

1 HONG KONG LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL -- 1 March 1990

HONG KONG LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL -- 1 March 1990 1

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Thursday, 1 March 1990

The Council met at half-past Two o'clock

PRESENT

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR (PRESIDENT)

SIR DAVID CLIVE WILSON, K.C.M.G.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY

THE HONOURABLE SIR DAVID ROBERT FORD, K.B.E., L.V.O., J.P.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY

THE HONOURABLE SIR PIERS JACOBS, K.B.E., J.P.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

THE HONOURABLE JEREMY FELL MATHEWS, C.M.G., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE ALLEN LEE PENG-FEI, C.B.E., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE STEPHEN CHEONG KAM-CHUEN, C.B.E., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHEUNG YAN-LUNG, O.B.E., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MRS. SELINA CHOW LIANG SHUK-YEE, O.B.E., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MARIA TAM WAI-CHU, C.B.E., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHAN YING-LUN, O.B.E., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MRS. RITA FAN HSU LAI-TAI, O.B.E., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHENG HON-KWAN, O.B.E., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHUNG PUI-LAM, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE HO SAI-CHU, M.B.E., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE HUI YIN-FAT, O.B.E., J.P.

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

THE HONOURABLE NGAI SHIU-KIT, O.B.E., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE PANG CHUN-HOI, M.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE POON CHI-FAI, J.P.

PROF. THE HONOURABLE POON CHUNG-KWONG, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE TAI CHIN-WAH, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MRS. ROSANNA TAM WONG YICK-MING, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE TAM YIU-CHUNG

THE HONOURABLE GRAHAM BARNES, C.B.E., J.P.

SECRETARY FOR PLANNING, ENVIRONMENT AND LANDS

THE HONOURABLE MICHAEL LEUNG MAN-KIN, J.P.

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT

THE HONOURABLE EDWARD HO SING-TIN, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE RONALD JOSEPH ARCULLI, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE PAUL CHENG MING-FUN

THE HONOURABLE MICHAEL CHENG TAK-KIN, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE DAVID CHEUNG CHI-KONG, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE RONALD CHOW MEI-TAK

THE HONOURABLE MRS. NELLIE FONG WONG KUT-MAN, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MRS. PEGGY LAM, M.B.E., J.P.

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

THE HONOURABLE MRS. MIRIAM LAU KIN-YEE

THE HONOURABLE LAU WAH-SUM, J.P.

DR. THE HONOURABLE LEONG CHE-HUNG

THE HONOURABLE LEUNG WAI-TUNG, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE JAMES DAVID McGREGOR, O.B.E., I.S.O., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE KINGSLEY SIT HO-YIN

THE HONOURABLE MRS. SO CHAU YIM-PING, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE JAMES TIEN PEI-CHUN, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MRS. ELSIE TU, C.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE PETER WONG HONG-YUEN, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE YEUNG KAI-YIN, J.P.

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION AND MANPOWER

THE HONOURABLE PETER TSAO KWANG-YUNG, C.B.E., C.P.M., J.P.

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS

THE HONOURABLE ALISTAIR PETER ASPREY, O.B.E., A.E., J.P.
SECRETARY FOR SECURITY

THE HONOURABLE NIGEL CHRISTOPHER LESLIE SHIPMAN, J.P.
SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND WELFARE

ABSENT

DR. THE HONOURABLE HENRIETTA IP MAN-HING, O.B.E., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE PETER POON WING-CHEUNG, O.B.E., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE DAVID LI KWOK-PO, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE SZETO WAH

DR. THE HONOURABLE DANIEL TSE, O.B.E., J.P.

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

THE HONOURABLE LAU WONG-FAT, O.B.E., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MARTIN GILBERT BARROW, O.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE MRS. ANSON CHAN, J.P.
SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC SERVICES

IN ATTENDANCE

THE CLERK TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
MR. LAW KAM-SANG

Members' Motions

FUTURE POLITICAL SYSTEM IN HONG KONG

Resumption of joint debate on motions moved on 28 February 1990

MR. ARCULLI: Sir, I received the pronouncement of the Basic Law Drafting Committee on the Basic Law with mixed feelings. I say mixed feelings because I sensed that Hong Kong's reaction would be one of relief but no joy. Relief because the four-and-a-half-year long process of drafting the Basic Law had come to an end. No joy because despite repeated reassurances by senior officials of both the British and the Chinese Governments that our views would be taken into account that was not to be. We had hoped that the British Government could successfully champion our cause and that the Chinese Government would be sufficiently magnanimous to accede to our requests. Negotiations behind closed doors are always viewed with suspicion. However, when the result of such bargaining falls so far short of expectations is it any wonder that this suspicion turns to mistrust?

All of us in this Council know that the OMELCO consensus on constitutional changes is in no way drastic, has obtained the widest possible public support, and clearly reflects Hong Kong people's strong determination to help realize the concept of high degree of autonomy and "one country, two systems" as promised in the Sino-British Joint Declaration. Beijing can be under no illusion that Hong Kong people want autonomy and democracy after the handover. But it has chosen to go its own way.

The draft Basic Law now awaits the approval of the Chinese National People's Congress later this month and it is extremely unlikely that there will be an improvement from our point of view to the post-1997 political blueprint before promulgation. Although we should no longer place high hopes that Beijing would allow last-minute changes to the draft, it would be a serious mistake to jump to the conclusion that Hong Kong would have no future under this document.

Sir, I do not think any useful purpose would be served to continue lashing out

at the Chinese Government for not heeding our wishes or at Whitehall for yet another sellout. Criticisms never correct prejudices. Action, patience and persuasion may. There are those who hold the view that if the future Basic Law is unacceptable to Hong Kong we should not only say so clearly and loudly, but insist on striving for a better deal. I do not think that as an intellectual exercise anyone is likely to disagree. The difficulty is balancing our desire with reality. Will we not be asked this question: Is the reality of the situation not that we have no means of ensuring that all our aspirations are faithfully reflected in the future Basic Law? Would we be accused of misleading the people of Hong Kong unless we tell them in no uncertain terms, as some of my colleagues have done, that all we can do is to try our best? Are we supposed to fight on irrespective of the consequences? Certainly not. But we can nevertheless take on this struggle step by step.

Any comparison of Hong Kong's and Eastern Europe's quests for democracy is fundamentally unsound. The Eastern Bloc's cause is founded not just on a love of freedom and democracy but also because of economic plight. Hong Kong has a lot to lose if we tip the balance the wrong way. One wrong step may cost us dearly. In this context, I would like to remind ourselves that the lesson to be learnt from all this is simply that we in Hong Kong have been masters of compromise in our dealings with China and the rest of the world. We have had to alter and to adapt to survive and to be successful. We can do it again.

There has been a suggestion that the second part of the Honourable Allen LEE's motion is too vague. I could not disagree more because it would not be possible to set out all that we should do to achieve a successful democratic system. What we should do, and can do, is to focus on the forthcoming 1991 reforms. If we are committed to this tiny dot on the South China coast, if we believe that Hong Kong has the ability to continue to thrive and prosper, we must stand together and do everything possible to make next year's direct elections a resounding success.

The introduction of direct elections to the legislature is the first and giant step towards a democratic government. But having directly elected lawmakers alone is not enough. To ensure that Hong Kong's first direct polls to the legislature would not end up as a failure or a farce, many things have to be done as soon as possible. I would like to point out several.

The first thing we should do is to decide upon the number of constituencies for direct polls and their boundaries because different methods of dividing Hong Kong for election purposes could bring about totally different political consequences.

A balance should be struck to avoid gerrymandering by the Government as well as to ensure that a successful candidate would be able to reflect the views of his constituents to the legislature and, when making decisions, he would also take into account Hong Kong's interests as a whole.

The introduction of functional constituencies to the legislature in 1985 has been widely accepted as a reasonable transitional arrangement in the course of local democratic development. This system enables various sectors to contribute their expertise to society through their representatives in this Council. In return, their views would be well reflected during the legislative process, ensuring the support of relevant parties to such legislation.

Since the draft Basic Law proposes retaining functional constituencies in the future SAR legislature for a considerable period of time, it is therefore logical to expand this system before 1997. Nevertheless, both the Hong Kong Government and the future SAR Administration should ensure that all functional constituency elections be held democratically and that sectoral interests, be they professional, trade, labour or whatever, should be discouraged.

The next point, Sir, I would like to deal with concerns money. I believe the Government should encourage potential community leaders to serve the public and stand for Legislative Council direct elections by granting future candidates a subsidy set at a realistic level for running election campaigns and it should be payable to a candidate on a reimbursement basis according to actual expenditure incurred during his campaign. Such a subsidy should be available to all candidates but should only be reimbursable if a candidate has obtained a certain percentage of valid votes cast in his constituency.

This might not be a perfect arrangement, but it would certainly help substantially remove any criticism that the rich have an edge over the not so well-off in public elections.

From next October 18 members of this Council will be returned by geographically-based direct elections. For those members representing functional constituencies it is expected that they are more than likely to remain within their field or group and therefore their employment, business or profession and will thus be in constant contact with their constituency. Those returned by direct elections will be expected to have at least the same contact with their constituencies. However

they will suffer the disadvantage of not being in the same field or group as their constituencies. I believe therefore that there is a strong case for their stipend and allowance to be higher than their functional or appointed colleagues because they may have to give up full time employment to serve their constituents. We surely do not want to see our first batch of directly elected lawmakers being penalized financially or, even worse still, struggling to make ends meet.

Another urgent task, Sir, is to review and update existing electoral laws. For instance, section 21(1)(b) of the Legislative Council (Electoral Provisions) Ordinance merely states that an elected Legislative Council Member will be disqualified from the legislature if "he holds any public office or any office of emolument in the gift or disposal of a public body" without giving a clear definition of "public office". This uncertainty has already given rise to a series of litigation. Section 19(1)(a) of the Electoral Provisions Ordinance, which regulates the polls of the two municipal councils and the 19 district boards, contains a similar difficulty.

Another aspect of the electoral law which also warrants attention is the vague requirement that a candidate running for a functional constituency seat or the holder of such office has to have a "substantial connection" with his constituency. The law stipulates that a candidate or an elected member shall be disqualified if such connection ceases to exist. That the term "substantial connection" is justiciable cannot be denied and for that reason alone it is quite unsatisfactory. This is especially so in respect of non-professional functional constituency representatives because it is entirely up to the court to interpret the law and determine what substantial connection means.

One might argue that a requirement is essential to ensuring a direct and reasonable link between a functional constituency and its representative and that removing it from the law could give rise to the scenario of having lawyers represented by a doctor and doctors by a lawyer. If that be the case, so be it. At least there would be a lawyer and a doctor on this Council. If there was to be a situation in which functional constituencies were not represented by the people from within their group, perhaps we should call it a day and have direct elections to the entire legislature. Above all, Sir, it is time for us to trust our voters.

Sir, I believe the afore-mentioned legal problems deserve close scrutiny by both the Attorney General and the Secretary for Constitutional Affairs and I earnestly

hope that solutions can be found and implemented well before next year's elections. It is not that I do not have faith in the majesty of the ballot box. What may be open to doubt is the magnanimity of losers. There have been precedents as a result of these loopholes and it is possible, and perhaps foreseeable, that the courts may be inundated by cases of this sort from next year on as we are set to have more and more elections.

Sir, since the signing of the Joint Declaration in 1984, a large part of communication between Hong Kong and Beijing has focused mainly on the Basic Law drafting exercise which, however, was completed earlier last month. In the coming seven years we expect an increasingly closer Sino-Hong Kong relationship and a continuous dialogue over various aspects of life in Hong Kong and a wide range of matters of common interests. The existence of effective channels of communication between Hong Kong and Beijing is essential to enhancing mutual-understanding and co-operation. With the expected disbanding of the Basic Law Drafting Committee and Consultative Committee, the need for such channels is crucial.

Not everyone of us in this community will be invited to Zhongnanhai. Nor can ordinary citizens afford to fly to Beijing at their own expenses whenever they want to reflect their views to the senior Chinese leaders, not to mention whether they will be received by the Chinese authorities. I believe that it is right for the British Government and this Administration to actively encourage and nurture the Sino-Hong Kong dialogue and relationship at all levels so as to ensure a smooth transition and handover.

In conclusion I would like to say that each of us could spend a little time analyzing the pros and cons of the two motions before the Council today. However, Sir, we are not here to indulge in word games. We are here to inform the community of how we see the way ahead of us. I would like to believe that it can be business as usual from now on but we will have problems ahead of us which the community must tackle. For these reasons, Sir, I have no mixed feelings in supporting the Senior Member's motion.

MR. PAUL CHENG: Yes, I am disappointed that the OMELCO consensus was not adopted; because it was achieved through much discussion and considerable compromise, and it represents what most people in Hong Kong would like to see adopted. Yet we should not spend time on a post mortem. We are not looking at a death. We are looking at

a new chapter in Hong Kong's history. A new period in a game which is still in progress.

Things do change. Look at what is happening in Europe. Who would have thought that political development could occur so quickly? Nowadays with telecommunications and virtually instant media coverage, the world has never been more close-knit than it is today.

