

OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Friday, 4 July 2003

The Council continued to meet at
half-past Two o'clock

MEMBERS PRESENT:

THE PRESIDENT

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE CYD HO SAU-LAN

THE HONOURABLE ALBERT HO CHUN-YAN

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

THE HONOURABLE LEE CHEUK-YAN

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE NG LEUNG-SING, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MARGARET NG

THE HONOURABLE JAMES TO KUN-SUN

THE HONOURABLE CHEUNG MAN-KWONG

THE HONOURABLE HUI CHEUNG-CHING, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHAN KWOK-KEUNG, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE BERNARD CHAN, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHAN KAM-LAM, J.P.

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

THE HONOURABLE LEUNG YIU-CHUNG

THE HONOURABLE SIN CHUNG-KAI

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

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

DR THE HONOURABLE YEUNG SUM

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

THE HONOURABLE LAU CHIN-SHEK, J.P.

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

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE ANDREW CHENG KAR-FOO

THE HONOURABLE SZETO WAH

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE LI FUNG-YING, J.P.

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

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

THE HONOURABLE MICHAEL MAK KWOK-FUNG

THE HONOURABLE ALBERT CHAN WAI-YIP

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

THE HONOURABLE WONG SING-CHI

THE HONOURABLE FREDERICK FUNG KIN-KEE

THE HONOURABLE IP KWOK-HIM, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LAU PING-CHEUNG

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE CHAN YUEN-HAN, J.P.

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

THE HONOURABLE WONG YUNG-KAN

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

THE HONOURABLE LAU KONG-WAH, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHOY SO-YUK

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE MA FUNG-KWOK, J.P.

PUBLIC OFFICERS ATTENDING:

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

THE HONOURABLE ANTONY LEUNG KAM-CHUNG, G.B.S., J.P.
THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY

THE HONOURABLE ELSIE LEUNG OI-SIE, G.B.M., J.P.
THE SECRETARY FOR JUSTICE

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

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

CLERK IN ATTENDANCE:

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

MOTION ON ADJOURNMENT

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): The Council now resumes to debate the adjournment motion.

As there have been different interpretations of my permission to allow Dr YEUNG Sum to move this motion, I would like to say a few words to clarify.

During the course of the meeting held on the day before yesterday, Dr YEUNG Sum sought my permission to move, without notice, an adjournment motion between two items of business under Rule 16(2) of the Rules of Procedure. When I considered whether or not to grant his request under this subrule, I must decide whether the issue of the motion for discussion was a specific issue of urgent public importance. After careful consideration, I was of the opinion that the issue was of importance but not one that was so urgent that it must be moved at that meeting. Moreover, I could not predict how Members would vote on the motion; if the adjournment motion was passed at that time, the Council might not proceed with the remaining business on the Agenda. I have explained on the day before the reason for my decision of not to grant Dr YEUNG's request.

Yesterday, Dr YEUNG Sum made his request under another subrule, that is, Rule 16(4) and not Rule 16(2). According to subrule (4), the proposed adjournment motion was to be moved at the conclusion of all the business on the Agenda for this meeting, then followed by a debate. Also, there must be a written notice of not less than seven clear days, unless I exercise my discretion to waive the notice.

When I decided to waive the required notice by Dr YEUNG Sum yesterday, I stated clearly that this decision was consistent with my usual practice in handling things as the President. Since the House Committee had not been able to call an urgent meeting to discuss Dr YEUNG Sum's request, I came to the decision of granting his request after consulting all those Members whom I could contact, and after over half of the Members expressed support for waiving the notice required of Dr YEUNG Sum.

The two requests of Dr YEUNG Sum on the day before and yesterday were made under different subrules of the Rules of Procedure, and different considerations and procedures were involved in dealing with these requests. Therefore, there were no inconsistencies between the two decisions I made.

I would like to reiterate here that as the guardian of the Rules of Procedure, the President of the Legislative Council makes decisions from the procedural point of view rather than any political compromises. Otherwise, the integrity and reliability of the Rules of Procedure will be reduced to nothing.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Under Rule 16(6) of the Rules of Procedure, the total speaking time for Members is up to 45 minutes. The public officer making a reply may have up to 15 minutes to speak. Members who wish to speak will please press the "Request-to-speak" button.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I have made reference to the House Rules in deciding that the mover of the motion, that is, Dr YEUNG Sum, has up to five minutes to speak. It is now 2.35 pm; the debate shall now proceed.

