be participated by a minority of people or a critical mass, we still do not need to worry as we have spacious harbourfront areas. We hope that the Government will not turn all harbourfront areas into places for leisure walk. This is the first point.

Second, it is about vibrancy. I would like to take the Hung Hom harbourfront as an example. Although the area concerned is not big, I still want

to take it as an example. Talking about the pier opposite to Whampoa Garden, of course I have strived for maintaining the ferry services. Because in fact, a lot of people still need to use ferry services.

Nevertheless, I am not going to discuss this point. On the contrary, I want to ask why ferry services were terminated. One of the reasons is that when operators bid for the contract, they could not get the Government's guarantee to allow topside development of the pier so as to provide ample space for business operation, such as food establishments, which can supplement the operating costs of ferry services. As we all know, the operator will definitely suffer a loss if ferry services are the only source of income, and business operation can hardly continue. However, for reasons such as environmental protection, provision of other means of convenient transport, maintenance of the shrinking domestic ferry services or provision of leisure activities, we hope that ferry services can be maintained. If the Government can relax the restrictions on topside development to allow the operation of restaurants or erection of advertising signs, the operating costs of ferry services can basically be supplemented.

However, if the abovementioned ferry services really disappear permanently (this is only an example), what shall we do? In my view, if the Transport and Housing Bureau as well as the Development Bureau can consider this point and relax the planning restrictions, ferry services can in fact be rescued. This can actually be figured out. The difference is minimal. There may be a difference of \$1 million to \$2 million per year. If the planning restrictions can be relaxed to allow business undertaking and operators can be given certain guarantee, the target has already been attained indeed.

I do not say this purely for ferry services. However, if the multi-use mode is adopted such that in providing ferry services, the covered areas are also open for public use or for the operation of restaurants, an ambience will be created to attract people who pass by to have a drink. In this way, the harbourfront will not just be a place for leisure walk, because if the harbourfront only serves for this purpose, it will indeed be very monotonous and can hardly attract visitors.

Diversification is very important, as members of the public can go to different harbourfront areas at different times to meet different people. They may visit the areas with their partners and participate in different activities.

They can have different feelings about the place. If the harbourfront is only meant for leisure walk, I think it will be rather dull and boring.

Finally, I would like to point out that certain harbourfront areas always give off foul smell. It would be most disappointing if we are affected by the unpleasant smell while we are strolling along the harbourfront and enjoying the nice environment. I do not want to say any more on this issue. The Secretary is also aware that there are sewage outfalls at certain harbourfront areas. Some outfalls were originally not for discharge purpose but were mistakenly connected. I hope that the Government can improve the situation as far as possible. Otherwise, if it gives off an unbearable stink smell, how then can people be attracted to go there? I hope the Government can pay attention to this problem and strive to improve the situation. The Government should also set up a reporting mechanism so be kept informed of such situations.

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Prof Patrick LAU, you may now speak on the four amendments. The speaking time limit is five minutes.

**PROF PATRICK LAU** (in Cantonese): President, the amendments of four Members have raised different issues and proposals which are worthy of in-depth study and discussion by the Administration. I also thank the Secretary for responding to them one by one.

Mr WONG Kwok-hing has pointed out that the current harbourfront development strategy always plans only one step ahead, and government departments follow different policies, displaying a lack of foresight. In fact, in my motion and as well as in the amended motion of many Members, we have pointed out that if a statutory body with substantial power, such as the Harbourfront Authority as mentioned by Mr Alan LEONG, can be established as soon as possible to co-ordinate the work concerning harbourfront development, the problems can be resolved. This statutory body can break the barriers among

departments and facilitate their work. I am very grateful that the Secretary has undertaken to study seriously the feasible options.

Regarding the hosting of various activities in the harbourfront areas, I certainly support this proposal. I also consider it vital that the special features of each district can be fully utilized in designing the harbourfront development. We learn that in some big cities in the United States and Canada, the harbourfront piers or other local characteristics have been incorporated. In these cities, buildings with conservation value will be preserved, such as decommissioned factories. These elements will then be incorporated in the harbourfront design. I am surprised to find that in prosperous cities like New York, some natural or conservation factors can be incorporated in the planning. We should draw reference from this practice.

Mr KAM Nai-wai points out that the problem of harbourfront areas being used by public facilities or being privately-owned should be solved expeditiously. I understand that there are great difficulties in resolving this problem if the land concerned has already been put into appropriate use. Nonetheless, if we can work on the design, for instance, by making use of rafts, bridges and tunnels as proposed to link up harbourfront lands, we may not need to resolve the problem of private ownership of land. The above proposals may be more feasible. I fully agree with Mr KAM Nai-wai's proposal on the accessibility of people with disabilities. All our harbourfront areas will only serve the purpose if they are accessible to all members of the public.

Mr IP Kwok-him proposes to build the two sides of the Victoria Harbour into a world-class harbourfront area, to showcase the vitality of the scenery of Hong Kong. This is exactly my purpose of moving this motion. Just now, a number of Members mentioned that one must be able to see the sea along the harbourfront, and can enjoy the scenery at different times of the day, such as sunset and sunrise. I think this is very important. I am also very grateful to the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong for conducting a detailed study on how this idea can be materialized in each district. To all people in Hong Kong, it is very important to restore and manifest the distinctive cultural features of various districts. This certainly has my support.

Miss Tanya CHAN has deleted one proposal of my original motion concerning private development. In fact, many harbourfront lands are now privately owned and it is very difficult to totally ban the owners from developing

the land. However, from the recent overseas duty visit, we notice that in places such as Boston, the private management approach is a good basis for us to draw reference on when taking forward public-private partnership. Furthermore, overseas experiences also indicate that the problem can be resolved by law. Through legislation, we can still ask private developments to open the harbourfront to provide some public land. Thank you, President.

**SECRETARY FOR DEVELOPMENT** (in Cantonese): President, I would like to thank seven other Members for expressing their valuable views on this motion today, and I believe that many people share their views. Last Saturday, Prof Patrick LAU and a few Members shared with us the fruits of their duty visit in April. Prof LAU made a great deal of efforts, and what he said the other day had given me much food for thought. According to Prof LAU, during his duty visit to Boston, Vancouver and New York on harbourfront development, he felt strongly the passion of the host organization and friends. Why did that give me much food for thought? I believe that we need passion to promote the beautification and enhancement of the harbourfront in Hong Kong. The Chairman of the Harbourfront Commission immediately responded to Prof LAU and asked him not to worry as all those people sitting there were extremely passionate.

The passion actually comes from joy. In the past few years when we worked on harbourfront beautification, we constructed for all Hong Kong people some harbourfront promenades through the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee or the Harbourfront Commission. The scale maybe rather small and we may refer to them as quick wins. However, whenever I visit the Wan Chai Temporary Promenade (that is, the dog park that we are all familiar with) and the Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 1 which was completed last year, I notice that people are full of joy when they get close to the Victoria Harbour. Their joy provides an endless supply of energy for promoting our work on the harbourfront.

The harbourfront on both sides of the Victoria Harbour has huge development potentials. As Mr CHAN Kam-lam has just mentioned, the task before us is how to properly utilize these development potentials. I also agree with a number of Members that properly utilizing such potentials does not only involve constructing a continuous promenade for leisure walk. So long as the potentials are well utilized, we can enhance the international status of the Victoria Harbour and boost the local economies in various districts. For example, there

are three sites on both sides of the Victoria Harbour, namely the West Kowloon Cultural District, the Kai Tak Development and the Central Wan Chai Reclamation. We have proactively carried out planning and preliminary work on these sites and I believe that there will be a new facelift a few years later.

We are now going to revitalize some new harbourfront sites that are not created by reclamation, and we are facing many challenges and obstacles as just mentioned. I have repeatedly said in this Council that quite a number of old urban areas can be revitalized through harbourfront construction. The Kwun Tong Industrial Area is a very conspicuous example; if we do a good job at the Kwun Tong harbourfront, I believe that this would be very helpful to our work on revitalizing the industrial buildings in Kwun Tong.

It has lately been widely discussed that Hong Kong has a large area of waters but few pleasure boat berths. Perhaps the last pleasure boat berth we built is the Gold Coast in Tuen Mun that a few Members have mentioned today. In other words, no pleasure boat berth has been built in Hong Kong in the past 10 to 20 years, and our neighbouring cities have already caught up with us. This is exactly the reason why the Harbourfront Commission and the Director of Marine have considered it necessary to set up the fourth working group, to be specially tasked to consider how the work can be better performed through land and water links.

Public-private collaboration is a must for the development of a vibrant harbourfront with activities and a huge flow of people. For this reason, I would adopt a more proactive attitude towards the establishment of a statutory organization. I am not sure if Mr Alan LEONG was present when I spoke for the first time. In this connection, I am very understanding and open-minded, and I tend to support the demand for the establishment of a statutory organization to manage the harbourfront. As I can see, the fact is that it is indeed very difficult for various departments to manage these public assets; thus statutory organizations have been set up in the past to solve many difficulties. I had given two examples when I spoke earlier: we established the Hospital Authority to manage public hospitals and we established the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority for the West Kowloon Cultural District. Besides, there is the Urban Renewal Authority responsible for urban renewal and the Construction Industry Council responsible for promoting our construction industry, manpower training and quality enhancement, and creating a quality construction sector. There is also the Airport Authority for managing the Hong Kong Airport. These

outstanding examples have been verified through practice. I fully understand why there are so many demands for similar organizations for harbourfront management and planning. I am open-minded, and according to the official saying, we have not yet adopted any position. We are open-minded and we hope that Members would discuss this issue together and express their views.

I especially mentioned one point last evening to indicate that I tended to be supportive. The argument for my intended support has already been given in my speech. With the mission and task of planning and revitalizing the harbourfront of Hong Kong, the organization has the ability or mindset to turn old piers, dilapidated industrial buildings or abandoned land, and so on, regarded by many as negative assets into useful assets; and to turn the factors considered as negative by Mr WONG Kwok-hing into positive factors, thereby injecting new momentum into these factors. And, only through a leading authority with such a mission can the flow of people or activities considered as essential by Ms Starry LEE be turned into indicators of success of work rather than expenditure pressures. I believe many people would think that if they have to organize so many activities, the financing pressures will be great and they may not have the resources to do so, so why should they still be so passionate to aim at getting a huge number of people and organizing so many activities? Only an independent organization with financial resources and its own mission will take up this important task with such a mindset. Hence, I tend to be supportive and I have triggered a study in the hope of formulating with the Harbourfront Commission a framework for the establishment of an authority in the coming 12 months. Mr Alan LEONG seems to have read my mind, and he hopes that I would try my best to lay a foundation for what I would like to do within my remaining term of office. This is my mindset today, not only in connection with harbourfront work. If Members have noticed ..... in connection with many other tasks such as heritage conservation and even law enforcement, my mindset is to "lay a foundation" so that more people can directly participate, hoping that these tasks can be sustainable and be long-lasting.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam has given a number of examples. In beautifying the harbourfront, we have plenty of opportunities for heritage conservation. It is a right move for Miss Tanya CHAN to add "heritage conservation" in her amendment. Similarly, we have found in respect of the Kai Tak Development that integrating heritage conservation such as the Long Tsun Stone Bridge that we excavated, the Kai Tak River and the adjacent harbourfront will make the vision of Kai Tak more fascinating. I would like to make an appeal — Mrs IP seems to

be absent — Mrs Regina IP's New People's Party has recently expressed a lot of views on the government system and organizational changes. If I can make an appeal, I hope that the next-term government will never separate the work on heritage conservation and town planning regardless the changes in the system and structure. I can boldly say that the Government of this term has achieved success in heritage conservation to a certain extent because we have infused heritage conservation into town planning and land use. As a result, greater importance is attached to heritage conservation, and heritage conservation has become the prime consideration in planning.

I would like to respond to the specific views respectively expressed by some Members. First of all, I am very thankful to Mr CHAN Kam-lam who knows the areas around Kowloon East and Kwun Tong perfectly well. To consolidate harbourfront development in East Kowloon especially the Kwun Tong district, we must tackle the typhoon shelter problem and we cannot evade it. We have taken the first step to solve the problem of the Public Cargo Working Area (PCWA) through joint efforts with the Marine Department. As a next step, we need to tackle the problem of the Kwun Tong typhoon shelter. I am really thankful to Mr CHAN for raising this point; perhaps he would support our efforts to straighten out afresh or re-allocate the typhoon shelters in Hong Kong on the basis of the usage rate, in order to vacant some places or waters for use as pleasure boat berths as I have just said.

Ms Starry LEE would apparently think that I am biased because I have not talked about Kowloon West. I am now going to discuss the harbourfront development in Kowloon West in great length. As regards the new harbourfront promenade in Kowloon West or Kowloon as a whole, we have encountered more difficulties there than on Hong Kong Island because Hong Kong Island is more spacious with many newly reclaimed sites. Therefore, the harbourfront promenade in Kowloon has greater challenges. Let us start from the west. Generally speaking, it is our common wish that the harbourfront promenade should pass through the West Kowloon Cultural District and extend to Kowloon East, and we are gradually moving in this direction. The challenge in Tai Kok Tsui in Kowloon West is that the harbourfront promenade has been provided by several new private housing developments. The developers and land owners are required to build harbourfront promenades under the lease conditions for public enjoyment. The remaining part of the promenade (that is, the harbourfront of the development at Hoi Fai Road) will also be constructed by a private developer under the lease conditions, which is expected to be completed by 2012. The



Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) is now making detailed design for the development of the harbourfront site to the south of One SilverSea into a harbourfront open space. Regarding the harbourfront sites around this area, the Development Bureau has maintained close contacts with the relevant departments, and has explored the feasibility of developing these sites into open space. Indeed, there are many government facilities in this area and there are practical needs for these facilities. A new Yau Ma Tei PCWA and some government facilities have been established along the Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter, including the sewage pumping station of the Drainage Services Department, the marine refuse collection point of the Marine Department, the water selling kiosk of the Water Supplies Department, the Harbour Patrol Section of the Marine Department, as well as the PCWA Administration Building of the Marine Department, and so on. Regarding the bidding for berths, the sector still has a very strong demand for PCWAs. Since two PCWAs in Kwun Tong and Cha Kwo Ling will be closed this year, the Government does not have any plans to close and relocate the PCWA in the district. Nevertheless, the Government will consider the feasibility of improving and providing additional pedestrian links, beautifying the appearance of buildings and installing additional landscaping on the condition that the operation of the PCWA will not be affected.

The harbourfront around Tsim Sha Tsui and Hung Hom will soon take on an entirely new look. The Hung Hom Harbourfront Promenade (Initial Development) of about 500-metre long will be completed in August. Upon completion of the project, members of the public can use the Hung Hom Harbourfront Promenade and the footbridge in Salisbury Road to directly travel to the Tsim Sha Tsui Promenade and the Avenue of Stars. The harbourfront of about four-kilometre long from Star Ferry Pier in Tsim Sha Tsui to Laguna Verde in Hung Hom will then be connected.

In To Kwa Wan, the project of developing open spaces at Ma Tau Kok harbourfront will soon commence. The Hoi Sham Park and the open space at Chi Kiang Street will be developed jointly with the section connecting the open space at Chi Kiang Street and Hoi Sham Park and the end section of Chi Kiang Street impending closure. The project is now under planning. The initial concept of development includes the provision of a green promenade and a landscaped theme garden with rain shelters, pavilion and seats, and so on.

The Kai Tak Development is now in full swing. Under the development plan, a continuous promenade of about 11-kilometres in length will be provided

for public use. The first section of the 200-metre long Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 1 located next to the Kwun Tong PCWA was opened in January 2010 for public use. The design work for the development of Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2 has commenced. After the PCWA has been relocated, we will commence the construction of another 600-metre section of the Promenade. As regards Lei Yue Mun in the east, to fully capitalize on the harbourfront views, seafood and gourmet, the Tourism Commission will carry out the Lei Yue Mun Harbourfront Enhancement Project. Its scope of works includes the construction of a public landing facility-cum-harbourfront promenade and other streetscape enhancement works. I hope that Ms Starry LEE would wait patiently together with us for these projects to be implemented one after another.

According to Mr LEE Wing-tat, various methods including the exchange of land can be adopted to solve the problem of private ownership of harbourfront sites. I welcome his suggestion but the task may not be easy. At present, our strategy is to encourage redevelopment. As a matter of fact, some sites at the harbourfront such as the two warehouses across the Kai Tak runway were constructed for some time, and we are now discussing their redevelopment with two developers. One of the projects has been approved by the Town Planning Board (TPB) and another project is pending TPB's approval. In the redevelopment process, it can be specified that certain buildings should be moved to the rear, to leave room for a harbourfront promenade for public use. In regard to our co-operation with private companies, I strongly agree that the transparency level must be extremely high, and we must be fair, open and impartial. Mr LEE Wing-tat wishes that our work can be extended to the harbourfront outside the Victoria Harbour, and Mr WONG Yung-kan concurs. We will make our best efforts; yet the work on both sides of the Victoria Harbour is already very arduous.

As Mr WONG Yung-kan knows the Hong Kong waters very well, he made some points that are neutral. After years of reclamation, the sea is rough inside the Victoria Harbour, which created immense difficulties; and we should take this into account when we consider the provision of floating facilities. Nevertheless, my colleagues from the Civil Engineering Department have told me that the seawalls in the reclamation area have already been installed with wave reduction facilities in the course of the Central and Wan Chai Reclamation Development. Perhaps we should wait and see, and we will review the overall situation when these works have been completed.

Of course, it is the objective of the SAR Government to complement harbourfront and tourism development. For this reason, we will take the initiative to introduce a harbourfront site in Sai Kung for hotel development later on. This will be able to energize Sai Kung, create job opportunities and promote economic development in the district. Regarding Lau Fau Shan as Mr WONG Yung-kan has just mentioned, we have just completed a study on a beautification project and we will release the details through the Internet later. This is a study conducted after the completion of our studies on the Tai O and Mui Wo enhancement projects. It is not easy for us to group different departments together and implement simultaneously this project in Lau Fau Shan. Hence, I highly recommend the mode of development adopted for another tourist spot, that is, the Lam Tsuen Wishing Square in Tai Po. As Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming has taken the initiative to promote the development, he is very clear about this mode of development. In fact, this mode of development promotes revitalization through social enterprises. Through the co-operation among the local District Council, villagers, enterprises and government departments, social enterprises are set up to promote enhancement and beautification work. I have personally discussed the matter with the village head of Lau Fau Shan, up till now, there are still some difficulties. I believe that the Government can provide them with very strong support when social enterprises are set up.

Mr CHIM Pui-chung has touched on clearing up rubbish at sea and improving the facilities for public use. We understand this point very well. Actually, the LCSD has preserved a white house at Repulse Bay earlier based on the views received from members of the local community. We would like to identify a partner with whom we can work with to provide facilities for public use in the Repulse Bay area.

I fully agree with Mr James TO that we cannot adopt a unitary approach for the construction of continuous harbourfront promenades, and diversified approaches must be adopted. For example, the Tsing Yi North harbourfront that Mr LEE Wing-tat is very familiar with is actually divided into static and dynamic areas. The static area is close to the residential areas; and as Mr TO has just said, it is an area for dating couples and residents walking their dogs. There is also a dynamic harbourfront area closer to the shopping centre managed by the MTR Corporation. Such a diversified mode of construction is very helpful to our work on the harbourfront. I hope that Members would feel relieved for we will fearlessly undertake the work with a view to improving and beautifying the Victoria Harbour.

President, the discussions today and last evening are highly encouraging and supportive; I believe that Members would understand after my introduction that the work cannot be done overnight, and we need persistence, resilience and immense power to promote the work. Yet, I believe that our dream will come true one day and we can certainly overcome obstacles and setbacks through concerted efforts, and we will be able to create harbourfronts that all Hong Kong people will be proud of.

Thank you, President.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): I now call upon Mr WONG Kwok-hing to move the amendment to the motion.

**MR WONG KWOK-HING** (in Cantonese): President, I move that Prof Patrick LAU's motion be amended.

**Mr WONG Kwok-hing moved the following amendment: (Translation)**

"To add ", given that Hong Kong's harbourfront development strategy always plans only one step ahead, and government departments follow different policies on the use of harbourfront land, displaying a lack of foresight and failing to progress with the times," after "That"; to add "forward-looking and" after "formulate a"; to add ", a development plan and a timetable for implementation" after "harbourfront development policy"; to add "and greening" after "harbourfront beautification"; to add "(e) to fully utilize harbourfront resources for holding a diversified range of tourism, recreational and festive events, such as international or local mega events such as dragon boat races, boat shows and cross-harbour swimming competitions, etc., with a view to boosting local community economy;" after "seafood restaurants, etc."; to delete the original "(e)" and substitute with "(f)"; to delete "and" after "the local community;" and substitute with "(g) with a view to dovetailing with the plan of harbourfront beautification and greening, and optimizing the precious natural endowment of Hong Kong's harbourfront, the top echelons of the Government should co-ordinate various government departments as early as possible to expeditiously formulate planning and make proper arrangements for the various existing harbourfront urban public

environment facilities, so as to turn negative factors into positive factors, and in turn revitalize to the fullest extent the various existing public facilities to dovetail with the new strategic development of the harbourfront; and"; and to delete the original "(f)" and substitute with "(h)"."

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Mr WONG Kwok-hing to Prof Patrick LAU'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, that is, those returned by functional constituencies and those returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, who are present. I declare the amendment passed.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Mr KAM Nai-wai, as Mr WONG Kwok-hing's amendment has been passed, you may now move your revised amendment.

**MR KAM NAI-WAI** (in Cantonese): President, I move that Prof Patrick LAU's motion as amended by Mr WONG Kwok-hing be further amended by my revised amendment.

**Mr KAM Nai-wai moved the following further amendment to the motion as amended by Mr WONG Kwok-hing: (Translation)**

"To add "; (i) when adopting the public-private-partnership approach for putting harbourfront construction and management under private development projects, to ensure that harbourfronts are accessible, and the public can freely enjoy harbourfronts without unreasonable restrictions; and (j) to expeditiously resolve the problem of harbourfront areas being used by public facilities or falling within privately-owned land, so that more harbourfront lands can be linked up to form harbourfront promenades for public enjoyment" immediately before the full stop."

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That Mr KAM Nai-wai's amendment to Prof Patrick LAU's motion as amended by Mr WONG Kwok-hing 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, that is, those returned by functional constituencies and those returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, who are present. I declare the amendment passed.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Mr IP Kwok-him, as the amendments by Mr WONG Kwok-hing and Mr KAM Nai-wai have been passed, you may now move your revised amendment.

**MR IP KWOK-HIM** (in Cantonese): President, I move that Prof Patrick LAU's motion as amended by Mr WONG Kwok-hing and Mr KAM Nai-wai be further amended by my revised amendment.

**Mr IP Kwok-him moved the following further amendment to the motion as amended by Mr WONG Kwok-hing and Mr KAM Nai-wai: (Translation)**

"To add "; (k) in the spirit of 'Harbourfront for the People', to build the two sides of the Victoria Harbour into a world-class harbourfront area, give a makeover to the shorelines of Hong Kong Island and Kowloon Peninsula on the two sides of the harbour and energize community connections for showing the distinctive vitality and scenery of Hong Kong's Victoria Harbour; and (l) under the people-based principle, to construct a harbourfront promenade stretching from Kennedy Town to Chai Wan, and build infrastructures along the harbourfront promenade, including revitalizing Western Wholesale Food Market, preserving Fenwick Pier in Wan Chai, developing Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter and connecting it with Victoria Park, constructing a cycling park at North Point Ferry Pier, building a cultural and recreational district in Quarry Bay, revitalizing Shau Kei Wan Wholesale Fish Market and the shipyards nearby, constructing a water sports centre in Chai Wan, and constructing a 'new harbourfront promenade in Kowloon' linking up Lei Yue Mun, Kai Tak, To Kwa Wan, Hung Hom, Tsim Sha Tsui as well as Sham Shui Po and cutting through the West Kowloon Cultural District" immediately before the full stop."

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That Mr IP Kwok-him's amendment to Prof Patrick LAU's motion as amended by Mr WONG Kwok-hing and Mr KAM Nai-wai, 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, that is, those returned by functional constituencies and those returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, who are present. I declare the amendment passed.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Miss Tanya CHAN, as the preceding amendments moved by three Members have been passed, you may now move your revised amendment.

**MISS TANYA CHAN** (in Cantonese): President, I move that Prof Patrick LAU's motion as amended by Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr KAM Nai-wai and Mr IP Kwok-him be further amended by my revised amendment.

**Miss Tanya CHAN's moved the following amendment to the motion as amended by Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr KAM Nai-wai and Mr IP Kwok-him: (Translation)**

"To add "; (m) in the course of harbourfront planning and management, to give appropriate consideration to the needs of the shipping, cruise and ferry industries, so as to take advantage of the harbour; (n) to provide appropriate ancillary facilities for the public to make good use of harbourfronts for conducting various community recreational activities; and (o) to perfect effluent treatment and sewage systems, so as to improve



the water quality of the harbour and harbourfront views" immediately before the full stop."

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That Miss Tanya CHAN's amendment to Prof Patrick LAU's motion as amended by Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr KAM Nai-wai and Mr IP Kwok-him, 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, that is, those returned by functional constituencies and those returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, who are present. I declare the amendment passed.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Prof Patrick LAU, you may now reply and you have 51 seconds.

**PROF PATRICK LAU** (in Cantonese): President, I wish to thank Members who have spoken on this motion. The most important thing, in my opinion, is that the orientation and vision of the Government is in line with ours on the motion of perfecting harbourfront planning and management in all districts of Hong Kong that we discuss today. I hope that the zeal mentioned by the Secretary will not cool off, not just this year, but to keep on finishing her jobs later on, so as to

allow us to have better harbourfront planning and management in all districts of Hong Kong, and to build a beautified harbourfront city. Thank you, President.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Prof Patrick LAU, as amended by Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Mr IP Kwok-him and Miss Tanya CHAN, 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, that is, those returned by functional constituencies and those returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, who are present. I declare the motion as amended passed.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Fifth motion: Bidding farewell to the Legislative Council Building.

Members who wish to speak in the debate on the motion will please press the "Request to speak" button.

I now call upon Ms Miriam LAU to speak and move the motion.

**BIDDING FAREWELL TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL BUILDING**

**MS MIRIAM LAU** (in Cantonese): President, in my capacity as Chairman of the House Committee, I move that the motion on "Bidding farewell to the Legislative Council Building", as printed on the Agenda, be passed.

Today is a special day, because it sees the conduct of the last day of Council meeting and the moving of the last motion in this Legislative Session in this historic building. This is a special motion in the sense that it is the very first and probably the only motion on bidding farewell to this historic building.

Before Members reminisce about the past of this Legislative Council Building, let me recapitulate its history with you through a journey in the time tunnel.

This granite building was formerly the Supreme Court of Hong Kong Building. It was completed in 1912 and designed by Aston WEBB and E. Ingress BELL, consulting architects to the Crown Agents to the Colonies. In their submission to the Hong Kong authorities on their architectural design, they remarked that in order to highlight the solemnity of this building, they would adopt a "majestic multi-column architectural design ..... with columns on the four sides and a dome on the top of the two-storey building to accentuate its majesty."

The foundation works contract of this building was awarded in 1900, and its construction took almost 12 years to complete. One reason for taking such a long time was that the foundation of this building was formed by driving hundreds of Chinese Fir tree trunks into the mixture of reclamation materials. Therefore, the whole building is in effect floating on a timber raft. To be fully effective, such a foundation system requires the ground water level to be maintained at a constant level. Accordingly, a ground water replenishment system is installed to replace ground water as required.

The construction of this building, like our life journeys, also encountered twists and turns. As originally intended, the façade of the building should face what is now the Statute Square. However, under the first design plan, it would face the then Cricket Club in the opposite direction, that is, orientated towards the present Chater Garden. The two architects maintained that any change in

orientation would necessitate the re-designing of the interior of the building. After many exchanges of correspondence, the design plan was eventually amended. The Supreme Court Building, upon completion, would still face the present Statue Square, rather than the then Cricket Club.

Starting from 1912, the Supreme Court heard its cases in this building. In 1978, the construction works of the Mass Transit Railway in the vicinity led to changes in the ground water level, and the resultant subsidence caused cracks in the building. Subsequently, in the middle of the year, the Supreme Court was relocated for the conduct of propping works.

In 1983, the Executive Council approved the plan to convert the former Supreme Court Building into the Legislative Council Building, and the Architectural Services Department commenced the conversion works in 1984. In the same year, this building was declared a monument and came under the statutory protection of the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance. After massive interior works, this building became the seat of the legislature in October 1985, and almost 26 years have passed since then.

In the past 26 years, this building witnessed the change in Hong Kong's sovereignty and the making of history together with all of us.

President, I joined the legislature in 1988, which was known as "立法局" in Chinese. I have worked in this Legislative Council Building for 23 years without any interruption. It has been 23 solid years throughout. However, I have known this building for far more than 23 years.

In the mid-1970s and up to 1985 (or the early 1980s), when this building was still the seat of the Supreme Court, I already came to this building on countless occasions as an article and then a solicitor. This present Chamber was formerly the Library of the Supreme Court. The Members' Rooms on the second floor (rooms that are smaller in size) which Members use frequently were the places that I went to most often many years ago. They used to be the offices of judicial personnel.

The present Dining Hall (where we have meal gatherings) was formerly courtrooms and ancillary rooms. I can no longer recall the courtroom numbers now. Our present Conference Rooms A, B and C were converted from

courtrooms and ancillary rooms. The ground floor probably housed such facilities as prisoner reception rooms, but such facilities are no longer in use. All this has left behind very clear images in my memory, fresh and vivid.

Let me now return to my experiences after joining the then Legislative Council. My work in the Legislative Council Building over the past 23 years, whether for the then Legislative Council or the present Legislative Council, has been marked by an abundance of indelible memories.