The whole world is in transition. More and more borders are falling. The European Community will come into being in 1992. The United States has signed a pact with Canada which may eventually include Mexico. I have just returned from attending a conference to assess the formation of an Asia Pacific Economic Co-operative Pact. There is a genuine and almost autonomous world economy of money, credit and investment organized by information which no longer knows national boundaries.

Additional recent transition is seen in cuts to defence spending. After more than 40 years of the longest, biggest, and most widely spread arms race in world history, arms are now recognized as counterproductive. They drain economic performance and economic development. And economics is today's world linchpin. We have become transnational.

Things do change. And we are faced with new realities. The entire world is taking on a new vision. Increasingly, sovereign national governments are finding they have to be reactive rather than proactive. They have been drawn into the new transnational world.

Let us hope that China will soon recognize this new age of national governments' participating transnationally. In this way Hong Kong can move more smoothly from a British colony -- and from this intervening period of fighting for our identity -- to 1997 when, in effect, we become an international division of "China, Inc.". We are to be in a subsidiary relationship with our head office. As such, we will be working for the same broader good and welfare of the people of Hong Kong and eventually Greater China.

From a world perspective, this transnational impact evolved through several eras. We have by-passed the mechanical model of technology brought in with the industrial revolution. We went as far as we could go with the ultimate source of power, atomic energy replicated in 1945 with atomic fission. We have crested the information age

with information technology as the organizing principle for work. It is hard to believe that the first computer came on stream as long ago as 1946, when we now enjoy, as commonplace, telecommunication technology with our portable phones, fax machines, and satellite television coverage. In cresting the information age, we have embarked on the transnational era.

The cold war ended in the last years of the 1980s, and the arms race has been slowed through improved relationships between the United States and the Soviet Union. The postwar period of nationalism and ideological differences has been replaced by globalization. The worldwide shift from authoritarian regimes to democracy will lay the political groundwork for further economic growth. The world is undergoing a shift from economies managed by governments to economies run by markets. Democracy is by far the most successful context in which to nourish entrepreneurship and successful economies. Peace, not war; global trade, not protectionism, will see us through the 1990s and into the new millennium.

While the proposed political system for Hong Kong is not perfect, it does enable us to set the wheels of democracy in motion. So now we must do our part. We must concentrate our efforts on next year's direct elections. Now more than ever before, we must focus some energies on communicating widespread civic responsibility among Hong Kong people so they feel comfortable and competent to get out and vote. They need to be able to identify those who can represent them well -- those who are articulate and conversant with the many issues that Hong Kong is facing today.

Distinguished author and professor Peter DRUCKER in his newest book, *The New Realities*, focuses attention on the new transnational world in which we live. It gives us a new vision evolving out of the information age. He says, "The realities are different from the issues on which politicians, economists, scholars, businessmen, union leaders, still fix their attention, still write books, still make speeches. The convincing proof of this is the profound sense of unreality which characterizes so much of today's politics and of today's economics."

What struck me most strongly in DRUCKER's work was his zeroing in on the social impacts of information. The information economy puts new force and new responsibilities on the shoulders of each one of us as individuals.

All of us know that Hong Kong is faced with a lengthy agenda of issues -- all of them important; all of them requiring attention. Yet if we are to be governed

well, priorities must be set and a balance must be achieved in addressing these issues. A major step on the road to democracy is through everyone in the community understanding this concept. Understanding must go beyond the Chambers of Legislative Council and the Halls of Government.

On our part, then, as Legislative Councillors, we must support all efforts to inform citizens in public policy based on education at the grass roots level. We are looking at a transformation in how Hong Kong people are to be involved in politics. It is this new "how" -- the "how to be involved" that is at the crux of our successful governance through the 1990s and beyond.

So much negative news confronts us daily. We need to strive for balance in sharing information. We need to see the positive that is a big part of Hong Kong, too. The media can go a long way in helping to rebuild Hong Kong's confidence, and I welcome their support.

I also sincerely believe it is time to stop the plethora of surveys that buffet us with how many of our best and brightest are leaving Hong Kong and of how many more of us want to leave, but cannot. It is time to move our surveys to Toronto, Sydney and New York. How do we attract investment? How do we attract Hong Kong people back to Hong Kong? How many people in these geographical regions know what truly praiseworthy benefits exist in Hong Kong making it a desirable place in which to live and do business?

On Government's part, then, it must be thoughtful and well-organized. It must have vision. The Administration needs our support and encouragement more than ever before. For the people it serves, it must address the Hong Kong image problem forcefully and positively. This is its major "outside issue". For the people it serves, it must also address the transitional period by putting a well-defined political system in place with an established election process. This is its major "inside issue".

Yet, in the end, it will be the response of the populace of Hong Kong, the response of every one of us, which will determine the success of democratization. Let us continue to work through diplomacy. Let us not start another round of war of words, for it would only create further loss of confidence.

Sir, of the two motions being debated today, I believe the motion of my colleague, the Honourable Allen LEE, gives us firmer footing and a better beginning on the road

to democracy. With these words, I support his motion.

MR. MICHAEL CHENG (in Cantonese): Sir, it is the aspiration of the majority of the local population to see further democratization of the political system in Hong Kong. We are under the obligation to strive on behalf of Hong Kong people for a more democratic political system and for the setting up of a government more accountable to the public.

Yet a democratic system alone is not enough to maintain Hong Kong's prosperity and stability. The Basic Law provisions on other areas such as economy, judicial independence, the relationship between the central authorities and the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the rights and duties of the residents and some social issues are also of great importance to our future development. The two motions before us today, however, give people the impression that they are put forth to give vent to our emotions over the rejection of the OMELCO consensus. They make no mention of other provisions which would have a significant bearing on our future development, nor do they touch on the important elements concerning the political system, such as the chief executive, the executive authorities and the legislature. Their scope of concern is indeed too limited.

During the period of consultation on the draft Basic Law, numerous political models were proposed. The Basic Law Consultative Committee received altogether 40 proposals, an indication that Hong Kong people who used to be "politically apathetic" have gradually become more concerned in politics. This is indeed heartening. During the final stage, these proposals were boiled down to a handful of major models, one of which was the "4-4-2" model which was probably more acceptable to the general public in Hong Kong because it was a consensus reached in a give-and-take spirit by the radicals, the middle-of-the-roaders and the moderates. It was also the model of my preference. The Basic Law Drafting Committee finally produced the final draft after four years and eight months of preparation, consultation, discussion and voting. Although the final draft is still some way off perfection, we must be sensible enough to accept the reality. I believe that compromise is a necessary step towards democracy. All parties concerned should take the interests of the whole into consideration. For the sake of safeguarding Hong Kong's overall and long-term interests, they should set aside their prejudice and seek common ground while accommodating differences. Nothing will be gained if the advocates of different models remain intransigent by sticking fast to their own views and continue with the

endless arguments over the number of seats in the Legislative Council, but rather this lack of democratic spirit in demeanour will pour oil on fire where our confidence crisis is concerned and cause anxiety among Hong Kong people just when they have begun to calm down. As a result, Hong Kong's stability and prosperity will be directly affected.

The Basic Law provisions on the formation of the legislature may not be acceptable to all. They have, however, laid down a clear direction for the future development of Hong Kong. The provisions have provided a development framework for the future of Hong Kong in maintaining the principle of gradual progress towards democracy. Despite the fact that there has never been any region-based direct election for Legislative Council seats, 18 directly elected seats will be introduced to this Council in 1991. This is a big step forward in that there will be eight seats more than what was promised in the White Paper on the Development of Representative Government published in 1988. Two more directly elected seats will be added in 1995, another four in 1999, and by 2003, half of the 60 seats in the legislature will be returned by district-based direct elections while the other half will be filled by candidates from the functional constituencies. It is hoped that through this paced arrangement, stability and continuity may be maintained.

The drafting of the Basic Law is a sophisticated task that needs to be done with great care. Apart from the need of attention for a wide range of issues, cool-headedness and careful analysis are also required. Yet, the drafting process was affected by emotions, confrontation and shock throughout. It is indeed a good thing that the Chinese and British Governments have finally given up the bickering and come to an agreement through mutual understanding. What is most important is the settlement of the problem of convergence. This will enable Hong Kong to enjoy a smooth transition in 1997 and is therefore extremely helpful to the maintenance of stability in the community. It is a welcoming development to the people of Hong Kong. It is hoped that both governments will continue to work for the good of Hong Kong through reconciliation and close co-operation and not to deal any more blows to the confidence of Hong Kong people by creating confrontational situations.

The great majority of Hong Kong people will have to stay in Hong Kong after 1997. We must take care of their interest, hence, it is now time for us to make concerted and positive efforts to fulfil our mission of building a better future with a view to achieving a successful democratic system. The most urgent task before us is to make a success of the 1991 district-based direct election and lay a foundation for

future democratic developments. This is very important. Hong Kong people must elect for themselves members of good conduct and high calibre who are capable of serving Hong Kong and should in no way choose those who only intend to satisfy their own desires for power or care about the interests of the bodies they belong to. I believe that the success of the 1991 direct election is determined by how well the following three principles are observed: (1) to encourage people to stand for election; (2) to encourage more electors to vote; and (3) to adopt a voting system which is familiar to the people.

To comply with these principles and to make a success of the 1991 election, the demarcation of constituency boundaries is very important. In the past six years since 1985, the voters have already grown accustomed to having their representatives indirectly elected from the 10 established constituencies to speak for them in the Legislative Council. These 10 Legislative Council Members thus elected are accountable to the people of their constituencies and, in this way, the development of representative government has been progressing at a steady pace. In 1991 when the district-based indirect election is transformed into direct election, the existing 10 constituencies should be used as a basis in drawing up electoral constituencies for the 1991 election. What is more, in the White Paper on the Development of Representative Government published in 1988, the Government has also stated her intention to introduce 10 directly elected members into the Legislative Council in 1991, each to be elected from one of the 10 geographical constituencies. Hence, these 10 constituencies should be used as a basis for the 1991 direct election. However, since it will be difficult to distribute 18 seats evenly among the 10 constituencies, I suggest that, bearing in mind the above-mentioned principle, the number of constituencies should accordingly be reduced from 10 to nine, that is, two constituencies for Hong Kong Island, three for Kowloon and four for the New Territories. Each medium-size constituency with a population of approximately 600 000 will return two representatives to the Legislative Council.

I think that if the entire territory is to be divided into four to six constituencies, the constituencies would be too large in size. Candidates from district boards which cover relatively smaller areas would stand a poor chance of being elected and, thus, would have little opportunity to speak on behalf of the residents in the Legislative Council. This is surely against the spirit of representative government.

Direct election in a large constituency may result in the snapping up of seats

by big political or financial groups and by people who are expert at using excessive means and unscrupulous promotion tactics through manipulation of the media. We should provide greater opportunity for middle-ranking people who sincerely and earnestly wish to reflect public opinion but have no backing from major political parties or financial groups to stand for election. The Legislative Council will then be able to draw in more people with different backgrounds and ensure that government policies can cater to the needs of a wider spectrum. Furthermore, a higher turn-out rate of voters in various districts will be achieved if residents in smaller districts know that they are being represented by candidates from their own districts. The development of our representative government will go backwards if the 1991 district-based direct election fails to return candidates who truly represent their constituencies.

We must maintain our social and economic stability in order to have a steady pace of democratic development. Our economic strength is to a great extent built upon our excellent physical infrastructure. The Government is now prepared to spend \$127 billion on the new airport, the port, transport links and supporting industrial and commercial facilities. This programme is indeed encouraging. During the transition period, Hong Kong must go ahead with the infrastructural projects in good earnest in order to cope with the increasing demands. Meanwhile, the Chinese and British Governments as well as the commercial sector should make concerted efforts to develop our links with other economies in the world in such aspects as trade, investment, manufacturing and finance by encouraging foreign investment and establishing economic links with other countries in the Asia-Pacific region so as to make Hong Kong a big international city and economic centre. In view of its close relationship with China, Hong Kong must establish close economic links with southern China and other regions in China for the sake of mutual benefits.

We shall need an efficient administration to achieve all these. Through a fair and carefully planned direct election, we shall be able to prove with facts that candidates of good conduct and high calibre can be elected under such an electoral system to form a more representative and accountable legislature that is capable of maintaining the efficient operation of our government and ensuring continuous stability and prosperity in Hong Kong. With these facts, we shall then be in a better position to persuade China to review the Basic Law which is to be promulgated shortly, allow further development of Hong Kong's democratic political system and completely scrap the separate voting system for private Members' Bills and amendment Bills which may delay the legislative process and upset the smooth running of our government.

Sir, with these remarks, I support the Honourable Allen LEE's motion which "urges the community, in the interest of Hong Kong, to be united in its efforts to achieve a successful democratic system".

MR. DAVID CHEUNG: Sir, I rise to join my honourable colleagues in expressing our disappointment with the political model proposed by the Basic Law Drafting Committee last month, with the deepest sentiment of regret.

Barring a miracle at the meeting of the National People's Congress later this month, the proposed model will be set in concrete, much as it falls far short of the OMELCO consensus and does not meet the general wishes of the people of Hong Kong.