DR YEUNG SUM (in Cantonese): Madam President, first of all, I have to thank the President, on behalf of the Democratic Party, for allowing me to move this motion. I also have to thank the other colleagues for their support. I have consulted other colleagues who said that they would not have sufficient time for preparation. Out of respect for all Members, I decided to propose to the President to hold the meeting in this afternoon, and to listen to the response of the Government.

Madam President, the march on 1 July made a mark on the history of Hong Kong! Half a million of people from all walks of life took to the streets for a common notion: to strongly oppose the legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law (Article 23) and to voice their deep dissatisfaction with the administration of the Government. They insisted on the march, despite the baking heat, to express their discontent with the Government. Though these people had to wait for hours before they could embark on the march, the orderly manner in which the demonstration had proceeded displayed the high civic quality of the people of Hong Kong.

The Democratic Party members went on a 100-hour hunger strike to pledge support to our aspiration for democracy and our opposition to the legislation on Article 23. The march of half a million of people is a clear demonstration of the strength of people's power. In the past, the people of

Hong Kong laid stress on the economy and people's livelihood. Now, they take to the streets to fight for democracy and freedom. The Democratic Party urges all pro-democracy groups to unify the power of the masses in opposition to the legislation on Article 23, turning this power into a driving force for the next phase of democratic movement for election of the Chief Executive and Members of the Legislative Council by universal suffrage.

The Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong (DAB) accused Members opposing the legislative proposals for not being patriotic, and said that people participating in the rally had been misled. They said that regardless of the number of people taking to the streets, the DAB's support for Article 23 legislation would remain unchanged. Witnessing the march by half a million of people, will the Government and the DAB still insist on scorning on the public opinion most clearly demonstrated? Could they, the half a million of people, or even overseas governments, have been so easily misled, as TUNG Chee-hwa and the DAB have claimed? Members of the pro-democracy camp, like all citizens participating in the march, love our country. However, this does not mean that we also love a particular political party or a particular regime. Our love for our country includes our love for our history, our culture and our people. Therefore, if anything harmful to our people happens, we will stand forth for their interest without any hesitation. The draconian laws to be enacted to implement Article 23 will curtail the freedom of expression, the freedom of the press and the freedom of association, and severely undermine the cornerstone of the success of Hong Kong. In view of the far-reaching impact of these draconian laws, can any citizen, member of the Democratic Party or the pro-democracy camp loving Hong Kong and the Motherland not protest vigorously against these?

TUNG Chee-hwa, in his six years of governance, has performed badly, making the people's life a misery and causing widespread indignation and discontent. The Article 23 legislation sparks off an outbreak of discontent; grievances pent up since the reunification have all vented in one eruption. If TUNG Chee-hwa still has some wisdom of governance, he should stop bulldozing the Bill and withdraw it. He should open dialogue with Members from the pro-democracy camp and social groups against the legislation on Article 23, like the Civil Human Rights Front and professional bodies like the Hong Kong Bar Association. Only then, could public grievances be placated a little bit. Otherwise, people will no longer tolerate a government that is not democratic, not accountable and performing poorly in governance.

The march by half a million of people has practically cast a vote of no confidence in TUNG Chee-hwa. If TUNG Chee-hwa keeps on ignoring the public outcry, he will only fan greater resentment among the public, which is extremely undesirable to the stability of society. Now, the Civil Human Rights Front has already appealed to the public to attend the sit-in protest to be held outside the Legislative Council on 9 July. In view of the serious consequence that can be caused by forcing through the legislation, I urge TUNG Chee-hwa and all pro-government Members to think twice. If TUNG Chee-hwa still indulges in having his own way, ignoring public opinions, he will be a leader hostile to the public, and he is doomed to be discarded by the people. Mr TUNG has only two courses of action now: first, withdrawing the Bill at once and launching the political reform; second, stepping down! Shelving of the legislation is a victory of the people of Hong Kong. Pushing through the legislation will only damage the future of Hong Kong. This is the last chance for TUNG Chee-hwa. Will TUNG Chee-hwa please cherish the last opportunity given him by the people of Hong Kong?