I cannot forget my first day in the then Legislative Council. It should be around October 1988. As a newcomer, I was told to see the Senior Unofficial Member (Mr Allen LEE). I did not know him at that time, so I was afraid and wary, wondering, "Why does the Senior Unofficial Member want to see me?" *(Laughter)* As I entered the Legislative Council Building, I was very fearful, wondering whether I had been summoned for any mistakes I made before joining the then Legislative Council. *(Laughter)*

The most important point I am driving at is that the then Legislative Council was marked by ranking on the basis of seniority, meaning that the earlier a Member joined the then Legislative Council, the higher would be his seniority. It was something like "first in, first be superiors". A Member who joined the then Legislative Council earlier than others would be superior to them. Meetings of the then Executive and Legislative Councils were held behind closed doors, and the order of speaking ..... Junior Members did not have any opportunity to speak, and only senior *(Laughter)* or experienced Members could do so. Those who have gone through all this will understand what I mean perfectly.

If Members contrast the situation years ago and that we see today, they will, most interestingly, notice a very great difference. Years ago, practically all meetings were held behind closed doors, but nowadays, almost all meetings are open to the public. And, as for the speaking order, the principles of ranking on the basis of seniority and "first in, first be superiors" have already given way to that of "last in, first be superiors". *(Laughter)*

Speaking from the perspective of equality, I would think that all Members are equal today. One can say that everybody has "no regard for seniority"

nowadays, (*Laughter*) or one can even say that what we see now is only "last in, first be superiors". Why? The reason is that Members who have resigned can return to the legislature. And, after their return, they can occupy the first few positions in the queue for asking oral questions (*Laughter*) or moving motions.

This is completely different from the situation in the then Legislative Council when I first joined it in early 1988. At that time, the emphasis was on "first in, first be superiors", meaning that Members who joined the then Legislative Council earlier would be accorded priority. In contrast, nowadays, Members who return to the legislative Council after resignation are accorded priority instead. I have indeed witnessed a great change in ways of thinking over the past 23 years.

I also cannot forget that even several years after my joining the then Legislative Council, I still mixed up the four Entrances. (*Laughter*) I think the four Entrances may indeed cause confusion very easily, because they look so similar. A Member heading for Conference Room B may end up finding himself on the other side for reasons unknown, but from there, it is impossible to access Conference Room B. So, he must search here and there for the correct way. Honestly, it was only after quite a number of years that I finally managed to get all the directions clear. I do not know whether this is also the case with other Members.

I think making people lose their way easily is also a feature of the Legislative Council Building. Some people no doubt have a strong sense of direction, but I nonetheless also saw many Members nodding in agreement with me just now. I suppose Members may all have different feelings. So, they may wish to share with us their own feelings afterwards.

I also cannot forget my first experience of speaking in Chinese in a meeting. Before I joined the then Legislative Council, and when I first joined it, almost all Members spoke in English. Whether in Council meetings or committee meetings, Members invariably spoke in English.

It was roughly in 1989 that I used Chinese for the first time in a meeting. The unification was then fast approaching, and it was necessary to commence bilingual law drafting. As I was the most junior Member of the then Legislative

Council (for reasons of ranking on the basis of seniority again), I was put in charge of the Chinese versions of ordinances. This appeared to be an easy task, but it turned out to be a difficult one because new concepts were involved and enormous efforts were required. However, I was still very happy to take part.

The first bilingual ordinance in Hong Kong was the Securities and Futures Commission Ordinance (SFCO), and I was responsible for its Chinese version. Before that, I had never looked up any words in any dictionaries of Chinese etymology and lexicology. I have no idea about how many dictionaries I had consulted before I was able to clearly ascertain the meanings of the terms concerned.

As a result of thorough research, we came up with quite a number of neologisms. For example, expressions such as "管有" (for "possess" or "possession") and "信納" (for "satisfy" or "be satisfied that"), with which we are by now very familiar, were adopted in the Chinese version of the SFCO after research. I was delighted to participate in the discussions of the SFCO, and I was also proud of myself, not least because I had the opportunity to participate in the process of preparing the first ordinance drafted in both Chinese and English.

I remember that when I delivered a speech in Chinese for the first time, I was standing before Mr TAM Yiu-chung's present seat. This was my first experience of speaking wholly in Chinese after joining the then Legislative Council. At that time, I was accustomed to speaking in English, so were nearly all colleagues. I can still remember that my courage even led many colleagues to write me brief notes in appreciation of my attempt to speak in Chinese. But, well, Members who do not speak in Chinese have become the minority, as a vast majority of colleagues now speak in Chinese. This is also a change in the legislature that I have witnessed.

I also cannot forget all the overnight Council meetings in the past 23 years. Overnight meetings have turned rare in recent years, but they have not completely disappeared. I remember that shortly before the reunification, a Council meeting ran on for days, and we had to hold the meeting overnight. Many Members said that it was no difficult task to hold a meeting overnight. But could Members who said so really made it in practice?

It was around 1 am and 2 am. Many Members had already yielded to drowsiness. In the Ante-chamber, they all ..... Gentlemen slept spread-eagled while ladies dozed off with cheeks resting on hands, fast asleep, but elegant as ever. I still have a vivid recollection of Members' sleep positions, whether they were elegant or otherwise. Photographs of us taken by reporters can also help me refresh my memory of the scene. From their photo files, you may find a few photographs that capture how elegantly you were sleeping or dozing off at that time. All is so unforgettable.

That last meeting before the reunification was a distant example, and not too long ago, there were the meetings on the Interception of Communications and Surveillance Bill in 2007 and the statutory minimum wage, both of which ran overnight. Members certainly have all the sincerity to participate in overnight meetings, but when it comes to strength and energy, all will vary from Member to Member.

I find myself very fortunate because I have never been overcome by drowsiness in all those difficult tests. Should any further challenges of this kind come my way in the future, I think I can still say that I am fortunate to have the required energy and strength.

In the remaining minute of my speaking time, I want to point out that I also find the "January Siege of the Legislative Council" unforgettable. Following the Finance Committee's approval of the appropriation request regarding the Hong Kong Section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link in January last year, the Legislative Council Building was besieged for almost six hours, rendering us unable to leave. However, this was honestly something good, as we thus had the opportunity to chat with the Secretary for Transport and Housing. We usually do not have any time for such conversation, but that day, our conversation spanned six hours. We could only have wonton noodles, though.

President, in the remaining fraction of a minute, I wish to conclude my speech by quoting a remark made by Chief Justice Sir Francis PIGGOTT at the inauguration ceremony of this building in 1912 after receiving the keys to the Supreme Court Building from Governor Sir Frederick LUGARD. He said, "..... Hong Kong could be proud of the famous masonry ..... if I may prophesy



that when Victoria has ceased to be a city, when the harbour has silted up, when even the Hong Kong Club has crumbled away, this building will remain like a pyramid to commemorate the genius of the Far East."

President, I so submit.

**Ms Miriam LAU moved the following motion: (Translation)**

"That, as the Legislative Council will move to the new Legislative Council Complex after this legislative session, this Council bids farewell to this historic building."

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

**MR WONG KWOK-HING** (in Cantonese): President, every colleague has an opportunity to speak on the motion of "Bidding farewell to the Legislative Council Building" today, but you do not. *(Laughter)* I hereby pay you my highest respect for your sacrifice.

President, I wish to share with Members two feelings of mine. First, I think by the time I part with this Legislative Council Building, I really need to ask myself whether my presence in the Legislative Council over the past seven years has been a complete waste of time. Besides, I also think that I must ask whether I have achieved anything meaningful.

I have done an absolutely impartial examination of my work over the past seven years. I am proud of myself and filled with a sense of achievement, because I honestly have done many things concrete. It can be said that I have succeeded in striving for a long list of things, including the criminalization of wage defaults, which can ensure that wage earners will definitely get paid after all their sweat and toil, thus fulfilling my wish over the past 40 years.

Besides, I have succeeded in striving for enacting legislation on a minimum wage level. It is particularly worth mentioning that with the commencement of the law, the livelihood of cleaning workers in this Council has now come under

protection. Furthermore, I have successfully fought for the Government's reissuance of 61 itinerant hawker licences for the sale of frozen confectionery (commonly known as "small ice-cream vendors"). This is a major breakthrough.

In the time to come, we will see the enactment of legislation on criminalizing certain offences relating to personal data privacy protection and pyramid selling activities, as well as the enactment of legislation on a licensing and monitoring mechanism for property management companies to protect the rights and interests of small property owners. All this makes me feel that I have not squandered the past seven years.

I have always been going about my tasks in the Legislative Council with a "countdown" attitude, and I treasure every single moment of being here. Why do I hold this attitude? It is because of two complexes. First, my upbringing was marked by hardship and misery. Honestly, my childhood was even more miserable than what the movie "Echoes of the Rainbow" depicts.

I can still remember what happened in the very year when Typhoon Wanda attacked Hong Kong. No. 10 Local Storm Signal was hoisted, and I had to struggle my way through the storm in the streets. I remember that I was at that time a doorman (responsible for opening the front door for guests) at August Moon Hotel opposite Champagne Court — I mean no disrespect to the Democratic Party, and I do not mean to bring up that particular incident, but Champagne Court is really a famous building. At that time, water rationing was in force in Hong Kong, and I was asked by a boss of August Moon Hotel living on the top floor of Champagne Court to carry buckets of water for him to the rooftop of the building after work. Due to my family's poor finances, I ceased schooling at Primary Four and started to work as a doorman to cover part of my family's expenses. When I looked up at the starry sky and sunrise from the top floor of Champagne Court, the plight in my life brought home to me that the grassroots and wage earners were all faced with immense livelihood difficulties. I found it necessary to make their voices heard in the Legislative Council and fight for their rights and interests.

The other complex is that I have always thought that my becoming a Member of the Legislative Council is mainly attributable to the sacrifices made by countless predecessors, including workers, labour movement leaders, and voluntary union executives. Thanks to their selfless contributions and sacrifices

in the form of money and time, I managed to join the Legislative Council. Therefore, I have always thought that even though I am now a Legislative Council Member, I must still bear the grassroots in mind. I have striven to do my utmost every single minute and make the best use of my time in the Legislative Council, so as to make their voices heard.

I do not think that my presence in the Legislative Council over the past seven years has been a waste of time. I will continue to work hard and complete my remaining term of office. And, as usual, I will honour my pledges.

President, I still wish to talk about one more feeling of mine. By bidding farewell to this Legislative Council Building today, we are actually returning it to its original and rightful owner. Looking up from here (despite the obstruction caused by the ceiling), we will see the statute of Goddess Themis mounted on top of the building. Holding a pair of scales in her right hand and a sword in her left hand, she is blindfolded. This signifies the upholding of justice and the law. She upholds impartiality for all, regardless of their backgrounds, social status and whom they represent.

However, since this building became the seat of the then Legislative Council 26 years ago, all people here have understandably been going about their tasks with the purpose of serving their respective "bosses". There are things that public officers need to uphold, and Members likewise need to argue things out and strive for different interests on behalf of their respective "bosses" here. We have quarreled under the feet of Goddess Themis for quite some time, and the time has finally come for us to return this building to the Court of Final Appeal for conversion to its courtrooms. I think this can restore the solemnity of this building, something which is wonderful.

According to a recent opinion poll, the popularity rating of Legislative Council Members is merely 10%. I find this result very unfortunate and most regrettable to all of us on the eve of parting with the Legislative Council Building. There is an abundance of things which we have successfully fought for through peaceful, rational and non-violent means. We need not think that vulgarisms, hurling things or physical conflicts are the only means of successfully striving for what we want.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): I thank Mr WONG for offering me his sympathy at the beginning of his speech. However, as I am not good at delivering sentimental speeches, nor do I have any fruit of struggles to show others, I am glad to say with relief that I need not deliver any vehement speeches like Honourable Members.

**MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG** (in Cantonese): President, the Legislative Council Building, the subject of this farewell motion today, is the very place where I and other "Class of 91" Members have been engaged in political discussions for 20 years. We have in the process gone through historic moments and events as well as heated debates. There has been valuable friendship, to speak less of indelible memories. The eve of parting is invariably marked by sadness at its thought, and recollection is bound to be sentimental.

I can vividly remember that when I took my oath for the first time here, I did so before the colonial Governor and the insignia of the British colony, which made me rather uncomfortable. When the reunification arrived in 1997, the colonial insignia was replaced by the emblem of the Special Administrative Region (SAR). But in the evening of the reunification day, Members of the democratic camp declared, on the veranda of the Legislative Council, that they would "alight from the train". Sadly, one of the aspirations we have been fighting for even at the cost of "alighting from the train" — democracy — has not yet been realized in this Legislative Council Building, much to my immense regret.

In spite of this, I am enormously fond of this building, particularly this Chamber. The marble and round columns in this Chamber are both very beautiful. This is especially true of the dome overhead. The dome is just like a mini-cosmos. Looking up, one can naturally feel the heaviness and wisdom of history. When Members' remarks get boring, I may look up and gaze at the dome, for it makes me feel the existence of a more expansive, magnificent and civilized world that constitutes the solemnity of the Legislative Council.

One thing about the Legislative Council that saddens me most is the loss of decorum and order. Twenty years ago, when I first bowed to the then President, I was puzzled as to why I must bow to him upon every entry and exit, thinking that this was a rather annoying ritual. In those days, male Members were even

required to wear ties. I remember that when "The Bull" resolutely refused to do so, Chris PATTEN even gave him a tie as gift and encouraged him to wear it.

The aforesaid parliamentary decorum is actually aimed at maintaining the authority of the President, so as to make Members discreet in their speeches and avoid insulting and attacking other Members. Such is the appropriate decorum necessary for maintaining rationality and detachment in the debates of a civilized legislature. However, as Members also realize, since the reunification, such decorum has turned lax.

It all started with permitting Members to wear T-shirts. Then, the bowing was dispensed with; gradually, Members began to put different sorts of publicity materials and objects on the benches, and the sizes of such objects and materials have turned increasingly large. Later on, there even emerged interruption at will, verbal violence, hurling bananas and sweeping things off benches. All this runs counter not only to the usual civility and order in a legislature, but also the reasonable expectation of the majority of the general public.

I am not sure whether we can also bid farewell to this culture of verbal violence while bidding farewell to the Legislative Council Building. I naturally do not dare to cherish any unrealistic hope. But some have told me that the future Chamber will be very spacious, so it will take a very long time, and will not be easy, to rush to the President. The hurling of any object may end up hitting those sitting in front, so it will likewise be doubly difficult. I hope that after our relocation to the new building, such behaviour can disappear. If so, Hong Kong's parliamentary culture will surely benefit.

Nevertheless, I very much treasure the debates and friendship among Members. On one occasion, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG and I looked at the photos in the common room together. As we looked at the photos one by one, we saw, initially, how young we still looked years ago, but as we walked from one photo to another, we saw older and older faces in them. Actually, this Council itself is also a place where the new will replace the old. A year after our relocation to the new Legislative Council Complex, new faces may perhaps appear, bringing fresh impetus and progress to this Council.

After spending 20 years in this Council, I have learned to be persevering and accommodating. I understand that our remarks, like blades, can hurt people. We need to be careful with our words even when we are focusing on facts only. If any of my remarks in the past 20 years ever happened to be excessive to the extent of causing any hard feeling, I would like to take this opportunity to tender an apology to those affected.

The Legislative Council Building is a monument, so as is usual among such buildings, it is associated with various eerie tales. Many people have asked me whether I know that during the Second World War, this building was the headquarters of the Japanese Kempeitai, and the plant room in the basement was used as a venue of inquisition. But during daytime when the whole building is brightly lit, there is of course no ghost, but just a surfeit of human presence instead.

However, one day, when I took part in a hunger strike outside the Legislative Council Building, I decided to take a shower on the third floor of the building. Only then did I realize that when all the lights were switched off, the third floor of the building was so very eerie and scary. To make things worse, I could not find the light switches.*(Laughter)* And, while failing to find the light switches, I even saw a lady in kimono popping out from the flashing computer monitor of a staff member.*(Laughter)* That sent a chill down my spine.. Nevertheless, I had no alternative but to finish my shower. After this, I realized that the Legislative Council Building during daytime and at night represented two worlds: a bustling one and an eerie one.

The next day, I asked a Member whether the Legislative Council Building was haunted. He told me that some Members who worked late into the night would hear soldiers marching downstairs on the second floor. I am not sure whether this is true. It is a good idea to organize a team of government officials and a team of Members after the farewell dinner, switch off all lights, and play a game of hide-and-seek *(Laughter)* to see whether the ones we catch are human beings or ghosts. I am sure that this will be very interesting.

We are going to part with the Legislative Council Building instead of the Legislative Council. I hope that in the new Legislative Council Complex, there

will still be justice and perseverance. Even though we cannot move the statue of the blind-folded Goddess to the new Legislative Council Complex because this building is a monument. *(The buzzer sounded)* .....

Thank you, everybody.

**MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG** (in Cantonese): President, on the eve of departure, many media have asked us repeatedly about our fondest memories of this building. My reply is invariably that our fondest memories are of this Chamber. I remember that when I first set foot on this Chamber, I was impressed by its solemnity and aloofness. But at the same time, I also wondered how I should handle the issue of Oath-taking. All along, I thought that the then Legislative Council was a place exclusive to the highest strata of society, and the common masses could rarely gain admission to it. However, I was elected to the then Legislative Council as the representative of the textiles and garment functional constituency, so I thought that I must conduct myself in the then Legislative Council with the grassroots' mindset.

What was I supposed to do in that case? I told myself that I must not wear any tie and suit. But I also knew that I must respect the solemnity and aloofness of the legislature. What should I do then? In the end, I picked my best shirt and trousers from the wardrobe, and ironed them all straight by myself. Then, I wore them for Oath-taking in the Chamber. Many journalists asked me whether I was disrespectful to the legislature because all Members, except me, wore a tie and suit. I replied that this was not true at all. I also told them that I actually respected the legislature very much, as I had selected my nicest clothes and even taken the trouble to iron them myself. I asked them how I could possibly be perceived as being disrespectful to the legislature. In this way, I broke the dress code convention of the then Legislative Council by not wearing a tie and suit.

Later, some media approached Ricky FUNG, the then Secretary General, asking him whether Members were permitted to dispense with the wearing of a tie and suit. He replied that there should not be any problems, as long as they did not wear sports shoes and jeans. However, all of you know that the situation is very different now. As Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said just now, it is alright

for Members to wear a T-shirt, jeans and sports shoes. "Ah Che" himself also attends meetings in jeans, so there is no problem with this at all.

However, I remember that years ago, a male Member proposed to hold discussions on this matter in the legislature, because he argued that since the image of the then Legislative Council would be drastically changed, discussions on Members' attire must be held. However, Dr Margaret NG rose to oppose this proposal, retorting that the issue of attire is within Members' individual freedom, so it must not be discussed at all. Therefore, no discussion was held on this matter. Since then, the legislature has undergone tremendous changes. Besides relinquishing its requirement on Members' attire, this Council has since been permitting many community organizations and members of the public to air their views in this Chamber, in marked contrast to the past practice and thus bringing forth a significant change. The legislature has turned into a genuine legislature, one which allows people from various classes to express their views in it. I think this is indeed a significant change.

Besides, I still have another vivid recollection, one which Members here may presumably remember. Back in 1996, because of my remark "foul grass grows only out of a foul ditch", Mr CHIM Pui-chung complained against me, saying that this was an insult to him. Therefore, Mr Andrew WONG, the then President, had to handle the matter. Subsequently, he ruled that I had offended other Members and asked me whether I would withdraw this remark. As the first Member encountering such a situation, I truly did not know how to deal with it, nor did I know whether I should withdraw the remark. However, I thought that this actually involved the matter of principles. What I meant to say at that time was that the Chief Executive was elected by 400 people who were in turn pre-ordained by the Central Authorities, so the entire process was comparable to "foul grass growing only out of a foul ditch". As I saw nothing wrong with this remark, I simply wondered why I should ever withdraw it. At that time, I debated with Mr Andrew WONG, arguing that it was just a very common expression. In my childhood, I said, my mother often taught me the rationale behind the saying "a tung oil container naturally contains tung oil, and foul grass grows only out of a foul ditch". So, I asked him what was wrong with this remark and why he should be so very concerned.

Nonetheless, President Mr Andrew WONG said that I was not allowed to make such a remark as it offended other Members. He went on to ask me



whether I would withdraw it. At that time, I truly saw no reason for withdrawing this remark, so I refused. The President therefore ordered my withdrawal from the Chamber, saying, "You are not allowed to return to this Chamber today." Later, this even became a famous quote. So, I withdrew from the Chamber. However, I must make it a point to say that mine was a very decent withdrawal. I was, however, very indignant even after my withdrawal from the Chamber because I did not think that I had said anything wrong and could not understand why I had been ordered to withdraw from the Chamber.

In my moments of perplexity, Ms Cyd HO telephoned me, commenting that there was nothing wrong with me, and that the order for my withdrawal was not justified. She even told me to continue to attend the meeting. I asked her in return how I was supposed to do so, now that I was barred from entering the Chamber. In response, she advised me to go up to the Public Gallery. Subsequently, I stayed there until the end of the meeting. I thought that I had the right to take part in the meeting, and I saw no reason for being barred from the meeting after my expulsion. For this reason, I sat through the remainder of the meeting up there. I have a vivid recollection of this incident, and I was made to realize that the legislature was governed by so many rules. At that time, as I was not yet familiar with the relevant rules, I was totally ignorant.

Subsequently, my assistant Richard TSOI and I prepared a document consisting of three or four pages for the purpose of debating with President Andrew WONG. We both held that there were no reasons for him to expel me. Initially, I thought that I could debate with him in the Chamber, but he told me the otherwise, explaining that once the President had made a ruling demanding the withdrawal of a Member, the Member concerned must comply, and no debate would be conducted. He further explained that even if a debate was deemed necessary, it must be conducted at a later time. As a result, I must withdraw from the Council at the juncture.

Another vivid memory of mine is about the bill on restricting the rental increases of public rental housing (PRH) shortly before the end of the then Legislative Council's term in 1997. The bill was surprisingly passed in the end, thus preventing the Housing Department from increasing PRH rents in the ensuing decade or so. This was really something hard to come by, showing that Members are indeed able to stand up for the masses.

Finally, I wish to say a few words particularly about a former colleague whom I can still remember — Mr Edward HO. I do not know whether Members still remember him. A broad-minded man, he described the features of each and every Member in pithy and incisive terms without missing out any of the 60 Members as we said farewell to the then Legislative Council years back. That was really superb. He was even able to highlight the specific strengths of each Member. I do not know whether any Member can likewise do the same later on. If yes, we will all have a pleasant memory. I hope some colleagues can do so.

Thank you, President.

**MS EMILY LAU** (in Cantonese): President, I rise to speak in support of Ms Miriam LAU's motion on bidding farewell to this place, the very place that I have regarded as my second home over the past 19 years.

I was elected a Member of the then Legislative Council in 1991 but I was out of the legislature for one year in 1997. I have been a Member since 1991 with the only exception of that very year. Since I am a full-time Member, I very often arrive here around 7 am and do not leave until 8 pm or 9 pm. Therefore, many people remark somewhat jokingly that what is missing is only a canvas bed, or I will be able to station here permanently without having to leave. This shows that I am deeply attached to this building.

The kind of past emphasis on seniority mentioned by Ms Miriam LAU just now was exactly the case when we first joined the legislature. President, I do not know if you can still remember that Members were assigned seats according to seniority starting from Mr Paul TSE's present seat, and the Member occupying that particular seat was also the first one to speak in the order of speaking. Some time after joining the legislature, we started to hold discussions. We all thought that Members belonging to one single political party or grouping should sit close together, and Members intending to speak should raise their hands in indication. Subsequently, Members accepted these arrangements, thus bringing changes to the relevant rules.

Ms Miriam LAU also mentioned just now that many meetings used to be held behind closed doors. We understandably found this arrangement unacceptable. Members soon agreed to open all meetings for public audience.

This is a very desirable arrangement. All this could only be possible on the basis of consensus.

Ms Miriam LAU disclosed how Mr Allen LEE contacted her. Actually, he also contacted me. When I first joined the legislature in 1991, I did not have a clear idea about the matters it dealt with, to speak less of the fact that there was a Public Accounts Committee (PAC). Mr Allen LEE asked me over the phone whether I was interested in joining the PAC. In response, I asked him what the responsibilities of the PAC were. He explained that the PAC was responsible for scrutinizing the reports of the Audit Commission, and seven Members were to be selected to join the PAC. At that time, PAC members were selected through co-ordination. I agreed to join the PAC. The then United Democrats of Hong Kong, now the Democratic Party, likewise selected Mr NG Ming-yum as a member of the PAC through co-ordination. As I look back, I realize that 20 years have passed like the blink of an eye.

On the eve of our saying goodbye to this building, I believe many people inevitably have all sorts of feelings. I am grateful to the Secretary General for asking her staff to take photographs of Members just now in response to Members' request, because many Members, staff members working in this building, public officers, and even friends and reporters visiting this building invariably wish to take photographs in memory of it.

However, my most vivid memory of this building is an event that happened during the times of the pre-unification Legislative Council. It took place from 29 to 30 June 1994. On 29 June, the then Legislative Council began to debate Chris PATTEN's constitutional reform package, which we describe as "a drop of democracy". President, you had not joined the legislature at that time. That day, this building was just like a marketplace, and the situation was very frightening. National People's Congress deputies and members of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference all crammed here. Everyone lobbied for votes here, and a tense atmosphere pervaded this place. Since Members led by the Liberal Party intended to move amendments to Chris PATTEN's package, Chris PATTEN began lobbying for votes in London and Beijing. It was rumoured that a certain British magnate even telephoned from Beijing to tell his subordinates how they should vote, and in London, even the Cabinet and the Prime Minister had to issue orders on how people should vote.

At that time, I saw some colleagues sitting in this Chamber, including Mr Simon IP. His presence puzzled me because he always hated listening to such debates. Later on, I came to realize that all was because once he stepped out of the Chamber, he would be intercepted right away and forced to make a volte-face. Since both sides were lobbying for votes, once he expressed support for one side, the other side would approach him, and he might thus be made to shift his stance again. The situation was very chaotic. Rumours had it that he was subsequently led into a room. Chris PATTEN was really a master in that kind of things. When he wanted to lobby for support, he would ask one's most respectable person to negotiate with one. Therefore, rumours had it that Mr Simon IP was called into a room, and the person in the room asked, "Simon, what do you want? I am on my knees." Afterwards, he cast an abstention vote. As the room was equipped with a television set, he found that his rendezvous had been brought to light. It was really a day full of excitement, and the place was swarming with people. The Government was a bundle of nerves while monitoring the entire course of voting. At one stage, it came to its attention that one or two of its supportive "votes" had gone missing. So, a government official went upstairs, and he located PANG Chun-hoi. When asked why he hid himself in such a dimly-lit place, PANG replied that LU Ping had just offered to make him a Hong Kong Affairs Adviser over the phone. Hearing PANG's reply, the government official turned pale with fright because PANG had initially promised to side with the Government. Finally, the matter was settled only with the help of Kuomintang.

President, it was a really historic day. I hope someone can later write a book about the course of events that day. At that time, certain BBC journalists were with Chris PATTEN in the then Government House. They told me the next day that at one stage, "the Governor was very worried." He was not worried about his own package, because in regard to the Liberal Party's amendments to his package, he was finally able to win by a margin of one vote.

His worries were about my private bill. At the time, there were not many Members present in the Chamber, so I thought that my private bill might stand a chance of passage. To my utter surprise, John SWAINE declared, "The vote is 21 to 20." I was defeated by a narrow margin of just one vote. Hearing the result, members of the United Ants on the Public Gallery turned so emotional that they jumped to their feet and kicked up a row up there. This is a moment that I will never forget. Back in those days, I had the power to move a private bill on returning all Members of the then Legislative Council by direct elections. Hong

Kong has now been reunited with the Mainland, the sovereignty over it has been handed over to China, and colonial rule has been brought to an end, but the many powers we used to enjoy are taken away by the Basic Law. And, there is also the system of separate voting. I therefore cannot help asking whether we have actually been regressing.

Anyway, President, I believe that you, many Members, many other people and I are all deeply attached to this building. But on my part, I shall part with this building with delight because it is not purpose-built for the legislature. My office is not located here, and neither are the offices of any other Members. This explains why I need to stay here every day. My office is located on Garden Road. As I must often attend meetings in this building, how am I supposed to work in the office there? To sum up, I hope that this building can stand at its present location forever and ever with all its splendour. But I also hope that soon after our relocation to the new Legislative Council Complex, we can embrace a democratic system. I so submit.

**MR LEE WING-TAT** (in Cantonese): President, since childhood, I have lived in many places, including Ap Lei Chau, Aberdeen, Wong Chuk Hang, Tsuen Wan, Tai Wo Hau, Kwai Chung Estate, Lei Muk Shue Estate, Shek Lei Estate and Tuen Mun, where I currently live. I lived in each of these places for only several years, so I have moved my home very frequently. This building is the one with which I have had the most frequent contact in my life. Even in terms of actual amount of time, this is also the case. Although I sleep at home, I will nonetheless return here after a sleep from 11 pm to around 6 am or 7 am. As I have myself reckoned, this building is also the one I have frequented most often in my life. Since 1991, interrupted only by four years when I was not a Member, I have spent a great deal of time here. Among all the places I have lived in and the many buildings I have come into contact with, this building is the one I like best for reasons of its roominess and soothing ambience. Unlike Ms Emily LAU, I have no special expectations about the new Legislative Council Complex. Rather, I like old buildings a bit more.

There are three places in this building — well, let me talk about something pleasant — that I will miss most dearly. The first place is Room 217. Even long-time Members may not quite remember what was so special about this room. It used to be the smoking room. Back then, I almost ended up having a brawl with Mr Andrew WONG, because whenever I entered the room, I found it

full of the smell of tobacco. At that time, I had already ceased smoking. But every time after I had been to this room, I would definitely be asked, "Ah Tat, why have you smoked again?" Later, we renamed it as "gas chamber". Mr Andrew WONG frequently stayed there alone to smoke.

The second place I like is the shower room. I went there for a shower many times in the past. After jogging, physical exercises, processions and assemblies, I will go there for a shower. It is quite a comfortable place because it is even larger than the bathroom in my home. The third place I like is the rooftop. In times of protracted debates, I like going alone to the glass house on the rooftop storey and pushing open its door. Actually, it is possible to circle the whole rooftop from there, only we need to hurdle some railings and go around a pump room. My only regret is that I have never climbed up to the highest part of the rooftop, and so far, no colleagues have ever done so. I once tried to do so, but for fear of falling to death, I dared not climb further upwards. For this reason, I have never been there after so many years.