It has been asserted that the proposed model is a big improvement on the version proposed in Guangzhou and should therefore satisfy the people of Hong Kong. Why should it be when the community's overwhelming support for the OMELCO consensus has not even been discussed, let alone adopted? The ultra-conservative Guangzhou model is but a bargaining chip.

People in Hong Kong have been accused of playing a number game. It is not true at all. Even if it was so, they are not to blame because by 2003, between the two models there is a difference of 30 directly elected seats in the legislature, and 30 is certainly a large number.

Nothing could be farther from the truth than to label the OMELCO consensus model as British, for if so, the British Government would have supported it. The painstaking efforts on the part of OMELCO Members to strive to reach a consensus amidst two polarized conceptions of democratization and to stick to the same model after what has happened on 4 June 1989 show that we, as responsible OMELCO Members, have taken the entire situation into careful consideration, including the political sensitivity of the Chinese leaders.

OMELCO Members are not radicals, neither do we want confrontational politics. A middle-of-the-road and gradual-increase-as-we-move-along approach has been adopted. If the OMELCO consensus has been brushed aside simply because of face or in order to prove who Hong Kong's sovereign master is, it is totally unnecessary. It would only discourage Hong Kong people from expressing their views, knowing that

China has no desire to heed their cries. This will further erode confidence in Hong Kong. Is this what China wants, I wonder? Is this what the British Government wants, I wonder? Sir, is this what the Hong Kong Government also wants?

Sir, to be very honest, I do not accept the political model that has now been proposed and cannot commend it to the Hong Kong people because I do not see how the model could achieve the ideals which are underlain by the spirit of the Joint Declaration to allow Hong Kong people to rule Hong Kong with a high degree of autonomy.

However, paradoxically, the realities of politics are such that we in Hong Kong will have to live with this model for the time being, however dissatisfied we may be. But I would not like to give an impression that Hong Kong people's pragmatism is to be taken for granted. The fire of our aspirations for a more democratic political structure will continue to kindle and spark. If we are able to prove, for the benefit of those who are less democratically prone, that democracy is not an evil to be stifled at all costs, maybe the Government will have an easier job in persuading the Chinese Government that more democracy for Hong Kong is not just desirable, but also beneficial to Hong Kong's long-term development.

Thus, it is all the more important that we as a community should face up to the challenges of the acid test in the 1991 Election. I appeal to all those who are eligible for voting to register as voters and to vote for those who can really represent their interests and the interests of the community as a whole. Only through active involvement of ourselves in the election of our representatives will we, in time, be the masters of our own destiny.

Sir, with these words, I support the Senior Member's motion.

MR. CHOW (in Cantonese): Sir, I support the Honourable J.D. MCGREGOR's motion, which unequivocally indicates that up to this very moment, we still back up the OMELCO consensus model and maintain that a clear-cut timetable for democratic developments should be enshrined in the blueprint of our political system. We must be aware that while today's debate may not have a profound impact on the future political structure, what we said and did would be put on records and we would be held accountable to the public and answerable to history. Unless one considers that the adoption of the Basic Law political model has become an established fact and thus withdraws his backing to the OMELCO consensus model, it is only right that the motion should incorporate

the consensus model which the OMELCO arrived at after lengthening negotiations and compromising. Many people have mentioned the need for unity. Unity is indeed very important, but the question is, on what basic we are to be united and towards which direction such unity should develop. Without having these questions cleared, what difference would there be between unity and capitulation? Who would we rather be -- CHAO Gai or SUNG Jiang in the Chinese classical novel Water Margin?

Sir, it is indeed a disappointment to most of us in Hong Kong that the Basic Law Drafting Committee have failed to adopt the OMELCO consensus in the formulation of the future political system. The way our consensus model has been treated reminds one of the situation as described in SUNG Yu's Ode of the Lustful Deng Tu Zi. According to the ode, Deng Tu Zi spoke ill of SUNG Yu in front of the Emperor of the State of Chu. Deng Tu Zi criticized that SUNG Yu was so good-looking, soft-spoken and lustful that he should not be allowed into the inner chambers of the palace. In rebuttal, SUNG Yu argued that he was born handsome, taught to be soft-spoken by teachers but never a lustful person. SUNG Yu went on to say: "The beauties of the state of Chu excel all beauties of the world; the beauties in my neighbourhood are the best among the beauties of the state of Chu; the beauty next door is the most outstanding in neighbourhood. This neighbour of mine is the epitome of perfection. Her beauty is so impeccable that there is absolutely no need to add anything to or take away anything from her appearance. Her complexion is so lovely that the use of any cosmetics would spoil her natural beauty. Her eyebrows are like fine feathers and her skin is as white as snow. Her waist is slender and her teeth look like pearl. A smile from her would fascinate the whole county of Yong Cheng and get the county of Xia Cai infatuated. Though such a beauty has been flirting with me over the wall for three years, I never yielded to her overtures. On the contrary, Deng Tu Zi married a woman who has deformed ears and dishevelled hair. Her lips are chipped and her teeth sparse. Suffering from a crooked spine, she limps around carrying skin disease and ailments of many kinds. However, Deng Tu Zi is fond of her and made her the mother of five children. Under the circumstances, whom do your Majesty think is more lustful of the two?" The tactics adopted by SUNG Yu was "concentrating on one point and ignoring the other aspects". From this anecdote we turn to what happened to the OMELCO consensus model which was foundered before getting off the ground. There was only one point which came under attack -- it was alleged that the OMELCO model originated from the British side, that it was a conspiracy to prolong the British rule over Hong Kong. As to the other aspects -- how widely representative the OMELCO is, how much effort the OMELCO has made to reconcile various opinions in hammering out the model, how the model is widely supported by different consultative bodies

and political parties, how effective it is in meeting the subjective and objective needs for democratic development in Hong Kong, and how far it goes in putting people's mind at ease -- all these aspects were simply brushed aside. The model was not even given the chance to be tabled for discussion. Had we known that whatever the OMELCO proposed would have met with opposition from China in the formulation of the Basic Law, we should have at the very beginning supported the bicameral system or the separate voting mechanism.

Sir, the finalized political blueprint has drawn a rather favourable response from the political circle, with "acceptable" being the most commonly given comment. This is hardly surprising, as the Chinese Government has indeed gradually and effectively dampened Hong Kong people's aspirations for democratization in recent years. Back in 1984 when our political system was under review, the mainstream thinking then was that all seats in the legislature should be returned by direct elections by 1997. Based on this concept, a timetable was worked out which envisaged that one quarter of the seats in the Legislative Council should be directly elected in 1988. Today, the finalized proposal that only one-third of the Legislative Council seats would be returned by direct elections in 1997 is applauded by various sectors as if they were overjoyed at great mercy being given unexpectedly. Are Hong Kong people like the monkeys depicted by ZHUANG Zi in the fable of Zhao San Mu Si (Three in the Morning and Four in the Evening)? The fable reads, "The monkeys rose in protest when given three fruits in the morning and four in the evening, but all become contented when the number of fruits given in the morning and in the evening was reversed." It should be borne in mind that, where the ratio of directly elected seats in the first three terms of the legislature is concerned, the "Cha-Cha" model suggested 27%, 38% and 50% respectively, while the current proposal aims merely at 33%, 40% and 50%. As such, even if it is not a difference between "three fruits in the morning and four in the evening" and "four fruits in the morning and three in the evening", it is at most a change from "three fruits in the morning and four in the evening" to "3.1 fruits in the morning and four in the evening". Should we really weep for joy for buying something at a 70% discount, when actually the price has been marked up by 300%?

It is an indisputable fact that the Basic Law political model is undemocratic and falls far short of the expectations of people from various sectors, including the industrial and commercial sectors. Some academics consider that the June 4 incident has "overloaded" our discussions on the political system, and subjective aspirations go far beyond the bounds of objective reality. But they overlook the

fact that theories, once in the grasp of the people, can turn into physical strength, and that subjective aspirations can be transformed into objective reality. The greatest drawback of the Basic Law political model is the lack of a sufficiently democratic element in the legislature to enable the general public to monitor the government through elected members. Moreover, the legislature will not have adequate power to exercise checks and balances over the executive. The separate voting mechanism will bring to the legislature intense internal conflict and further undermine its unity in monitoring the performance of the chief executive who is not returned by democratic election. Although it is claimed that there will be a tripartite balance of power, one leg of the tripod may be longer than the other. The time will come when the legislature will really be no more than a forum for topical discussions.

While the finalized political model leaves much to be desired, what is even more worrying is the way it was passed. Before the finalizing of the Basic Law, which is a solemn legal document, the paramount leader of China had to take the trouble to receive seven persons. The partial adoption of the separate voting mechanism sets a very bad precedent: as long as "a man of insight" does not hesitate to go north, he will eventually gain something, at least some consolation prizes. Such an unhealthy trend deals an even more severe blow to Hong Kong than the undemocratic political model itself!

The conflicts that might appear in the future Special Administrative Region (SAR) are conflicts between the central government and the SAR government as well as those within the SAR government. Whether the conflict between the central government and the Hong Kong SAR will be serious depends only on whether China is willing to let Hong Kong people rule Hong Kong, let them have a high degree of autonomy and put into effect the Sino-British Joint Declaration. If China really tries to refrain from interfering in Hong Kong affairs and allows Hong Kong people to rule Hong Kong, we can imagine that there will not be too much confrontation between the central government and the SAR government. We may perhaps look back on the Daya Bay and June 4 incidents. They just happened only once in a blue moon. As regards the conflicts within the SAR, they are to be expected given the difference in interest and ideological outlook among the various sectors. There is no need to worry about it. Such internal conflicts can be resolved through competition among various sectors in accordance with fairly set rules. If any sector loses out in the arena of politics, it has only itself to blame. Internal conflicts can generally be resolved under the fairly set rules.

However, the so-called "men of insight" provided eye openers for our citizens. They did not hesitate to go north and, with the support of China, they upset the contest which should have been conducted according to fairly set rules in Hong Kong. As a result, problems arose. What started out as local conflicts became conflicts between the central government and Hong Kong. The conflicts which might originally be less serious were unnecessarily escalated. Subsequently, the confrontation between Hong Kong and the central government deteriorated further, and the acceptability of the central government was undermined. It is very unwise for the central government to get unnecessarily involved in Hong Kong's internal conflicts. Such involvement will only upset the political equilibrium of the territory, so that procedures cannot be properly conducted by the rules and the so-called democratic elections become meaningless. If China does not break off relations with those "men of insight", she will only be encouraging the contestants in the political arena to go north. By then, the business of any travel agent who provides "Beijing petition prize sharing tours" will surely be booming.

Sir, despite my criticism on the political model and the recent undesirable trends, I believe it is difficult to change the future political system of Hong Kong within a short time. However, as a responsible Legislative Councillor, I still insist on supporting the OMELCO consensus model which introduces a faster pace of democracy and a more definite direction for democratic development. Finally, I wish to give my fellow citizens the following advice: The reality does not allow one to be optimistic about the future, and yet the future does not allow one to be pessimistic about the reality. Pandora's box has been opened, but there is still hope in the world.

Sir, with these remarks, I support Mr. McGREGOR's motion.

MRS. FONG: Sir, I stand here today to say I am glad the Basic Law drafting stage is over. The worst part of anything involving change, or the prospect of change, is the uncertainty that develops during the waiting period. This is bad enough if it is waiting on one's own. It is infinitely worse when it involves political issues and different sectors all expressing views and all wanting acceptance. This adds to the confusion in the mind of the average person. Now this is over and we can focus our minds once more on building Hong Kong. This is all to the good.

In saying this, I am not expressing the view that the Basic Law is a perfect

document. But I am saying that I believe this Basic Law provides a framework within which Hong Kong can prosper, in peace and stability.

With regard to the political structure and, particularly, the pace at which we introduce direct elections, there are people who wanted a faster pace and people who wanted a slower pace. The fact remains that a decision had to be made and that no decision can satisfy all. Hence, some groups will be disappointed. However, I believe that there is a basis for acceptance of the terms of the draft Basic Law. There is no point being emotional or confrontational. The Basic Law foresees a continuation of development for Hong Kong along democratic lines. The changes as foreseen will be gradual. I see no reason for the change to be disruptive.

What we, the people of Hong Kong, really want is the opportunity to retain the lifestyle we have grown accustomed to, freedom to travel and to trade. We want a Hong Kong that encourages business and fosters the environment in which business can prosper. We want an exciting, dynamic and prosperous Hong Kong. We want a Hong Kong that continues to be a recognized centre of cultural and economic power in Southeast Asia. These things are described by the Basic Law; but they cannot be guaranteed by any piece of paper. They can only be attained, by determination, by good and mutually beneficial relations with our neighbours and with the right leadership.

Let me ask: "What sort of leadership does Hong Kong really need?"

-- Is it someone that condemns everyone and everything?

-- Is it someone that is unwilling to listen or negotiate?

Surely not.