The 1 July march has given the people of Hong Kong an important enlightenment. They know in order that the goal of "Hong Kong people ruling Hong Kong" can be achieved, Hong Kong has to achieve full democratization through the election of the Legislative Council and the Chief Executive by universal suffrage, thus enabling the full reflection of public opinions, and extricating Hong Kong from the plight. Otherwise, the stepping down of TUNG Chee-hwa may not be the way out. Democracy is the only way out for Hong Kong.

Thank you, Madam President.

Dr YEUNG Sum raised the following issue: (Translation)

"How Hong Kong should deal with the strong demands made by over 500 000 people on 1 July, so as to avoid Hong Kong sinking into a political crisis."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That this Council do now adjourn.

At 2.36 pm, 20 Members have requested to speak. I will allow these 20 Members to speak, and each Members shall have up to two minutes.

MR SZETO WAH (in Cantonese): Madam President, half a million of people have taken to the streets; this is a display of enormous strength. Their tolerance of the baking heat and long hours of dry waiting is a display of iron will. The peaceful and orderly manner in which the march proceeded is a display of strict rationality. Confronted by this iron will, clear rationality and enormous strength, TUNG Chee-hwa must respond.

During the past six years, discussions have been held on many issues without any decisions and many decisions have not been implemented despite their having been made. But insofar as the legislation on Article 23 is concerned, why can a decision be reached without any discussions and be implemented once it is made? Why has the Government been in such a hurry as if it is hastening for reincarnation? Why does it have to bulldoze the legislation?

A few days ago, TUNG Chee-hwa said that a lesson must be drawn from the bitter experience of the atypical pneumonia incident. In fact, the lesson he has to learn is not limited to this incident alone. The march participated by half a million of people has given him a hard slap on the face. Has he felt the pain? Has he come to terms with the pain? What is the result of this painful lesson? He must give an immediate response to the aspiration regarding "the opposition of the enactment of legislation to implement Article 23 and strive for the return of political power to the people".

MR LAU CHIN-SHEK (in Cantonese): Madam President, on 1 July, more than half a million of citizens took to the streets, expressing their strong "opposition to the enactment of legislation to implement Article 23 and to strive for the return of political power to the people" in a peaceful and orderly manner. Hong Kong people should definitely be proud of it!

If Mr TUNG and the Government insist on responding to the outcry by stating that people have been "misled" or that "everyone has his own aspiration", it means that they still fail to understand why more than half a million people joined the march, and that Mr TUNG fails to understand public sentiments. If Mr TUNG still intends to take expedient measures by making minor amendments to the National Security (Legislative Provisions) Bill, and keeps on refusing to communicate with people holding different views, I think he has completely miscalculated the situation. He will only push our society to the brink of an abyss with no return.

Madam President, a Member of this Council who is also a Member of the Executive Council proposed that the Government should withdraw some of the provisions in response to the quest of the half million people. Madam President, I can only say that it has come too late. The enactment of laws is not like bargaining at a market stall; the proposal is an insult to the dignity of law. What the public dislike is the barbaric way in which the legislation has been pushed through. On the same ground, the public cannot accept a barbaric amendment. In fact, by setting the deadline at 9 July, the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region has tied its own hands. The 9 July deadline is meaningless. Shelving the legislation on Article 23 is the only acceptable response.

Madam President, I hope Mr TUNG and the leaders in Beijing can realize clearly the seriousness of the present crisis. To placate public grievances, the Government must respond to the call of the 1 July march: "to hold dialogue with the people", "to shelve the legislation on Article 23" and "to launch political reforms for election of the Chief Executive and the Legislative Council by universal suffrage".

To prevent any crisis caused by division and confrontation in society, every one of us must exert his utmost at this critical moment. It does not matter what positions we take, whether we support or oppose the legislation on Article 23; or that we support universal suffrage or have reservations about this. I urge all of you, in the overall interest of Hong Kong, to press for a prompt response from Mr TUNG "to open dialogue, to shelve the bill and to conduct review".