So much for past events. Let me now turn to people. I missed several ex-Members of this Council very much, one of them being Mr NG Ming-yum. He used to occupy the present seat of "Ah Fu". Having assumed office as a Member in 1991, he once served on the Public Accounts Committee. He devoted much effort to the inquiry relating to The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, but he passed away in 1992 due to a serious illness. I often think of him. The second one is Mr Stephen CHEONG. He and I differed vastly in political views. Mr Stephen CHEONG was an uninhabited person. I recall that in 1994, the then Legislative Council held a debate on whether Hong Kong should bid to host the World Exposition. Long-time Members may still remember that Mr Stephen CHEONG was standing over there. He was such a big man, but he spoke with tears and mucus running down his face. He could not possibly have feigned all this. He remarked that while Members strove for bidding to host the World Exposition, the Government did not approve of the idea, so Members must be undaunted in their efforts. Tears and mucus kept streaming down his face while he was speaking, and I think he actually shed more mucus than tears. Later, Mr Stephen CHEONG passed away while singing a song in a banquet. Beside these two former Members, two other Members also passed away during their terms of office. One of them was Dr Samuel WONG, and the other one Mr MA Lik.

President, I personally have two recollections. The first one is about our scrutiny of the bill on "killing" the two Municipal Councils. I must thank the President for mentioning this to the press earlier on. You said that we had to conduct an overnight debate on the legislation for abolishing the two Municipal Councils. At that time, I was the one in the Democratic Party responsible for scrutinizing this bill. I remained in my seat throughout the debate save when I once left for the washroom. Back then, I sat at Sophie's present seat, and Secretary Michael SUEN occupied the seat opposite mine. I vaguely remember that he likewise went to the washroom only once. Everybody laboured for 12 whole hours from 8 pm to 7 am or 8 am the next day and glued to their seats overnight for debating the bill, because I had put forward several dozen amendments. The President has a good memory. Sometime around 3 am or 4 am, a Member said that he was exhausted and wanted to go outside for some sleep. But I replied that it was fine for me as more work would only make me more invigorated. President, you also remember my saying so, right? You said that more work would only make Mr LEE Wing-tat more invigorated. The debate went on and on until well past 8 am. Why did the debate last until that time? The reason was that Secretary Michael SUEN was playing a trick. He obviously could not secure enough votes at the time because a Member — probably Dr Philip WONG — had left for having tea with members of the industry he represented. I have never known whether he did this intentionally. We had to count the number of votes every now and then throughout the debate, but every time, there were not enough votes, so the debate simply dragged on and on. It was only after everyone had returned to the Chamber that the bill could be put to vote. In the end, we lost.

My second most vivid memory is about what happened on 30 June 1997. At that time, I was a Member of the then Legislative Council, and as such, I still had the modest privilege of entering and leaving the Legislative Council Building at any time. Mr TUNG Chee-hwa was already the Chief Executive-elect. He repeatedly asked what sort of arrangements the Democratic Party would have on the night before the reunification. One of our party members, TSANG Kin-shing, replied, "Reunification? Members belonging to the Democratic Party will all chain themselves to the marble columns. Let's see how you are going to carry us away." TSANG Kin-shing wanted to chain himself up, but I dared not do so. Later, a plan dawned on me — staging a protest on the veranda of the Legislative Council Building. At that time, the Administration Wing said that we were not allowed to do so. Well, could that door be opened? We originally

thought that it could not, but upon entry, we found that it was wide open. All doors were open for us. So, we staged a protest out there. These are my two vivid memories.

The then Legislative Council and the present Legislative Council are both noted for neologisms. In the past, there were no such expressions as "royalists", "the opposition", and so on. President, I remember you saying to the SAR Government to this effect: "This ruling coalition only gets a share of shame but no glory." You are apparently the first person who used the expression "to get a share of shame but no glory", meaning "only sharing the shame but not the glory". Besides, we have also invented the expression "different treatment on the basis of close and distant relationships". All in all, this is indeed a good place for inventing Chinese neologisms.

President, I find it most regrettable that this place has not yet seen the implementation of universal suffrage. Over all these years, no ruling party has emerged. My greatest hope is that in the new Legislative Council Complex, we can witness the full implementation of universal suffrage for selecting the Chief Executive and electing all Members of the Legislative Council. Furthermore, I also hope that in the future, however hard we argue with one another in our debates, we can still have the breadth of mind to dismiss all affairs of the legislature and the world by a hearty laugh. Thank you, President.

**MR ANDREW CHENG** (in Cantonese): President, that which begins shall end.

Members all have their own feelings about bidding farewell to the Legislative Council Building, and I also have a thousand words to say, only that I have not properly organized what I want to say because there are just too many thoughts I want to express. Since I have only seven minutes to speak, I can only make one or two points concerning why I question the necessity of moving so hastily to the new Legislative Council Complex this year.

To begin with, when Donald TSANG first mentioned the need for moving the seat of the Legislative Council to Tamar, the general election of the Legislative Council in 2012 immediately came to my mind, and I thought that it was actually quite near to the time of removal. As the saying goes, even a removal from upstairs to downstairs will still cost something, so I believe that the



costs of our relocation will not be small. Frankly speaking, the fitting-out works required after removing Members' offices will also incur the use of public money. Speaking of Donald TSANG's decision to relocate the seat of the Legislative Council hastily for the sole purpose of enabling himself to deliver his last policy address before the 60 Members in October in the new Legislative Council Complex, I have always felt a bit uneasy. But, nothing can be done about this by now. I merely want to say that if we had not been asked to move so hastily, we would not have to bid farewell to the Legislative Council Building today, at so soon a time — though we will always bid farewell to the legislature at the end of each four-year term.

President, my second point concerns Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong's remark just now that he will gaze around when Members' speeches get boring. As I sit beside him, I notice that he really gazes around very often. *(Laughter)* But I got to know the reason only just now. I now know that to him, many people's speeches are very boring. This is one amusing point here.

Speaking of this building, my greatest worry is the falling down of the chandelier. When I entered this Chamber for the first time and saw the overhanging chandelier, I immediately thought that in case it fell down, it would drop right onto Mr Albert CHAN, and since he had no hair, he was very likely to get hurt. Anyway, this building, with the many people and events in it, has turned into the venue of many delightful or saddening stories.

Quite a number of Members have expressed the strong hope of seeing genuine democracy in the new Legislative Council Complex. President, I joined the Legislative Council in 1995. Sixteen years have passed, with my hair having turned from black to grey. And, I note that Mr Albert CHAN's luxuriant hair has given way to baldness. The legislature has indeed been ageing like the whole of Hong Kong, making us lament the passage of time and feel somewhat powerless to do what we would like to do. What is more, people have been chiding us, describing us as the "Rubbish Council" and constantly querying Members' work, claiming that we do not represent the public. President, sometimes, we really cannot help sighing with regret.

Members have all been working wholeheartedly despite their political differences, but all may be to no avail in the end. This is indeed lamentable for Hong Kong people. How to induce aspirants to join the legislature is a very

important issue in our constitutional development. Some Members have remarked that some controversial issues, such as those leading to the siege of the legislature by people, are invariably related closely to politics. Events related to constitutional development, such as the pre-unification Chris PATTEN package mentioned by Ms Emily LAU just now, and the constitutional reform packages put forward in 2005 and last year, all gripped the very hearts of the people, arousing their attention to this legislature and this building, and even leading them to besiege this building.

I believe that after the relocation, it will be very difficult for people to besiege the new Legislative Council Complex located in Tamar. Of course, I still agree that the masses represent power. Some Members, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong in particular, remarked just now that Members should preferably adhere to the parliamentary culture in the past, rather than resorting too frequently to vulgarity in their language. Honestly, I myself do not approve of the culture of vulgar language either. Why has the legislature been plunged into such a situation? Members should really ask themselves this question. And, why do so many people in the community think that such attacks are inevitable? Members must do some self-examination.

In the past, Mr Albert HO and "Uncle Wah" used to sit beside me, and now Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong does. When "Uncle Wah" sat beside me, I was a bit wary. As I often say, he taught me a lot about the Chinese language. I notice that Mr Albert HO and Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong have one thing in common as a Member sitting beside me: frequently drinking my glass of water by mistake.*(Laughter)* Members may recall that on one occasion, before I even sat down, the water in my glass was already half gone. I therefore asked for another glass of water, because my glass of water had been drunk by others by mistake. This also proves that this Chamber is rather cramped. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong put his glass of water on my side of the bench just now, because he needed room for his script-holder. The Chamber in the new Legislative Council Complex will surely be more spacious than this one, so I believe that no such embarrassing situation will ever happen again.

President, finally, I would like to conclude my speech by relating a very embarrassing situation I encountered in the Legislative Council Building. As Members all know, there is a toilet on the second floor. When answering the "urgent call of nature", I often forget to lock the door of this toilet.*(Laughter)*

On many occasions, I noted this problem of mine only when I left the toilet, and I felt lucky that nobody rushed in. Unfortunately, however, a female Member rushed into the toilet on one occasion. She still works in this legislature, and I would like to openly apologize to her now. Over the past years, I have all along found it embarrassing to apologize to her. What happened that day can show that although the Legislative Council Building is crammed, its toilets are still so spacious that I will occasionally forget to lock the door.

President, while bidding farewell to the Legislative Council Building, I hope that Members can make a fresh start in the new Legislative Council Complex. Thank you.

**MR JAMES TO** (in Cantonese): President, this building has been the seat of the legislature from 1985 to 2011. If our relocation can successfully take place this year, the legislature will have spent 26 years in this building by the time of removal. President, I have been working here for 19 years, with only a brief interruption during the times of the Provisional Legislative Council (PLC). I was elected in 1991. At that time, I was 28 years old; since then, I have been working as a Member, and I am 48 now. For anyone, the years from 28 to 48 must be the prime time of their life. As rightly pointed out by several Honourable colleagues, during our waking hours, we see our fellow Members, staff of the Secretariat and government officials far more frequently than seeing our own family members. I often remark somewhat jokingly that during my waking hours, I definitely see Emily, Audrey or Ms Miriam LAU more often than seeing my wife, because for several hours every day, I must be here for numerous meetings of different kinds.

Speaking of unforgettable memories, I frankly find it difficult to tell them all. A certain television station once followed me for four days in order to film a feature documentary. When I was elected, I was the youngest Member. But, there is one thing that makes me sigh with sadness: had there been a democratic political system in Hong Kong, I would have become a junior minister by now, to say the very least. Many overseas friends of mine actually became prime ministers and completed their terms during this period of time. Naoto KAN is still in office; Abhisit VEJJAJIVA has recently stepped down; several prime ministers in Europe left office 10 years ago, and several foreign ministers and deputy foreign ministers of Italy ..... All this makes me sigh with sadness.

Why are Hong Kong people prevented from truly selecting their ruling officials through the ballot box? Many Members in this legislature are highly competent. I can say with every confidence that I am one example, and so are many establishmentarian Members. What factors or systems have prevented us from fulfilling our aspirations, ideals and political platforms as representatives of the people? President, I hope that with our relocation to the new Legislative Council Complex, a new chapter in democratization can begin.

In the past, particularly in the days of the Legislative Council before the reunification, whenever we asked a written question, government officials would invariably respond very seriously. As soon as we made known our intention of asking a written question, they already hastened to ask us for reasons. And, by the time a question was eventually put forward, the situation concerned would have been improved already. What saddens me these days is that very often, even after we have expressed many views, government officials will simply turn a deaf ear to them. On many past occasions, I actually proposed numerous meaningful amendments, but the officials concerned simply did not respond, showing total indifference. In former times, as long as we could offer a meaningful and concrete reminder, or even just a mere proposition, government officials would already study it very carefully. Afterwards, it would definitely offer a reply, a very concrete reply. In contrast, these days, many officials simply will not bother to give any response once they are assured of sufficient voting support. Why has such a situation emerged?

What saddens me even more is that 20 years ago, many of the principal officials today were merely junior officials; they came to the legislature as Assistant Secretaries or Principal Assistant Secretaries, who were not even eligible to do any lobbying. Why have they changed so much?

President, like many other people, I experienced all the sorrow, joy, parting, reunion, happiness and unhappiness in my life in the past 20 years. President, I first met my present wife in this building. Certainly, no romance happened at that time, but I have always been delighted to have met her here. Therefore, I selected this public venue as the site of taking my very important wedding photos. In the past 20 years, many Members and people urged me to have children. The ones I can remember most clearly were Donald TSANG, Ms Miriam LAU, Selina CHOW and LAW Cheung-kwok. Today, eventually, I can

tell everybody that I am going to be a father. But I am still a bit wary because my child is yet to be born.

I know that many Honourable colleagues hold differing political views, but our attitude has always been one of mutual respect. I especially respect those Members who maintain a consistent stance both inside and outside the legislature. Despite our differing views, we are true friends who respect each other. In more rhetorical language, it is all about heroes respecting heroes. I have also sought to constantly upgrade myself to prepare for assuming the role of governing at any time. When I said so 15 years ago, Uncle Wah said that I was stupid. He remarked that I should expect to be in opposition for 20 years, and that the days of being in power might not come even after 20 years. However, I told myself that I was returned by elections, and I could represent public opinions. I also told him that since I belonged to a political party and abided by an integrated political platform, I should be prepared to assume the role of governing at any time, to live up to the people's expectations, and to realize the political platform and ideals they had chosen in the election. I wish to give a word of encouragement to Honourable colleagues by saying that the new Legislative Council Complex will surely see the beginning of a new chapter in democratization, because world trends and democratization are irresistible. This is true in Hong Kong, in China and in the world at large.

**MRS SOPHIE LEUNG** (in Cantonese): President, having listened to Mr James TO's speech, I think I must remind myself to give him a baby cookbook as a gift of congratulation.

After listening to the thoughts expressed by Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong yesterday and today, I too want to give some thoughts of mine. On Members' attire, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong remarked that this Council had undergone many drastic changes such as dispensing with the requirement of wearing ties. In the past, Members were only permitted to bring tiny placards into this Chamber, but these days, practically anything, even brooms, are permitted. Somewhat apologetically, he asked himself how this should be described — insidious resignation or true tolerance. His question has led me to do lots of thinking.

I believe that if even Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong is so apologetic in this respect, I must be even more so, because I have always been like this in personality, tolerating everything, as long as I think that people know what they should be doing. However, it seems to me that quite a number of Members are very much like members of a debate team in mentality, forever bent on winning and wanting to be victorious no matter what. Outside the Chamber, Members may be amiable towards one another, but once inside, they will put on fierce looks, behaving as if others must be either their friends or their foes.

Sometimes, I am also astonished, thinking that they have severed the truth by telling only a portion of it while covering up the other portion, rather than revealing the whole truth, so as to show that they should be on the winning side. They show absolutely no magnanimity at all — this is what I feel most strongly. Worse still, I notice that the situation has shown signs of deterioration. Even the media sometimes seem unable to grasp the whole truth, but they never make any attempt to ascertain it. Even when the truth is already evident, the media will still try to smear the people concerned on the basis of the partial truth they know. I believe that many Members do feel the same. Nevertheless, I still adopted the let-it-be, never-mind, let-them-have-their-way and let-by-gones-be-by-gones kind of attitude.

The newspapers today have in such a rare fashion carried a news report about me. But then, in this report, I am criticized for "incapacitating" myself, and it is even alleged that some pan-democratic Members hold the same view. At first, I was very upset because they failed to see that I already made my own points clear in the relevant report. But in the end, I still decided to forget it and let them go. President, in Buddhism, there is the concept of "those eating at the same table having separate ways of spiritual cultivation". I think that this is also the case with our legislature. Members can all cultivate themselves separately, and bear their own fruit. To me, all this does not matter at all.

President, I still wish to discuss one more point. Are we unable to achieve what we want to achieve? Actually we are able to do so, but sometimes we will have to follow the trend. I first joined the legislature as an independent Member, and I have also insisted on being an independent. The situation I then encountered was not as worse as the oppression in 1994 mentioned by Ms Emily LAU just now, but still many people advised me to join a political party. Never

mind. After all, I have had 10 joyful years and gained an understanding of the workings of political parties.

I do not want to talk about things in the past. I only want to say that we can do something together here in this legislature. I am thankful to Members of the Legislative Council because their enthusiasm for football enabled us to move a debate here. I am pleased that in that debate, no Member added anything unnecessary to my motion, and the motion was eventually passed. However, the stance of the government official at that time was very dubious. Therefore, as far as I can remember, I rose to give a very emotive response. In the end, with the support of Members of the legislature, we achieved many other things, including signature collection and submitting letters, thus bringing certain improvement and change to the football industry today. I believe that all this is to the fruit of our concerted efforts.

President, even if a must-be-ever-victorious attitude is really necessary for survival in the legislature, I must still point out that the same attitude may not necessarily be quite so appropriate in life in general. We must realize the realities in society and bear in mind that our words and deeds here in the legislature will be imbibed and responded to. I think that we should act with a sense of social responsibility, never try to sever the truth and tell only part of it. Naturally, all must depend on individual Members. I hope that for the sake of our young people, Members can reflect more on their words and behaviour, and set good examples for them.

In addition, I hope that we can do one thing after moving to the new Legislative Council Complex. I note that our attendants are very dutiful, and they often give us a big glass of water. After one certain meeting, I deliberately stayed behind to do some observation, and I noticed that they had to pour away huge quantities of water — the drinking water that we left behind. I then realized that we had been wasting a lot of water. First, I hope that Members can finish all the water in their glasses before leaving. Second, President, can we launch a campaign called "Operation Half-filled Glasses" for our meetings? I so submit.

**MRS REGINA IP** (in Cantonese): President, I rise to speak in support of Ms Miriam LAU's motion. I am also very delighted that through this debate, I can

hear Members speak on their many interesting experiences, which have brought us back to many historic moments in Hong Kong.

President, I am only a newcomer to the Legislative Council, but this Council is likewise loaded with many memories of mine. I think that our bidding farewell to the Legislative Council Building today and its return to the Court do not purely mean the handover of a building, but also signify the many twists and turns in Hong Kong's constitutional development.

Ms Miriam LAU remarked just now that when she was still a junior lawyer, she already came to work in this building, which was then the seat of the Supreme Court. President, in my early career as an Administrative Officer, I did not need to come to the then Legislative Council, because as you also know, it was not necessary to canvass any votes at that time.*(Laughter)* At that time, most Members and government officials spoke in English, and "the ayes always have it" was an expression often used to describe the Legislative Council, meaning that the business of the Council was all the time about raising hands.*(Laughter)* I believe that experienced Members of this legislature, such as Dr Margaret NG and Ms Emily LAU, should all know my superiors. They all spoke tersely. Successive Secretaries for Security at the time, such as Lewis Mervyn DAVIS, David Gregory JEFFERSON and Alistair ASPREY, when responding to a question, would promptly sit down after saying "the answer to this question is no" *(Laughter)* or "the answer to this question is confidential".*(Laughter)* They did not even need to give any reply, and nobody dared to throw anything either. President, this was "executive-led" in the truest sense, because civil servants had all the powers. It was certainly the heyday of civil servants.

I think that 1991 was a turning point in local politics, because with the introduction of directly-elected Members to the legislature, the political environment and mentality in Hong Kong began to change. President, I wonder whether you know that Dame Lydia DUNN, then concurrently Senior Member of the Executive Council and the Legislative Council, once wanted to establish an office of Executive Council Members and Legislative Council Members under her chairmanship. I think that Mr LEE Cheuk-yan should remember this. But as directly elected Members — Members who wore T-shirt, and who were rather rough in style — had already joined the legislature, Dame Lydia later came to realize that such a political environment was no longer suitable for her. As a



result, her plan for establishing a company incorporating Executive Council Members under her chairmanship fell flat.

I also remember that when Governor Chris PATTEN came to Hong Kong in 1992, I was Deputy Director of Administration. What I can still remember most vividly is that led by the then Director of Administration, Nicholas NG, I accompanied Governor PATTEN to this Chamber for the purpose of selecting a seat for him in the then Legislative Council. As a politician brought up under the Westminster system, Governor PATTEN found the Presidency of the colonial Governor in the Legislative Council unimaginable. He also found it equally unimaginable that so many civil servants who had not undergone the tests of any elections should be serving, or "posing", as ministers. Therefore, shortly after his arrival at Hong Kong, he requested us to accompany him to the Legislative Council for selecting another seat for him. President, we selected for him that particular seat over there, where he could sit when speaking in this Chamber. Next, he went on to ask Mr John SWAINE to serve as the President of his first Executive Council. Unfortunately, people sometimes wrote his name wrongly as Mr John "Swine". *(Laughter)*

In 1995, Governor PATTEN decided to withdraw the last 10 government officials who still sat on the legislature. This is also recorded in books. Mrs Anson CHAN, my then superior, was likewise astounded, because without the support of the last 10 "iron votes", the political situation in the future would turn very turbulent. And, since the reunification, the SAR Government has indeed been facing very great challenges, and vote canvassing has become a routine task. I started to serve as a principal official in 1997. In 1998, I became the Secretary for Security, and henceforth, I spent a lot of time on the Legislative Council, handling many motions and pieces of legislation of great significance. I do not intend to dwell on all this, however.

Speaking of the new Legislative Council Complex at Tamar, I wish to point out that the architectural design is meant to bring the Government Secretariat, the Legislative Council and the Office of the Chief Executive much closer together. I hope the next Government's efforts will not simply be limited to shortening the physical distance. Rather, I also hope that the next Chief Executive can have sufficient political wisdom to properly handle the relationship between the executive and the legislature, so that a genuine ruling coalition can be built in Hong Kong.

Just now, I heard a Member, Mr James TO, say that he wanted very much to be a government official. He added that if a different system had been in place, he would have been a junior minister already. Yes, he said "junior minister"; he said that he would have become a junior minister to say the very least — not "a toilet minister"<sup>1</sup>.*(Laughter)* Many Legislative Council Members are very knowledgeable, so it is a pity that they cannot be absorbed by the executive authorities. But, we have to accept a reality, the reality that Hong Kong will not enjoy the kind of genuine democracy practised in the West. Genuine democracy means the formation of a cabinet or government, but this is not allowed under the Basic Law, because Hong Kong is part of China in the final analysis.

However, if we can properly implement the provisions of the Basic Law and adhere to the timetable of implementing universal suffrage for selecting the Chief Executive in 2017 and electing the Legislative Council in 2020, we will actually have a political system which is more democratic and accountable than the one in the colonial era, and which is "sunnier" than the systems in many other places of the world. I think that the next Government must as a matter of priority continue with Hong Kong's constitutional reform in the direction of striking a balance, so that Hong Kong can listen to public opinions, accept the views of different sides, and even absorb various knowledgeable people into the Government on the one hand, while maintaining effective governance for the pursuit of greater happiness for Hong Kong people on the other.

I so submit. Thank you, President.

**MR TOMMY CHEUNG** (in Cantonese): I likewise rise to speak in support of Ms Miriam LAU's motion on "Bidding farewell to the Legislative Council Building".

President, some time ago, I was asked by a radio station to do an interview, but the interview did not take place due to time clashes. They actually wanted to ask me about my most vivid recollections of the Legislative Council Building.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Junior minister" is the English translation of "次官" in the original Cantonese discourse. The pronunciation of "次官 (ci3 gun1)" is the same as that of "廁官 (ci3 gun1)", meaning "toilet minister".

Since the interview did not take place, let me perhaps talk about such recollections in my speech today.

As many people and Members have remarked, this Chamber is understandably the very venue where we deal with a host of issues, such as taking oaths, enacting legislation, holding motion debates and canvassing votes. And, in recent years, there is also the hurling of bananas, which makes it necessary for our security staff to run around like goal-keepers. But the goal is constantly shifting, thus rendering them unable to know whom to protect and whom to escort away. Therefore, this Chamber is actually a venue full of very interesting happenings.

However, I am rather ..... As I am rather lazy, I often do not remain here to listen to all the speeches of Members. I often go to the Ante-Chamber for doing so. As I am rather fat and doze off easily, I sometimes go to the Ante-Chamber. Actually, I like staying there very much.

In the Ante-Chamber, I can see the true selves of many people, including Mr CHIM Pui-chung. He is much gentler and quieter in the Ante-Chamber; he does not speak too much there. Very often, we will feel hemmed in by the four walls of this Chamber and all the cameras targeting on us. But, we will be much more relaxed in the Ante-Chamber. Even after arguing heatedly in this Chamber, some Members can still hug each other in the Ante-Chamber.

What makes me like going to the Ante-Chamber? It is because in the Ante-Chamber, I can have plenty of time to discuss various issues, either with Members or with government officials. As the industry I represent is often the target of many people's criticisms, I will frequently hold discussions in the Ante-Chamber with Members on how this or that issue should be tackled. I also hold such discussions with officials.

As a matter of fact, the Ante-Chamber can enable me to get many things done. I do not want to talk about things in the distant past, but I can still cite the recent radiation leakage incident in Japan as an example. This incident posed a big headache to the industry I represent. At that time, the business turnover of the industry dropped to a mere 10% to 30% of the usual volume. One evening, when I dined at one restaurant, I saw that there were only three customers. Just one month before that, even with an advance booking of two or three days, I

could not get a table for dining at the same restaurant. But, that evening, there were only three customers, while there were 10 waiters and waitresses. I stayed there from 6 o'clock to 9 o'clock, and I could feel their plight.

When I subsequently talked to Members about this situation, they all agreed to pitch in. Some tried to work out ways of offering help, saying that everybody should put in an appearance as support. Even the Chief Secretary for Administration pitched in. In the end, one single appeal of mine led to numerous responses, with everybody thinking up various ideas and advising me what to do. Therefore, speaking of this recent incident, I must thank the Members whom I met in the Ante-Chamber. Many of their recommendations were adopted by Japanese restaurants, and their business soon recovered.

People may think that I am frequently at loggerheads with Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, but the truth is that I have had quite a lot of discussions with him in the Ante-Chamber recently. We have even reached a consensus, whereby we are to initiate discussions on the hawker policy in the two Panels we respectively belong to, so as to explore how to help hawkers and create more employment opportunities for them. We basically see eye to eye on this issue, and a consensus has been reached readily.

What is most infuriating, however, is that when he and I invited the authorities to attend a meeting, no Policy Bureau agreed to come. One bureau said welfare was not within its purview, and another claimed that development was outside its portfolio. In the end, Under Secretary Gabriel LEUNG agreed to attend the meeting, only out of a grudging sense of obligation, though. However, Gabriel LEUNG also said that the establishment of dawn markets was outside his portfolio, and that his bureau was only responsible for arresting hawkers. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan then said, "Don't arrest so many hawkers in that case, man. They all need to earn a living."

Mr WONG Kwok-hing even asked the two of us when we could visit a dawn market to get to know the situation. I replied that we must think twice because if we decided to pay a visit, the authorities would certainly "clean up" these markets beforehand. They would probably arrest all hawkers in Tung Chung, Yuen Long, Tuen Mun or anywhere else. In that case, we would not be able to see the actual conditions, and the hawkers would not be able to do any business the whole day long. I said that we must think twice.

I joined the Legislative Council in 2000, and over the past 11 years, I have managed to get many things done in the Ante-Chamber. In contrast, in the Chamber ..... It cannot be said that I have achieved absolutely nothing here, but I do think that there is a lot more fun in the Ante-Chamber at the back. I can get many more things done over there.

I have never told anybody why I like the Ante-Chamber so much. Today, I would like to talk about the reason. Actually, the first time I ever set foot on the Legislative Council Building was 1995. I was then a member of a deputation. We were cordially received, and after putting on name plates, we were allowed to enter the Ante-Chamber, where drinks were served. Why did I come to the Legislative Council at that time? That was because in 1994, the then Legislative Council was going to enact legislation on levying the Trade Effluent Surcharge (TES). But the catering industry had to pay over 80% of the surcharge. Therefore, as a member of the deputation, I came to this building. The first person I saw was Samuel WONG Ping-wai, an old friend of mine. He and I were both horse owners, and I even fed his horse with carrots sometimes. So, I thought that he might treat me in a friendlier manner. To my surprise, however, he began to chide me in the Ante-Chamber as soon as I entered, grumbling that "restaurant guys" were especially irresponsible, knowing only profit but not environmentalism. Hearing this, I argued with him in the Ante-Chamber, questioning why we should pay so much money.

Precisely because of this very visit and my debate with him in the Ante-Chamber, it subsequently dawned on me that I might as well join the legislature to argue things out with everybody. This explains why I have been arguing over the TES in this Chamber for so many times over so many years. The Ante-Chamber is indeed a very vivid part of my memory.

Another vivid memory of mine, without any doubt, is our experience of being stranded here for several hours, as was also mentioned by Ms Miriam LAU just now. I was actually able to leave at that time, but since she was still here, I told myself that I should not go away first and leave behind the Chairman of our Liberal Party here. *(Laughter)* I thought that although I knew not how to fight, I could at least act as a shield in case anyone hurled anything. Therefore, I chose to stay here.

However, the one thing that touches me most greatly is the Interception of Communications and Surveillance Bill in 2007, something that Ms Miriam LAU also mentioned just now. The last meeting on the bill was held on a Saturday night, and it lasted until 2 am. Including that Saturday night, we had been debating the bill for six months. That night, I and my daughter's in-laws, that is, their son and my daughter, already invited some friends for dinner. Ten Members were also invited. At that time, we really did not know what to do. So (*The buzzer sounded*) ..... That night .....

Thank you, President.

**DR RAYMOND HO** (in Cantonese): I honestly do not quite subscribe to the idea of relocation, for I am enormously fond of this building. To begin with, as I am sitting here, let me start by first talking about what I can see from here. In this Chamber, there are two things that I frequently look at, one being the four Greek Ionic columns. The sight of these columns is soothing, conjuring up images of the solemn and dignified architectural design in ancient Europe. Naturally, this is also useful in adding to the solemn atmosphere of Council meetings. But, what I often gaze at is the dome, spelled as d-o-m-e, that comes into sight as I look up — this does not mean that I am disrespectful to the President. We are sitting here at the bottom, and looking up from my seat here, I can feel the sublimity and aloofness of the dome. I am not worried about the falling down of these chandeliers. Honestly, the Chamber looks very grand and magnificent from here, and this makes me so magnanimous when debating various issues.