We want leaders:

-- who are not against China and not against Britain but have the respect of both countries;

-- who have Hong Kong's overall best interests at heart;

-- who have the insight to work with Britain and with China for the good of Hong Kong;

-- who accept the fact that Hong Kong will be part of China in July 1997; and

-- who reflect the sentiment that Hong Kong people are proud to be Chinese and to have a chance to govern Hong Kong ourselves, the place we call our home.

So, let me repeat my call for unity, not against China or Britain, but for the benefit of our Hong Kong, that will inevitably soon be part of China.

Let us continue working to make Hong Kong a strong and prosperous city. Let us continue to cherish our values of freedom, of free enterprise and free trade. Let us work diligently for our future stability.

For those who have the ability and the inclination to leave, let me urge you to reconsider. And let us encourage those who have left to return to help build our city.

I realize the difficulties, but wish to encourage a spirit of optimism and would pray that it can become contagious.

If there is to be opposition, let us oppose the forecasters of doom and gloom. Let us oppose those who bring disruption and discontent and who allow ambitious political motives to take precedence over the general good. Let us realize that the biggest enemy is not someone external but among ourselves. It will be our own internal friction and selfishness that could cost Hong Kong its prosperity.

The Hong Kong people should therefore unite to work towards making the future Hong Kong SAR the best, the most stable and the most prosperous city in China.

Sir, with these remarks, I support the motion proposed by Mr. Allen LEE.

MRS. LAM (in Cantonese): Sir, since the signing of the Sino-British Joint Declaration in 1984, the people of Hong Kong have been looking forward to a Basic Law by which the concepts of "one country, two systems", "Hong Kong people ruling Hong Kong" and "Hong Kong to remain unchanged for 50 years" can genuinely be put into practice. OMELCO Members naturally have the responsibilities and obligations to reflect the aspirations of Hong Kong people to the authorities concerned. Therefore, the studying and discussion of the Basic Law has been an important task for current

Legislative Councillors as well as those of the last term. For more than four years, Members have been unceasingly considering the political models of various countries, and extensively collecting public opinions. After numerous meetings and debates, Members finally reached the OMELCO consensus which, since its release, has been widely supported by people of various sectors because it reflected the majority views of the Hong Kong public. It is indeed disappointing that the OMELCO consensus has not been adopted in the final draft of the Basic Law in formulating the future political system.

Though disappointed, we should not feel depressed. We should be pleased to learn that the civic consciousness of Hong Kong people has gradually matured. I presume that one of the reasons why the OMELCO consensus was not accepted was that both Britain and China had preconceptions about Hong Kong. The lack of mutual trust has resulted in numerous conflicts. Now that the Basic Law blueprint has been formulated, though the version is not entirely satisfactory, everything has for the moment been finally settled. I urge the people of Hong Kong to look forward and hope that China, Britain and Hong Kong will restore the good relationship and close co-operation of the past, set aside differences and, in a spirit of mutual understanding and accommodation, jointly strive for a democratic, stable and prosperous future for Hong Kong.

Sir, during this transitional period, I think that everyone in Hong Kong should show greater concern for community affairs and enthusiasm in politics, in order to pave the way for a democratic political system for Hong Kong in the 50 years after 1997. 1991 will be an election year with directly elected seats for the district boards, the two municipal councils and the Legislative Council. I hope that Hong Kong people will actively participate in political affairs and exercise their right of voting, so that those who are able and worthy will be elected to work sincerely for the overall interests of the territory.

Taking a broad view around the world, can Hong Kong be an exception when various countries are striving for openness and democracy? Yesterday, Dr. the Honourable Daniel TSE expressed his feelings by means of poems. Regrettably, I am not good at singing, otherwise I will conclude my speech today by voicing out in a song my aspirations for the future. And, the song is of course entitled "Things will be even better tomorrow."

Sir, with these remarks, I support the Honourable Allen LEE's motion.

MRS. LAU: Sir, the final shape of Hong Kong's future political structure endorsed by the Basic Law drafters comes as little surprise to Hong Kong people. To some people, it brings overwhelming disappointment and anguish as they feel that they have been let down by both the British Government and the Chinese Government. To others, it brings a certain measure of relief; for after all, it has been 56 months since drafting of the Basic Law started, and even though the political model may not be ideal, at least the matter has come to some kind of a conclusion.

As a Member of OMELCO, I am naturally disappointed that the final product does not mirror the OMELCO consensus which we have so persistently and painstakingly advocated over the past seven to eight months. The OMELCO consensus was not easily arrived at. Many months of lengthy debate took place before OMELCO Members with divergent views eventually saw the necessity to set aside their personal differences and unite for the good of the community. We genuinely believe that the OMELCO consensus will best serve the interests of Hong Kong and our belief is reinforced by the widespread support given to us by the community as reflected through district boards and in other public forums. I am sure that the British Government knows that the OMELCO consensus has wide community support and I am sure that the Hong Kong Government also knows this to be so. We had hoped that such a widely supported model would receive due consideration by China, for the Chinese officials have always said that they will listen to the views of Hong Kong people and the British Government has repeatedly assured us that it will stand by Hong Kong's interests. But unfortunately, what transpires is that political expedience takes precedence over popular demand.

Disappointed as we may be, the reality of the matter is whether we can do anything about it. There seems to be no hiding of the fact that the political system now endorsed was a compromise resulting from negotiations between Britain and China. The British Government must now explain to Hong Kong people why that compromise was reached and why in its opinion such compromise was necessary in the interest of Hong Kong. But whether or not we accept the reasons for Britain's agreement with China, the fact remains that an agreement has been reached and Britain is not likely to break that agreement. Before condemning the political model and rejecting the Basic Law, we must ask ourselves the following questions:

(1) Does Hong Kong have a right of self-determination on its political future?

- (2) Is Hong Kong capable of confronting China on its own?
- (3) Will Britain be prepared to enter into confrontation with China over Hong Kong?
- (4) Is confrontation with China in the overall interest of Hong Kong?
- (5) Will the Chinese hardliners yield to confrontation?

Bitter experience tells us that the honest answers to all the foregoing questions are in the negative. Then what do we do? Do we take to the streets, tear up the Basic Law and raise havoc or do we wring our hands, rend our hair and despair? Do we continue to shout loudly hoping that someday somehow the Chinese leaders will lend a sympathetic ear? Would any of these actions serve any useful purpose? Would any of these actions help us regain any part of the confidence which Hong Kong people have lost or would it yet worsen the situation?

I am of the view that however strongly we may personally feel about the political model produced by the Basic Law drafters, we must now accept the fact that for the time being, the issue has rested. We must accept this fact courageously, not as defeatists but pragmatic and sensible realists. In saying so, I am not suggesting that we should abandon the OMELCO consensus. It shall remain the political model which I, together with many others, firmly believe to be the best for Hong Kong and we must continue to uphold its merits. It is just that under present circumstances, we have exhausted all means whereby the matter can be further advanced. However, we must remain hopeful that when the skies become clearer and the political climate turns warmer, we may be able to find more understanding from and acceptance by those who now keep us out in the cold.

Actually, it is most unfortunate that the political future of Hong Kong should be decided at a time when Sino-British relationship is most strained and mutual trust and respect appear to be lowest. The tragic events last June shocked Hong Kong and the world but repercussions on China caused by worldwide reactions and those of Hong Kong's could not have been unfelt. As much as Hong Kong loses confidence in China, so has China lost confidence in Hong Kong. China has become paranoid that democracy breeds subversion. She is obsessed with the misconception that if Hong Kong should get too much democracy, it will become a base for subversion. This misconception is and will, unless corrected, continue to be a stumbling block to furtherance of our democratic process. This being the case, we must try to correct the misconception

and take steps to foster better understanding and mutual trust between Hong Kong and China. We must prove by action that we can be entrusted with democracy and that subversion has no part to play in the democratic system which we seek.

It is true that we are not able at this stage to procure a political model of our choice, but let us think and act positively rather than recriminate. The framework available is not one which we cannot work with, particularly in relation to 1991. Let us, within the limited resources given to us, make a successful start of our democratic system. Let us demonstrate to China that democracy in Hong Kong is not something to be feared and suppressed. We have spent too long simply debating the political model and we seem to have forgotten that it is not just the political model that makes a democratic system. There are actually many other areas which we have yet to work on. A successful democratic system depends not on whether we have 18 directly elected seats or 30. It depends on whether we have the right persons to fill those seats, whether we can get enthusiastic support and active participation from the community, and whether with the directly elected members we can still maintain an efficient and effective government. Civic education and promotion of knowledge in politics are priority items we still have to work on. I am optimistic that if we can make a successful start of our democratic process, we will be able to further negotiate with China for relaxation of the gag on democracy and for other improvements to the Basic Law.

The Chinese officials have openly stated that there is no way the Basic Law can be changed after it has been ratified by the National People's Congress. I do not accept this statement. Given the political will and determination, I am sure that we can overcome whatever technical difficulties that may be in the way. I remain confident that revisions and improvements can and will be made to the Basic Law to cope with the changing political environment in Hong Kong and China. For the time being, the most important thing is to maintain our sense of direction, be constructive and adopt a positive attitude.

Sir, with these remarks, I support Mr. Allen LEE's motion.

DR. LEONG: Sir, in 1984, this Council, perhaps rightly so in the absence of any other choice, recommended the Joint Declaration to the people of Hong Kong. Since then the people of Hong Kong have taken heed of the leadership and determination of this Council. Most recently the trust of the Hong Kong people on the OMELCO, of which this Council plays a part, is demonstrated by the wide support given to the OMELCO formula of political development of Hong Kong in the run-up to and beyond 1997. This formula,

Sir, was given a favourite pet name -- the OMELCO consensus.

The final draft of the Basic Law has come out to be a farcical flop. Admittedly, no matter how much heart-searching and heart-breaking debate this Council could put in, it will not change the stonely concrete heart of China, nor the slippery shoulder of the British. Yet this Council owes the people of Hong Kong a proper explanation of the sequence of events leading to what it is today. This Council owes it to the people of Hong Kong for our determined stand on the OMELCO consensus and that no stone shall be left unturned on our further drive to attain the pace of democracy that is so dear to our heart.

Sir, the clandestine deals between the Chinese and the British Governments have finally sealed off our right to a government truly representing the Hong Kong people.

The formulae "Hong Kong people ruling Hong Kong" and "high degree of autonomy" promised in the Joint Declaration will simply not work under the present arrangements contained in this jerry-built draft. The pedestals of the future system have been undermined, if not swept off en masse.

It was most indignant to hear Beijing's mandarins unscrupulously allege that the views of Hong Kong people had been duly covered in the drafting of the Basic Law. Equally repulsive to us, Sir, was British Foreign Secretary Douglas HURD's statement to the Parliament that he regarded "the outcome as one which, though not ideal, we could reasonably commend to the House and to the people of Hong Kong as a basis for the future."

We are totally let down by the fact that our voice for a faster pace of democratization has been completely and totally subdued.

The Beijing authorities have placed sovereignty on top of everything else when coming up with the draft and it is most sorrowful to see the British Government caving in to the pressure from the North.

So, Sir, our fate has been decided. It is a historical masterpiece as declared by DENG Xiaoping. What is left to be done by China is for the National People's Congress to tag a "Made in China" label on the draft to complete the five-year historical mission.

Sir, in 1991, Hong Kong will be allowed to have 18 directly elected seats. The number will be increased to 20 in 1995 and legislators selected that year will be allowed to serve till 1999. Of the remaining 40 seats, 30 will be selected by functional constituencies while the remaining 10 will be chosen by an election committee to be set up by the Hong Kong Government.

This, Sir, is far short of what OMELCO recommended. Ironically too, the Foreign Affairs Select Committee of the British Parliament recommended an even faster formula.

Could we accept this with a clear conscience? Could we with hands on our hearts recommend this to the people of Hong Kong?

It has been hinted in this Council that objections to the Basic Law draft political model is based on emotions. Our honourable colleague, Mrs. Selina CHOW, said yesterday, and rightly so, that China had picked and chosen points that China liked from the views of Hong Kong people. Is it therefore simply emotions that draw Hong Kong people to deplore the undemocratic political model? Or is it simply out of the fact that their basic rights have been robbed from them?

Furthermore, a 20% restriction will be laid on the number of legislators holding foreign passports or the right of abode overseas.

It is on this aspect, Sir, that I would like to concentrate a little bit more, not because I have a right of abode elsewhere, or because I have any special soft spots for non-Chinese nationals, but simply because it is just not right; for many of these people stand for Hong Kong and for Hong Kong alone.

The Chinese authorities are believed to fear that an unlimited quota of foreign nationals in the legislature could lead to the internationalization of what they feel should be a primarily Chinese law-making body, and China would find it intolerable, after having made such strenuous efforts to resume the sovereignty of Hong Kong from Britain, for its future legislature to be peppered with representatives with international interests.

They may also worry that foreign countries might grant passports to legislators solely to extend their influence in this territory.

The gist of the matter is that China fails to see that Hong Kong will not be a sovereign state and therefore the jurisdiction of its legislation will only be on local affairs.

The spirit of the Joint Declaration, Sir, is to safeguard and guarantee that the freedoms and rights Hong Kong people now enjoy will be maintained after 1997 for 50 years.