Thank you, Madam President.

MS EMILY LAU (in Cantonese): Madam President, the Frontier will launch a "one-person, one-letter" campaign at the pedestrian precinct in Mong Kok later at 4.30 pm today to call on Mr TUNG Chee-hwa to step down. Madam President, the content of the letter is as follow:

"1 July 2003 was not only the sixth anniversary of the transfer of sovereignty over Hong Kong, it was also a historic moment when the people of Hong Kong came forward to demonstrate their discontent. On that day, hundreds of thousands of people took to the streets to protest the enactment of

legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law, but more so to call on the SAR Government to return the political power to the people.

"The SAR Government, under the leadership of Mr TUNG Chee-hwa, has ruled the territory for six years and made a series of blunders in the course. And its barbaric act to bulldoze the legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law will damage "one country, two systems" and seriously undermine the rule of law, human rights and freedoms in Hong Kong. Faced with the overwhelming outpour of wrath and grievances of the public, Mr TUNG lacks the courage to face the masses and be accountable to them. We think Mr TUNG lacks the quality and ability to govern Hong Kong. We call on Mr TUNG to step down forthwith and return the political power to the people.

"We also call on the authorities to institute democratic political reforms for we believe that only a government elected by the people through universal suffrage is able to solve Hong Kong's many pressing problems. We call on the authorities to shelve the unpopular legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law at once.

"If the SAR Government and Mr TUNG Chee-hwa insist on acting against the wishes of the masses, we will again come forward to demonstrate the people's power and to exert pressure on the authorities."

MR ALBERT HO (in Cantonese): Madam President, given the development of events, Mr TUNG has no other choice but to shelve the legislation on 9 July, and open dialogue with the community again to seek reconciliation.

I have to stress that this is not the time for patching up the Bill. No one has the right to represent the half a million people who participated in the march and make compromise under the present circumstances. The Government has to win back the trust and acceptance of society and the people. In seeking reconciliation of society and the people, a democratic dialogue is a crucial process.

Mr TUNG, please listen to us. This is not a time to talk about personal dignity or glory, or anything else. I call on Mr TUNG not to give to fits of temperament, and not to behave like a bull. Mr TUNG must calm down. He should respect the wishes of the people and take the interest of the community as the ultimate goal. Only then, could he salvage the Government from the great perils it is now facing.

If the Government refuses to respond to the aspirations of half a million of people who demonstrated in a peaceful, rational and extremely restrained manner, the political consequences will be disastrous.

I believe, if the Government dare trample on the wishes of the people once again, Mr TUNG will no longer have the recognition and legitimacy to rule Hong Kong. I foresee that, next time, a million people will take to the streets to call for the collective resignation of all Members of the Executive Council and Mr TUNG.

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): Madam President, some yes-men claimed that the half a million people who took to the streets have been misled. Later, they changed their mind and suggested the withdrawal of some provisions of the Bill would ameliorate the problem. Have those yes-men ever thought seriously about the reason for these half a million people taking to the streets? In fact, these people are not only dissatisfied with some of the provisions of the Bill, they are also dissatisfied with the entire policy-making process of the Government for it has ignored the sentiments of the public. These people find it all the more dissatisfactory that some yes-men thought that under the undemocratic system of the Legislative Council, they can be so self-centred and supercilious as to do anything they want if they are in the majority. This is also one thing that the people of Hong Kong considered most dissatisfactory with the SAR Government in the past six years. Therefore, what the people demand the Government to do is not just withdrawing one or two provisions, but to shelve the entire legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law. The relevant legislation should then be scrutinized by the Legislative Council returned by universal suffrage.

Actually, after the 1 July march, I believe Mr TUNG has become aware that he is in a ruling crisis. Otherwise, he would not have held meetings for the past consecutive days. Unfortunately, Mr TUNG has still been slow in response and is heading in a wrong direction. The general public, but not the very few Members of the Executive Council or the Beijing Government, is whom Mr TUNG should have communication with. If Mr TUNG still insists on having his own way, he will only isolate himself from the people, further encourage Beijing to interfere in Hong Kong affairs and wreck the "one country, two systems" arrangement.