Actually, over all these years ..... I joined the PLC in 1996, and initially, the PLC held its meetings in Shenzhen. On 1 July 1997, it started to hold its meetings in this Chamber. Fourteen years have passed. Over the past 14 years, I have shown many people or visitors around this building. Usually, I will personally lead all such guided tours. Most visitors are from overseas, the Mainland or even ..... I can remember that one certain group of visitors comprised 30 primary school children from Scotland. They raised many questions in their lovely naivety. I liked them very much, and went on and on for nearly two hours, explaining every detail to them. I thought that they were keenly interested in this building. As a matter of fact, this building can be called a tourist spot. I remember that in the past, Members could host dinners upstairs

on Tuesdays or Fridays, but patronage was low. As I can remember, there must at least be bookings for four tables all at the same time, or all bookings must be cancelled. Many a time, after a Member had already extended an invitation to his friends, the appointment had to be cancelled at short notice, much to the displeasure of all. Recently, however, a new arrangement has been introduced to enable Members to host luncheons for their friends.

Many people know that I have spent quite a lot of time here. Why have I spent so much time in this building? Well, I am not sure whether this habit of mine is good or bad. I often stay behind for handling my Council business without realizing how late it is getting. The first example was the chaos that emerged on 6 July 1998 after the commissioning of the new airport. The relocation of the airport was very smooth initially, but chaos occurred after the commissioning of the new airport. We therefore established a select committee, with me as Deputy Chairman, and Mrs Selina CHOW as Chairman. We held 92 meetings in a matter of seven months. I remember that each meeting usually lasted four hours, and the two of us, respectively the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, must be present for the entirety of the four hours. Then, there was the writing up of drafts, which could be available from the Security Office only after midnight. After obtaining a draft, I must still read it, but the next meeting would be held at 8.30 am the following morning. What should I do in that case? Well, I could only stay behind in this building for a little longer to read the draft and then return to my office to continue with the reading until 3 am or 4 am. Then, after a short rest, I would come back to this building the following morning for the next meeting. In other words, I often used Room 216, where all documents were kept. I spent a lot of time there indeed.

Then, there was the investigation into the short-piling case, and lately, we have established a subcommittee on Lehman Brothers minibonds. Actually the full name of this committee is very long, but I would still like to read it out, for it is worth mentioning. It is called Subcommittee to Study Issues Arising from Lehman Brothers-related Minibonds and Structured Financial Products. There are 31 characters in its Chinese name, Secretary General. I believe that very few subcommittees have as many as 31 Chinese characters in their names. This is something unique. Actually, over 300 meetings have been held under the investigation; some 140 to 150 preparatory meetings have also been held. Because of the investigation, I must sometimes work at night ..... The reason is that I must write rulings on, for example, claims for public interest immunity. I

had to write such rulings on my own, because even the Legal Adviser told me that he could not offer me any help. So, I had to write such rulings by myself, so as to cope with those barristers and Senior Counsels. To cope with them, I had to write such rulings on my own. Luckily, when I showed the Legal Adviser the rulings I had written, he commented that they were alright.

Early last year, when we discussed the issue of constitutional reform, I asked Chief Secretary for Administration Mr Henry TANG for his comments, and he remarked that during discussions on functional constituencies (FCs), people should not keep speaking ill of FCs, adding that they should note how Dr Raymond HO sometimes worked until 3 am or 4 am. I do work until 3 am or 4 am at times. In 1998, I was asked to host one programme segment of *LegCo Review*. I think no one probably know that I was asked to climb up to the dome on the rooftop of this building, where I was supposed to cross to the other side for climbing over the railings. At that time, the security guards were really scared. I told them not to be afraid, as I often climbed up and down in construction sites. When I reached the spot, they filmed some footage on introducing the Legislative Council (Powers and Privileges) Ordinance (LCPPO). In this footage, I held a wooden sword symbolizing a Sword of Imperial Sanction. As Members also know, we mainly have two Swords of Imperial Sanction, one being the LCPPO, and the other the power of funding approval. If we do not give funding approval, the Government will run out of money. At that time, I read out the script and then brandished the wooden sword at the request of the radio station. Members may find time to watch this TV programme. There is also the Statue of Justice, represented by Greek Goddess Themis. I think that this building is very special, and as one with a history of 110 years, it is of great historic significance, impressing me greatly with its ambience as a workplace, and arousing my attachment to and fondness of it. I would rather not leave, but in the end, we must ..... Well, the new building does have its own advantages.

I also like the Ante-Chamber very much, because we can exchange our views there. Very often, government officials lobby for Members' votes there, and Members likewise do so among themselves. But it is nonetheless quite a harmonious place. However bitterly we argue with one another in the Chamber, the atmosphere in the Ante-Chamber still remains harmonious.

I still wish to say a few more words on one thing. Members are aware that some Honourable colleagues like to take drastic actions. For this reason, on



one occasion, we actually brought along some safety helmets used on construction sites, intending to put them on immediately in case Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung hurled any object or took any action. But after a split-second hesitation, we did not put them on. Our original intention was to react in a lighter and more jocular and humorous manner.

Speaking of my working late at night, have I ever seen any lady in kimono or soldiers marching? Many people asked me whether I had seen or heard anything late at night in this building, and I said never. Members need not be scared. And, I can also tell Judges or staff of the Court of Final Appeal that they need not be scared even if they have to work through the night. At night, there is no ..... It is very safe and quiet here at night, with a very good atmosphere. People can concentrate on their work without any worries.

Finally, I wish to confess that it saddens me greatly to bid farewell to this building. Thank you, President.

**MS LI FUNG-YING** (in Cantonese): President, I first joined the Legislative Council in 2000. Time really flies, 11 years have lapsed in a wink. In these past 11 years, Hong Kong has experienced many storms. The essential parts of these storms were staged in this Legislative Council Building, and they have affected the future development of Hong Kong immensely. In the coming session, we will be working in a brand new and more modernized building.

President, if we are to recall in detail the work of the Council over the past 11 years, this farewell motion will be overloaded with details. As such, I just wish to raise one point, that is, it seems that my relation with this Building is preordained.

President, 26 years ago, this building, which had formerly housed the Supreme Court, was officially turned into the then Legislative Council Building. On the day when the then Legislative Council inaugurated this building, I and more 1 000 fellow workers from the then Universal Electronics Manufacturing Company staged a protest right outside the building. The 1 000-odd workers were abandoned by their employer — the factory folded and the employer disappeared — there was no way for them to get back their wages in arrears. In their desperation, they came to this building to present a petition to the Members

of the then Legislative and Executive Councils, in the hope that the Councillors would help them restore justice, safeguard labour rights and interests, and set up a Protection of Wages on Insolvency Fund and implement the long service payment requirement expeditiously. At that time, the Councillor who came to receive the petition was Sir CHUNG Sze-yuen.

President, 26 years have passed since then. One after the other, the Protection of Wages on Insolvency Fund and the requirement or long service payment have been instituted in Hong Kong by way of legislation. We did not have such protection in the past, and in attaining these goals, we have encountered countless difficulties and hardships. But at least, this is some kind of improvement as far as the protection of labour rights and interests is concerned. On the other hand, however, when it comes to enhancing the rights and interests of labourers, things have been proceeding at a snail's pace, lagging far behind Hong Kong's economic and social development.

While many electronic manufacturing plants were found in Hong Kong's industrial areas 26 years ago, we can hardly see one these days. Manufacturing plants have disappeared in Hong Kong, with the service industry replacing the manufacturing industry, our labourers are being marginalized. Time really flies, while I was once a protester outside this Chamber, today I am sitting in this Chamber discussing issues of public concern. Despite the change in role, one of my objectives always remains unchanged. I still hope that I can put in my best effort to fight for the enhancement of labour rights and interests.

President, in bidding fare to this building, I have to mention one point. In early 2009, I had a bad fall walking down Staircase One inside this building. I was badly hurt in this incident, and a lot of people have come to my assistance. Throughout the time I underwent operation and rehabilitation, I have received much care and assistance from medical professionals, Members of the Council, staff members of the Legislative Council Secretariat, as well as members of the Security Office. Today, I can still stand here to speak, as if nothing has happened before. I am really grateful to Members and the ones I have mentioned, they have indeed moved me deeply.

Hence, as I bid farewell to this building, I need to give them my heartfelt thanks once again. Thank you, President.

**MR KAM NAI-WAI** (in Cantonese): President, just now many senior Members have delivered their speeches. I am just a "newcomer" to the Legislative Council and I have worked in this Chamber for less than three years. Regarding this building, I would like to share with Members three features which have deeper impression in my mind.

To begin with, I would like to talk about the lavatories. As an echo to the lavatory issue raised by Mr Andrew CHENG just now, I have to point out that I have also made a blunder in relation to lavatories. I did not know that the lavatories inside this building were categorized in this way, which is indeed rather troublesome for "newcomers". In addition to men's room and ladies' room, there are also lavatories for male Members and female Members. What is more, there is a Member Lavatory which can be used by both male and female Members. So, there are so many types of lavatories. Actually, it has taken me two to three months to figure out the different lavatories in the Legislative Council Building, that is, which ones are for gentlemen and which ones are for ladies. I made a blunder once by entering a ladies' room. Hence, I need to apologize for making such a blunder on the first day I entered this building. I have no idea whether the lavatories in the new Legislative Council Complex will also be divided into so many types, they are really very hard to memorize .....

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

**MS EMILY LAU** (in Cantonese): There are more.*(Laughter)*

**MR KAM NAI-WAI** (in Cantonese): More? Ms Emily LAU says there are more. In that case, Members have to be very careful when entering lavatories.

The second feature I would like to talk about is this Chamber, which we have lots of deep feelings about. Knowing that we will soon bid farewell to this building, many members of the public and kaifongs wish to come and visit. In just a month's time, I have taken more than a dozen to 20 groups of people to tour around the building. I wish to tell Members that when members of the public were sitting in this Chamber, the majority of them would ask this question: Where did the Member stand when he threw out the banana? This is the most common

question raised by kaifongs. Just now Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong mentioned about the culture and rules of the Legislature, what I wish to say is that the changes in this respect can hardly be reversed. I feel that this building has witnessed the changes of the Legislature. Mrs Regina IP also mentioned about the changes in the way government officials respond to questions and the way Members speak and behave. In my view, as time passes by, the changes that have taken place inside this building just cannot be reversed.

Certainly, we can witness in this Chamber the change in the culture of the Legislature. On top of that, I would also like to talk about the democratization of the Legislature. Just now Mrs Regina IP opined that we are now more democratic than the colonial era. In this connection, I cannot but sign with emotion. As Chinese nationals, we are now the master of our own place. Ensuring the proper management of one's own place is a universal standard valued by any civilized modern community, it is also a goal we all strive to attain. I am not going to compare the present situation with the colonial past, but I do wonder whether this democratization of the Legislature is also a trend we cannot reverse. In this connection, I believe this would somehow depend on the people of Hong Kong and Members.

One thing I must not forget to talk about is the design of this Chamber. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said sometimes he would look around the Chamber and gaze at the ceiling. Honestly, I do not quite admire the internal design of some old buildings, I prefer the modern design more. As we can see, the Legislative Council Building is rather crowded, there are chances that we take up the neighbouring Members' glasses by mistake, instead of drinking from our own glasses. What is more, as I am standing here now, my legs are tightly pressing against my chair. As far as interior design is concerned, I hope that the new Legislative Council Complex will be more spacious and more convenient to Members, so that we can demonstrate higher standards of parliamentary deliberations. I hope the design of the new Chamber will have some improvement in this respect.

Comparatively speaking, is our Chamber really very small in size? Recently, I paid a visit to the Parliament House in Britain. When I saw it on television, the British Parliament House did not seem very special, but when I was there in person, I found the seats there were even smaller in size than ours. What is more, some of the Parliament Members do not even have their own seats.

The future Legislative Council Complex is worthy of ..... I do have some expectation.

The third feature I would like to talk about is the carpark. Ms Emily LAU has reminded us many times that we should not keep talking about how much we would like to have a parking space, as Mr Martin LEE loved to mention in the past how he liked the parking space in the carpark of this building. Why do I like this carpark so much? This is because members of the public can visit the carpark easily, which means that we can readily come into contact with the public here. As a "newcomer", the first case I received upon entering this Chamber was the Lehman Brothers incident. At that time, the carpark was filled with victims of the Lehman Brothers incident. A moment ago, Ms LI Fung-Ying said more than 1 000 people were surrounding the Legislative Council building when she came here to present a petition 26 years. While such a situation would most probably not be described as "besieging the Legislative Council" at that time, a crowd of about 1 000 people was indeed very large in size. Recently, people are talking about besieging the Legislative Council, but such a situation has actually taken place 26 years ago.

I just think, are we ..... apart from a place where the public can voice out their demand, another scene I saw in the carpark that cast a deep impression in my mind was an incident where tens of thousands of people came to present their petition to the Legislative Council. What impressed me most was that a small child from Shenzhun was among the petitioners outside this Council. He came to Hong Kong with his family members to look for his father, only to find himself being abandoned by his mother and left alone on his own. The carpark is indeed a place where we can see what is going on in society, this is an epitome of our society. There we can easily get into close contact with the public, so that we can listen to their review and reflect such views to the Council. With regard to the new Legislative Council Complex, do we still have some places where the public can voice out their views and get into contact with government officials and Members? I do hope so.

Today, I wish to thank Ms Miriam LAU once again for moving this motion on "bidding farewell to the Legislative Council Building". I so submit. Thank you, Deputy President.

**MR CHIM PUI-CHUNG** (in Cantonese): Deputy President, when you spoke earlier on, you mentioned that the Legislative Council Building was erected in 1912. Before we notice it, almost 100 years have lapsed since then. Certainly, the centenary of the building is next year. According to my understanding, in these recent 26 years, the Legislative Council has two very senior Members — the first one should be Dr David LI, and the second one should be Mr LAU Wong-fat — they have been Members of this Council since 1985. While they are still very young now, they were already Members of the Council in 1985.

The motion on "bidding farewell to the Legislative Council Building" today gives Members a chance to review our feelings about the Legislative Council Building over the past years, and to speak on our understanding about each other.

Deputy President, four persons have taken the Chair of the Legislative Council respectively. The first one is ..... just now Mrs Regina IP mentioned about the then Executive Council, but she was wrong, what she referred to should be the Legislative Council — the first one is Mr Joseph SWAINE. He is a barrister and is still in practice. The impression he gave me was that he did not laugh much, nor did he care to talk with others, (*Laughter*) he discharged his duties as President of the Council in the manner of a barrister.

The second one is Mr Andrew WONG. We all know that he loves to drink. It was indeed very magnificent of him to not crave for any alcoholic drinks when he was in the President's seat. (*Laughter*) Besides, he is also a follower of smoking.

The third one is naturally Mrs Rita FAN. She took the Chair of the Provisional Legislative Council in Shenzhun in 1996, and when the Provisional Legislative Council returned to Hong Kong, she was elected the President of the then Legislative Council. The fourth one is our present President, Mr Jasper TSANG.

Looking back on all those years, I find myself the most special Member. I am the first one who has been removed from office after being Members of the council for seven years. I subsequently went to Stanley to take a rest (*Laughter*) — I was actually taking a rest, not in jail. I came out after eight months and resume my eligibility for getting elected to the Council. Some people asked me,

"Is the Legislative Council your home, how come you could return and leave at any time?" In 2004, some people considered that efforts should be made to prevent CHIM Pui-chung from winning the election; otherwise, he would bring shame on the representativeness and capacity of Legislative Council Members. However, they were wrong. The way I have acted and the courage I have demonstrated serve to highlight the commendable part of the laws of Hong Kong. Members love to talk about striving for human rights and the rule of law, I have played my part with my own actions.

Let me tell you, Deputy President, many security personnel have come to the Council to state their case, saying while that some people could still become Members of the Council upon releasing from jail, they could not remain in the security industry if they should have any criminal record. I really do not know how to respond to them, because such provisions are written in law. Anyhow, this is the commendable part of the laws of Hong Kong. What I am referring to is the legal provisions concerned.

Hence, I wish to raise one point here. I was first elected as Member in 1991, and I have been in office for 14 years. Over these past years, several unfortunate Members have resigned from office. Some of them are in office now, and some of them are not Members any more. In addition, three to four unfortunate Members — apart from me — were also required to take a rest in Stanley or some other places upon resignation. However, they had lost their capacity as Members before taking the rest. I, CHIM Pui-chung, am the only one who has endured imprisonment and still possess the capacity as Member of the Council.

I take this chance to report to Members that in 1998, two thirds of the then Legislative Council Members passed the motion moved by Dr LEONG Che-hung to remove me from office. On that day, I was prepared to defend my case in this Council. My argument was that Hong Kong was a Common Law jurisdiction, and under the Common Law, we would have trials in the Court of First Instance, Court Appeal and Court of Final Appeal. Nevertheless, the Basic Law clearly stipulates that any Member sentenced to imprisonment for more than one month will be relieved of his or her duties by a motion passed by two thirds of the Legislative Council Members.

However, as I said just now, I was of the view that as my case had not been tried in the Court of Final Appeal, I should not be deprived of my rights. At that time, the only Member who expressed doubt about the council's decision was Dr Raymond HO. I am not saying that the rest of the Members present at that time were wrong, this was simply their view on a certain incident. I have always pledged the Legislative Council to amend the relevant provisions — "knock on wood", of course — it really does not matter whether we follow the Common Law or the Basic Law, but we need to make it clear.

Deputy President, under such circumstance, we need to realize that the culture of the Legislature in Hong Kong is changing with history and social culture. As time is running short, I just hope Members will observe to points upon relocating to the new Legislative Council Complex. The first one is to have mutual respect, and the second one is to remember that, as participants in politics, we are but some passersby in history. It really does not matter if we have different political perspectives, we can just take the difference like a joke after making our points. Certainly, we may hold fast to our belief and insist on our own views, but we also need to respect the opinions of other Members. More importantly, we need to understand that Hong Kong is not an independent region but a special administrative region of China. Let us show respect for each other.

**MR WONG SING-CHI** (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I first joined the Legislative Council in 2000 also. Before then, I had been a Regional councillor and a member of a District Council. Actually, I had not expected that I could join the Legislative Council to work with the friends I admire so much, including Mr LEE Wing-tat and Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong. Before joining the Council, I thought they were really brilliant.*(Laughter)* Then, upon entering the Council, I realize that they are more or less the same as me. Hence, I believe I have learned a lot in this place.

Also, before I joined the Council, I had found "Emily" very magnificent, because many government officials had been rebuked by her. I just thought, how nice it would be if I had the chance to become a Member of the Legislative Council. Upon joining the Council, I have unexpectedly noticed that I have no other choice but to rebuke the government officials, *(Laughter)* because many of the things they do really make people mad. As such, I started following the



example set by "Emily". In some cases, we have to resort to more radical and strong measures to voice out our views and discontent.

Deputy President, I have intermittently spent 11 years in this Council. While Ms LI Fung-ying has been a Member for 11 consecutive years, I was not a Member of the Council in four of those years. I can recall that in 2000, when I first met with the press before formally joining the Council, they asked me what I had prepared. I did not know what to say, I just told them that I had prepared several suits, because the ones I used to wear were worn out already. Even though I have put on weight, the suits I bought then still fit me. But these days, there are not many chances that we have to wear neck-ties and suits to this Chamber. Nevertheless, I do remember that from 2000 to 2004, I dressed like that every day when returning to the Council. Things have indeed changed a lot. This Building has seemingly endured a lot of changes and witnessed many changes in culture. I believe this is an evolution process. It is my hope that the forthcoming new Legislative Council Complex will be more people-friendly, so that members of the public can be a part of it.

Here, I would like to share with Members one thing. Actually, I am not a very brilliant person, nor am I very clever. But then, I can still manage to discharge my duties as a Member of the Council. Before joining the Legislative Council, I was rather low-profile in playing the role as members of other representative councils. I was never an eye-catching star. I had never expected that I could survive so many years in this Council and make a little achievement.

When I was in school, I had been a repeater, and I had to take the Certificate of Education Examination several times. Many people believe that only the elites, well-educated, very brilliant and wealthy ones can become Members of the Legislative Council. But my case is a very good experience. Hence, I wish to take this chance today to tell the young people that so long as they have the determination and work hard enough, I believe they will successfully achieve their goals one day. Even though I cannot be considered particularly successful today, I have at least managed to stand here to speak for the public and to strive for their rights and interests. Nothing can be achieved without hard work, each and every Member of the council have indeed been working diligently and conscientiously.

As such, I really take pride in having the opportunity to come to this building to participate in the work of the Legislative Council, the work here really gives me a feeling of satisfaction. Inside this building, I have witnessed many important social issues in this brief period of 10 years or even eight years. Many Members show up on television more frequently than Charmaine SHEH and Stephen CHAN, because the work we are doing every day is related to issues of immense public concern. Here, I hope that we will all continue with our good work when we move to the new Legislative Council Complex in future. Let us keep on working diligently and conscientiously for the public.

Deputy President, this Building has provided me with some impressive experience. Before joining the Council, I saw on television that many Members were doing their work very conscientiously and diligently in this Chamber. They held fast to their beliefs and expressed their support and disagreement without any reservation. Now that I am part of the Council, I can still see Members working diligently, showing their love and hatred without any reservation, and standing firm on their position, both in front of the camera and inside this Chamber. Nevertheless, on other occasions, despite the divergent political views and stances we have, many Members can still be friends. Hence, I hope that members of the public will not take us simply by the messages we express in front of the camera and apply the impression they gather from such messages to their daily lives, and eventually make vicious comments on certain Members, political parties or individuals.

We need to understand that when we rise to deliver our speeches here, we have a lot of beliefs and views behind our messages. Our speeches are targeted at specific issues, not any individuals. Behind the camera, sometimes we do chat with Mr CHIM Pui-chung, and I admire Mr CHIM Pui-chung for his talkativeness. We may not agree with what he says in this Council or his political views, but we can still exchange views in relation to many other areas. I wish to take this opportunity to tell members of the public that they should not let Members' image or opinion in front of the camera affect their daily lives or behaviour. Actually, every single person has his or her own private life, stance, and different images. I just hope members of the public will not be affected by certain people's behaviour in front of the camera and lose their heads. It is my hope that our community can still conduct debates on truths and lies, and show our love and hatred. The most important point is that we should not direct our

views against any individuals. We should target or views at specific issues, not any individuals.

Thank you, Deputy President.

**MR FRED LI** (in Cantonese): Deputy President, a number of Members from the Democratic Party and I, as well as the Member who enter the Chamber at this very moment, have a so-called club named "Class of 91". I have no idea when did I join the club, but all of us did join the Legislative Council together in 1991. This was the first time in history that we have directly elected Members in Hong Kong. There were a total of 18 seats then, and the Members are returned by a "double seat, double vote" electoral system. Thanks to the votes in support of "Uncle Wah", I was able to join the Legislative Council. People used to call us "Uncle Wah" and "Wah-ming" then. This was how I first elected to this Council. At that time, nobody knows who "Fred LI" was, with the only exception of the Tsui Ping Estate District Council constituency where I belong to. But then, that constituency comprised two to three thousand voters only, and the voting rate was very low.

Twenty years have flown by in a wink. Certainly, we had to "get off" in the year the Provision Legislative Council was formed. I still remember that night on the balcony ..... we were in fact "playing foul" then, and the British-Hong Kong Government was indeed very helpful. That evening at the Convention and Exhibition Centre ..... that should be JIANG Zemin ..... a banquet was held. After dinner, we witnessed the lowering of the British national flag, followed by the raising of the national flag of China. Then, the British-Hong Kong Government arranged a 24-seat mini-bus to smoothly take us from the Convention and Exhibition Centre back to this Legislative Council Building. Many of us in the picture taken at that time are not Members of the Council any more.

We said goodbye on the balcony, because we boycotted the Provisional Legislative Council and refused to join it ..... yes, we would certainly come back, and we talked to the people gathered under the balcony ..... a crowd was there — of course, nobody threw out any paper plane — it was so happy and so sentimental. In the past 20 years, during that period of more than half a year when the Provisional Legislative Council was in office, I could only sit in on the

meetings and observe what was going on. After a while, I found that it was indeed "meaningless", because the Provisional Legislative Council had nothing to say at all. I went to sit in on its meetings for many times, and each time I just felt so boring.

I got re-elected to this Council in 1998 and have remained a Member since then. This is the work I have been engaged with for the longest time, and the Legislative Council is also the institute I have served for the longest time. As Mr LEE Wing-tat has referred to before, the Legislative Council is the place where I have stayed for the longest time. Even if I do not run in the election any more and look for other jobs instead, there will not be another job where I can engage myself with for a long period of 20 years. This is just not possible, I cannot have another 20 years ..... and I do not wish to do that either, it is just not appropriate to work 20 years more.

Let me now talk about the year 1991. At that time, some of the Members were appointed Members. As we all know, appointed Members like Vincent CHENG and Marvin CHEUNG did have frequent communication with elected Members like us. In many instances, we had collaborated in the light of the issue in question. When speaking in response to Mr LEE Wing-tat yesterday, Chief Secretary Henry TANG mentioned that he had also been one of us in the past. I still remember the days back in 1991 when Chief Secretary Henry TANG and we were Members. At that time, he was the Chairman of the Panel on Economic Development, which is the panel currently chaired by Mr Jeffrey LAM. Mr TANG was the Chairman of the Panel then. Actually, I have remained a member of the Panel since 1991. I have joined the Panel for a very long time without any break.

When Henry TANG was the Chairman of the Panel, he collaborated with us "against" the China Light and Power Company in dealing with the eight generation units in Lung Kwu Tan. He offered elected Members much room for actions, and he requested the Government to send representatives ..... as I can recall very clearly, he was a comparative more liberal panel chairman. Besides, at that time he and Mr LAU Chin-shek were speaking for the employers and the employees respectively, and they had plenty of time working together and "flattering" each other. One of them praised the other as a kind-hearted employer, and one praised the other as a trade union leader with the best sense of mission. They always "flattered" each other in this Chamber.*(Laughter)*

There is another incident that I remember very well. When Henry TANG was a Member of the Council ..... I remember my seat then was somewhere around there ..... I used to see him diligently study some information, as if he was doing some research studies. But when I looked at the papers carefully, I found that those were Bordeaux red wine lists. *(Laughter)* He kept studying the lists before making his choices. I asked him what he was doing, and he told me he was ordering some red wine, and that he was buying large boxes of those bottled wine. How could I had knowledge in such things back in 1991, I found that very profound to me. So, he was the bad guy who enticed me into drinking red wine. This is the impression Henry TANG gave me then, and he have said he had been one of us before.

Several other incidents have also set deep impression in my mind. Deputy President, I totally agree with what you said in the beginning of your speech earlier on. Many a time I have chosen the wrong one of these four entrances of this building, and yet I did not dare to consult other people, lest they would earn of my stupidity. So, the only thing I could do was to walk around the building again. It was indeed very odd that I chose the wrong entrance every time. After two to three years, I managed to choose the right entrance some times. Initially, I really made the wrong choice every time, I would always found that "oops, not the right place" upon entering entrance, and had to walk around the building to get to the right place.

Besides, I always find that the lift is too slow. I have never seen any lift slower than this one. Sometimes, I even wonder whether it is moving at all. I have enquired why this lift is so slow. I am not referring to the "cargo lift". I know we have two lifts, one is located ..... I do not know how to describe that entrance ..... another one is located near the entrance of the carpark. This is the one used by the Chief Executive, and is better looking. Professor, that lift is very slow because it is driven by hydraulic compaction, perhaps it is not one of those mechanically driven lifts.

The second incident is related to Mr WONG Yung-kan. I have already told him earlier on that I would certainly mention about him in relation to the "wiping off ordinance", which was passed in 1999 to "wipe off" the Urban Council. I became a member of the Urban Council in 1991. At that time, I was a "triple" councillor — an unpleasant name is "category III" councillor — I was a District Council member, an Urban Council member, and a Member of the

Legislative Council. The then Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong (DAB) was also against the "wiping of" of the Urban Council, because their members in the Urban Council joined us in urging fervently the Legislative Council to negative the "wiping off ordinance". The Federation of Trade Unions (FTU) has raised objection within the Urban Council, but inside the Legislative Council, the FTU representatives were in support of "wiping off the council". Mr WONG Yung-kan from the DAB disappeared when the relevant bill was put to a vote, and so the Government could pass the "wiping off ordinance" with a margin of just one vote. Later on, Mr WONG Yung-kan showed up in the corridor outside. So I walked up to him immediately and asked him, "What were you doing? Where were you then? Members from the DAB were all present to vote against the bill, where were you then?" Of course, he just kept speaking evasively. He subsequently explained to reporters that he had gone to Admiralty to have some tea. My response then was "how could he do that". Obviously, he was collaborating with the Government, and went away to avoid casting his voting. I can still recall every detail of the incident.

Last but not least, I need to apologize to Ms Emily LAU regarding the voting held on 29 June 1994. I was the first one to stir up the trouble, and it was the first time that I was rebuked by people sitting in the public gallery up there. It was the first time since I started participating in politics. From 1991 to 1996, I was not rebuked by anybody in the public gallery except that time. At that time we abstained from votes. The Meeting Point had three votes ..... four votes, but I abstained from votes (*The buzzer sounded*) .....

**DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Your speaking time is up.

**MR FRED LI** (in Cantonese): ..... that was a real regret, I am sorry.

**PROF PATRICK LAU** (in Cantonese): Deputy President, today is the last meeting of the current legislative session, and this is also the last time that the Legislative Council holds its meeting in this old building of historical importance. I am very glad that I have this opportunity here to witness such a historic moment. Many colleagues have talked about the people and events of the Council, and I believe Members do know what I am going to talk about.

Naturally, I will talk about this building, as we will soon be leaving it. I am thankful that Members have also provided a lot of background information on the building, and hence I do not intend to speak too much about the building's background. Perhaps let me talk about the unique features of the building, so that colleague can have some idea or look further into the details.

This building is in fact very environment-friendly, only that many Members do not understand how it is so. This building has balconies on all sides and a wide arcade surrounding the ground floor. What are the uses of these designs? Hong Kong's climate is very hot, the surrounding arcade serves to shelter the public and Members from rain and strong sunlight when they enter the ground floor of the building. As regards the balconies, they can protect the building by preventing direct sunlight from shining into it, and thereby makes the building more environment-friendly.