The existing system here does not bar anybody, be he a Chinese or a gweilo by race, or whether he holds a foreign passport or right of abode, from taking part in the administration and legislature so long as he is qualified as a permanent resident here.

There is also absolutely no nationality qualification imposed on people joining politics. China has pledged not to change Hong Kong's system. But to impose such a restriction is to change the system.

Yes, Sir, it is important that Hong Kong needs to retain and strengthen its own identity which transcends racial and national frontiers; yet what Hong Kong needs is freedom, never and not restrictions.

Let us pause for a moment and consider why China made such a big fuss by creating "one country, two systems" and "high degree of autonomy", and why China dispenses a VIP treatment to Hong Kong by allowing a complete capitalist way of life flourishing within a communist state for 50 years beyond 1997?

The answer has to be that China wants Hong Kong to keep on vibrant. What makes Hong Kong tick depends on our international identity, which is, everybody who takes Hong Kong as his or her home belongs to Hong Kong and identifies himself or herself as a Hong Kong believer irrespective of race and creed.

The Joint Declaration clearly stipulates that "the Government and legislature of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region shall be composed of local inhabitants." The term "local inhabitants" is irrespective of nationality.

Thus, Sir, the final draft which imposes nationality restrictions appears to contravene the clear intent of the Joint Declaration.

It really baffles my commonsense how Her Majesty's Government could have co-

operated and allowed an issue that clearly violates the spirit and the letter of the Joint Declaration.

Even on a technical basis, Sir, the nationality restriction on the future legislature simply will not work.

How could the system ensure that no more than 20% of the legislators would be returned by the end of the day?

Will it be necessary to impose a quota on the number of candidates holding foreign passports to join the elections?

Should a first-come-first-served rule be set to limit the number of foreign nationals seeking candidacy?

Then there are other problems -- if more than 20% of the legislators holding foreign passports are elected, shall we then draw lots and let sheer luck decide on the final winner? Or shall there be a second round of elections?

Perhaps an easier way out will be to disallow foreign nationals altogether to take part in the geographically-based direct elections or in some functional constituencies. But then what are the justifications?

For some constituencies like the industrial, commercial and professional ones, it is doubtful whether sufficient numbers of quality people will be attracted to join the elections as many of them are holding foreign passports or right of abode overseas. They would have second thoughts to take part if too many restrictions were to be imposed on them.

All the above-mentioned propositions serve, Sir, to point at one thing: the future election could well be a farce. Apart from the devotion, the talents, the popularity of a candidate, you need all the luck and have to overcome all the restrictions.

Sir, what then should be the way ahead? What then should we recommend to the people of Hong Kong?

Disappointed and dejected as we are, we should not give way to despair. The promulgation of the Basic Law should not be taken as the end of Hong Kong, far less the end of democracy in Hong Kong. If Eastern Europe can denounce communism and

repeal a single party totalitarian system overnight, there is all the reason to believe that China too can change hopefully for the better.

But the people of Hong Kong must stand firm. OMELCO must take a lead and keep her ground. We must show the people of Hong Kong our determination in our drive for democracy. We must be firm on our stand and never to impart the feeling that we are giving in with a gentle push of a finger.

It is with this in mind, Sir, that I commend Mr. McGREGOR's motion to my honourable colleagues for we must show conviction for what we stand for and OMELCO must stand firm on her own consensus.

Sir, the 1991 election will be vital for Hong Kong. Vital in the sense that we have to show the Beijing Government that Hong Kong people have come of age in politics and that we are mature enough to deal with our own internal affairs. Vital in the sense that we have to show Her Majesty's Government that Hong Kong will not waver to any degree of trade-off.

The election package and election methods must be open, fair, equal and free to ensure that genuine representatives of Hong Kong are being elected. The people of Hong Kong must be stimulated and self-motivated to come out to vote en masse to reflect our concern to control our own destiny.

I am concerned, Sir, with the rumour that the package of the 1991 election will be carried out without consultation. Whatever the reason, I would urge the Administration to, at least, take heed of the feelings and advice of OMELCO on this aspect.

Sir, if the Chinese Government could consider OMELCO Members as just a group of "Britain's inspired plotters", and Her Majesty's Government could simply and unashamedly brush off OMELCO's consensus, I shudder to consider the status of OMELCO in future in the eyes of Hong Kong people and the Hong Kong Government!

MISS LEUNG (in Cantonese): Sir, I am glad that in this open debate, Members finally have the opportunity to speak on two motions or either one of them at the same time. I believe that this is unprecedented in this Council. This new manner of conducting a motion debate will surely leave us with an unforgettably novel and precious

experience. With the on-going development of the democratic climate in Hong Kong and, in particular, the impending change to this Council in 1991 when 18 seats will be returned by region-based direct elections, I believe it is most likely that there will be more and more debates of this kind. I am sure that with the experience gained from this debate, Members will be able to take this form of debate in an open sitting in their stride.

Sir, for this debate, although there are concurrently two motions concerning the future political model in Hong Kong, one moved by the Senior Member, the Honourable Allen LEE, and the other by the Honourable J.D. McGREGOR, the latter is essentially an amended version of the former. In any case, except for the part concerning the outlook and approach to be adopted in dealing with Hong Kong's future political model, apparently there is no major conflict or contradiction between the two. Rather, they share common views on the most fundamental and essential points of the issue. Both motions, euphemistically or otherwise, spell out our dissatisfaction over the Basic Law Drafting Committee's failure to adopt the OMELCO consensus in its decision on the proposed political model in the draft Basic Law. This shows that both motions are negative about the proposed political model in the draft Basic Law.

Nevertheless, I believe I understand why the Honourable J.D. McGREGOR slightly amended his original motion which had been overruled by a majority in the in-house meeting not too long ago and asked for the permission of the President of this Council to include his revised motion in the agenda of today's open sitting. I agree that there is a need for his motion to be juxtaposed with the Honourable Allen LEE's motion so that Members can make known their views and positions on these two different motions under the scrutiny and assessment of the general public.

If we make a comparison between the intentions of the two motions, it is not difficult to tell the difference. The Honourable Allen LEE's motion is expressed in such a reserved way that one is at a loss as to what it intends to mean. It is so obscure that one can make nothing out of it. Although it is obvious that the motion concerns the Basic Law which would have decisive and crucial bearing on the course of our future political development, it makes no mention of such terms as Basic Law, draft Basic Law or even draft Basic Law political model. As for the fact that the OMELCO consensus is not adopted as the future political model, the motion just expresses disappointment. I think that disappointment is just a fairly mild term. Does the disappointment so expressed refer to the extremely undemocratic political model proposed in the draft Basic Law? I am not absolutely certain about what it

refers to. Of course, the motion also urges members of the public to work for a successful democratic system. However, any cursory study of the undemocratic political model proposed in the draft Basic Law would readily reveal that the hope expressed in this motion is just a naive and unrealistic wishful thinking. Unless the Chinese Government takes the initiative to make substantial amendments to the draft Basic Law, especially the part concerning the political model, with close reference to the true wishes of the people of Hong Kong and gives us a fully convincing assurance to that effect, what can the public do to ensure that Hong Kong will eventually be able to establish a successful democratic system after 1997?

Unlike the Honourable Allen LEE's motion, the Honourable J.D. MCGREGOR's motion is frank and forthright. The main theme is plain and clear. In a clear-cut manner it expresses regret at the extremely undemocratic political model proposed for the Basic Law by the Basic Law Drafting Committee and makes a noble commitment to urge the Chinese Government to map out a more democratic political structure modelling on the OMELCO consensus for the Basic Law. Only by this way can the true wishes of the people of Hong Kong be reflected and their confidence in the future be boosted. Also, the motion solemnly and sternly urges the Hong Kong Government to introduce legislation providing for no less than 50% of the total Legislative Council seats to be directly elected by 1995 so as to keep in line with the OMELCO consensus.

Sir, the OMELCO consensus is a general agreement reached by the non-government OMELCO Members after prolonged and repeated analysis and examination of various aspects in the spirit of give and take. The consensus was reached long before the unforgettable tragic Beijing incident and, basically, was not influenced in any way by it. The consensus reflects the common views of the non-government OMELCO Members who are representative of public opinion. It has won the support of the district boards and the municipal councils which represent public opinion at grassroot levels, and is widely backed up by many other organizations in Hong Kong. The OMELCO consensus model is not only the model agreed by the non-government OMELCO Members, but also the model preferred by the vast majority of the Hong Kong people. Therefore, this model belongs to the majority of the people of Hong Kong.

When the Basic Law Drafting Committee announced the final draft of the Basic Law on 16 February, all the 12 tertiary institutions representing the younger generation joined forces for the first time ever to stage a half-day class boycott in protest against the extremely undemocratic political model imposed on them. About a week later, the Survey Research Hong Kong Limited conducted a random telephone poll for

the Radio Television Hong Kong. Its findings reveal that immediately following the announcement of the undemocratic political model, confidence index in Hong Kong has plunged to a record low, the lowest ever after the signing of the Sino-British Joint Declaration. It is even worse than the post-June 4 index last year.

Sir, Hong Kong's public preference regarding the future political model is well known to all. Being Members of the Legislative Council who have solemnly pledged allegiance to the people of Hong Kong in this Chamber, we must not for a single moment forget our duty to reflect public opinion, especially the true wishes of the majority of the people. To reflect public opinion will always be our paramount duty as Councillors. As the OMELCO consensus model is the model favoured by the vast majority of Hong Kong people, we who have the duty to reflect public opinion must continue staunchly to support our model, assume the unshirkable duty to keep on urging the British and Chinese Governments to understand the people's genuine aspirations, and strive to secure from the Chinese Government her promise to introduce under the Basic Law a more democratic political system which refers to our model as a blueprint.

Sir, since the majority of Hong Kong people support the OMELCO consensus and since we are bound by our duty as Members of this Council to reflect public opinion faithfully, we should support our own model in a positive and unwavering way. The Honourable J.D. McGREGOR's motion as mentioned earlier very clearly indicates that Members should support the OMELCO consensus model in a positive and unwavering way. For that reason, I think the motion is worthy of support. Furthermore, I think that objection against the Honourable J.D. McGREGOR's motion from any Member of the Council would mean that Member in question has given up the OMELCO consensus or even his role in reflecting public opinion, and is therefore also against the effort to urge the Chinese Government and the Hong Kong Government to accept our model. If any Member chooses to vote neither against nor for the Honourable J.D. McGREGOR's motion, it will mean that he has turned a blind eye to the importance of rendering positive support to the OMELCO consensus and taking the right attitude in reflecting public opinion as stated in the Honourable J.D. McGREGOR's motion and turned a deaf ear to the public outcry for acceptance of our model by the Chinese Government and the Hong Kong Government.

As for the Honourable Allen LEE's motion mentioned earlier, it has not clearly indicated what we should do with our model and how we are going to be accountable to the people of Hong Kong for the future of our model. Therefore I am compelled to spell out my reservations about this motion.

Sir, some feel that since the Basic Law Drafting Committee has already decided on the political model, we as Members of the Legislative Council should no longer keep a high profile in taking a hard line on this issue by holding fast to the OMELCO consensus. And, if we persist in so doing, we shall possibly give the Chinese Government the impression that we are adopting confrontational tactics with a view to opposing them. I think such logic is erroneous. The wrong lies in their under-estimation of the political wisdom of the Chinese Government. I firmly believe that the Chinese Government will never think in this way. If that logic holds true, then the hard-line profile as well as the soft-line and reserved profile would unavoidably arouse the Chinese Government's suspicions.

In general, mutual understanding and due regard for each other's interests are most essential for the establishment of useful and constructive contacts between Members of the Legislative Council and the Chinese Government. We must understand that, with regard to Hong Kong's future political model, while we are most concerned about whether or not the OMELCO consensus supported by the majority of Hong Kong people is accepted, it is, however, unrealistic to expect the Chinese Government to regard the same as her first consideration. Their greatest concern is how to ensure that the future political model and the Special Administrative Region will not have any adverse impact on the Chinese Government and the Chinese Communist Party. Since the main concerns of the two parties are different, it is therefore not surprising that there are often contending views which sometimes even lead to conflicts. I am very sure that both parties would come to some sort of mutual understanding. But what worries us most and poses an insurmountable hurdle is that the powerful Chinese Government has all along shown too much apprehension about the democratization of Hong Kong's political system.

Lastly, Sir, may I state once again that I support the Honourable J.D. McGREGOR's motion and have reservations about the Honourable Allen LEE's motion.

MR. McGREGOR: Sir, it is a pity that I would not be able to present my motion to the Council at the beginning of this debate to achieve parity in consideration by Members of the two motions. Let me also say that many speakers supporting Mr. Allen LEE's motion have spoken in terms which clearly support mine as well. Many of our Councillors are upset by what has happened in regard to the Basic Law, but do not seem to know quite what to do now and quite sometimes what to say. In speaking to

my motion, I wish to make it clear that I am speaking as a Councillor responsible to the people of Hong Kong. I speak with a feeling of personal commitment to the ideals of democracy and human rights. I cannot speak for my constituency although I believe that my views will be supported by many businessmen. In short, Sir, I speak from conscience.