Madam President, every citizen who loves Hong Kong hopes that our territory will remain stable and prosperous, as well as democratic and liberal. However, the closed Government is strangling the aspirations of people. What Hong Kong needs now is a reconciliation of all fronts in society, and the reconciliation should be founded on a democratic political system and communication on an equal footing. I therefore urge Mr TUNG to engage in dialogue with the public forthwith, and to institute democratic political reforms and shelve the legislation on Article 23 immediately.

Madam President, I so submit.

MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG (in Cantonese): Madam President, Members of the Legislative Council must reflect the will of the public in opposing the enactment of legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law without reservations. Or else, we will be making ourselves enemies of the people, sinners in the history of Hong Kong.

Now, 22 Members of the Legislative Council have already called for the shelving of the legislation on Article 23. We only need eight more votes to thwart the Second Reading of the relevant Bill. Members, your constituents, like the half a million people participating in the march, brought along the elderly and the young in the march under the blazing sun. Have Members heard the voices of the people? Have Members heard the call of their own conscience? Have Members heard the worries of the business sector? Have Members heard the wrath of the professionals? Those Members who have once supported the legislation on Article 23 should now change tack for the sake of the half a million people today. If they can abandon their obstinacy, they will win the applause of the public. But if they refuse to realize their fault, they are hopeless. The people are looking at the Members on how they cast their votes. Will Members please make a clear break with TUNG Chee-hwa? Please oppose the legislation on Article 23 for Hong Kong lacks just eight votes!

To date, TUNG Chee-hwa knows only saying "good morning" to the public. However, what the people like to hear most is a "goodbye" by Mr TUNG, his early step-down. Now, TUNG Chee-hwa has only two options, to resign or to concede to the public by shelving the legislation on Article 23, removing Regina IP who has provoked widespread public anger and returning political power to the people. The people of Hong Kong have tolerated him for

past six years. Now, they cannot put up with him any longer. TUNG Chee-hwa, please do Hong Kong a last favour, please concede to the people by shelving the legislation on Article 23. I call on TUNG Chee-hwa to know when to press forward and when to withdraw, and to conduct himself well.

From the 4 June incident to the 1 July incident, the people of Hong Kong should be proud of themselves. Today, the half a million of people who have come forward should not give in until the legislation on Article 23 has been shelved and universal suffrage been implemented. Hopes for Hong Kong lie in the struggle by the people of Hong Kong.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Madam President, on 1 July, half a million people took to the streets voicing aloud two main messages — firstly, to oppose the legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law; and secondly, to call on TUNG Chee-hwa to step down. However, on the next day, TUNG Chee-hwa just greeted reporters "good morning". On the day after next, at the press conference just finished a minute ago, he talked lots of nonsense, making no concrete or meaningful responses. God created the entire universe in six days. But over three days, half of the time used by God to create the universe, TUNG Chee-hwa just managed to say "good morning" and talk a load of rubbish. We can see clearly that TUNG Chee-hwa is slow in response and incompetent. It is absolutely a lame duck government.

With the resignation of TUNG Chee-hwa, public anger may subside. And I believe this is the only choice for Hong Kong now. If TUNG Chee-hwa continues to govern Hong Kong, the "one country, two systems" arrangement as well as the future of Hong Kong will be ruined. Unless TUNG Chee-hwa steps down, anti-TUNG forces will grow and public anger against him will grow stronger and stronger.

If the Government does not listen to the call of the half a million people, insisting on proceeding with the Second and Third Readings of the relevant Bill on 9 July, I call on the public to take to streets again and to wear the three-colour ribbons to show support. All people should join the activity to be held on 9 July. I also call on all drivers to drive to the Legislative Council in Central at 1.00 pm on that day to render support to the opposition of the legislation on Article 23. By that time, the blame for the congestion in Central should not be laid on us. The barbaric and unreasonable Government should be blamed. I call on

Members not to underestimate the people's power. TUNG Chee-hwa acts against the people. Time and again he has exploited the rights and interest of the people of Hong Kong, which will only make the anti-government force grow stronger and stronger.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): Madam President, it is now not only the issue of legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law. Now, most Hong Kong people do not trust TUNG Chee-hwa. His name and ability have already become a laughing stock of most people at every corner of the streets. Can Mr TUNG continue to govern Hong Kong?