Why does the Legislative Council need to move to a new location? One of the reasons is of course the need for more space to cater for operational needs. Sometimes I just wonder, why do we not make good use of the balconies of the building? The people every where in Hong Kong have erected unauthorized building structures on their balconies, (*Laughter*), then why do not make good use of the balconies before moving to another place? I have asked this question many times. Actually, my point is: why do we not make good use of the space on the outside of the building? There is yet another interesting point which Members may not have noticed. Although the Legislative council Building was designed by some British architects, the building was still designed with some oriental characteristics. As Members may all have noticed, the roofs of the building are all covered by layers of Chinese tiles. The most unique feature is the wooden brackets supporting the roofs. We can see such brackets outside Conference Room A, and they are carved with lucky cloud patterns (if Members have blackwood furniture at home, they can see that the same cloud patterns on the furniture). Those wooden brackets are made of teak, which is a typical Hong Kong style. The external walls of the building are engraved with many carvings, and one of such is in Roman, which reads "Erected A.D. 1900". Earlier on, the Deputy President has mentioned that the building was completed in 1912. Why did it take such a long time to complete the building? PESCOD is right in saying that it will take seven years to construct a public housing estate, because the construction work of this building already takes 12 years to complete. What has gone wrong? Certainly, something must have gone wrong with the

foundation work; otherwise, things would not have turned out like that. All these could be found in some documentary records.

Deputy President, I love buildings, and I love to wander around to see things. Many special features can be found in the different areas of the building, and it is a pity that I cannot pay a visit to the roofs. Actually, there is some space between the ceiling and the dome crowning the building, and the dome serves to enhance the external appearance of the building. The dome is a common feature for important buildings, such as cathedrals and some ancient buildings. However, the indoor headroom of the buildings will be made a lot lower, so that the air-conditioning expenses will not too huge.

This building has won a number of awards which are worth mentioning. To begin with, the Legislative Council Building has won an award from the Institute of Architects for its revitalization works, as this is an old building originally housing the Court and subsequently revitalized to house the Legislative Council. If we pay attention enough, we can see a plaque giving some details of such development. This building has many other plaques giving information on the building. Besides, the foundation stone outside also tells us what the situation was like at the time when it was laid. As I have talked about the dome just now, I would also like to mention one point which not many Members may know. When we walk outside this building later on, we can take a look at the small tower on top of the dome. What is inside that small tower? I believe not many Members know the answer, and perhaps Dr Margaret NG may know what is inside the tower. Placed inside the tower is a crown, a crown of the then King Edward, symbolizing that the British were "overwhelming" the Legislative Council. Hence, if Members would wish to make any changes, they should do something with that crown.

Some rumour claims that we may not be moving to the Tamar site — I need to make some clarifications here — we should thank the Secretary General for her good efforts, without which the different divisions of the Legislative Council Secretariat cannot work under the same roof in the new Complex located in the Tamar site. As we all know, the offices of many Members are not located inside the Legislative Council Building, neither are the places of work of many Secretariat staff members. I am not sure if Members are aware or not, but the Legislative Council is in fact "supporting" many people. Even though there are only 60 Members, do we have any idea how many reporters and personal



assistants to Members are working here? Do we know how many staff members the Secretariat has? The Council is supporting the livelihood of many people, but we do not have enough space to cater for operational needs. When the Legislative Council is relocated to the new Complex at Tamar, we can meet with the different streams of personnel working for the Legislative council. I expect very much to see some new environment and new outlook upon the relocation to the new Legislative Council Complex.

After many changes in its use, the building will soon be housing a part of the judiciary again. Instead of the High Court, this time the building will be housing the Court of Final Appeal. I am very glad that I can be a part of the process and have worked in this building. One of the factors that have caused me to decide to become a Member of the Council is this building. I just hope that I can do something in relation to this building upon retirement. Thank you.

**MR JEFFREY LAM** (in Cantonese): Deputy President, today is really like the blossoming of one hundred flowers with a huge array of very splendid colours. I notice that many Members are dressed very beautifully today — in red, in green, in yellow and in purple, with some even in a combination of many different colours that makes them stand out sharply. Usually, when Members speak in this Chamber, I will look around in case I find their remarks disagreeable. So, my mind has actually recorded many unforgettable events in the past.

Today's Legislative Council meeting is the last one before recess, and this motion is the last of all Members' motions. I am very much grateful to Ms Miriam LAU for proposing this motion. I am supportive of it. In past meetings, different political parties would invariably cling to their respective political positions, engaging themselves in eloquent and heated debates. Sometimes, I could even observe tension on Members' faces. The atmosphere today, however, is much lighter, with all Members pouring out many recollections for everybody's sharing.

Today's meeting is actually very meaningful as we will not be holding any more meetings in this building after this session. We went through many historic events right here, and we are also witness to the century-old history of this valuable building. This farewell motion today has aroused some sadness of departure in me, turning me a bit melancholic. Perhaps because other Members

share the same feeling in such a situation, the "smell of gunfire" today is less acrid.

Deputy President, we are but sojourners in this century-old building. It is my honour to be able to serve as a Member during this term of the Legislative Council because I can thus inherit the past and herald the future. To begin with, I can witness how this Legislative Council Building brings full circle to its historical mission. Second, we will move to the new Legislative Council Complex at Tamar. I have not been to there, but some friends of mine and Members have. We will also have an opportunity to visit the new Legislative Council Complex on the 19th of this month. I know there are a lot of glass panels, but I do not know whether they can withstand the impact of bananas or other objects. After relocation, they may change their tactic and switch to hurling durians instead.

Deputy President, you are a very senior Member of this legislature, much more experienced than me. I have been working here for seven years only, and this year is the seventh year. Over these seven years, I have been working happily with all other Members. I remember that although we usually speak in this Chamber from our own standpoints, we did have some sort of co-operation after the outbreak of SARS, putting forward many proposals to the Government that helped the Hong Kong economy turn round the corner. And, in 2005, we also witnessed the voting down of the constitutional reform package. It was not until last year that a revised package was finally passed by two thirds of Members. This is also a milestone.

In addition, the marathon meeting on considering the appropriation request related to the Express Rail Link is likewise an unforgettable incident in my memory. After the meeting that night, perhaps we did not leave early enough, we had to spend quite a long night inside the building. Here, I really have to thank Pauline. She showed very great care for us, asking us whether we were hungry, whether we were scared, and whether we were disturbed by the din outside. She even bought wonton noodle, congee, and so on for us ..... No congee? Right, no congee. Perhaps, I really have too many memories. I remember that we even went upstairs and took photographs of ourselves. After that, we left the building. On our way to the subway, Dr Philip WONG walking behind me was unfortunately hit in the head by a plastic bottle, perhaps because of his height. So, being tall may not be so good after all. But I hope that such

culture of violence will not be brought from this building to the new Legislative Council Complex.

Sometimes, during our meetings, people may observe that some Members are not present. They are not lazy because they may be holding meetings in the rooms upstairs. It is 1 pm now, so Members may be having lunch upstairs. In this building, there is a very famous "corridor of Shaolin wooden men", where we and journalists often have exchanges, trying to get information from one another and chatting openly and happily. I do not know whether there will also be a "corridor of wooden men" or "corridor of glass" in the new Legislative Council Complex. But all these are my memories. Many journalists come here to cover news, and every four years, we will see big changes. Some journalists may quit journalism and become assistants to new Members. This goes on and on, but our friendship remains.

My only hope is that we can respect one another in the new Chamber. I am not merely talking about the relationship among Members themselves. I am also talking about the relationship with journalists or Pauline's staff. I also hope our relationship with government officials can be more harmonious. Of course, I understand what some Members meant when they said that since government officials refused to give any replies, it would be difficult for the relationship to be harmonious. I understand that if government officials can offer more satisfactory replies, the relationship will be more harmonious. But it is still alright if disharmony is going to stay. The most important point is that we should argue verbally only, rather than hurling any objects. I know that "Tai-fai" and the rest of "The Five Loners" have each bought a helmet because "Yuk-man", "Long Hair" and "Big Guy" will be sitting behind them. "The Five Loners" thus fear that once these Members miss the targets, they may get hurt. Anyway, today is a very important moment in history (*The buzzer sounded*) .....

**DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Your speaking time is up.

**MR ALAN LEONG** (in Cantonese): Deputy President, today, we bid farewell to one of the few declared monuments in Hong Kong — the Legislative Council Building. As we are saying goodbye to this building, perhaps I should say a few words on my connection with this historic building.

The first time I set foot on this building was in 1983 when I was admitted to the bar. The ceremony was held right in this building where this Council is now housed. The next time that I had the honour to come to this Legislative Council Building was many years later in 2002, when I was Chairman of the Hong Kong Bar Association. At that time, the Legislative Council was dealing with the enactment of legislation to implement Article 23 of the Basic Law in Hong Kong — I was here to attend a public hearing. I can still remember vividly that the day after the public hearing, the *Apple Daily* carried a very large caricature of me with many arrows on my back. After that, the first time I ever set foot on this building again was in 2004 when I was sworn in here as a Member of this Council.

Having talked about my connection with the Legislative Council Building, I would like to take the opportunity of speaking on this motion today to refresh our memory that this building has witnessed the most important 26 years of development in Hong Kong's political ecology.

Initially after the turning of this edifice into the Legislative Council Building, there were only 12 directly-elected Members. Subsequently, the number increased to 20, and then 30. When the number increased to half, that is, 30, progress was held up by a decision made by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress. However, it remains a fact that this building has indeed witnessed such a development.

In addition, Chater Garden in the vicinity of this building has also witnessed several important events in Hong Kong's democratic movement that are related to me. To begin with, my involvement in politics owed its beginning to the assembly held at the night of 9 July 2003, when large numbers of participants in Chater Garden requested me to consider going into politics. After thorough consideration, I made a decision seven or eight months later in 2004, and announced — also in Chater Garden — that I would run in the Legislative Council election. In 2007, the mobilization rally in support of my candidacy in the Chief Executive election was likewise held in Chater Garden. Needless to say, the kick-off ceremony for the "*de facto* referendum" campaign last year was held in the carpark at 1 Jackson Road just outside this building.

(THE PRESIDENT resumed the Chair)

Having mentioned the increase in the number of directly-elected Members and the several important events related to me, I also wish to add that if I describe the Legislative Council as witnessing the maturing of Hong Kong's civil society and the rising public demand for political participation over the past 26 years, I think nobody will raise any objection. As remarked by some experienced Members earlier on, 26 years ago, in the initial days after this building became the seat of the Legislative Council, nearly all meetings in this building were held behind closed doors. And, no Member would suddenly emerge from the Chamber to speak before the microphones of the media. Back then, only the President and the spokespersons appointed by him would come out to meet the press. Today, naturally, as democratic elements in Hong Kong increase, and as Hong Kong's civil society matures and turns more and more active, what we now witness is an increasingly mature aspiration to political participation.

In the process of China's political and governance modernization, Hong Kong has actually been playing a very important role. The Legislative Council was China's earliest window of opening on the world, a place where Chinese culture and Western culture first blended and interacted. It inspired many personalities, including the Founding Father of Modern China, Dr SUN Yat-sen. I hope that after moving to the new Legislative Council Complex at Tamar, this Council can inherit this important historical task of Hong Kong, bearing witness to a more mature civil society and the establishment of a democratic political system.

President, I wish to spend the last minute of my speaking time on thanking the Secretary General of the Legislative Council Secretariat and her staff. I think the President will probably share my feeling. Under the leadership of the Secretary General, all staff members of the Secretariat, be they front-line or back-end support personnel, have been totally dedicated to their work. They are also very friendly, so friendly that some even greet me with practically a 90-degree bow when they see me. This must be the result of the Secretary General's good training and a manifestation of her staff members' love and respect for their jobs. Speaking of love and respect for one's job, I must mention a front-line staff member, Mr Andy LAU, who is also known as "Prince Charming of the Legislative Council". Is the President aware of this? His amicable behaviour has built a very good image of the Legislative Council in the eyes of the public. I so submit.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Members can rest assured that the Secretary General and all her staff, including "Prince Charming of the Legislative Council", will move with us to the new Legislative Council Complex. They will not be left behind.*(Laughter)*

**DR JOSEPH LEE** (in Cantonese): President, with the President's reminder, it has dawned on me that today's meeting is not my last one in the legislature — it just happens to be the last meeting before the end of this Legislative Session. The important thing is that the Legislative Council Building will still be here. The only thing is that we are not going to work here any more and will move to another place. The Building, however, will still be here.

I am grateful to Ms Miriam LAU for proposing this motion on "Bidding farewell to the Legislative Council Building". I hope I will still be elected a Member next year, for it will not be so nice to bid farewell to the Legislative Council in case of anything goes wrong.

President, I likewise have special feelings about this building. Before 2004, this building had nothing to do with me. Back then, I was just an ordinary passer-by who would, at the sight of this building, marvel at its majesty and wish to have a look inside. My parents once brought me to the Statue Square when I was small. I seldom went there afterwards. I often walked past this building on the way as I had to go to Central on the MTR, but I never went inside it

In 2004, I began to have connection with this building as I was elected to the Legislative Council and must start working here as a Member. This building henceforth changed from a place totally unrelated to me to a venue full of fun, amazement and excitement, one which I would love to explore. I can remember a certain story about the basement in this building, one which some Members have already told. Gossip has it that the basement is fitted with a tunnel leading to the Government House (formerly the Governor's residence), and that lots of weird things are found there. I once managed to find time to visit the basement, only to find that nothing but only machinery was there. Anyway, I still found the experience quite a lot of fun.

Also, I always lose my way in this building. This was honestly already the case when I first joined the Legislative Council. This building is designed

with a square-shaped layout, and I can still remember that in those days, I was never able to locate Conference Room A and Conference Room C no matter how hard I tried. Even after walking round and round, I could not find the way. Once when I was in the Dinning Hall having lunch with other Members, we heard the ringing of the division bell. The division bell would ring for three minutes, and we must run back to the Chamber within one minute to cast our votes. We left the Dinning Hall at the same time, and they were older than me, so it puzzled me as to why they could arrive earlier than me. I told myself that this did not stand to reason at all. Later, I came to realize that they had taken the shorter route and I the longer. In the initial days, I frequently lost my way. Because of the peculiar design of this building, I felt like being inside an amazing and exciting place in those days.

Also, I wish to talk about our Dining Hall. Before going there for the first time, I had very high expectations, thinking that it must be a lot of fun to eat in the dinning hall of one of the power centers in Hong Kong. But upon arrival, I found that it was only a self-service eating venue, meaning that one must serve oneself, and the food was all cold. I then realized that there was nothing special about the Dinning Hall. Later, I told myself that things should actually be like this anyway. First, we must pay for the food ourselves, and this should also be how public money was to be used. Anyway, being able to eat in this place is already a delightful experience. But I have also come to realize that it is not such a mysterious place after all.

Having worked in this Building for a few years, slowly, I am able to lift or remove the veil on this very building. I am already very familiar with this building, and I probably will not lose my way any more, nor do I still find anything amazing about it. However, on the eve of parting with this building, some special feelings still well up inside me. I can remember several special incidents.

Some friends and Members have mentioned the carpark, which, I must say, provides us with fast and convenient service. But I must also disclose that our carpark was the first carpark where I performed a task related to my profession. One day, there was a mild accident involving a vehicle and a colleague there, and the colleague's foot was hurt. As I happened to be passing by, I immediately gave him some initial nursing care until the ambulance arrived.

There was another accident that happened during a Council meeting of this term. Prompted by my professional instinct, I hastened to offer help. That was also quite an experience. I think this building is not suitable for certain activities because its design is too old, or I should say that it is very cramped in design. I remember that when we were carrying down the injured, we were constrained by the very narrow staircase. Perhaps, that was why Ms LI Fung-ying fell and hurt herself. The design of this building is very old, and I thus find many interesting things about it.

There is another point of interest to me in this building. One day, someone said to me, "Joe, it seems that you have never conducted any guided tours of the Legislative Council Building." I wondered what activity he was talking about. I also asked myself whether I was actually required to serve as a tour guide. Right, Members have to serve as your guides. But I forgot about the whole thing in 2004. So, I started to do so from 2005 onwards. A tour guide must do preparation, and it was only when doing so that I came to realize many little-known facts about this building, such as its hundred-year-old history, and what happened in the course of its construction. Having conducted some guided tours, I now know several things that Members may be unaware of. Outside Conference Room A and the Dining Hall upstairs, the rooftop was supported by layers of bucket arches, shaped like those "auspicious clouds" appearing in "Monkey King" cartoon serials. I used this as a means of describing the Legislative Council, telling young people that the Legislative Council would not fly away for reasons of its support by a lot of "auspicious clouds". Such a building is rarely found in other places.

Apart from all these, we also see a variety of designs in different parts of the Legislative Council Building, all very unique. While the staircases are old and elegant in design, the designs of many other parts of the building are equally unique. What is more, why is the Statue Square near the Legislative Council so named? Well, 100 years ago, there was indeed a bronze statue of Queen Victoria over there because she preferred this site. Subsequently, perhaps because it was felt that the site was not such a pleasant place, the Government relocated the statue Victoria Park. This is the origin of the name "Statue Square". But interestingly, the bronze statue itself is now located in Victoria Park.



All this is what I learnt from conducting guided tours of the Legislative Council Building. In brief, I can observe many interesting features of this building. Whichever organizations are going to move into this building, its many features will remain all the same, only that they may not be noticed. With the passage time, we may get used to all the features and forget all about them.

Naturally, there are still many other things about this Building. Unlike other experienced Members, I am not so deeply touched. However, I have one hope, the hope that one feature of this building will never change. I am talking about the statue of Goddess Themis outside. It does not matter how we call it — the goddess statue, the goddess of democracy statue or the statue of the blind-folded goddess. The important thing is that the statue signifies fairness and impartiality under the law. The building was originally used by the Court, and later it was used to house the law-making body. Interestingly it is now going to be returned to the Court. I hope that following our relocation, it can become a "new" building — "new" in the sense of its new role — and resume its business a hundred years ago — serving as Hong Kong's gatekeeper of law and adjudication. This is something very important.

Friends, colleagues and Members of the Legislative Council who are present now will shortly move to the new Legislative Council Complex. Naturally, we hope that this will lead to a new and majestic atmosphere because we all believe that with the design of "Doors Always Open", close contacts with society will be possible. However, I have heard Mr SHEK crack one joke — the new Complex is actually like "a phony millionaire looking to the North". Well, having to look to the North actually signifies that we are all "incompetent". I hope this will not be the case. I hope that the objective realities will turn out to like this — after our relocation to the new complex, all will be like "old wine in a new bottle", meaning that the same people will still be there, and the only difference is that they all work in a new place. We hope that the relationship between the executive and the legislature will be disharmonious as ever — oh, I of course do not wish to see this. As we bid farewell to this old edifice today, I hope that it can henceforth play a new role. I also hope that although the new complex to which we are moving looks very differently, we people in the Legislative Council will continue to cling to our different ways all the same. Thank you, President.

**MR CHEUNG KWOK-CHE** (in Cantonese): President, I am very grateful to Ms Miriam LAU for moving this motion. I am a newcomer. I have been a Member for less than three years, so my seniority should be the lowest.

Just now, I heard a large number of experienced Members talk about many interesting stories, anecdotes and memorable events of the Legislative Council. All this was just like a recorded lesson and lively book, something that brought us back to the old days.

Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong talked about the round columns and the dome just now. Frankly speaking, I seldom look at these things. Usually, I will sit down right after entering, write down a few lines, listen to Members' speeches for a while, have a few words with others, and simply go out for a cup of coffee if I get bored. Reminded by Mr CHEUNG's remark, I have tried looking up. I now realize that the dome is indeed very lofty, resembling the boundless cosmos. If one is a person with imagination, one's breadth of mind will certainly increase as one looks up at it.

I think the most representative and eye-catching feature of the Legislative Council must be the statue of Goddess Themis mentioned by Dr Joseph LEE just now. According to the information gathered by my staff, Goddess Themis holds in her right hand a pair of scales which represent fairness and impartiality. She also holds in her left hand a sword symbolic of her power. Most importantly, the Goddess is blind-folded, signifying the impartiality and fairness of law. I often ask myself whether the Legislative Council should also be like this. The relocation of the Legislative Council to this century-old building years ago, I believe, should have been underlined by a special purpose, the purpose of enabling the Legislative Council to inherit the impartiality of the Supreme Court, so that it could discuss different issues and handle the bills submitted by the Government in a fair, impartial and open manner. I wish to see the continuation of this tradition and spirit after the removal of the Legislative Council to Tamar.

In fact, it is not exactly true to say that my encounter with the Legislative Council Building started only two years ago. More than a decade ago, I already came to the outside of this building very often. As rightly pointed out by Mr KAM Nai-wai earlier, we came here for staging petitions and handing in submissions, in the hope that the voices of the public or grassroots could be brought into the Legislative Council through the Legislative Council Members at

that time. We also hoped that the Legislative Council could make decisions in a fair, open and impartial manner.

Even before joining the Legislative Council, some friends already reminded me that I should not expect too much of the Legislative Council. Following my joining the Council, I have come to realize the partisan nature of the 60 Legislative Council Members, and I have also noticed that sometimes, owing to political differences, Members are unable to assist the legislature in doing things which are beneficial to society. I do find this a bit regrettable. For this reason, I have been reminding myself constantly that I must always do what is demanded of my job here. This is the most important thing.

President, I represent the social welfare sector on this Council, and I am a functional constituency (FC) Member. I have explained that the abolition of FCs is one of the goals I want to achieve by joining the Legislative Council. But we have failed completely to achieve this goal over the past two years or so. This building has seen the democratic progress of the Legislative Council. Had it also been able to witness the full implementation of universal suffrage for electing Legislative Council Members, there would have been a perfect ending. Let me bring the regret left behind by the Legislative Council Building to the new Legislative Council Complex. I hope that dual universal suffrage can be implemented as early as possible after our relocation to the new Legislative Council Complex.

My last point is that as said by some Members earlier, there are many staff members in the Legislative Council Secretariat — from the Secretary General down to those personnel providing security and other support services. We are not their employers, but they show great respect for us and are just like our friends. Over the two years or so, I have noticed that all Members and Secretariat staff could get along sincerely and with mutual respect. I wish that such relationship can be maintained. I also hope that after the turning of this building into the Court of Final Appeal, we can better uphold the parliamentary spirit of our legislature. Thank you, President.

**MR RONNY TONG** (in Cantonese): President, I arrived at this Chamber as early as 8.30 am this morning. As I sat alone in this empty Chamber reading the documents before the commencement of the meeting, all sorts of feelings welled

up inside me. President, I have thousands of words to say, but I do not really know what to begin with. I do not know what to begin with because my life-long career is inextricably related to this building.

President, I remember that the first time I came to this building was when I was a final-year law student in university. I was here for the final of a moot court competition held upstairs in what is now the Dining Hall (then a courtroom). The presiding Judge was a Supreme Court Judge. My opponent was Mr Edward CHAN, now already a well-known senior counsel. I won the competition.

The first case I handled on my first day of practice was heard in the same courtroom and presided over by the same Judge. But I lost. At the time, I took my defeat very much to heart until a senior lawyer exhorted me that my defeat in my first case was something positive because, first, my arrogance could be subdued; and, second, I could thus understand that there was always a discrepancy between ideals and the realities. President, it was only when I became a Member of this Council some years later that I came to truly understand his point.

President, when I first set foot on this building, it did not occur to me that I was to have such an indissoluble relationship with it. The place where I spent the bulk of my time was this Chamber, then the Supreme Court Library. Next on the list was the small room now called the radio room opposite Conference Room A. It was then a tuck shop. I do not know whether I was the last person to speak in this building before the removal of the Supreme Court; even if the answer is negative, I must still be one of the last few persons to speak here. The last time I spoke here in the days of the Supreme Court before its removal was when I spoke downstairs in a courtroom on the side of the existing western exit nearest to the MTR station. The presiding Judge was drowsy on the point of dozing off, when all of a sudden the building shook all over. When the Judge thus came to a rude awaking, he asked what had happened. Everyone thought it was an earthquake. But the security guards came along 10 minutes later to ask us to evacuate the building immediately, saying that as a result of the MTR Corporation's construction works of Central Station nearby, the building had become a dangerous building. Sadly, we did not have any chance of bidding farewell to the building at that time as we do today.

President, later, when I came back to this building again for the first time, I was here in the capacity as Chairman of the Hong Kong Bar Association, sitting on Mr Alan LEONG's present seat and giving views on the interpretation of the Basic Law by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress. At that time, I found the remarks of the government officials and Members totally not to the point. I later realized that this was actually a tradition in the Legislative Council. Even now, it is still the same. However, President, the mixed feelings I now have are not caused by such trivial matters, but by my perception of this building.

President, when I first saw this building as a child on a tram ride past Central, it impressed me as a place for the pursuit of justice and a symbol of social justice. Throughout my career as a barrister, I have been able to see the upholding of justice. Admittedly, justice cannot possibly be upheld in each and every case, but most of the time justice can be upheld. In court, most disputes will come to an end one day. It is always either victory or defeat, and sometimes out-of-court settlement, of course. In contrast, I have not noticed any traces of this in the Legislative Council since I became a Member seven years ago.

President, I dare not say that the goddess of justice on the rooftop is ashamed of what happened in the Legislative Council during its stay here, but I dare not say that she is thus delighted or proud either. President, the only pleasant thing to us today is that this building will be returned to a place for the upholding of justice at long last. My farewell to this building today is not going to be the last one, or the first one either. I hope that there will be chances for me to return to this building for upholding justice in the future. Perhaps, I should say that it is right, in the final analysis, to relocate the Legislative Council to the new complex, so as to give it a new image in the eyes of Hong Kong people. I just hope that the realities can converge with our ideal, and that we can see the eventual emergence of democracy in the new complex one day. Thank you, President.

**DR MARGARET NG** (in Cantonese): President, I speak against the motion. The new Legislative Council Complex at Tamar actually fails to meet the most basic requirement of the Legislative Council Commission, that is, there should be a clear demarcation between the executive and the legislature in terms of the

architecture massing. If the new Complex is accessible from the waterfront promenade in the north, this requirement can then be met. Unfortunately, it is not until the last minute that the authorities informed us construction for facilities like the waterfront promenade, the Tamar station and the bus stops will not be soon, and there is no time-table available. Right now, one must get to the new Complex from Admiralty, and the only way to do so is to pass through the main building of the executive. If one has to go to the Legislative Council, he must get past the government headquarters. In principle, such an arrangement runs counter to our most basic requirement. Thus, in my opinion, before the public can enter the Legislative Council in a dignified manner from the front door in the north, we should not move into the new Complex at Tamar.

President, regarding Ms Miriam LAU's motion, what I agree is that this building has its historical mission, a very distinctive mission. The foundation of this building was laid in 1903; it was completed in 1911 and was officially opened in 1912. It was not just designed as Hong Kong's High Court to start with. In the Far East, this building symbolizes the rule of law. It is also the most magnificent court building of the British Empire outside its territory. Therefore, the original mission of this building was extremely eminent.

President, in 1985, this building was formally handed over to the Legislative Council. The building's symbolic value is enormous since upon the signing of the Sino-British Joint Declaration, Hong Kong's most important mission is to develop a democratic political system. The Legislative Council or the legislature is the core of the democratic political system, thus, it can no longer come under the executive building, and must have its separate building. On the formation of the legislature, whether it is going from indirect election to direct election, or from partial direct election to the full direct election as we desire, it is very monumental that the legislature can operate independently on its own during the process.

The legislature has passed numerous legislation, including the Legislative Council (Powers and Privileges) Ordinance and the Legislative Council Commission Ordinance, giving the legislature an independent status. Moreover, from 1985 to date or a few years ago, we have established the Legislative Council's regulations and system, including the Rules of Procedure and the panel system. Among the major and minor lawsuits, we have highlighted the constitutional status of the Legislative Council. Transiting from the old era to

the new, the former legislature during the time when Hong Kong was under British rule became the legislature under the Basic Law. Not only does it have a separate building, but also, it has its independent system. More importantly, since 1985, we have come up with a professional and independent secretariat, and its professional status is of significance.

President, with the passage of the political reform package in 2010, I think the development of the democratic political system has reached another stage, and it may be high time for this building to be returned. Thereafter, this building will become the Court of Final Appeal (CFA), which is very appropriate. President, be it the executive or the legislature, it is still a political structure. Our days ahead and Hong Kong's future rest on the rule of law. The relocation of the CFA to Central, this place in the heart of Hong Kong, attracts attention. Let us see if judicial independence can be sustained. In the future, this is of utmost importance.

President, many colleagues today have expounded on their respective memories. Of course, everyone has his own memories, I am no exception. Yet, I do not consider today as important, and it is not necessary for us to make those comments. Rather, I think the constitutional symbol is more important. President, since 1995, I have been a Member of the Legislative Council representing the legal sector, my major task is to strive to ensure a smooth transition for the rule of law. This building will become the CFA. Today, even though I may find it hard to part, I do not need to be overly reluctant because so long as I remain a practising counsel, I still hope that I can return to this building to work, and continue to work hard to safeguard the rule of law.

Thank you, President.

**MR FREDERICK FUNG** (in Cantonese): President, this building underwent conversion between 1983 and 1985 before being taken up by the Legislative Council. In 1984, it was listed as a statutory monument. In the beginning, this building housed the High Court, only to be handed over to the Legislative Council afterwards; in the future, it will become the Court of Final Appeal. Obviously, since its construction, the positioning of this building has been inseparable with law. Regardless of whether it is on the law enactment or judicial level, it has been playing a very major positioning role.

I wish to try to see from this building the changes it has witnessed in these 26 years. The first being witnessed is the separation of the executive and the legislature. In the past, the Governor of Hong Kong was both the chief executive and the President of the Legislative Council; when David WILSON was Hong Kong's Governor, he retreated to the executive and the Legislative Council was to choose its President. The then President was John SWAINE who was an appointed Member. Afterwards, the popularly elected Andrew WONG took his place. This change from placing the legislature instead of the executive in charge of its meetings, then from having an appointed Member to a popularly elected Member is the first major change.