I do not oppose Mr. LEE's motion. Indeed I will vote in favour of it. I do not think however that it has gone far enough. It does not, in my view, suggest that this Council recognizes that the political deal done between the British and Chinese Governments, without the participation of the people of Hong Kong, does not reflect the wishes of the majority of the people. Nor does it hold our hope for further substantive change in the political model before and after 1997. It does not indicate the commitment of this Council to its own hotly debated and carefully structured compromise political model, the so-called OMELCO consensus. Mr. LEE's motion is therefore too conciliatory to both the British and Chinese Governments which have imposed their agreed political model on Hong Kong, in disregard of the clearly expressed wishes of the Hong Kong people.

I blame the British Government more than the Chinese Government for this state of affairs. Britain has enjoyed full democratic freedom in the election of its government for most of this century. The British people have fought wars to retain democratic freedom not only for themselves but in defence of democracy and liberty in many other lands. I myself answered the call to arms in 1940 at the age of 16 to take part in one war against a tyranny which threatened democratic freedom across the world. At least, I believe, one other Member of this Council did the same thing.

Mrs. THATCHER has shown herself a fierce and determined supporter of democratic freedoms and human rights. Her Government has been advised repeatedly by Dame Lydia DUNN, the Honourable Allen LEE, by Members of this Council, by the Council as a whole and by many other organizations in Hong Kong that the people of Hong Kong wish to have democracy and democratic government, if not immediately, then within a reasonable time frame.

Douglas HURD and Francis MAUDE have repeatedly acknowledged the desire of the Hong Kong people for a faster rate of democratic development and both have said that the British Government would do all it could to satisfy that wish. Both officials however entered the latter stage of negotiations with China with some perception, possibly originating in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, that Hong Kong people were ready to concede a slower pace of democratic reform. Where on earth did the

British Government get this idea? Certainly not in Hong Kong unless public opinion here is to be judged from statements made by those who speak for China directly or indirectly, including those who jumped for joy at the so-called "concessions" made by China in the final days of negotiation with the British authorities.

What we have been given, and what the British Government has agreed to, is a pale shadow of what is needed to guarantee our future vigour and vitality and to ensure the support of the population of Hong Kong. We deserved better from the Mother of Democracy.

I cannot level the same criticism against China. That great country has never enjoyed democratic freedom nor do its leaders seem to understand the vital contribution that democratic freedom could and will make to the success of Hong Kong's economic and social development and to the confidence so important to its continual regeneration. They appear to expect that what was good enough for Britain should be good enough for China; that successful colonial Hong Kong should become a successful special administrative region of China without any great change in the system of government.

Nothing could be farther from reality. The British track record in administering Hong Kong has been benign and non-interventionist in character. Hong Kong has been encouraged to develop without serious interference from Britain and certainly without overt intervention. We have prospered mightily.

In contrast China has had almost continual political and economic upheavals and uncertainty during the last 50 years. The Chinese Government has made a brave attempt to change their economic system during the last 12 years and this has indicated very clearly that there is great potential for further liberalization and alignment with market forces. But during the same time, the Chinese Government has not recognized the need for corresponding change to the political system or even to accept moderate political change. Economic and political change are interdependent. One cannot succeed without the other.

It is also true to say that everywhere in the world people have been allowed to elect their government. Moderates and those believing in democracy have emerged. Democratic freedom has been the linchpin of economic growth and success.

It is clear that Hong Kong people have little faith in the Chinese political and economic systems. That is why so many Chinese people have poured into Hong Kong

during the last 50 years and why we have had to limit further entries.

It is also, of course, the factor that is now causing the greatest brain drain in Hong Kong's history. People who have a choice are choosing to leave and nothing that China has done so far with the Basic Law will provide the assurances necessary to slow this down and to give Hong Kong a chance to keep our most talented and best trained citizens.

Chinese friends have told me not to waste time seeking what cannot be achieved, a steady path towards democratic government in Hong Kong. They say that China will never permit it and that it is futile to shout into the storm. No one will hear. My reply is that many Hong Kong people do not agree. Many of those who care deeply about the future of this territory feel that change will come to China also and that this will be for the better. The vast and unpredicted changes now sweeping through Eastern Europe will certainly have significant effects for China and Chinese leaders. It is impossible to say what these effects will be but they must surely be beneficial to Hong Kong and to the system which we have built here and which China so earnestly wishes to preserve. Change in China, I believe, is Hong Kong's greatest hope.

I have complete conviction that during the next few years we will see changes in Chinese attitudes and policies towards Hong Kong. I believe that China will recognize that we pose no threat, that our economic system is vastly superior to theirs, that an essential part of it is confidence, both personal and corporate, and that greater democracy in government is the best way of ensuring that our system continues to flourish and in fact to support China.

My motion is based on this conviction and on the view that this Council cannot now abandon the very moderate political model that it has championed for so long and which has been so widely supported by the people of Hong Kong. By doing so, we may be seen as abandoning the people of Hong Kong.

Five years is a very long time in politics and economics. Many changes can be brought about by continued negotiation and pressure on the two sovereign governments, especially if our 1991 elections are highly successful and the subsequent track record of Legislative Council is enlightened and helpful to our further development. We can then seek the specific changes I propose in my motion.

Sir, I want to suggest, in addition, that the number of seats in Legislative

Council for 1991 be restricted to 54 thus maintaining the first leg of the OMELCO consensus at one-third of members being elected by universal suffrage.

I am pleased that some of my fellow Councillors support this motion. In doing so, they support the OMELCO political model and the best interests, I believe, of the people of Hong Kong.

Our obligation is to the people. This is our sacred trust.

MRS. SO (in Cantonese): Sir, in Hong Kong, spring is not at all a delightful season. People living in this metropolis in the south find it hard to appreciate the joy of the northerners in welcoming the return of springtime. Instead, they only find the drizzling of this rainy season disheartening. Even the sudden advent of a southward bound cold spell fails to bring any change to their depressing mood. The sight of bombax trees in full bloom seems to remind people of the melancholic scene that "flowers will eventually wither and fall, do what one may". It is at this part of the year the formulation of the Basic law enters its final stage. As the proposed final version is to a certain extent falling short of people's aspiration, it has inevitably aroused mixed feelings.

Notwithstanding the many setbacks in the past four odd years, OMELCO Members have worked body and soul to strive for a political model which would be as acceptable to the people of Hong Kong as the Sino-British Joint Declaration. They have made a lot of proposals for the purpose of maintaining prosperity and stability in Hong Kong and for the realization of the concept of "one country, two systems". OMELCO Members have done a worthwhile job and they have a clear conscience in what they have done.

Whether democracy is a means or an end has been a subject of endless arguments among scholars in politics for several centuries. I do not wish to add my comments on this subject now. What I wish to point out is that we are not striving for democracy for the mere sake of democracy. In the middle of last year, OMELCO Members reached a consensus on the political model for the development of Hong Kong's future political structure after a thorough review of the prevailing situation. The consensus was reached in the belief that it would serve to restore the confidence of Hong Kong people and help maintain the prosperity and stability in Hong Kong. Of course, it was also believed that the model would have positive effect on putting the "one country, two systems" concept into practice. It is disappointing that the finally adopted

arrangements for the political structure of the future Special Administrative Region have failed to satisfy the wish of Hong Kong people.

Sir, Hong Kong people have always been renowned for their pragmatic attitude. Following the agreement reached between the Chinese and British Governments on Hong Kong's future political development, the final version of the Basic Law has been settled at last and will soon be officially endorsed by the National People's Congress for promulgation. This is a reality which Hong Kong people should face in any events. Regardless of its acceptability, the future political system in Hong Kong will have to develop within the restraint of the Basic Law.

It is true that Hong Kong people have not much experience in exercising the democratic rights. Nevertheless, judging from the development of our economy, the general education level of the public and the conduct and practice of the media, I believe we shall stand a very good chance of making a success of next year's direct election. As long as Hong Kong's democratic system is able to work and develop gradually and smoothly along the right track, Hong Kong people will have a stronger case to make in their future fight for a quicker pace of democratic development. We have to prove with facts that instead of having an adverse effect on the economic prosperity and social stability of Hong Kong, the introduction of democratic elements to our political structure will turn out to be beneficial to the development of the community as a whole.

In the past few years, the media have developed a habit of labelling certain groups or figures as "liberals", "middle-of-the-roaders" or "conservatives" when covering any discussions on the political structure. It is probable that the people concerned do not mind being so labelled. In actual fact, all of them share basically the common goal of securing interest for Hong Kong people though they may hold different views on some specific points of the issue. It is therefore totally unnecessary that they should be polarized in their views and become uncompromising or hostile. It is more important that we should show our spirit of co-operation by seeking common ground on major issues and reserving differences on minor ones after the new electoral provisions are announced and in the course of preparing for the forthcoming direct election.

Hong Kong people lived in anxiety for a rather long period of time when the Sino-British talks on the future of Hong Kong were under way during the early 1980s. The three phases of consultation of the draft Basic Law brought about endless arguments among the people of Hong Kong during the latter part of the 1980s.

Notwithstanding these, Hong Kong's economy has continued to make rapid growth and the general living standard of the public has substantially upgraded throughout the 1980s. As Hong Kong begins to practise democracy in some measure in the early 1990s, I sincerely hope that equal attention will be paid to the healthy development of our political and economic system.

"The river will continue to flow eastward in defiance of the green hill standing in its course". Similarly, under the trend of democratization prevailing in the international community today, Hong Kong people will not for ever remain helpless in shaping their own political development.

Sir, with these remarks, I support the motion moved by Senior Member the Honourable Allen LEE.

4.25 pm

HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT: Members might like to take a short break at this point.

4.40 pm

HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT: Council resumes.

MR. TIEN: Sir, after more than four years of discussion, the final product has been unveiled. It is now set in concrete. We have even seen the picture of Mr. DENG Xiaoping, China's senior leader, speaking about this in glowing terms as if a new page of history had been turned.

But, for us, it does not look like that at all. Many of us are disappointed.

The final model fails, I believe, to meet even the baseline of the so-called 4:4:2 model, not to mention the OMELCO consensus. We should remind ourselves that the 4:4:2 was itself a compromise between the liberals, the moderates and the business and professional members of the Basic Law Consultative Committee. So, I share the keenly-felt disappointment of my fellow Councillors, but perhaps for different reasons.

Let me spell this out. Compared with the OMELCO consensus and the 4:4:2 model, the model in the final draft is different in terms of its proposed timetable, in terms of the ratio of its component parts, in terms of the separate voting mechanism and again in terms of the nationality restrictions.

Let us put this all in perspective. The British flag was raised here in Hong Kong in 1841. From 1841 to the introduction of direct elections in 1991 is exactly 150 years. In terms of Hong Kong's history we will move far in the next 12 years (1991-2003). We will see by next year 18 new members, admitted through the avenue of direct elections. We are on the brink of changes which can only be described as fast in history terms. For a century and a half, we managed without direct election. In a short 12 years, Hong Kong is promised to progress from a position where there are no directly elected legislators at all to one with half of this entire Council so elected.

Social implications of the move to direct elections

The question of direct elections naturally involves a dramatic transfer of power. Advocates of rapid change, both inside and outside this Council are vociferous in their support for direct elections. That is understood. They no doubt anticipate support from the "grassroots". But they should not forget that the "grassroots" will want something tangible in return. Pressures will be on our liberal friends to "bring home the bacon". We can imagine the clamour for extra housing, education, social welfare, medical facilities and other social benefits.

If you operate in the name of the people they will want action. There is a price to pay. That price is normally met by the taxpayer. The outcome is often the welfare state with its gigantic costs. Just to cite the United Kingdom, the National Health Service costs HK\$300 billion per annum, and absorbs a labour force which is four times that of the total British armed forces.

The welfare state also means more bureaucracy. In Britain, France and even the United States of America, there are about 80 civil servants for every 1 000 population. In Sweden, the home of the welfare state, the figure is an enormous 160 per 1 000. In all the states of Western Europe, the welfare state has assumed enormous proportions, consuming up to 60% of the national budget. Hong Kong is not a welfare state. Hong Kong does not want to become a welfare state. But no doubt direct elections will move us in that direction. Even at this stage our government is

pressurized to spend more and more on housing, on education, on health, on road, on social services. The list is endless.

When over 50% of our Members are directly elected the Council will effectively be controlled by "spending" members, if I may call them that. Taxes will no longer be responsibly imposed, thus producing a high disincentive effect. The exodus of entrepreneurs and investors from Hong Kong will surely increase. Our prosperity will surely be jeopardized.

Freedom and enterprise

All around us we see the collapse of old-style socialist states and the march towards free markets and enterprise. The events of the past few months in Eastern Europe afford a fascinating insight into what happens when states and parties confiscate private property in the supposed interests of the "people".

Ultimately the "people" will reject those who deny them freedom. They have done so in East Germany, Rumania, Poland, Hungary, and now, even in the Soviet Union itself. The critical exception so far is, of course, China. I submit that Hong Kong's political freedom ultimately depends upon Hong Kong's economic freedom. But prior to achieving economic freedom is the creation of wealth. China's problems stem from not understanding that basic point.

Freedom and democracy

Sir, I prefer freedom to democracy. What is democracy? In fact there are many definitions of democracy. Go to America. They have American "democracy". Go to Europe. They have a European version, different in France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Britain and Scandinavia.

Democracy is all too often used as a slogan, but this is to debase it. For 150 years, we do not have in Hong Kong this elusive thing called democracy yet. But, we have freedom. We have all kinds of freedoms. Freedom of the press, travel, association, movement, religion and all administered in a spirit of tolerance.

Freedom is not guaranteed by democracy as expressed by direct election. Consider the examples of India, Philippines, Malaysia and others around this region. Freedom is guaranteed where free men live in dignity under just laws. A lot of times

"democracy" fails to guarantee this dignity and justice. For "democracy" in the sense of one man one vote is merely a means to an end. My liberal colleagues do not have a personal line to God via "direct election".

It is not enough to feel that marking a piece of paper with a "X" is sufficient to satisfy the impulse to be free.

Many countries claim to be "democracies". In Africa, north, south, east and west -- we see a continent full of so-called "democracies", but which are, in effect, tyrannies. Eastern Europe has, only recently, rid itself of so-called "people's democracies". Indonesia describes itself as a "guided democracy". Even China calls itself a "democracy". Democracy is indeed an elusive thing.

I think democracy succeeds best when it rests on a solid base. Those who create wealth are the true democrats.

What this Council needs, now, and in the future, is a balanced voice, with not only liberals but commercial, financial and industrial sectors also firmly represented through their functional constituencies. The latter can help balance labour, social workers and teachers. Those who produce the wealth should also be encouraged to offer their expertise to the community on how to spend the wealth.

Sir, the Hong Kong version of "democracy" has not yet been born. Here is an opportunity but also a danger. For the easy way out is to stand on a platform and shout slogans about democracy into a microphone. But, the next step will be to give away taxpayer's money and to accept in this Council whatever the loudest shouts for. So, if "democracy" demands that bus fares will be abolished for free rides then that would happen.

The current Basic Law proposal on the future political model includes many different streams of opinion. Grassroots opinion comes from the directly elected element, while the functional constituencies ensure that professional and managerial skills are recognized. All those who create the wealth of our society and the resulting freedoms should be allowed and encouraged to participate in Hong Kong's future.

This is the spirit of Hong Kong people ruling Hong Kong. Hong Kong people ruling Hong Kong does not mean the welfare-minded liberals ruling Hong Kong with the support

of the "grassroot" people alone. I contend that everyone in Hong Kong as long as they are Hong Kong citizens has the need and the right to be involved in political life, and not the liberals alone.

The future political model proposed by the Basic Law Drafting Committee allows Hong Kong people to elect our own Chief Executive, allows Hong Kong people to elect all members of our Legislative Council, partly by direct elections, partly by functional constituency elections. Nowhere did they suggest that some or all of the members of our Legislative Council will be sent down from Beijing or appointed by Beijing. Therefore, a motion that this Council deplors the extremely undemocratic political model for the Basic Law is inappropriate.

Separate voting

Sir, on the subject of separate voting in this Council, it will surely suit the future Chief Executive to have division, argument and confrontation within the Council. Separate parts to a single chamber can only promote disunity and disharmony. In consequence, what the executive wants, he or she can have -- by using the time-honoured techniques of divide and rule.

I do not see why the future Chief Executive should be presented with division within the Council which he can easily exploit. Real democracy is achieved not so much through the ballot box as through making the executive answerable to the legislature.

Limitations on nationality

Sir, the Basic Law has a new article, replacing the original Article 66. This limits members of the legislature who have the right of abode in foreign countries to 20%. To be realistic about it, many professionals and business people are likely to possess foreign passports and/or right of abode elsewhere by 1997 as an insurance policy. Too many restrictions on eligibility for public office, including membership to this Council, will surely be undesirable. That will simply deter businessmen and professionals from participating in politics.

Conclusion

Sir, I do not oppose direct elections. But I strongly support the principle of a balanced legislature, in particular in those areas which contribute to our

commercial success. I urge greater realization of the fact that the development of direct elections here is only a means to an end. I have supported the 4:4:2 model as the best pace. That is still my view.

I know that some people see gradual, but nevertheless in Hong Kong's context, dynamic, changes with disapproval. They refer to it as "toothpaste democracy", squeezed out bit by bit. But, consider what happens when you squeeze the toothpaste tube too hard. The answer is a mess.

For my part, I favour putting on as much toothpaste on the brush as is necessary. Hopefully the result is a bright and healthy smile.

I advocate the close and eager participation by all sectors of Hong Kong society in the future political system. Between all the elected members, either by one man one vote or by functional constituency, we can make a solid base for future progress. After all, we must all get involved in our civic life -- all of us, collectively to create the economic and political freedoms which all Hong Kong people cherish and wish to maintain.

Sir, as far as today's motions are concerned, I support Mr. Allen LEE's motion that expresses disappointment of the future political model especially in respect of the separate voting mechanism and the nationality restriction. I also strongly support the second part of Mr. LEE's motion that urges the community to be united in its efforts to achieve a successful democratic system. Sir, I do not support, with due respect to Mr. McGREGOR, his motion that deplores the political model proposed as extremely undemocratic.

MRS. TU: Sir, as we grow older we are supposed to grow wiser, but maybe some of us merely grow more obstinate. Of course I am not referring to anyone in this Chamber. As for myself, there is one thing in which I claim to have grown wiser. It is that I now realize that when the chips are down, there is nothing more we can do except pick ourselves up and look for other ways to succeed. If we stop to flog a dead horse we may miss the remainder of the race.

The race in this case is 1997, and the apparently dead horse is the political model which we still think best for Hong Kong. I doubt if anyone really believes that we can bring that horse back to life.

I think everyone agrees that the Joint Declaration laid a good foundation upon which to build a completely democratic structure for Hong Kong. The problem is that five years ago when it was signed, no one realized that the words: "The legislature shall be constituted by election" did not mean democratic election, but only partial-direct election, mainly indirect election, and even some selection.

The blame for this public misunderstanding rests not only on China but on Britain. The British Government has resisted democracy for Hong Kong for more than a century. Since the time that Britain realized the colonial system was coming to an end, it has been introducing a system of indirect election instead of going for direct election. China has cottoned on to this idea, and now we have a kind of misshapen offspring conceived by the Mother of Parliaments.

It is a pity that China did not take the opportunity of allaying the fears of the Hong Kong public caused last year by violations of human rights beyond our imagination. A simple four-phase path to democracy as proposed by OMELCO and other groups would have gone a long way towards restoring Hong Kong's confidence. But that was not to be.

Neither Britain nor China has left us anything to hang on to in our dilemma, so we must collect all our courage and determination to secure our future, come what may. We must face the task ahead of us, and we must begin now. In spite of the Senior Member's claim yesterday that Hong Kong has enjoyed the rule of law under colonialism, there is still much lacking in our own record of human rights, and to these shortcomings we must address ourselves at once. At the level of the less privileged of our society, crime, vice and corruption still cause immense anxiety. There are also legal injustices left over from the old extra-territorial rights complex. There is very little provision for legal representation in court for those who cannot afford to pay for it, while those who can afford it can escape through loopholes, well-paid lawyers or even by devious means. We still kill the mosquitoes but let the tigers go free. We still have a long way to go to make our society more egalitarian for the elderly poor, the sick and the handicapped, people for whom we should hold a specially sacred trust.

We must make sure that we have true freedom of the press and other media which should be the mouthpiece of democracy. At the same time, the media should hold truth more valuable than sensation.

I have mentioned only one or two of the issues we must attend to in the years ahead if we are to make our society truly democratic by 1997. We must seek freedom, equality, economic prosperity, social security, and all these things are interdependent. Only by this means can we prove to China that democracy will succeed in the Special Administrative Region. Only by this means can we influence China far more than by harsh word, fist-raising and effigy-burning, activities which only serve to fuel public fear and uncertainty.

I therefore hope that our community will unite, stand firm, and have no more fear for the future.

I should like to support Mr. McGREGOR's motion, but I think it would be unrealistic to believe any longer that in 1995 Britain will step out of line with China's formula for convergence. I do not know what our Hong Kong democrats were doing in the past two or three decades, but after lobbying the British Government myself for democracy during those years I learned that the reply was always the same and I quote that "China would not like it", and Britain has not changed her story, even since the sad happenings of last year. She is never likely to do so, so we have to face the facts and learn to live with our frustrations.

In these circumstances, Sir, I must reluctantly support Mr. LEE's more realistic motion.

MR. PETER WONG: Sir, the time of arguing about the abstract draft Basic Law is about to pass. We have to face the reality that the National People's Congress will promulgate the Basic Law shortly and no amount of logical or succinct arguments on Hong Kong's part will make any changes to its, certainly not in the next few years.

Like my honourable colleagues, I am disappointed that we did not get everything that we have asked for, despite our genuine attempts to express what Hong Kong people feel and want. But this is not the first time that decisions that set the course of our future have been made without our participation. I have never been under any illusion that we would be treated any better this time around.

The time has now come to discuss and decide on the electoral system for 1991. Hong Kong has had no experience of direct elections and Hong Kong people have been

castigated as apathetic, naive and even stupid where political issues are concerned. But like everything else, only time can tell; within the confines set, Hong Kong is in the enviable position of being able to pick and choose a system that is best for Hong Kong. Our minds are uncluttered and unbiased by experience. In the interest of Hong Kong, we must work hard to construct a truly democratic system that will allow us to continue with our lifestyles and yet be responsive to the changes that must inevitably come.

As a first step, we must be clear in our minds what we want our new system to achieve. Most importantly, should it be highly proportional, an accurate reflection of the diversity of opinions held by the people of Hong Kong? It would be wrong to deny minority groups a voice, especially those minority groups whose interests will not be represented by the functional constituencies. At the same time, all out proportionality must not be pursued at the expense of political cohesion. The representation of too many diverse interests can only result in prevarication, indecision and sometimes pure antagonism. A clear majority works wonders to get legislation through.

Strong links between elected representatives and their constituents must be forged. Hong Kong people must have a channel through which they can express their concerns to Government, and it is indeed desirable that they should be encouraged to do so. Yet it is equally important that this Council should not become a mere stage for local politics -- that should remain the prerogative of the district boards. Concern with local issues should not be allowed to crowd out the debate on issues that concern the whole of Hong Kong.

The electoral system we adopt must be fair and impartial. The equality of population between constituencies is paramount, and the current gross imbalance of the number of voters between district board constituencies cannot be continued. Each vote cast should be of equal value, and none should be wasted. It is important that an elector who prefers a candidate who is not the runaway favourite should have the incentive to turn up and cast his vote and so increase voter participation. This can be achieved through multi-member constituencies or transferable votes.

There are three more issues with which we should concern ourselves. Firstly, we should acknowledge the vital role played by political parties in a modern democracy in articulating policies and providing representatives for the people. The system which we choose should ensure that those parties which are formed are strong and

cohesive, and not weak and fragmented. In this connection, we should be examining the sort of legislation that will govern the formation and running of political parties; how they can solicit funds and run political campaigns. In time political parties will control the flow of candidates and ultimately influence government policies.

Secondly, we must ensure that this Council remains effective in its task of scrutinizing the actions of the Government and in the future, the Chief Executive. Its members must be capable of providing leadership for Hong Kong throughout the testing times ahead.

Finally, it is vital that we adopt a system that is flexible and adaptable. I am certain that everyone of us will be wrong in our guess as to the pace of democracy of Hong Kong and the changes in the circumstances of China and the world. Inevitably, we will have to move with the times and our system must be able to cope with changes.

Whatever system we are going to adopt, it is important to remember that the overall interests of Hong Kong people must be served. I do intend to concentrate my efforts in the months ahead to study and enter into the debate of what system is best for Hong Kong. Since we are all in politics for the good of Hong Kong, in the course of our debate over the electoral system, it must be our duty to speak only for what is good for Hong Kong.

Let us take this as an opportunity to build up a system that will truly enable Hong Kong people to rule Hong Kong and clearly demonstrate to everyone that we can indeed do so in a democratic spirit. Only thus, can we convince everyone that we are ready, fit and proper to rule ourselves.

Sir, with these words, I support the motion put forward by the Senior Member.

MR. POON CHI-FAI (in Cantonese): Sir, after almost five years of hard work, the Basic Law which is an unprecedented and unique set of laws having a direct bearing on the future destiny of every Hong Kong citizen is at last finalized. Since the Basic Law should be a document that would ensure a high degree of autonomy in Hong Kong through the practice of the "Hong Kong people governing Hong Kong" principle and due consideration should be given to the realization of China's sovereignty in Hong Kong, a lot of difficulties had to be ironed out in the formulation of an absolutely

satisfactory Basic Law, particularly when people with different backgrounds and different political views may have different understanding of the provisions and may make different demands. During the period, the June 4 incident in Beijing, the drastic changes on the political arena all over the world, the disharmony between China and Britain and the distrust between China and Hong Kong created further obstacles to the formulation of a Basic Law which could be acceptable to all. Furthermore, perfection is somehow an impossible dream. Given all these factors, we simply cannot expect the draft Basic Law to win everyone's applause. As a matter of fact, divergent views of objection, reservation and approval are healthy responses in our free society where everyone can express their own opinions.