The second change witnessed is that in the past, the executive and the legislature would hold joint meetings, chaired by the senior member of the Executive Council (Lydia DUNN at that time), to discuss some co-ordination and consultation matters. However, the meetings saw more and more arguments and co-ordination became increasingly impossible. In the end, the Executive Council and the Legislative Council held their respective meetings. This is the second change.

The third change involves Members' background. In the past, all Members were appointed, but they became mainly returned through functional constituency elections, supplemented by 12 Members through geographical constituency elections, the number of whom then expanded to 20 to 30. Currently, popularly elected Members account for half of the seats. This is the democratization process of the entire Council. Nonetheless, to date, we have only achieved half of that process. Regretably, another half waits to be accomplished.

The fourth change is the seniority system of the past. That was the tradition left behind by the British-style parliament when Members delivered their speeches. On the back of democratic elections held in 1991, the seniority system then turned into Members coming together in groups and parties. Now, it has descended into a split between the pro-establishment camp and the democratic camp. We can see that it has evolved from the appointment style into doing things in their own way, then to the present mode of Members organizing themselves internally.



The fifth witnessed is a change in parliamentary culture. It can be said that we are going public, and this can be realized in several aspects. The first is attire. I remember when I came here the first time, everybody was wearing suit and tie (maybe Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung was not yet elected then. I presume he is the first Member who does not wear a tie). Now, Members can put on T-shirts, or even very colourful clothes. Then comes the props. I wonder if the President is aware that Frederick FUNG is the first Member to bring props into the Chamber. At the end of 1991, I brought with me an imperial sword when I directed my question at the Land Development Corporation to symbolize that it could acquire a building or the property of an owner as it wished. On that occasion, I was here holding the imperial sword as I raised my question. Of course, Members now do not only bring along props, but also a range of unimaginable things which can both be displayed and hurled. The third is speeches. The speeches we used to hear during debates were very decent but now, they can be very sharp and impassioned; even what sounds like foul language is allowed.

The sixth change is the Secretariat. President, when I first became a Member, Secretariat staff were all civil servants providing two kinds of services. The first was the transcription of Chinese and English speeches, which also included translation. If the speeches were written in English, they would translate them into Chinese, and *vice versa*, but the texts had to be made available three days in advance. At that time, I could not figure out why every time I asked a question, the officials were able to provide clear replies promptly. Since they were all civil servants, I doubted if any civil servant had secretly passed our drafts to those civil servants for perusal beforehand.

The second service was that every AO grade staff of the Secretariat was to serve three Members, tending to even their personal needs. For example, when I got married in 1992, a staff asked if I needed any help with my wedding. I wondered but the staff said that was allowed and he would try his best to help. So, he helped me with all the visa applications required for the trip after the wedding, visiting the different consulates. Despite such services, we were not impressed because as the Secretariat for the legislature, it should not have connection with the executive, nor should it provide that many personal services. Therefore, within a short span, we turned the Secretariat into the Legislative Council's own Secretariat, with no more civil servants or personal services.

We have witnessed these six changes, and today is possibly the last one or two days we will spend in this building, and we have to leave in the future. This building is an important cornerstone in the entire process of our democratic transformation, but this is not enough, much remains to be changed. How are we to turn the Legislative Council with half of its seats being directly elected into a Legislative Council formed by universal suffrage? In the future, how can the Chief Executive, who is elected by the small circle and who takes questions from us, be elected by universal suffrage? How can the present pro-establishment and pan-democratic divide become one between the ruling and opposition camps? How can we build up a sound and healthy parliamentary culture or democratic culture? All these await our laying of another important cornerstone in the new Complex. I wish this can be witnessed in the Legislative Council Complex at Tamar in the future.

President, in the little time left, I would like to talk about two first occasions of my own. The first time I shed my tears in the Legislative Council was on the day when a moment of silence was observed for the death of NG Ming-yam who was a very dear friend of mine. When I stood for election in 1983, he helped me with campaigning in Sham Shui Po. Another first occasion is the imperial sword which I mentioned earlier. When I took it out, President SWAINE said no props were allowed here and asked me to put it on the ground after display. Third, I was the Member who raised the most questions, and I still am. This is because I think directing questions at the Government is the most important role of a Member.

Thank you, President.

**MR CHAN KIN-POR** (in Cantonese): President, for the current term of the Legislative Council, I am a new Member. I feel honoured to be in time to take part in the business of the Council conducted in this almost century-old building before relocation. No matter how different our views may be, I believe every Member will agree that the Legislative Council Building is very important to Hong Kong. It has witnessed Hong Kong's development in the last century, especially the Legislative Council Building during the British Hong Kong era, which had since 1985 experienced the gains and losses and ups and downs of Hong Kong's political arena.

As the Legislative Council is relocating soon, many friends from the insurance sector expressed their wish to visit the Building. Playing the role of a guide, I showed them round the Building, and therefore also had the opportunity to re-examine every corner inside. The Legislative Council Building is modeled on the architectural design of ancient Rome and Greece, with a dome in the centre surrounded by 17-meter high Ionic columns. The roof is covered with Chinese tiles and the eaves are supported by conventional teak trays. On top of the roof is the statue of Goddess Themis, standing 2.7 m tall symbolizing justice. After the visit, all my friends were amazed at the dome structure, the 17-metre tall columns and the statue of the goddess of justice of the Building.

Actually, whenever I feel very tired during meetings in the Chamber, I will look up to admire this magnificent dome. It gives me an open and relaxed feeling and before I realize, I am refreshed.

Looking back at these three years working in the Building, there are mixed feelings in my heart — times of happiness, disappointment and distress. Anyway, every moment in this Building will remain in my heart. I met four buddies in the Building. I remember when I first stepped into the Legislative Council, I was a newcomer with no political background. Many political parties or groups would like to invite me to join them. They were very intense in their action. So, I told a Member to whom I am particularly close (that is, Dr LAM Tai-fai) that if we did not come together, I would "marry" other political parties.

Thus, the five close Members who sit on the same row formed an alliance. Since I began "dating", no one "courted" me again. As we did not have an official name, the media referred to us as the "five free recluses". This sounded a bit odd to me in the beginning, but there was nothing wrong with it. Moreover, it is also quite an appropriate description of our relationship.

At first, we held our breakfast meeting at the China Club before the Council held its regular meeting but because two of our fellows (Mr Paul CHAN and Dr Samson TAM) have religious belief and have to attend morning prayers every Wednesday, they could not join our breakfast meeting on time. As a result, we changed to holding meetings at the Legislative Council Building on Fridays. However, as we are all very busy, it is difficult to gather for meetings. Gradually, we switched to communicating directly on the phone whenever a major issue requiring discussion cropped up. During the regular meetings, we

will grasp every opportunity to come together for discussion when time allows, to see how we should tackle certain issues. Many people think that we are slack. Frankly, slack we may seem but when it comes to action, our principle is compromise and mutual respect, and we always are closely connected.

Although there is still more than one year before the change of term, I would like to express my true feelings today through this motion on "Bidding Farewell to the Legislative Council Building". If we brothers of five are willing to run again, I sincerely hope that the five of us can all return to the new Legislative Council Complex for the new term of the Legislative Council.

President, I so submit.

**MS CYD HO** (in Cantonese): President, for the past century, this building has witnessed the different stages of development of Hong Kong's political system: from the control of the Legislative Council by the executive during the former British Hong Kong era, to the encouraging democratic development every 10 years before 1997, then to the indefinite implementation of the democracy promised to Hong Kong in the Basic Law after 1997.

During these few stages, elected Members make this Council all the more open to society. The role of civil society becomes more and more important and there is also increased participation of civil groups.

Parliamentary culture is influenced by hardware as well as building structure. In this building, the public gallery is where civil society is accommodated the most. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung and Ms Emily LAU mentioned earlier my interaction with them from the public gallery before 1997. Before 1998, I was a member of the civil group Ant Alliance, and had also engaged in non-compliant behaviour in the public gallery.

I remember on one occasion, when Chris PATTEN was pitching the political reform package in this Chamber, our member hung down a banner from the public gallery, reading "the public to vote on the political system". That simply meant "referendum". In the past, the colonial government would not see referendum as an enemy, nor would it put up a fight on hearing the demand for referendum. Chris PATTEN's response then to those Members who were in the

Chamber was that audio-visual teaching materials on political reform were again available. This is how they accommodated divergent views.

When it came to the debate on the political reform package in 1994, tension ran high inside the Chamber; outside, many democratic activists stayed to monitor the situation inside. At 22 minutes past five in the morning of 30 June, the full direct election option put forward by Ms Emily LAU was vetoed by a margin of one vote, members of the Ant Alliance shouted loudly "sinners in history" from the public gallery. Earlier, Mr Fred LI has fitted himself into the picture.

Yet, unfortunately, the situation now has not changed. The Legislative Council is still formed by some seats which are not generally accepted by the Hong Kong people, thereby imposing a lot of restrictions on the legislature. We can see that glass screens have been put up in the public gallery. According to the Legislative Council Commission (LCC), the glass screens can protect public safety but in fact, they are meant to prevent the public from throwing things down conveniently. The future Legislative Council Complex will install glass screens from the bottom to the top, making it impossible for the public to hang down banners.

However, the civil society is an improvement from the past. The public makes good use of the common areas around the Legislative Council Building to express their opinions. For example, parents fighting for right of abode in Hong Kong stayed in the Chater Garden for almost a month; youth opposing the Express Rail Link broadcast the meeting live via visual means in nameless road and Statue Square, so that more than a thousand members of the public outside the building could watch the discussion underway inside by the Finance Committee, while young people also marched slowly round the building. They have action, commitment and cultural foundation.

Nonetheless, the layout outside the new Legislative Council Complex is very much different from now. At the back of the Chamber is the executive. If someone has to get through the executive daily, he has to put up with the "disgrace" of having to pass under the executive, and to the left of the Chamber is the headquarters of the People's Liberation Army Hong Kong Garrison.

It is evident that such a layout for the buildings fails to bring out the independence of the legislature, and up till now, there is still no proper traffic arrangement, making it difficult for the public to gain access. If marchers want to get there, they will encounter many obstructions. Thus, we have to continue to follow up in this respect in order to maintain the legislature's culture of opening to the public.

The last thing I would like to mention is the "detention room" of the Legislative Council Building. Since more and more people resort to illegal acts in the public gallery, the LCC has come up with a set of new rules, bringing those who have broken the rules in the public gallery to the staff pantry located between the first and the second floors. During the recent debate on the political reform package, CHAN King-fai protested in the public gallery (no different from the Ant Alliance in the past) and was eventually brought to the "detention room". I paid him a visit. After being brought to the "detention room", he immediately demanded that he be allowed to continue to watch the live broadcast to update himself on the progress of the discussion.

I also feel sad repeating this incident. From fighting for direct election in 1988 to fighting for full direct election in 1994 and for political reform in 2010, the development of political system is in fact regressing, and there is no light in the tunnel for the implementation of democracy.

Yet, the continued emergence of new generations brings encouragement. Every setback and humiliation will lay a firmer foundation for the next stage.

Many people think that under this distorted parliamentary system, there is no way the *status quo* can be changed, and it is in vain to reason. Their confidence in rational debate has wavered.

Actually, before entering the parliament, we in the democratic camp are fully aware of the fact that we belong to the minority. We harbour no meaningless fantasy over protecting the freedom and rights of Hong Kong people by voting. Yet, why do we have to keep on reasoning here? We do not want to persuade those stubborn officials because in the present society, time and space have been turned around, the parliament is no longer encircled by the four walls. Through live broadcast, we can explain more devils in the details to the public

and appeal to more people who are still undecided to come out to protect Hong Kong people's rights and freedom.

President, it is said that the musical instrument violin has memory. If it falls into the hands of a master after it is made, the timbre will become more and more refined the more it is played. The same is true for the wooden chair in the concert hall in Prague. Even if a B-class national ensemble plays chamber music in the concert hall, the tone will also be very beautiful in the beginning. Yet, if such wooden musical instruments fall into the hands of ordinary people, nothing can be done to perfect the timbre.

For the stones and stone columns on the four sides of the building, after listening years and years to numerous righteous speeches, they must have picked up many senseless words. If stones have memory, they should be able to have better insight into the world situation and should become more and more accommodating and sophisticated.

Hong Kong by no means has a smooth path ahead. In *The Story of the Stone*, servant Big JIAO once said, the only clean things about the Rong and Ning Houses were the stone lions that stood outside the gate. I do not wish that this building is the only cleanest one in Hong Kong. After taking over this building, I wish the Judiciary can cling to the principle of judicial independence, defend Hong Kong's core value, and preserve for us a building which is equally solemn both inside and outside.

**MR LEE CHEUK-YAN** (in Cantonese): President, I joined the then Legislative Council in 1995. I do not know if Members are aware that I made it to the then Legislative Council under the replacement mechanism at the time. So, I must oppose the present replacement mechanism, as it takes away the right to by-elections and the right to vote.

Members all know that since we were at that time dissatisfied with the arrangements for long service payment, LAU Chin-shek moved a number of amendments to the Employment (Amendment) Bill 1994 proposed by the Administration to address the issue of long service payment. But for fear of losing, the Government withdrew the bill. LAU Chin-shek then resigned at the end of 1994 in protest.

LAU Chin-shek resigned at the end of 1994, and I contested in the Kowloon Central constituency in 1995. The "double-seat, double-vote" system was still adopted at that time, but no one contested in that constituency. It was not because anyone regarded me as a "formidable opponent" but just because only half a year was left in the remaining term of office. And, it might also be possible that they just wanted to prevent me from stirring up a *de facto* referendum. As a result, I made it to the then Legislative Council for the first time in February 1995.

The general election soon came in September 1995, and the "nine new functional constituencies (FCs)" were introduced in this election. Members will understand that as a member of the Hong Kong Confederation of Trade Unions, I must seek to assert workers' right to representation. Therefore, I ran in that election, and was successfully returned as a workers' representative. At that time, I joined the Council as the representative of the manufacturing sector.

Then, I was returned as a Member of this Council in the New Territories West constituency in 1998. As Members are aware, the 1997-1998 session was the time of the Provisional Legislative Council. This is an account of how I made my way to the legislature.

As I come from the masses, I must identify myself with the masses. So, I did not wear a tie to the then Legislative Council, as everybody could see clearly at that time. One reason for this was that no one was willing to pay. Why was it so? LAU Chin-shek was good at raising money. He wore a tie because some people were willing to pay. As he had already used this tactic to raise money by the time I joined the then Legislative Council, people would no longer pay any heed to me even if I tried to raise money that way. So, no one was willing to finance my wearing a tie. Unable to raise any money, I of course would not wear any tie. Hence, since the very beginning when I joined the then Legislative Council in 1995, I have not been wearing any tie. In a way, this is also one major change that this legislature has witnessed.

Sometimes when I try to recall what happened in the past, I will remember many regrettable events. In my view, the greatest pity is that this building has failed to witness the return of all Members of this Council by direct election. This is indeed very regrettable. Can Members recall what happened when the legislature moved into this building in 1985? FC elections were introduced that



year, meaning that a handful of Hong Kong people could henceforth have the privilege to vote. This was what happened when this building started to become the seat of the legislature.

President, FC elections have been with us for 26 years, but we are still unable to abolish the FCs and welcome the implementation of universal suffrage for electing all Members of this Council. Even the statue of the goddess on this building has chosen to "turn a blind eye" to this, as if wanting to tell us that the implementation of universal suffrage for electing all Members of this Council has yet to be realized. It has already been 26 years. What a big pity!

From my point of view, a truly honourable farewell will be possible only when the Legislative Council moves to the new complex after this building has accomplished its historical mission of witnessing the election of all Legislative Council by universal suffrage.. Now, the only thing that is left behind in this building is nothing but regret because the election of all Legislative Council Members by universal suffrage has yet to be implemented, and FC Members still account for half of the seats. How can anyone say that there has been progress? This is the first pity.

The second pity is about the Employee's Rights to Representation, Consultation and Collective Bargaining Bill moved by me and passed by the then Legislative Council in 1997. The Provisional Legislative Council, however, suspended the ordinance two weeks later, and repealed it four months afterwards. The ordinance was in force for only two weeks, so it is presumably the most short-lived legislation in the history of Hong Kong. This is also a great pity to me because so far, I have been unable to restore this ordinance in this Council.

The third pity is about the remarks I made when I first joined the legislature. The first ever question I asked in the legislature was directed at Governor Chris PATTEN and about when universal retirement protection would be implemented. We have been fighting for the provision of universal retirement pensions since that time, but nowadays, many organizations outside of this legislature are still fighting for the establishment of a universal retirement protection system. This is the third pity to me.

The period of time I miss most dearly is the two years between 1995 and 1997 that I spent in the then Legislative Council. I miss this period not so much

because it was the time of the British Hong Kong Administration but because Members of the then Legislative Council could move Private Member's Bills to amend labour-related ordinances. The Government could not stop me from doing so at that time. Why? It was because the Standing Orders at that time were very interesting — Private Member's Bills could be proposed as long as they did not involve public expenditure.

Moreover, there was no separate voting mechanism at that time. The mechanism was non-existent, and in addition, we could propose Private Member's Bills. I recall that the first Private Member's Bill that I proposed after joining the then Legislative Council was on revising the rate of maternity leave pay from two thirds of the wages concerned to 100%. Knowing that the bill stood a chance of obtaining a substantial number of votes for its passage, the Government made concessions and agreed to raise the rate to four-fifths.

Hence, between 1995 and 1997, there were totally 20 or so amendments to our labour legislation, because the Government knew that Members could propose Private Member's Bills in the Council, and that such bills stood a chance of obtaining a majority of votes for passage. Therefore, the Government agreed to make concessions after negotiating with me. I really miss this period dearly. It gave me the greatest delight because quite a number of amendments were made to our labour legislation at that time.

But I had to wait 12 years starting from 1998 before I could see the passage of the minimum wage legislation. Owing to the constraints imposed by the new mechanisms for the legislature under the Basic Law, I was never able to propose even one Private Member's Bill in the past 12 years. The greatest pity to me is that we have been unable to make any amendment to our labour legislation. We could do so only in those two golden years.

Thank you, President.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): As Members are aware, the Chief Executive's Question and Answer Session will take place from 3 pm to 4.30 pm. I will suspend the meeting at around 2.40 pm for the Question and Answer Session, and then resume the meeting after it for bringing this motion debate to completion.

**MISS TANYA CHAN** (in Cantonese): President, perhaps you are aware that I have always been concerned about conservation. I am not going to recount what I have successfully fought for. What I want to say is that in this declared monument, I have served as a Member of this Council for less than three years ..... A monument is naturally marked by its place in history and tradition. This is precisely where its value lies and what makes new buildings no match for it. Of course, as time goes by and given sufficient justifications, buildings with distinguishing features and historic significance may also become monuments. Today, we are inside a monument with high historic and heritage value.

Monuments and social development often seem to be mutually exclusive. Changes of the times and social development may often have a bearing on the existence of monuments, and changes of the times may also affect the existence of traditions. We may ask whether certain traditions are worth preserving. Having stayed in this Council for several years, frankly speaking, I still do not have a full understanding of many of its traditions. Very often, I must rely on Dr Margaret NG to remind me on different occasions. Of course, many experienced Members also gave me plenty of advice when I first joined this Council.

Nevertheless, I think that before moving to the new Legislative Council Complex, we should really ask ourselves whether there are any things that we should preserve and bring to the new complex at the time when we part with this historic building. I think tangible things will certainly be relocated, as the Secretariat will make arrangements for us. But I believe that the things which are most difficult to be relocated, or the things which can continue to be upheld in the new place after relocation, may all be intangible. We really need to consider how many such intangible traditions we want to preserve.

We have talked a lot about parliamentary culture. My knowledge of parliamentary culture may be very scanty. For example, in regular meetings held on Wednesdays, drinks with flavours are not allowed in the Chamber. Only water is allowed, while the consumption of coffee, tea, and so on is not so advisable. I do not have a thorough understanding of many things, and I have to learn gradually. But in the case of parliamentary culture, there is even ..... There used to be no public hearing. In contrast, the Legislative Council today is highly respected and treasured by the public as a place where they can voice their

views directly to public officers and Members. I believe this kind of culture will carry on.

Another problem we can observe is about the power of committees or panels. President, I find the discussions in these two days quite beyond my imagination. Members reached a consensus during their discussions at certain committee or panel meetings, but this was completely ignored in the course of voting. Of course, I can appreciate that everyone has his own opinions, but in some cases, I cannot help wondering whether committees or panels have been dwarfed in power. Let me digress a bit more here. President, the public officers attending the meetings of committees or panels are, to put it more bluntly, of lower and lower ranks. First come Directors of Bureaux. If they cannot make it, Under Secretaries come along. If even Under Secretaries cannot make it, it will be the turn of Political Assistants. If this goes on and on, even Permanent Secretaries or Deputy Secretaries will come.

President, we do not look down upon low-ranking government officials. But I must still ask why Directors of Bureaux do not come. Why do they not assign some officials with a genuine concern for social affairs ..... The point here has nothing to do with Members of this Council. Members actually ask their questions on behalf of society only. Does the Government respect the opinions of society? Why does it refuse to explain its policy objectives to the public through this Council?

Frankly speaking, like the Secretary for Development ..... I must say at this juncture that she has personally attended practically every meeting of the Panel on Development. Though she was not always required to give a reply in person to every item of discussion, she did more than once remain seated during the four consecutive hours of meeting without even going to the restroom for once. President, in my opinion, she is not just an "able warrior" but also an "iron lady". Her diligence also signifies her respect for this Council, or for the hard work and efforts of her staff. Maybe, she thus wants to explain everything clearly to us. And, she also knows her "homework" very well, it must be added.

Moreover, I think there is one more important tradition. This tradition has been here for just a short time, about 20 years and the ultimate goal has yet to be achieved, but we will definitely carry on. I am talking about the development of democracy. One more thing is independence. President, our system is based

on the separation of powers, instead of any co-operation of the three branches of government. However, as mentioned by Dr Margaret NG earlier on ..... Regarding the new Legislative Council Complex, we must ask ourselves ..... In a special meeting of the House Committee the other day, when we asked about the opening period of the main entrance of the new Legislative Council Complex, I was really amazed and shocked by their reply. How could they reply that they did not know the answer? President, from my point of view, this is utterly impossible.

I can remember very clearly that that day, Dr Margaret NG asked them whether Members and the public must really be required to walk between the legs of the Government (that is, the executive) before they can access the green corridor or carpet. She also asked whether Members must be required to use the side entrance for entering and leaving the new complex in the course of work. President, I can clearly remember that the first time when I went to a courtroom for work — It was not one inside this building because when the building was still used for housing courtrooms, I never came here. But in the future, I am sure there will be such occasions — my superior told me that when I entered a courtroom for the first time, I must go through the main entrance, upright and proud. I have actually asked other Members this question: what wrong have you done to the people to warrant the treatment of being forced to use the side entrance? We should enter and leave through the main entrance, upright and proud.

I would also like to point out that this monument is protected under the law, as are our human rights and the development of democracy. While I very much hope that this monument can exist forever, I hope even more strongly that all the human rights guaranteed under the law can be upheld, and that democracy, which still remains an unfulfilled promise to us, can be achieved shortly. Thank you, President.

**MR ANDREW LEUNG** (in Cantonese): President, I have worked for just seven years in this place under the solemnity of this goddess of justice and the "protection" of St. Edward's crown as mentioned by Prof Patrick LAU just now. I am certainly glad to be able to witness the changes in Hong Kong over these seven years. Actually, changes in society should take place step by step. We are not supposed to start a revolution anyway.

This legislature is a miniature of Hong Kong's pluralistic society, with the presence of different convictions. Members' views are different, and I can observe that they have been doing their utmost to expound their convictions and positions in the legislature. Unavoidably, we are sometimes antagonistic to one another. We may speak rudely, or we may even stare at one another ferociously. But this is only parliamentary culture. As Mr Tommy CHEUNG and other Members remarked earlier, the picture is entirely different once we leave the Chamber and enter the Ante-Chamber. There, we may hug one another and chat amicably. The scenes here that are televised to the public are totally different from what actually happens elsewhere in the whole legislature. I will also miss the breakfast that we took upstairs this morning (President, you were also there; that was a good initiative of yours). That was our "last breakfast", and we were served delicious food such as rice porridge, deep-fried dough sticks and turnip cake.

The first time I ever came to this building was in the late 1970s. Somewhat luckily, I was selected to serve as a juror in a murder trial. My memory of this trial is understandably very vague now. I can now work in this legislature to serve the public and the industry I represent. This is indeed an honour to me

Members will have many things to reminisce about. But some of them may not think so because very often, after a regular Council meeting on Wednesday, we may end up with "four futile attempts" or "five futile attempts". But do we really need to think that way? As long as we can sincerely work for Hong Kong people and try step by step to seek common grounds while accommodating differences, we will succeed in really serving them and promoting development. Speaking of this approach, I can recall our most remarkable achievement during the financial turmoil — getting \$100 billion in a matter of two minutes for providing loan guarantee for small and medium enterprises (SMEs), thus assisting the bulk of SMEs in tiding over the difficulties. This is indeed quite a world record because the assistance that we in Hong Kong render to SMEs after the financial tsunami is the best in the world.

The centenary of this building is fast approaching. Prof Patrick LAU told us that the building was completed in 1912. So, there is only one year to go before its centenary. The building has actually witnessed many vicissitudes of Hong Kong, including, of course, our successful transformation from a British

colony to a Special Administrative Region of China. This was a historic moment. I do not know whether Members can recall how some Members of the then Legislative Council said that following the handover, they would be sent to prison and there would be no human rights at all. We have listened to so many speeches here, and we can observe that Members can now chide government officials and other Members freely. In many cases, some Members' criticisms of Hong Kong are so severe that people may think that Hong Kong is a Third World country. Nevertheless, after looking at other places, we can observe that in many areas, Hong Kong actually ranks among the top in the world. Is the legislature unable to reflect the progress of Hong Kong? Is our legislature too unique to reflect the overall advancement of Hong Kong?

For instance, Members' discussions on the healthcare issue yesterday really made me wonder whether they were talking about a Third World country. But the truth is that if we look outside of Hong Kong, if we go to neighbouring places, we will notice that Hong Kong's healthcare system must be one of the top five or the top 10 in the world (regardless of the criteria of ranking). Sometimes, all of us want to voice our views on as many issues as possible in the hope of achieving certain goals and doing more for the public. This is alright. But please do not go too far in smearing Hong Kong.

This building is definitely not large enough. In view of our development, we will need more space. Moving to a new place is good. I certainly hope that the fung shui in the new place will be better, so that things can run smoothly with you, President. I also hope that the gap between the executive and the legislature can be narrowed. Shortening the physical distance between buildings aside (we are presently very far away from the Government Secretariat), we also hope to improve the relationship between the two sides. Of course, improving such relationship will require not only the efforts of the executive but also those of the Legislative Council. That way, we will be able to serve Hong Kong better.

President, I support the motion moved by Ms Miriam LAU.

**MR PAUL CHAN** (in Cantonese): President, several years ago, I gave my life a fresh orientation, deciding to devote the latter half of my life mainly to social service. The chance of working as a Member of this Council is a milestone of

my life, one which signifies that I can wholly and totally dedicate myself to social service.

I have worked in this building for only three years, but I would still like to explain my work attitude in the past three years by referring to two concepts advocated by Rick WARREN. The two concepts are Stewardship of Affluence and Stewardship of Influence. Both concepts are about people's stewardship roles. According to the former, while we enjoy affluence in life, we should not limit our affluence to ourselves and our families, and we must at the same care for the people around us, especially the needy, so that our happiness can become their blessing. The lesson of the latter concept is that the power and position that we hold are definitely not meant for showing off; rather, they are meant for enabling us to exercise our influence to uphold justice and to speak for, protect and look after the powerless, the poor and the helpless.

President, the place in this building where I spend the bulk of my time is precisely this Chamber. Let me say a few words on things that I feel more deeply about. First, as I counted, totally 21 people took the Oath with hands on the Bible during the swearing-in ceremony. I have learnt that the most radical Member of this Council is also either a Protestant or Roman Catholic. The Bible teaches us "to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God". These 22 Members could have become sons of peace, upholding justice and spreading love and care. Yet, how large is the discrepancy between this ideal and their actual deeds?

President, the second impressive aspect of this Chamber is that it is a place of madness and self-satisfaction as well as a place of humility and touching human concern. Why a place of madness? The reason is that freedom of speech is upheld here, and the code of behaviour is lax. The Rules of Procedure aims to safeguard the right of minority parties and groupings to fully voice their views. The objective is to ensure that even the minority can fully voice their opinions. I think that it is right to do so, but unfortunately, some have abused the rules, turning this Chamber into a place of violence and vulgarity. Worse still, while those committing violence and vulgarity will face no consequences, they even find that others must still lobby for votes condescendingly and courteously. Consequently, it is small wonder that some have turned mad and self-satisfied.



This is also a place of humility and touching human concern because I can notice that many Members are knowledgeable and full of ideals, aspirations and perseverance. This is a place of touching human concern because all problems in society are reflected to this legislature, whether they are large or small, and whether they are about the poor, the elderly or the weak. All these problems are constant reminders that we must not indulge in our own pleasurable lives and forget the plight of the socially disadvantaged.

President, one thing about this Chamber which I find a bit disappointing and saddening is that as I came to realize soon after joining this legislature, this Chamber is full of unforgiving people. Any remarks that others find disagreeable will lead to "assault" and acrid personal attacks. As an objective independent Member with no political affiliation, I sometimes do find it difficult to cope with such a situation.

In the past two days, we held two motion debates in this Chamber relating to the report submitted by the Committee on Members' Interests (CMI). One of the two motion debates, the first debate on admonishing Mr Abraham SHEK, is a bit disappointing to me. I observed that Members were able to recognize some objective facts, but they differed on how to mete out penalties. I would respect and accept the final outcome, for I think it is no big deal. However, yesterday, when we discussed issues on the procedures and rules pertaining to pecuniary interests, I noticed that objectivity and rationality in the debate were rare throughout. In contrast, hostility and personal attacks were plentiful. This is rather regrettable.

President, the CMI is a component of this Council's committee system. Its suggestions may not always be right, and we may thus hold discussions and negotiations. But we should base our arguments on justifications. We should never resort to emotive outbursts and even attack Members of this Council because of our dislike for the suggestions concerned.