Sir, as the dispute over the political issue has drawn to a close, Hong Kong people should now work together with concerted effort to build Hong Kong, strengthen her potential for economic developments and strive for a smooth transition and perpetual stability and prosperity. Sir, someone has said, "If Hong Kong has no future, China has no hope." I fully agree to this saying. The importance of Hong Kong to the economic development and the four modernization programmes of China is beyond measure. For the long-term mutual benefit of Hong Kong and China, I hope that the Chinese Government will come to understand that Hong Kong has all along been enjoying freedom of speech and that China should show her understanding, trust and support to Hong Kong when dealing with Hong Kong affairs, so that Hong Kong can restore her confidence and continue to thrive. In view of the close relation between China and Hong Kong, it is also true that "a gloomy future for China would mean a gloomy prospect for Hong Kong too." From now on, Hong Kong people should face up to the reality. We should be pragmatic and try our best to make substantive contribution towards the improvement of the Chinese economy and the implementation of the four modernization programmes, with a view to helping China turn into a stable, prosperous, wealthy and strong country. This approach will be far more practical and constructive than endless confrontation against China, or flattery or grovelling or putting labels on each other.

Sir, with these remarks, I give my full support to our Senior Member Mr. Allen LEE's motion in urging that "in the interest of Hong Kong, the community should be united in its efforts to achieve a successful democratic system." I believe that this is the most crucial step towards stability and prosperity for the territory.

Thank you, Sir.

CHIEF SECRETARY: Sir, I would like to speak to Mr. LEE's motion.

The conclusion of the drafting of those parts of the Basic Law which deal with political arrangements has brought to an end the uncertainty which has been unsettling for all those who have taken a keen interest in the future of Hong Kong. It is appropriate that we use this opportunity to reflect on the outcome and in particular on the way forward.

There is a strong sense of disappointment in this Council that the OMELCO consensus was not adopted as the basis for the political model in the Basic Law and I fully understand Members' frustration in not being able to achieve more on behalf of the people of Hong Kong.

But taking a wider view something else has been achieved over the period of the drafting of the Basic Law, which I think is worthy of comment. This community has faced up to, and grappled with, the task of securing progressive change to the political structure through the transition of sovereignty. Many people have been involved both within and outside this Council. But it fell to this Council to set down a firm marker on where the community's aspirations lay. Members of the Council hammered out a consensus, in itself no mean achievement, and stuck resolutely to it. The final outcome does not meet Members' expectations in full, but the progress which has been achieved, and there have been substantial improvements, would not have been possible without their firm resolve. But in the final analysis the Basic Law is a matter for the Chinese Government. We all hope that that government will be prepared to keep an open mind on the pace of political development here. Clearly the performance of the 1991 legislature will be the most important factor in influencing the Chinese Government on the way forward.

Attitudes in Hong Kong have changed over the past three years and we have responded to the demand for a faster pace of democracy by increasing the number of directly elected seats from our previously announced 10 in the 1988 White Paper to 18 in 1991. The success of democratic government in Hong Kong will depend very much on the quality of candidates who come forward in that election and the turnout of the voters. We have said that we will announce shortly the composition of the Council in 1991, the constitutional boundaries and the type of voting system. In considering all these important matters our concern is to devise as fair a system as possible, a system which will not favour any particular group in the community over another, and to encourage as many people as possible to participate and vote. This Council will of

course have the opportunity to scrutinize and debate the legislation which will give effect to those arrangements. But elections are not simply a matter of electoral arrangements. In order to succeed we must have the wholehearted and active support of the community in 1991.

The 1991 elections will mark a major step forward in the development of democratic institutions in Hong Kong. They will be a tangible demonstration of our resolve to develop a political system based on electoral choice. With choice comes responsibility: the responsibility of the ablest in our community to stand for office; the responsibility of the electorate to exercise their choice, and to exercise it wisely; and the responsibility of leadership. Increasingly the people of Hong Kong will be looking to their representatives in this Council for the leadership needed to see them through the uncertainties which lie ahead.

We need people of commitment and vision to take up the challenge of leading Hong Kong into the next century; leaders who will act in the overall interest of Hong Kong rather than on the basis of narrow factional interest. It will not help if we waste our time in castigating China or Britain for what has gone wrong in the past or indeed what may go wrong in the future. Above all we must look forward rather than backward. At this point in our history we must accept that if Hong Kong is to continue to be successful our future destiny lies with us.

The Basic Law provides a framework within which Hong Kong can continue to be successful. The fundamentals on which Hong Kong's success in the past has been built have not been changed nor are they likely to change in the future. We will still have a hardworking and resilient workforce, unrivalled entrepreneurs, a sound economy, personal freedom and a stable government.

It seems to me that the most difficult problems we face are not the practical tangible problems. We have demonstrated time and time again that we can deal effectively with those. The problems of today are in our mind. We focus our worries on an uncertain future. But if we continue to be pre-occupied with the future are we not in danger of increasing that uncertainty by failing to recognize and seize the opportunities available now to build a solid base for the development of this community? And so the solution to most of our problems are here, with us in Hong Kong, not in China and not in the United Kingdom.

Hong Kong is now firmly established as one of the commercial capitals of the world

with a mature and stable economy. The same spirit and determination which brought about that material success must surely now be directed towards making the future constitutional arrangements for Hong Kong work, and work well. Those who would lead Hong Kong owe it to all who are proud to call Hong Kong their home and whose future rests here, to seize that challenge with both hands, and so enable Hong Kong to go forward to the next century with confidence.

MR. ALLEN LEE (in Cantonese): Sir, this will be the first time I shall ever attempt to speak in Cantonese in this Chamber. I shall be responding to a few points made by my colleagues regarding the motion that I moved. I am choosing to speak in Cantonese because I hope my not too correct accent will help bring a few light moments to Members of this Council who have sat through two afternoons of solemn debate.

During the debate, some Members argued that if we gave up the OMELCO consensus it would mean forsaking the people of Hong Kong. In the matter of the OMELCO consensus on the future political model, I think OMELCO Members already discharged their responsibility towards the people of Hong Kong. As Members are well aware, we sent a copy of our report on the matter to the Basic Law Drafting Committee as well as the Hong Kong and Macau Office in Peking. Unfortunately, they refused to accept it but wrote to Dame Lydia DUNN and me, saying, "If you would want to let us know your views, you would have to go through the proper diplomatic channel." I believe Members of this Council have often heard it said that OMELCO is basically a British institution. To follow the diplomatic channel, we shuttled between London and Hong Kong. Dame Lydia and I met the Foreign Office Minister, the Foreign Secretary and the Prime Minister. In the matter of the OMELCO consensus, we put together our best effort, gave our commitment to the people of Hong Kong and in that regard discharged our duty to them. In the final analysis, as I said yesterday, we are not masters of our own destiny. Now that the matter has been decided, I would concur with what Mrs. TU said a moment ago, which is to the following effect: we are not giving up, we have never given up and we have to face the facts. I feel that if we do not face the facts we would risk misleading and misdirecting the people of Hong Kong.

I would also like to respond to what the Honourable Jimmy McGREGOR said a few moments ago. Mr. McGREGOR said he believed and hoped that China's attitudes towards Hong Kong would improve in the next few years. But as I said yesterday, have we ever asked ourselves what our attitudes towards China are? If we wish China to become more friendly, we must take the initiative to create the atmosphere of mutual trust,

understanding and accommodation. Otherwise, the wish will neither be reciprocated nor fulfilled. Members of this Council are all leaders of our community. If we adopt a distrusting, uncompromising and unsympathetic attitude towards China, I believe the Chinese leaders will not understand us or simply will not bother to. They will leave us out in the cold. These are lessons learnt from experience. We live and work and learn every step of the way. It is hoped that through our garnered experience we shall start afresh. Indeed, as I said yesterday, we need to try again. For the sake of our future and our people, we need to do what needs to be done -- for China will become our sovereign state.

Sir, there is something I might as well tell this Council. When the Sino-British Joint Declaration was ratified in 1984, Sir Sze-yuen CHUNG, our senior, said to me: "You must not forget, Allen LEE, our relationship with China is like that of a parent company and its subsidiary. You and I, having been the chief executive of the subsidiary, should know this best. Unless you want to quit, to resign from office, you can never ignore the parent company's policy directives. You may argue with the chief executive of the parent company. You can give him advice. But to fire him is impossible." Sir, I will never forget his advice. I consider Sir Sze-yuen a man of immense political wisdom. He was the longest serving Member of the Executive and Legislative Councils in our history, working for the good of our community. I hope Members of this Council today will listen to Sir Sze-yuen's advice and learn from his experience garnered through long years of participation in local politics with a China dimension to it.

Sir, I read again the eight poems of Dr. TSE last night. It struck a chord of unison in me. I fully understand and share his feelings. The poems reflect our feeling towards the Basic Law. Many of us in this Council, I believe, share this feeling -- it is most regrettable and disappointing that the OMELCO consensus has not been accepted.

Like Mrs. LAM, Sir, I am not good at poetry, neither is singing my strong suit. But the song she mentioned also happens to be the one I love most. Whenever I am asked to sing at receptions or parties I would be only too happy to sing this song which, incidentally, is the only song in my repertoire. The song is "Tomorrow Will Be Better". Today, I would like to wind up this debate on a note imported by the theme of the song. I hope Members of this Council will face the future positively, discharge our responsibilities and fulfil our commitments to the people of Hong Kong. This is an unshirkable duty. This is the only way to work for a better Hong Kong.

Sir, I commend my motion to this Council.

Question on Mr. Allen LEE's motion put and agreed to.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT: Mr. MCGREGOR, you now have an opportunity to move the motion standing in your name on the Order Paper.

MR. MCGREGOR moved the following motion:

"That this Council deplores the extremely undemocratic political model proposed for the Basic Law at the recent meeting of the Basic Law Drafting Committee and urges the Chinese Government to recognize the importance of preserving the confidence of the people of Hong Kong in their future after 1997 by accepting a more democratic political model for the Basic Law based upon the OMELCO consensus which recommends a fully elected legislature by the year 2003, reflecting the expressed wishes of the people of Hong Kong and urges the Administration in Hong Kong to introduce legislation providing for no less than 50% of the total Legislative Council seats to be directly elected by 1995."

MR. MCGREGOR: Sir, in our speeches throughout the last two days, we have been strong on rhetoric, pragmatism and, to a very large extent, convergence. Many Councillors seem to be somehow afraid of China. Some of us believe that conversely China may be afraid of us. We must stand by our deep convictions. We did so successfully in 1967 and we should do so now. The game is not over as some have suggested. With respect, there are not two kinds of democracy; there are not two kinds of freedom. I think we in this Council know perfectly well what we mean by democracy; if any do not, then they should not be in this Council. I believe that a vote against my motion is a vote against democracy and a vote against our own political consensus. It is a vote, I believe, against the wishes of the Hong Kong people. I do not ask Councillors to vote for my motion. They must vote according to their convictions. I will leave it to the people of Hong Kong to decide whether or not what I have said has merit. And let me finish with a little saying which I learnt a long time ago: "God helps those who help themselves."

Question on Mr. MCGREGOR's motion proposed, put and negatived.

Mr. MCGREGOR claimed a division. The President then ordered the Council to divide under Standing Order 36(4).

Mr. CHAN, Mr. HUI, Mr. Martin LEE, Mr. CHOW, Dr. LEONG, Miss LEUNG and Mr. MCGREGOR voted for the motion.

Mr. Allen LEE, Mr. CHEONG, Mr. CHEUNG Yan-lung, Mrs. CHOW, Mrs. FAN, Mr. CHENG Hon-kwan, Mr. CHUNG, Mr. HO Sai-chu, Mr. NGAI, Mr. POON Chi-fai, Prof. POON, Mr. TAI, Mrs. TAM, Mr. TAM, Mr. Edward HO, Mr. ARCULLI, Mr. Paul CHENG, Mr. Michael CHENG, Mr. David CHEUNG, Mrs. FONG, Mrs. LAM, Mr. LAM, Mrs. LAU, Mr. LAU Wah-sum, Mrs. SO, Mr. TIEN and Mr. Peter WONG voted against the motion.

The Chief Secretary, the Attorney General, the Financial Secretary, Miss TAM, the Secretary for Home Affairs, the Secretary for Planning, Environment and Lands, Mr. PANG, the Secretary for Transport, the Secretary for Security, the Secretary for Health and Welfare and Mrs. TU abstained and the Secretary for Education and Manpower and Mr. SIT were not in the Chamber when the division was in progress.

The President announced that seven Members voted for Mr. MCGREGOR's motion, 27 voted against it and 11 abstained. He declared that the motion was negatived.

Adjournment and next sitting

HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT: In accordance with Standing Orders I now adjourn the Council until 2.30 pm on Wednesday, 7 March 1990.

Adjourned accordingly at twenty-six minutes to Six o' clock.

Note: The short titles of the Bills/motions listed in the Hansard have been translated into Chinese for information and guidance only; they do not have authoritative effect in Chinese.