President, besides this Chamber, I also like lingering around the outdoor area on the second floor, which is right below the eyes of Goddess Themis, because the area can remind us that the blind-folding of the goddess symbolizes that we are required to deal with matters and exercise judgment on what is right and wrong irrespective of who the relevant persons are and which political parties or groupings they belong to. We must focus only on what is right and what is

wrong. The concern about what is right and what is wrong is of utmost importance in our world.

President, the training I received in the past as an intellectual and accountant requires us to be upright and impartial, complete with a sense of independence and objectivity. As accountants, we have to report to our clients any irregularities found in their accounts, even though we are paid for the auditing effort. This is our professional conduct.

President, it is my wish that after moving to the new Legislative Council Complex, this Council and the code of conduct for Members can both keep abreast of the times and ascend to higher levels, so as to set a good example for society. Thank you, President.

**MR TAM YIU-CHUNG** (in Cantonese): President, I initially feared that my turn to speak would not come in time. When I first heard this debate topic, I was surprised to know that even "Bidding farewell to the Legislative Council Building" was also raised for discussion, and I also wondered what Members actually wanted to say. I also told myself that I was not going to bid farewell to this Council after the current Legislative Session anyway. However, surprisingly, so many Members have spoken today. As soon as the debate started, more than a dozen Members already hastened to press the button indicating their intention of speaking. I was not as quick in pressing the button, so I may well be the last Member to speak in this session of the debate. Since they are saying that the meeting will resume after 4.30 pm, there are still opportunities for Members to display their skills of oratory. In a word, it is still possible for certain Members to grasp the last chance of speaking. Many Members may want to do so — who knows.

The speeches of the many Members I heard earlier certainly show that they did not really want to reminisce about this building. They just tried to use this building as a means of expressing their other thoughts. That was why Members all recounted many personal experiences in life, their election manifestos and stories in the historical past, all of which are certainly wonderful in their own right. Jokes, however, were rarely told. Members were very serious all the time, save when the story of entering the wrong toilet roused some sporadic laughter.

Two days ago, I read from the newspapers that Mr CHIM Pui-chung had referred to me as one of the "Class of 1991". Actually, I do not belong to the "Class of 1991"; rather, I am one of the "Class of 1985". But I have the impression that very few people have shown up in the gatherings of the "Class of 1985", which comprises three persons only. And, two of them are not present here. Nevertheless, very great changes have indeed taken place since 1985. If I am to describe all such changes, the speaking time of seven minutes will certainly be insufficient.

Yet, after listening to certain remarks, I still want to give a response of some kind. Ms Miriam LAU, for instance, recounted that when she first joined the then Legislative Council years ago, all Members spoke in English. But my memory is not quite the same. Some of us did speak in Chinese. However, one difference is that Members at that time all delivered scripted speeches. If they did not do so, interpreters would have a very hard time. Years ago, before a Member spoke, an interpreter would ask him for his scripted speech beforehand. Then, the interpreter would make some preparation, as he had no idea as to what the Member would say. With preparation, the interpreter would be able to do simultaneous interpretation, and his rendition would thus be more accurate and smoother. Of course, there has not been such a need for many years — probably 10 years or so. But this was the situation in the early years.

All appointed Members years ago spoke in English, because the one who appointed them knew only English but no Chinese. And, since the one who appointed these Members could not possibly be asked to wear a headset for listening to their speeches, they must all speak in English. In the then Legislative Council, Members using English thus represented the majority, but quite a number of Members still used Chinese.

I also remember one fellow Member of mine — Mr PANG Chun-hoi, who represented the labour sector. Strictly speaking, his Cantonese was no Cantonese, but just a blend of Shanghainese and Cantonese made worse by his peculiar accent. The simultaneous interpreters who still managed to follow him were doubtlessly very remarkable. This also explains why he must have a scripted speech. If not, no one could possibly know how to do interpretation for his speeches.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG is enormously fond of the Ante-Chamber, thinking that its design is excellent. But I can recall that when I first joined the then Legislative Council in 1985, the Ante-Chamber was fitted with one thing which can no longer be seen in it now. If Members can ever see this thing, they will certainly voice criticisms. Why? When we first joined the then Legislative Council, a spiral staircase typical of old British mansions was found in the Ante-Chamber. What was the staircase for? Members may notice that there is a loft near the ceiling of the Ante-Chamber. In the past, some books were placed there, and people were supposed to go up the spiral staircase for getting the books. But I found this very much a superfluity. The loft was so narrow and, in my view, unsafe. How could a lady possibly go up the spiral staircase? As result, many people made severe criticisms, and the staircase was removed eventually. It was there for just a short time. I cannot see why the designer at that time — who might be a student of Prof Patrick LAU (*Laughter*) — should ..... Oh, not his student? He was not yet a professor at that time? Might be his teacher? I really do not know. Anyway, this was what happened. Hence, design may not always be very practical. I do not know whether there will be any similar objects in the new Legislative Council Complex.

I think that having rumbled on for such a long time, we must not forget to point out that while the seat of the Legislative Council is to be relocated from this building, the building itself will nonetheless continue to exist, to stand here in its original shape. The only thing, I believe, is that following the relocation of the Legislative Council, the neighbourhood will turn peaceful. I do not think that anyone will besiege the Court in future. Should this happen, all of us will be in trouble. The "hotspot", on the other hand, may shift to another place — the waterfront. But the situation may well turn better over there in the waterfront because with sea breezes blowing, one may, who knows, turn more relaxed and less hot-tempered.

Invariably, on the eve of saying goodbye to a place and moving to another, there may be lots of reminiscences, with people thinking that the old place here is after all not too bad in many ways. I believe that after our relocation to the new Legislative Council Complex, such feelings may intensify. Members may make some comparison, thinking that everything was so much more convenient in the past. In the new environment, Members may find it hard to adapt to many things, may feel that things are just not as good or as convenient. Therefore, I believe that Members will need some time for adaptation.

Nevertheless, one good thing is that this term of the Legislative Council can talk about having held its meetings in two different venues and about having such experience within the same term. If our relocation comes later, we may not have any such opportunities. We therefore hope that the new Legislative Council Complex can prove itself to be better in each and every way. We also hope that we can do a much better job than before.

Thank you, President.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): I now suspend the meeting until 4.45 pm.

2.40 pm

Meeting suspended.

4.45 pm

Council then resumed.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Council now resumes and continues with the motion debate on "Bidding farewell to the Legislative Council Building".

**MR WONG YUK-MAN** (in Cantonese): President, I do not have much feeling for this building, and not only am I not indiscriminate in expressing my affection, I am also not pretentious. In fact, I have been a Member of the Legislative Council for just three years, it is impossible for me to be pretentious and say that I miss this building very much when we bid farewell to it. However, I love reading and thinking as you do, and the only slight difference between us is I like to make trouble.

On the roof of this building stands a statue of the goddess of justice, many Members have mentioned this. However, I would like to talk about the British

Royal coat of arms beneath the statue of the goddess. On the bottom of the coat of arms, the motto "Dieu et mon droit" for the highest ruler is inscribed. What is the origin of "Dieu et mon droit"? I will stay away from discussing issues like the British colonies and the British monarchs, but from "Dieu et mon droit", I come to think of the concept of the "divine right of kings". It turns out that this concept also exists in China. More than two thousand years ago, Confucius once talked about abdication politics, and later, his student and successor, Mencius, also discussed abdication politics with his student WAN Zhang. Dr Priscilla LEUNG is not here. She has mistaken Yao and Shun as father and son, right? It is Yao who abdicated his throne to Shun. Oh ..... she said Da Yu is the son of Da Shun, this mistake is even more ridiculous. This is because her organization is known as Dashun Policy Research Centre. Excuse me, let me correct. She first said the relation between Shun and Yu was one of father and son, she was wrong. What I am talking now is the abdication politics of Yao and Shun.

WAN Zhang asked Mencius, "Was it the case that Yao gave the throne to Shun?"<sup>2</sup> WAN Zhang asked if there was such a case, that is, did Yao give the throne to Shun? Mencius replied, "No", meaning there was not such a case. Mencius continued to explain, "The sovereign cannot give the throne to another"<sup>3</sup>, meaning the sovereign cannot give the throne to someone else. WAN Zhang again asked, "Yes — but Shun had the throne. Who gave it to him?"<sup>4</sup> In other words, who gave him the throne? Mencius said, "Heaven gave it to him"<sup>5</sup>, that is, he was given the throne by heaven. WAN Zhang said, "'Heaven gave it to him:' — did Heaven confer its appointment on him with specific injunctions?"<sup>6</sup> Was it fate then? Yet, Mencius replied, "No. Heaven does not speak."<sup>7</sup> He was saying heaven would not ask Yao to abdicate to Shun. Heaven will not say explicitly, but "it simply showed its will by his personal conduct and his conduct of affairs"<sup>8</sup>, that is, heaven will signal through action and incidents for him to abdicate to Shun.

---

<sup>2</sup> Adopted from James LEGGE's translation of Mencius

<sup>3</sup> Adopted from James LEGGE's translation of Mencius

<sup>4</sup> Adopted from James LEGGE's translation of Mencius

<sup>5</sup> Adopted from James LEGGE's translation of Mencius

<sup>6</sup> Adopted from James LEGGE's translation of Mencius

<sup>7</sup> Adopted from James LEGGE's translation of Mencius

<sup>8</sup> Adopted from James LEGGE's translation of Mencius

WAN Zhang was puzzled. How could heaven "show its will by his personal conduct and his conduct of affairs?" Mencius continued, "The sovereign can present a man to Heaven, but he cannot make Heaven give that man the throne ..... Yao presented Shun to Heaven, and Heaven accepted him. He presented him to the people, and the people accepted him. Therefore I say, 'Heaven does not speak. It simply indicated its will by his personal conduct and his conduct of affairs.'"<sup>9</sup> What does this mean? Even if heaven wanted Yao to give the throne to Shun, it had to "present him to the people" to secure their acceptance. This is how Mencius explained abdication politics some two thousand years ago. Not only does this involve abdication and heaven's wish for the one in power to give his throne to another, it also involves "presenting him to the people and the people accepting him". It is only after the people showed their acceptance that Yao could give the throne to Shun. How did that end? President, it turned out that at that time, there was also the voting system. However, instead of voting with their hands, they voted with their feet. After Yao gave the throne to Shun, Shun felt himself a man of little virtue and meager abilities. He dared not accept and hid himself. Yet, the people kept on following Shun and strongly asked him to be the sovereign. They voted with their feet and wanted to give Shun the throne.

The motto "Dieu et mon droit" on the roof of the Legislative Council Building reminds me of this story. In other words, the Chinese are more open-minded and greater than the British, right? This morning, I listened to an interview of Mr Andrew WONG by Mr Robert CHOW in his radio programme. Mr Robert CHOW mocked him for his frequent reference to what happened during the colonial era; he seemed to have been unable to shrug off the colonial influence after the reunification. Mr Andrew WONG said, "Say you have a foster father who provided you with education and you have learned a lot from him. Now, you have returned to your biological father. Do you have to forget all the good things about your foster father?" Mr Robert CHOW was rendered speechless. Today, Mr Andrew WONG also made a very meaningful remark. He said if both the Legislative Council and the Government are not formed by referendum, revolution is doomed to occur. He said what some people are attacking is not the parliament, but the political system. Mr Andrew WONG is really smart, is he not? This is what we are. I am not against you, not against the parliament, we are against this political system. We have to negate the

---

<sup>9</sup> Adopted from James LEGGE's translation of Mencius

positive and negate this political system first, right? Of course, my revolution may not be successful.

Today, many people are taking advantage of the occasion. Although this is just to bid farewell to the Legislative Council Building, they will not let go of the opportunity to criticize us for hurling bananas, and they also talk about parliamentary culture, so to speak. I find this ridiculous. We have here a lot of devil's advocates. President, do you know what devil's advocates are? What are devil's advocates? Actually, lawyers will also know that this is the origin of the defence system. Although you know very well that something is wrong, you still have to defend it. In the past, when some doctrines were introduced, they would find some opponents to query God but in the end, God of course is the truth, right? Devil's advocates usually have very miserable endings. Far too many, right? Therefore, some people are taking advantage of us, and they talk about whatever parliamentary culture. Even some from the democratic camp speak shamelessly about becoming more civilized after relocating to the new complex.

Here today, I am happy that this building will no longer house the Legislative Council and will in future be turned into a court, symbolizing its return to justice. President, from 1985 to date, this Legislative Council has been unjust. I dare not say it is filthy and stinky. I will not go to this extreme, but basically, this is an unjust parliament. Now, this building is finally turned back into a court. Fellow Members, this building is back to justice. Let us be happy for this building. This is what I have to say today. Thank you, President.

**MR PAUL TSE** (in Cantonese): Let me try to play the role of the Devil's Advocate. Mr WONG Yuk-man remarked that this building would return to the arms of justice. In fact, even if justice is done in the Court most of the time, some defendants or litigants are nonetheless denied justice. Justice, I am afraid, is never absolute. Many Members have lamented to heaven and earth today, demanding justice. Actually, justice can only exist in the overall and general sense. Any quest for absolute justice ..... In every society, with the passage of time, many values will change.

In the case of those homosexuals who were once upon a time burnt at the stake, arrested and chained up, where was justice? In the case of those who were once upon a time charged for receiving abortion, where was justice?



Hence, never ever think that there is absolute justice. Likewise, nothing is absolutely right or wrong in this world. I hope Members can be more light-hearted today ..... Initially, I did not intend to touch on such a serious topic, but then many Members have sounded like they are lamenting life-long departure and death. The speeches of some Members are very amusing too, particularly that of Mr CHAN Kin-por. I almost got him wrong when he talked about "intimacy followed by marriage". When first hearing this, I could not help wondering why he wanted to advocate this idea. It then turned out that he was just talking about political party connections.

President, Members all know that I am a lawyer, but more importantly, they should also realize that I am currently the representative of the tourism sector. We should not speak so seriously on today's motion topic, because we are not bidding farewell to the Legislative Council after all; we are just saying goodbye to this building for the time being. Naturally, though, there are many memorable places in this building, places that are worthy of photo-taking.

Nonetheless, I would like to share with Members the concept of "event realism". If Members have heard Dr LEE Tien-ming's exposition, they should understand what this means. Simply put (I hope I am not wrong), very often, our beloved persons or things — cars, cats, parents, girlfriends and wivies — will all eventually vanish, will all disappear with the passage of time, and sometimes, all of a sudden, we may even lose them, or they may go out of order, pass away or sustain irreparable damage.

In contrast, everything that once happened in the spacetime of history, like the speech I am delivering now, will never ..... Neither God nor Sakyamuni Buddha can alter the fact that something once happened. Hence, instead of allowing ourselves to be over-attached to the things or people around us, we should really treasure what happened in history, especially things we are right now doing or those things that we once did. We should grasp the time we have and do the things that we consider meaningful. This a universal truth that transcends all temporal and spatial limits.

This very concept is similar to what my mother taught me when I was a child. She said, "There is not much money that I can leave to you, but I will do my best to give you a happy childhood and enable you to live a good life." Even though we were not rich, she still encouraged me to participate in scouting, play tennis and take part in various other activities, such as serving as a voluntary

worker who took sightless persons out for swimming. I already did many such things as a child. I am fortunate to have done so many such things in my life, things that give me many wonderful memories. Naturally, though, I also have many bitter memories.

During the break just now, I chatted with Dr Priscilla LEUNG. She said that over the past few days, she had been under immense pressure and in great agony. I therefore gave her as much encouragement as possible, telling her that this could actually present her with a good chance to steel herself because it was only with more tests and setbacks that one could emerge stronger and more mature. Members all know only too well that in this Council, even a few simple words or a trivial matter may very often stir up many unnecessary blows to our lives.

Anyway ..... Once upon a time, lawyers were not allowed to advertise themselves; once upon a time, there must be a halo round the head of a lawyer. I have gone through a period of time when I attempted to shatter some traditional taboos and engineer reform. I found this very meaningful. Naturally, all these are now by-gones. All things, enjoyable or tormenting, will somehow pass. All will be fine, as long as we can remember "event realism", and grasp the time we have to do more work.

Speaking of this building, I must of course admit my fondness for it, because I am very fond of antiquities, such as old buildings and furniture. I have even said somewhat jokingly that I like "old" people. I have quite a strong liking for historical relics. However, people in the tourism sector, who have seen such a lot about the world, will certainly know and tell me that now and in the past, in all places on earth, all sceneries and edifices, however majestic and picturesque they may be, will all vanish like dissipating smog and clouds with the passage of time. Therefore, we do not really need to look so grief-stricken and overly sentimental.

On the contrary, we should strive for more opportunities to travel round Hong Kong or the whole world, so as to broaden our horizons. In this way, we will turn more detached, rather than being so anxious about a single brick or object from the past. In this way, we will not be like sentimental ancient poets, lamenting: "Peach blossoms still, but faces all different". Recently, documentaries about this Council are very much a fad. When looking at the old photos of some Members, I cannot help letting out a long sigh.

In fact, at that time, this Council was a hot kitchen where many stirring events happened. When looking at the old photos of these figures, I notice that they were all so young and green. However, their looks have changed rapidly due to the pressure on them over all these years. This Council is indeed a place that can make people's looks "wither" quickly.

I hope that Members can forever remain forward-looking and hopeful in heart. We may still fail to get many things at this moment, and we may still be struggling and asking for many things, but as long as we can adopt such an optimistic attitude and do things on the basis of "event realism", we can rest assured that no one will be able to gainsay what we have done or criticize us for not having made any efforts. This is the major message that I want to share with Members today.

We will move to the new Legislative Council Complex very soon. I hope that wherever we are, all Members will still go about their tasks on the basis of "event realism", work more on something that we need to do, quarrel less, and serve Hong Kong people more. Thank you.

**DR PAN PEY-CHYOU** (in Cantonese): President, I am good at neither story-telling nor cracking jokes. So, I am afraid what I am going to say may be a bit too serious. To me, and also to several other Members, the most striking feature of this Renaissance-style Legislative Council Building is the statue of Goddess Themis facing the Statue Square on the roof of the building. Themis is the goddess of justice in Greek myths. She is blind-folded, which symbolizes her absolute impartiality in the execution of justice. The scales in her right hand signify that she makes impartial judgment only after considering the justifications given by all sides; and, the sword in her left hand is a symbol of her power in upholding justice.

Themis is also the goddess of the law. The sight of this statue will invariably remind me that this building should belong to the judiciary rather than the legislature. Now, on its 99th birthday, this building is finally going to be returned to its rightful owner and become the seat of the Court of Final Appeal of Hong Kong.

For 99 years, Themis has been standing in all her solitude up there on the façade of the building, listening to the whistling of vessels, the blasts of artillery

in war, the piling for urban construction, as well as the hustle and buslte of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. In recent years, she has heard a new kind of din. Though Themis cannot see, her sense of hearing alone should already enable to her to sense that the building behind her and its surrounding areas have become a place full of rage.

This building is indeed filled with rage. The day before yesterday, we held a debate in this Council on whether Mr Abraham SHEK should be "admonished". I kept asking myself at that time: "What wrong has he committed to make it necessary to reprimand him as if he was an erring child?" Some Members did their best to plead for him, but in the end, they still said: "Since you did not disclose your interest according to the rules, we have no alternative. This is the 'minimum charge' for erring".

I do not know all those details of the rules. I only know that even as a Member representing property developers, Mr Abraham SHEK has still assisted in the establishment of a fund for helping the families of workers injured or killed in industrial accidents, lending them a hand in times of distress. Mr Abraham SHEK treats everyone in this building with all the humbleness and courtesy suggested by his Chinese name. When dealing with such a nice person, why have Members still so overwhelmingly "admonished" him here simply because of his accidental negligence of something which he will definitely do under normal circumstances, even when it is still disputable as to whether such a course of action is after all justified under the relevant rules?

During the several days from 15 January to 17 January 2010, when this Council debated the appropriation request relating to the Express Rail Link, protesters thronged the Statue Square every day. Under the fierce incitement of certain mass media, the songs sung and slogans chanted by protesters as well as the angry questions asked by some Members in this Chamber all converged to form deafening roars. After the passage of the appropriation request, some protesters even blocked the entrances and exits of this building deliberately, thus marooning a number of Members and government officials inside the building. This is also one of the most unforgettable experiences of mine in this building.

When I looked at the face of Themis, despite the fact that I could not see the expressions in her eyes, I could still notice that there was no anxiety, anger, despondency or fear on her face. I guessed at that time she also faced all the commotion in such a composed and rational manner.

Perhaps in the eyes of some Members and people, establishmentarian Members are all guilty of an original sin. We are burdened with these people's animosity towards the State, their anger with the Government and their discontent with the realities. As a result, all that we do for the common good are invariably interpreted as plots soaked with conspiracy. Yesterday morning, we debated the establishment or otherwise of a select committee on the GODFREY incident. The speeches of several Members made me realize the depth of their animosities. I have thought about the matter carefully, and I realize that in the past, when issues affecting Hong Kong's significant interests cropped up, we likewise supported the establishment of select committees without trying to harbour the Government. That being the case, there should not be any major differences in attitude towards such matters. What then are the causes of such grievances and outrage?

President, I always think that Hong Kong has come to a very significant historical moment that affects not only the well-being of the 7 million people in Hong Kong but also the fate of the entire Chinese nation. What I mean is the necessity of successfully implementing "one country, two systems". The reason is that such success will significantly increase the hope of achieving the peaceful unification of our country. The successful implementation of "one country, two systems" will also signify Hong Kong's success in preserving all its traditional values. And, apart from preserving such values, we also need to seek progress, more success and greater lustre.

It is now 14 years after the reunification. Over the past 14 years, we have witnessed to our great delight the progressive implementation of "one country, two systems". Over the past 14 years, there has been absolutely no regression on any of our cherished core values as reflected by the relevant benchmarks. In some cases, the situation is even better than before. In addition, we are now even heading for the implementation of dual universal suffrage. All this the best proof, right?

I know that some in society simply do not believe that "one country, two systems" has already been successfully implemented, nor do they want others to believe in the feasibility of this idea. They are furious, and they have been trying to persuade other people to share their fury.

Difficulties and problems are inevitable in real life. Frankly speaking, every family, city and country will inevitably encounter problems. Is it

reasonable for us to ascribe all the problems we encounter to any alleged insufficiency of democracy, freedom and social justice under our system? Can such an attitude help solve the problems? Unfortunately, once such discontent is brought to the extreme and compounded by the ready availability of scapegoats, it is very difficult to dispel this kind of fury.

I see reason, forbearance, perseverance and patience on the face of Themis. After leaving this building — though I do not know what other Members will do — I will certainly bear in mind how she looks and do my utmost every day in the future.

I so submit.

**MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG** (in Cantonese): President, many people have asked me if I have any recollections. Let me quote an indolent Member's statement, one which he was once barred from reading aloud. The name of this Member is "Long Hair", LEUNG Kwok-hung. This Member once sought your approval for reading this statement aloud. It is the statement I announced on 27 January 2010. My gratitude goes to you for your approval this time, and I no longer bother about why I was barred from reading it aloud that day. Please allow me to read it aloud now:

"President,

'Qualms absent, evermore tranquil my heart remains;  
Adversities profuse, courageous I nonetheless stand.  
Brows knit, coolly I defy a thousand accusing fingers;  
Head bowed, willingly I serve children like a dedicated ox.'

Recently, many journalists have approached me on my resignation, enquiring with concern whether I can endure the pressure amidst all the flaying and false charges of the Chinese Communist Government and its lackeys. Let me now give a reply with this centonical poem.

The first two lines were by May Fourth vanguard Mr CHEN Duxiu, created in his political imprisonment by Kuomintang with an impromptu stroke of his writing-brush at the request of a visiting friend for a gift of his calligraphy, a

masterpiece with heavenly perfection fully manifesting his admirable backbone as a founding pioneer of the Chinese Communist Party. The last two lines were from a humorous verse written by Mr Lu Xun in his delight of giving birth to a son in old age, projecting a kind of optimism that defies authoritarianism and aspires to the future.

By no means erudite, I can only pilfer the verses by these two vanguards to express my sentiments as a response to the covert and overt offensives of the 'owner of the label-production plant'.

All my life, I have always loathed 'speech censorship'. Little did I realize that even as a Legislative Council Member, I will likewise be circumscribed by the Rules of Procedures of the Legislative Council, having also to submit this statement of resignation to the President for censorship. Rules as draconian as this, regardless of which codes they are based on, should frankly be rescinded. That the five resignees are barred from speaking freely today is a corollary of the parliamentary culture in the Chamber of this Council. The spectre of colonial rule is still stalking around, and the President cannot but act against his own will, having even to act as a petty censorship official. What else more can one say?

Honestly, minor defects of this kind are certainly not the only symptoms of this legislature's ineffectuality. This Chamber is so brightly lit and crammed with people in formal attire, but this legislature, rather than being able to exercise its legitimate legislative power, is still circumscribed in authority by a Chief Executive elected by only 800 people and his aides. Any unusual moves, however slightly out-of-line only, will invariably be stifled by the Government under Article 74 of the Basic Law. We are truly at the entire mercy of others. Allowing the existence of an executive branch as autocratic as this is tantamount to imposing the will of government officials on the people and to ruling Hong Kong based on the wishes of the privileged few. The natural outcome is the happiness of the few at the expense of the majority's suffering.

The land grant for the Cyberport, the Link REIT, the construction of the Hong Kong Disneyland and the Express Rail Link, the repealing of law to deprive workers of their collective bargaining power, and even the forcible and futile attempt to enact legislation for implementing Article 23 of the Basic Law are all examples that inevitably induce people to suspect whether the Legislative Council

is really here to uphold people's opinions, and whether the interests of the minority have been put before those of the majority. In particular, as a result of the draconian rule on separate voting, directly elected Members supported by votes in the millions are even circumscribed by other Members with only several dozen thousand votes. Public opinions are thus distorted and people's livelihood ruined. Having looked at the huge variety of political systems the world over, can we possibly identify any systems under which the majority must obey the minority, and the minority must in turn yield to a yet smaller minority? Since the reunification, rather than being eradicated, this morbid phenomenon has worsened. How can one help seething with indignation?

The Chinese Communist Government has failed to return political power to the people as provided for under Annex II to the Basic Law. Quite the contrary, time and again, in 2005 and 2007, it frustrated Hong Kong people's attempt to implement dual universal suffrage and 'one country, two systems' through the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress. The possibility of electing the Chief Executive by universal suffrage in 2017 has been reduced by the privileged few to a nominating committee controlled by a handful of people, or a trickery for screening candidates, thus directly depriving people's right to universal and equal elections and indirectly rigging election outcomes. As for the 'universal suffrage' to be applied to the Legislative Council, this will also be the case. At best, what we are going to see will only be an arrangement of turning the handful of electors in FCs into the privileged few in the nominating committee, so that candidates can be screened.

President, as a Member, one should be accountable to the public, true to one's conscience, faithful to one's political platform in practice, and unequivocal in speaking up for the public, so that public opinions can be upheld in this Chamber and implemented in society as whole. Nonetheless, since public opinions and justice have been distorted time and again, how can I continue to remain silent and connive at the evil deeds of the privileged few? What is more, since my very first participation in elections, I have all along been advocating, in the form of big characters on all banners and leaflets, the conduct of a referendum and the implementation of dual universal suffrage as a means of realizing the idea of returning political power to the people. My arrests outside this Chamber and my expulsion from it on many occasions are just the outcomes of my concrete efforts to stand up for the masses who have been trampled on after the deprivation of their political powers. My resignation today is demanded by the cause of



justice. My resignation, along with the resignation of Yuk-man, Albert, Alan and Tanya, is only intended to bring forth vacancies in the five geographical constituencies, so as to necessitate a *de facto* referendum for enabling the people to cast their crucial votes and for returning political power to them. Isn't this a gratifying course of action? A war verse by Mr YU Dafu at the time of the Japanese invasion — 'As I re-read the Song of Righteousness, I feel that my road is already wider than that of past sages' — can serve precisely as my response to the phenomenon of 'one dog barking at the sun, and a hundred dogs joining in'.

'..... and so I would not speak in my defence; but at the request of my comrades, who have also refused to defend themselves, I shall attempt to explain to you those things you have not understood ..... I wish to make it clear that we do not consider the autocracy the only chain binding our country; it is only the first chain from which it is our duty to free the people.'<sup>1</sup>

This an extract from *Mother*, a masterpiece by the renowned Russian writer Maxim GORKY. As a socialist, I find it most appropriate to conclude my speech with this quotation. Thank you, President."

**DR LEUNG KA-LAU** (in Cantonese): President, I am one of the several Members with the lowest seniority, as I have been a Member for just three years. My impression about this building is that it is an edifice of historical significance where many major events have taken place. Such an impression is, however, quite like that of the general public, with no substantial difference. But after joining this Council, do I have any new perceptions of this building? Because of my role here, I have started to ..... I have done some research online, and I must thus say that I am a bit flattered for being able to sit in this Chamber together with so many experienced and renowned Members. As I become a focus of society and witness so many things, I begin to find this building a bit like the "Da Guan Garden" in *The Dream of the Red Chamber*, in the sense that one can learn a lot here.

Nonetheless, precisely because of our role, society has begun to have expectations on us and criticize us. The different walks of life in society do so, and so do Members themselves. Well, then, how have I come to regard this building as a result, especially this very Chamber? I have begun to feel that it is like a colosseum. Any indiscreet words or careless deeds may easily make one

come under attack. Therefore, I have gradually developed the tendency of saying less when possible.

There is also the third feeling concerning how I feel about this Chamber when a meeting is in progress. I find this Chamber a bit like the production studio of a television game show resembling, for example, "The Super Trio Show". Such game shows are usually divided into several segments. In the context of this Chamber, the first segment is the oral question time. When I attended a Council meeting in this Chamber for the first time, I noticed that many things were found on the benches. I subsequently realized that they were in fact the scripts of speeches. Then, I saw experienced Members stand up and read the scripts of their questions aloud. After that, government officials sitting opposite to Members similarly stood up and read the scripts of their replies aloud. Well, this made me think that a Council meeting was surprisingly as simple as that. I therefore went outside right away. Of course, I did not know that supplementary questions and follow-up questions would be asked. But the point I want to raise here is that as a medical doctor with so many years of training, I have unconsciously come under the influence of a certain culture, philosophy or way of thinking, with the result that I always adhere to several simple principles in my work, one of which tells me not to do any examinations or make any decisions in the course of treatment if they are not going to impact the eventual outcome.

The second point, a point which Members may also consider, is that in some cases, while we may have very lofty ideals, we may, however, need to go for the second best if we come to realize that such ideals will never be attainable. No one can understand this point better than medical doctors. Sooner or later, everyone must die. From the standpoint of a doctor, eternal life for everyone is certainly the ideal situation. But this is impossible. Now, in the legislature or in the course of handling social issues, Members surely have some lofty ideals that they want to attain. But in many cases, if it is really certain that such ideals can never be realized, we can only opt the second best.

My third point is that the conditions of many patients may deteriorate quickly. A patient may still be all very fine in the morning, so I tell his family that he is alright. However, his condition may change abruptly three hours later, and I must immediately inform his family that his conditions have turned critical and he must receive an operation. In this case, the patient's family would query: "Doctor, why are you so capricious?" Hearing such a question, I will tell myself

that patients' conditions are indeed capricious, and nothing can be done about this. In fact, I feel the same way about many social issues and policies being discussed in the legislature. I mean changes do come very abruptly. Sometimes others ask me to comment on something, and I give my view. But when I change my mind two days later, some people will scold me. Are they saying that I must not change my mind? I should be allowed to change my mind in response to the changing situation.

My fourth point is that very often, doctors have to perform operations. In this connection, what is the best time to perform an operation? Experience tells me that the best time should be "before it is too late". But Members should understand that there is a problem with logic here. How can we know whether it is too late? Nonetheless, it remains true that this is the best moment for an operation, since it is the moment when we can grasp most information and make the most accurate judgment. Certainly, if it is too late, the patient will die.

I have worked in the legislature for three years, and frankly speaking, I find that our productivity and efficiency are very low most of the time. There may be a certain point to which many Members agree, but every Member in agreement still wants to stand up and repeat the same point all over again. Even though a Member agrees to the remarks of other Members, he will not be satisfied with simply casting a vote in agreement. He still wants to stand up and himself repeat the same point once again. Therefore, productivity is indeed very low most of the time. Nonetheless, speaking of voting and voting positions, I notice that every year, there are two to three critical moments. But it is interesting that sometimes abstention and reticence are possible. Reticence and abstention can also convey a message of some kind and change a policy.

Lastly, do Members happen to know the origin of "The Five Loners"? "The Five Loners" are some minor roles in JIN Rong's novel *The Heaven Sword and Dragon Sabre*. Under the Ming Cult Master, there are the Left and Right Messengers, the Four Guardian Kings, and lastly, the Five Loners, whose roles are minor. But after doing some Internet research, I have come to know that the Ming Cult Master, the Left and Right Messengers and the Four Guardian Kings are all fictional characters, and only the Five Loners are based on real persons. The Five Loners were geniuses living in seclusion in the late Yuan Dynasty and early Ming Dynasty. Hence, the sobriquet of "The Five Loners" is really a kind of flattery to the five of us. They were martial art experts and well versed in

wizardry. I believe Members may have interest in two of them. One of them was called LENG Qian. Simply by painting a door on a wall, he could reach the government treasury through that door, and take as much money as he wanted. I believe Members would very much want me to have such an ability. Another one was called ZHOU Dian. He was a bit eccentric. When ZHU Yuanzhang was battling against CHEN Youliang, he went around and prophesied that ZHU Yuanzhang would win. Later on, ZHU Yuanzhang really won, and ZHOU Dian was revered as a god. I believe Members are interested in knowing who will become the next Chief Executive.

Thank you, President.

**MR IP WAI-MING** (in Cantonese): President, I also want to know who plays the role of ZHOU Dian among "The Five Loners" of this Council. Maybe he can tell me who the next Chief Executive will be.

President, there are "newcomers" to this Council, and I can say that I am just equally new. I have been a Member for about three years. In October this year, we will move to the new Legislative Council Complex. Many Members here are more experienced than I am. President, I can tell Members that after the passage of three years' time, I am not yet quite so accustomed to speaking on occasions like this. There are always some moments when I am not so sure about how I should deliver my speeches. If my speech is too long, the President will advise me against verbosity, or he may simply say "Time is up" when it is about time. Sometimes, I fear that my speech may offend certain people. As Dr LEUNG said, this Chamber is a place quite like a colosseum where lions and tigers might jump out any time to tear you asunder.

But I also have another feeling about this building. Some colleagues have been criticizing certain government officials for speaking like a "human mp3". But I sometimes think that from a different perspective, while government officials may be like a "human mp3", the several dozen of us here may also be a "human mp3". Members have been discussing over and over again issues that were first raised more than 10 years ago, probably because such issues have remained unsettled over the years. In fact, the views on certain issues expressed in various discussions have actually been raised by Members repeatedly over the past decade or so. While Members describe some government officials as a

"human mp3", has it ever occurred to them that to a certain extent, we may also be a "human mp3"? President, sometimes I really wonder whether Members are also a "human mp3". But I do not think so after some thoughts. The reason is that on many issues, the Government often fails to respond to us directly or attempt to figure out any solutions, thus making it necessary to raise them over and over again. And, although the discussion has been going on for more than 10 years, it seems that no genuine solution is in sight, nor is there any proposal for our discussion.

President, there were two events in the past three years that I personally found most unforgettable. The first one was the discussion on the Express Rail Link (XRL) — the Secretary General is smiling in tacit understanding — and the other one was the minimum wage issue. Regarding the discussion on the XRL, my most vivid memory is not the siege of the Legislative Council. That day, I was fortunate enough to be able to leave this building around 8 pm. Hence, I could only watch from a distance how my colleagues were besieged till midnight. My most vivid memory is what happened the night before (It should be Friday). Some colleagues set up a tent outside this building at that time, in preparation for a certain activity the following day, and we did not hide our support for the construction of the XRL. I recalled that after the close of meeting that day, the next day, some demonstrators rushed at the building and where the tent was set. The tent was thus damaged. At first I did not know if any colleague was resting inside the tent, so I was very worried about the safety of my colleagues. I can recall that I was very worried about their safety. I appreciate that it is very normal for members of different political parties to express their views. But I do not want to see the occurrence of anything undesirable due to clashes under such circumstances. I really cannot forget that very night. Therefore, even now, I still remind my colleagues of the importance of safety when they work outside, telling them that no matter what happens, they should be aware of their personal safety.

The second incident is the enactment of legislation on a minimum wage. That was the only time in the last three years that I had to stay up overnight for scrutinizing a bill, and this bill was also the fruit of our many years of struggle. I have been involved in labour-related work for many years, and I have also been taking part in the handling of labour issues and the enactment of related legislation. In fact, I have learnt a lot every step along the way — as an advocate outside the establishment, as a member of the Labour Advisory Board,

and now as a legislator. So, I am quite concerned about the Minimum Wage Ordinance. Hence, when problems occurred due to the Government's unsatisfactory handling in the course of implementation, I was a bit angry. I hope that in future, the Government can perform better in the course of governance and conduct thorough consideration before implementing any policies.

Finally, I hope we can make a new start after moving to the new Legislative Council Complex. I further hope that Members can get along more harmoniously and treat policy discussions more seriously.

Thank you, President.

**MR WONG TING-KWONG** (in Cantonese): The speeches delivered by Members to express their feelings during the motion debate on "Bidding farewell to the Legislative Council Building" today are — let me put it that way — intermingled with both solemnity and humour. I have served the Legislative Council for seven years, and this period is marked by gains and losses as well as bitterness and joy. The gains are the abundance of social experience and common knowledge I have acquired in my work. The losses are probably the dwindling hours that I spend with my family. The bitterness is the long working time in the Legislative Council, something I never expected before. In the past, many friends of mine and I used to think that being Legislative Council Members was a lot of fun, as their only job was to attend a Council meeting every Wednesday. But this is by no means the case in reality. I dare assert that over the last seven years, I have been fully committed to my work. All my time from Monday to Saturday is totally devoted to the Legislative Council. I can say that my work here is much tougher than my work in the business sector in the old days. Having worked in this environment for seven years, which is certainly not a short time, I have the following realizations.

I observe that the Legislative Council is a key segment of the entire political system of Hong Kong, pivotal to the implementation of "one country, two systems". It is my honour that I can serve the community and help implement "one country, two systems" in this Council.

In here, I can observe many different kinds of human behaviour. In this Chamber, the one thing that makes me most uncomfortable is some Members' lack of mutual respect. That there are divergent political opinions is not surprising at all. That there are differences in positions is likewise normal. But one should at least respect other people. Showing respect to other people in words and deed is actually the same as showing respect for oneself. Faced with such acts and language, I sometimes really feel very helpless. Back home, whenever my children ask me about what is going on in the Legislative Council, I just do not know what to say to them. These Members describe all this as civil disobedience, but I can hardly agree with them.

President, I wish to say that I miss very dearly several late colleagues who once worked with me in this Council during this period of time. Images of them are always in my mind. They are Mr Stephen CHEONG, Mr HUI Cheung-ching, Mr MA Lik and Mr SZETO Wah, who passed away only very recently. My respect and admiration goes to these colleagues for their service to society. Taking this opportunity of bidding farewell to the Legislative Council Building, I pay tribute to them with all my heart.

Here, I wish Hong Kong and the country a better tomorrow, and I hope all the debates in the Legislative Council can contribute positively to Hong Kong and the country, bringing to them more "bricks", more "roof tiles", but never any trouble. Thank you, President.

**MR ALBERT CHAN** (in Cantonese): President, witness to Hong Kong's democratic constitutional development, this building can be described as the cradle of Hong Kong's democratic development. It witnessed the disappearance of Official Members and the birth of directly-elected Members. However, we notice that since the reunification, this building has become a venue where regression in democracy takes place, witnessing the Legislative Council's loss of authority. Before the reunification, Members could put forth Private Members' Bills involving government expenditure, and they could also propose legislation with legal effect. However, all such powers had all been taken away after the reunification.

Executive hegemony and bullying have exacerbated the conflicts between the executive and the legislature over the past 10 years or so. In addition, the

Legislative Council has become less and less influential in monitoring the executive. Nowadays, many Secretaries of Departments, Directors of Bureaux and officials simply do not attend the meetings of the relevant committees of the Legislative Council. This shows that the executive simply ignores the legislature, and the Legislative Council has become nominal in existence and largely dispensable in many cases. Besides, the Legislative Council is now faced with an even more serious problem — there are many lackeys who are all too ready to accept orders from their master and brush aside the sanctity of this legislature.

Let us recapitulate how our society as a whole has changed since this Council became a sacred venue of law-making in the 1980s. The drastic rise of the Gini Coefficient is evidence of a widening wealth gap. The Gini Coefficient was 0.451 in 1981, but it climbed up to 0.533 in 2006. The asset values of large consortia and property developers have also leaped significantly. The asset value of Cheung Kong (Holdings) Limited surged from \$12.9 billion in 1988 to \$269.5 billion in 2010. Together with Hutchison Whampoa Limited's \$352.7 billion worth of assets, there is a combined asset value of \$622.2 billion. However, the population living in poverty in Hong Kong is now well over 1 million.

President, there is a 2.7-metre statue of Goddess Themis on the façade of the Legislative Council Building. The scales in her right hand represent justice, and the sword in her left hand is a symbol of authority. She is blind-folded, signifying her impartiality. In brief, this statue symbolizes the spirit of law as well as the spirit that the Legislative Council must uphold. Unfortunately, this Legislative Council Building, which is supposed to uphold justice, is rotten inside despite its impressive appearance. Greedy Members, corrupt systems, collusion between the Government and business and funneling of benefits pervade this Legislative Council Building. Many Members abuse their power for personal benefits, and collude with the Government to oppress the people and deprive them of their rights.

Many Members recounted their good old days in the legislature in their speeches. They know only their privileges, fame and wealth, and they are indifferent to the livelihood hardship of the 7 million people out there. They are totally ignorant of the outside world and the indignation of the people. Their only concern is their comfortable lives as Members. I can say that this Council



can fully reflect that those who have power and influence are now above justice, and authoritarianism has overwhelmed the truth. The existence of functional constituency (FC) Members is often used as a means of brushing the people's wishes aside. Public opinions are perpetually suppressed and distorted.

A few days ago, in the Ante-Chamber, a FC Member told me that some demonstrators were causing obstruction to road traffic. I immediately burst into an outrage, pointing at him and retorting that it was FC Members and all those lackeys who had obstructed the development of a democratic constitutional system in Hong Kong. I told him that they had blocked the expression of opinions, rendering it impossible to manifest public opinions. They had been causing obstruction to Hong Kong for some 20 years, I told him.

President, speaking of the obstruction to democratic development, I must say that even though this Council will be moved to the new Legislative Council Complex, it will still represent the powerful and influential, oppress the masses and distort public opinions as long as democracy is not upheld in Hong Kong.

A number of Members have recapitulated many of their experiences in this Council. However, they all fail to notice that the legitimate and sacred duty of this very legislature has yet to be implemented and discharged. I have listened to the speeches delivered by a number of Members, particularly Mr WONG Ting-kwong. He mentioned that some Members had shown no respect for other Members. However, in fact, they themselves have no respect for the legitimate and sacred duty of this Council. Nor do they have any respect for their status as representatives of public opinions who should speak for the people rather than serving as lackeys.

FCs are not the only ones to be held responsible for the sluggishness of Hong Kong's democratic development. I have repeatedly lashed out at the Democratic Party in this Chamber, criticizing that as a representative of the public and the political party controlling or representing the democratic camp for 20 years, it has engaged in backroom political deals with the Communist Party. Some members of the public even told me that it should actually be called "backroom adultery". How can such deeds improve Hong Kong people's livelihood and uphold justice? Hence, the relocation of the Legislative Council from this building will in fact return justice to this building, this sacred venue, and the statue of Goddess Themis outside. I hope that after the return of this

building to the Court, the latter will not tread the path of corruption, avarice and distortion of judicial justice like the Legislative Council. I hope the Court will not follow the footsteps of the Legislative Council in the future.

**MR WONG KWOK-KIN** (in Cantonese): President, when I caught sight of this very solemn edifice while walking past Central many years ago, I had a very special feeling because it was surrounded by skyscrapers and commercial buildings of the latest designs. The majestic presence of this solemn edifice in the middle of a concrete jungle can indeed make it stand out in prominence.

Once a seaman, I have been to many major cities in the world. I observe that in every major city, there are bound to be some old buildings representative of its past history. I suppose this is the only way to give prominence to a city's cultural heritage. If there are nothing but only skyscrapers in a city, it will seem like a parvenu to others. Erected in Central, Hong Kong, this very edifice is something like the sediment of Hong Kong history, or it may even be regarded as witness to our history. Hence goes my respect for this building.

I never imagined that I could have the opportunity and honour to catch the "last train" and serve the Legislative Council as a Member for three years. As Ms Miriam LAU mentioned this morning, there are the principles of ranking on the basis of seniority and "first in, first be superiors" in this Council, so I would find it only proper for us to speak last in the queue. My work in the Legislative Council has indeed increased my understanding of politics. Over the past three years as a Member, I have broadened my horizons greatly, and improved a lot as a result of exposure.

First of all, my understanding of politics may now be significantly different when compared with that in the past. In the past, I always believed that what was right and just would always remain so, and justice would definitely be done somehow and somewhere. Nonetheless, after joining the Legislative Council, I have come to realize that in many cases, it is simply difficult to reason things out, and it may not necessarily be possible to uphold justice in this very Chamber. The passage of any advocacy, very often, must depend on which side can have a louder voice. In addition, we have to compete in terms of political strategies and media relations, and make well co-ordinated efforts inside and outside the Council before we can be victorious. But can the victory won in this way really

manifest justice? The answer to this question can aptly explain why many members of the public have commented that the Legislative Council is just a "talk shop", or a performance venue, for its whole bunch of Members.

The public actually perceive this Chamber, as rightly pointed out by one Member just now, as just a colosseum where everybody vies for power. Nonetheless, to me, it is more like a theatre, where Members' sole concern is histrionics, that is, how they can project their personal images outside the Chamber through the two television cameras it is equipped with. Every word or deed of theirs is meant to convey messages to their supporters through the cameras. Therefore, the waning public support for the Legislative Council is only natural. One latest opinion poll shows that the popularity rate of the Legislative Council has dropped to only 10%, which is indeed saddening.

As a Member of this Council, I am naturally ashamed of myself. At times, when I met some friends whom I had not seen for quite a long while, if they did not know that I was a Member, I would not mention anything lest embarrassment might ensue, since everybody is well aware of the public appraisal of the Legislative Council.

Having said that, I must add that I still treasure my role as a Member. As Members, we can compel the Government to deal with certain matters. Also, as Members, we can directly contact government officials in charge of certain matters, so as to resolve problems for needy residents and members of the public, bargain with the Government at some critical moments, and strive for people's legitimate interests. Therefore, despite the fact that society's appraisal of the Legislative Council is not that favourable, I still maintain that Members should make still greater efforts to alter the public perception of all of us.

Although I have not worked in the Legislative Council Building for any long periods, I am likewise attached to this building. May peace be restored to this building after our removal. Just now, many Members mentioned Goddess Themis. I think there may well be another interpretation of her being blindfolded — she does not want to see the mud wrestling in this Council every day. I hope that peace can be restored to this Chamber after our relocation, and Goddess Themis can enjoy tranquillity.

President, I hope we can make a fresh start after moving to the new Legislative Council Complex. Though this hope is a bit idealistic, I would think that to be hopeful is after all better than cherishing no hope at all. Thank you, President.

**DR LAM TAI-FAI** (in Cantonese): President, I became a Legislative Council Member in 2008. This in fact came four years later than my original plan. Having received the Young Industrialist Award in 2000, I already indicated to the group my intention of running in the Legislative Council election in 2004. My then supervisor in the group said to me: "You have not done much for the trade and do not have adequate experience. The incumbent Member Mrs Sophie LEUNG is highly experienced, so if you run in the election, you will at best be an also-ran only. Why don't you seek more exposure in the next few years before planning what to do?" I took his advice and continued with my work. However, my conviction of serving the community remained unchanged. Hence, during that period, I joined a number of business associations and chambers of commerce, with a view to understanding the trade better, making more friends and broadening my horizons.

Later on, my patience really wore thin. In 2005, I again indicated to the group that I would definitely run in the election in 2008. But I decided to adopt a different approach this time around. I intended to run in the election on a full-time basis this time around, so I must quit my job. I always believe that we must be totally committed to whatever we do. Unless one is a superman capable of doing several jobs simultaneously, one must assess one's ability and be focused. I indicated to the group that if I was to run in the election, I would have to tender my resignation. Under the atmosphere at that time, there were frequent references to the collusion between the Government and business and conflicts of interests. If I ran in functional constituency election, I would be especially susceptible to misunderstanding associated with the belief in Government-business collusion and conflicts of interests, and this would prevent me from concentrating on my electioneering. Therefore, I quit my job in 2007, and spent a year on preparing for the election. The electioneering that followed was unexpectedly smooth, and in the end, I was elected *ipso facto*. Being elected *ipso facto* was certainly a delightful and smooth experience, but this also became a laughing stock, with people saying that I had not been "baptized" by the test of election. Hence, in case anyone still wants to support my candidacy in

the election in 2012, I would very much like to accept the challenge, in the hope of ridding myself of this laughing stock.

I have worked in this Chamber and building for three years. But frankly, I really feel no affection for this building. I only treat it as a place for work and meetings. In particular, since I am not from any background of arts and architecture, I frankly have no special feeling about a British mansion of this kind. Even during those days when I was running businesses in the United States, Britain and Australia, I was never interested in visiting any such buildings, because I have no affection for buildings. Therefore, I do not feel any attachment to this building, which is nothing but just a piece of hardware.

Nonetheless, I still want to talk about one feeling of mine. When I first joined the Legislative Council, someone said to me: "'Tai-fai', as an independent Member serving this Council, you are a lone fighter and cannot possibly do much. Moreover, you are also a newcomer, so you will not be given too many tasks." I replied: "I am very unlikely to join any political party or grouping, because convictions, culture and goals must be identical, and there must also be similar mindsets and background. It is very difficult to force anything on myself." He then said: "Then there will be great trouble. You will certainly achieve nothing and fail to show any result to the business sector." In my moments of hesitation as to whether I should join any political party or grouping, by sheer accident, something worked out. All of us, the five Members sitting at the back, happened to share the same idea. In one certain gathering, it was suggested that we should come more together for discussions.

We hold different qualifications. The rest of the four are respectively accounting, insurance, information technology and medical professionals. I am the only one who is not a professional. I am no professional. I run a small business only. But at that time, we all felt very comfortable with the idea, so it was suggested that we should come together to form a loose framework for complementing one another and exchanging information. This was how "The Five Loners" first emerged. The idea is very good. Kin-por also agrees that this is an arrangement we all feel very comfortable with. Though we do not hold any regular meetings, we will still come together to chat, communicate and candidly share our views whenever there are any significant issues involving the cardinal principles of what is right and what is wrong. We all hold fast to the same principle of not quoting others' words outside our own circle. But internally, we are well aware of one another's thinking. This is really not bad at

all. My own realization is that there is certainly room for survival in this legislature for independents, and maybe, independents can actually be more flexible, able to handle matters with their different mindsets and backgrounds.

Another feeling is ..... I am not being "sycophantic". I myself have managed a lot of people from different countries and places, including Britain, the United States and Australia. And, speaking of the Mainland, examples include Shanghai, Jiangxi and Dongguan. I have even managed people from Cambodia and Thailand. I notice that the management of the Legislative Council is totally up to standard. The service quality of many Legislative Council Secretariat staff members is surprisingly high. For instance, some stewards (such as Tony) are really very smart and quick on the uptake. I cannot describe them as clever, but they are smart people. The security personnel are also very smart. I really do not know how to describe them. The work attitude, enthusiasm and precision of the staff members of the Secretariat are highly commendable. My comments are honestly not sycophantic. In view of the performance of Secretariat staff in their rendition of the comprehensive range of services, I am sure that many Members will agree with me and raise no objection. The case of Secretariat staff is a very good example. If enterprises and companies can visit the Legislative Council more frequently to observe how its staff members perform their duties and attain their goals, I believe their future work and efficiency will certainly benefit very greatly. Secretariat staff are a very good example for them.

Besides, I have one more point to make. In fact, I bear much resemblance to pan-democratic Members. They are constantly fighting for universal suffrage, and I am constantly fighting for amending section 39E of the Inland Revenue Ordinance; they are not yet successful, and so am I; they have to continue with their pursuit, and so must I. Hence, we still have a lot to pursue. I always exchange words of mutual encouragement with "Sing-chi" and "Ah KAM" from the pan-democratic camp, saying that we should set our goals and work hard until the goals are successfully attained. I am convinced that one day, under who knows which term of government, section 39E of the Inland Revenue Ordinance will eventually be put forth for discussion and amendment. When that day comes, the industrial sector will be able to see sunlight and prospects of upgrading and restructuring.

President, I so submit.

**MR WONG YUNG-KAN** (in Cantonese): President, I joined this Council without any prior intention. What made me join the legislature? In 1998, there was an extensive outbreak of red tide in Hong Kong waters. I am very grateful to the then Provisional Legislative Council for approving funds to provide fishermen with loans as a solution. At the time, all fish culture zones in Hong Kong were struck by the catastrophe, and even the then Chief Executive, Mr TUNG, carried out site inspections to assess the impact of the disaster. As a result of the disaster, I had the opportunity to enter Conference Room A and listen to how funds were approved by Members to ease the plight of fishermen.

Prompted by the disaster, many fishermen advised that we should identify some people and see if they could get the seat for the agriculture and fisheries functional constituency in the first Legislative Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR). I was therefore asked to run for this seat. Honestly, I know very little, only that the sight of fish will delight me, and at the sight of agricultural produce, I will think of palatable meals as I enjoy good food very much. Since joining the Council, I have come to realize that I can learn a lot and experience many new things. I now feel entirely differently from how I felt in the days when I was not yet a Member of this Council, because I am burdened with the responsibility for seeking a solution to the problem that the agriculture and fisheries industry in Hong Kong has not yet been given any opportunities for development. When I moved a motion debate on this problem last year, some Members said that it had already been discussed for more than a decade, and they wondered why I should still be interested in continuing with the discussion. Actually, Dr LAM Tai-fai has similarly been talking about section 39E of the Inland Revenue Ordinance for three years, but he likewise also wants to continue with the discussion.

Why have I kept talking about this very same issue for 12 years? As soon as I joined the legislature, I already hastened to approach the Government in an attempt to ascertain when the agriculture and fisheries industry started to be neglected. In fact, this industry has been neglected and left to perish on its own since the 1970s. The then Government considered that this industry was no longer needed. I therefore thought that I had the responsibility to speak for this industry in the legislature. In this way, I started in 1998, and I have served as a Member for 12 years by now. I can well be described as an old hand — I am not really that old in age, but I have certainly been serving as a Member for quite a long time.

Anyway, since joining the legislature, I have come to realize the very fierce tug of war in it. I have recently read a press report which says that a long time ago, there was an anti-communist mentality in the legislature, that is, the then Legislative Council. However, even now, I can still sense the same mentality. Some people are extremely discontented with the Mainland Government and SAR Government. But in fact, this is no big deal, even in the case of the legislature. I believe this is just a problem arising in the course of social development, one which can enable the State to explore how to implement "one country, two systems" in Hong Kong and this legislature.

Besides, I also notice an odd phenomenon. A few years ago, the Legislative Council Secretariat posted some notices, reminding everybody to switch off the lights when leaving their rooms or washrooms. However, when I subsequently walked past empty rooms, I saw that the lights inside were still on. The notices were green in colour, so does this mean that it was a message on environmentalism? If yes, how come people were so indifferent, forgetting to comply altogether? I do not know whether Members had made this mistake knowingly or unknowingly. After our relocation to the new Legislative Council Complex, will such notices be posted again to remind everybody? Despite the existence of the reminders over the years, the situation has remained unchanged. These days, when I go to these rooms, I still observe the same problem — I do not know whether everybody is really in such a great hurry, but I do see that while — the rooms are empty, the lights are still on. I hope Members will pay attention to this after moving to the new Legislative Council Complex.

Actually, I have known many Members in this building for more than a decade. I can say that we are already old friends, and we can share our thoughts on many issues. Individual Members may be labelled "establishmentarian", "royalist" or even "non-establishmentarian", but no matter how they are labelled, they simply should not think that they must "kill others in order to survive". However, once in this Chamber, Members will behave as if they must "kill others in order to survive". I think this is not something desirable.

From some recent press reports, I have learnt of certain Members' criticism that after our relocation, people intending to access the new Legislative Complex via the footbridge under construction will have to walk past the Government Secretariat designed, if I can remember correctly, with the theme of "Doors Always Open". Some Members are not very happy with this. But frankly speaking, this is not a design that has popped up only recently. It was already



put forward many years ago, and Members were all consulted. Members have long since known that this will be the case. Well, what is so wrong with having to walk past the Government Secretariat? Why should any Members consider this a humiliation or feel unhappy? What is so humiliating anyway? Members themselves likewise insult and reproach other people very often. What do they think about their own behaviour? I personally think that Members should just relax, instead of lightly making a big fuss about everything. In fact, all will be fine if Members can just relax. Moreover, is there really any humiliation? I do not think so either. This design was finalized long ago. Why have those Members turned so insistent only now? The new Legislative Council Complex is already near completion, and today we are bidding farewell to this building. That some people should still be raising this issue repeatedly now is not something desirable in my view. Any opinions should have been voiced as early as possible. Maybe, in that case, it would have been necessary to abandon the present design and choose another site or design in the course of selecting a site for the Government Secretariat and the new Legislative Council Complex. I think this is the only responsible attitude that we should adopt in the course of making any criticisms.. Thank you, President.

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Ms Miriam LAU, you may now reply and you have four seconds.

**MS MIRIAM LAU** (in Cantonese): President, I thank Members for sharing with us their experiences and feelings in this building, both bitter and sweet. All their speeches will be recorded in Hansard as part of history.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): If wood and stone were animate, how would this building feel after listening to the speeches delivered by the 43 Members just now? Even if the answer is total indifference, one can never, I believe, say that it was bored to sleep by Members' speeches. No matter what happens inside or outside of the legislature, this building is forever so tranquil, composed and at

ease, because it has long since been accustomed to all sorts of sensational scenes and deafening noises.

The seat of this Council will shortly be relocated from this building, but will it thus rejoice, as remarked by Mr WONG Yuk-man just now? I would rather believe that this building will be proud of itself as a one-time seat of the Hong Kong Legislature, in very much the same way as how we hope that the new Legislative Council Complex will be proud of Members' demeanour.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Ms Miriam LAU be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr LEE Wing-tat rose to claim a division.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Mr LEE Wing-tat has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for three minutes.

(While the division bell was ringing, the media kept taking photographs of Members' movements and activities)

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): It seems that the media are more interested in Members' upcoming departure than the contents of their speeches.*(Laughter)*

(Mr WONG Kwok-kin raised his hand in indication)

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Mr WONG, what is the problem?

**MR WONG KWOK-KIN** (in Cantonese): I wish to ask whether it is true that if we vote down this motion, it will not be necessary for us to part with this building. *(Laughter)*

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Let me repeat that this is a motion with no legislative effect. *(Laughter)*

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Ms Miriam LAU, Ms LI Fung-ying, Dr Joseph LEE, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou and Dr Samson TAM voted for the motion.

Dr Margaret NG voted against the motion.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert HO, Mr Fred LI, Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Ms Emily LAU, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr LEE Wing-tat, Mr Ronny TONG, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Ms Cyd HO, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Sing-chi, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the motion.

Mr James TO and Miss Tanya CHAN abstained.

THE PRESIDENT, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present, 17 were in favour of the motion and one against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 22 were present, 19 were in favour of the motion and two abstained. Since the question was agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

#### **END OF SESSION**

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): I now adjourn the Council. Members please pay due attention to the notice of meeting with respect to the meeting venue in the next Session. *(Laughter)*

*Adjourned accordingly at five minutes past Six o'clock.*