He should not say how people have been misled, how strong his sense of mission is, or even how much he believes his principles are correct. I have to tell Mr TUNG: if from your heart you still cherish Hong Kong, please step down!

MR MARTIN LEE (in Cantonese): Madam President, actually, the number of people taking to the streets on 1 July was more than half a million. I am not suggesting that it should be 600 000 or 700 000, but that they are supported by a lot of people who also oppose the enactment of legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law. Therefore, we should not underestimate the number of people participating in the march. TUNG Chee-hwa has just held a press conference. I heard what he say in person. He was not talking nonsense; he talked a lot instead. Madam President, he said that the relevant Bill definitely would not injure the human rights and freedom enjoyed by the people of Hong Kong. It is utterly ridiculous that he dares make such a statement; he has absolutely insulted the intelligence of the people of Hong Kong.

I believe TUNG Chee-hwa wanted to accuse me or other Legislative Council Members of misleading the President of the United States, and he also said that the Americans could be easily misled. Now, the Government of the United Kingdom has said that the proscription mechanism runs against the principle of "one country, two systems". The European Union has also made a statement on this issue. Canada, Australia and New Zealand have also made relevant statements. Have the leaders of these countries all been misled by us? Or is it the case that TUNG Chee-hwa and his officials still want to mislead the public, claiming that the relevant Bill will in no way injure the human rights and

freedom enjoyed by the people of Hong Kong? However, he is not going to succeed. Hong Kong people are very "wise" and "smart". TUNG Chee-hwa and his government may try to mislead them, but they definitely will not succeed.

Actually, on 1 July, I stayed at the back of the march. As I am no longer the Chairman of the Democratic Party, I stayed at the back of the masses. I shook hands with many people and talked to them; I felt really good about it. Some people told me, "Martin, please keep on 'bad-mouthing' Hong Kong." Others said, "Martin, please keep on misleading us, we really enjoy taking to the streets now." Madam President, on the face of each and every protestor, I saw hope. These people love their country and love Hong Kong, so Hong Kong has hope. If TUNG Chee-hwa still refuses to shelve the Bill, I can only tell him, "Stupidity is incurable."

MS CYD HO (in Cantonese): Madam President, on 1 July, the temperature was as high as 32 degrees Celsius, but 500 000 people insisted on walking under the scorching sun, determined to be counted on foot, determined to enter Victoria Park, lest the police would not count them. However, today, on 4 July, the Government has not yet made any concrete response to the demands raised by the people on that day. No matter how the media inquires, Mr TUNG knows only saying "Good morning". We can see that the executive lacks the ability to deal with political crisis. The more it evades, the bigger the crisis snowballs, because the people can see that the leader of Hong Kong lacks the courage even to face a situation of his own making. I wonder whether Hong Kong is still being governed by anyone? If the answer is yes, whoever is governing Hong Kong? Where does this person hide himself in the course of carrying out his governance?

In fact, no matter the barbaric process of legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law or the high-handed and arrogant attitude of officials, or the economic doldrums or high unemployment rate, they were all superficial signs. The fundamental reasons are the congenital deficiency that the Chief Executive is not returned by direct election and the postnatal deficiency of his stubbornness and biased audience. Even now, Mr TUNG is still reluctant to listen to different views, and he is only willing to meet and exchange views with people of a smaller circle. Today, I hope he can realize that these people cannot represent the general public indeed, thus they cannot sense the public sentiments.

On 1 July, the people of Hong Kong demonstrated their excellent civic quality. On the contrary, our Administration was short of integrity and tried to polarize society, and it dared not face the reality after causing troubles, just trying to hide like a child. Hong Kong deserves governance by a government of better quality. Those people who oppose Article 23 legislation absolutely love Hong Kong and wish to see China progress. We should introduce as soon as possible direct election of the executive and the legislature by universal suffrage and pool our efforts to rebuild Hong Kong.

MS MIRIAM LAU (in Cantonese): Madam President, several days ago, hundreds of thousands of people took to the street. Be it 350 000 as estimated by the police, or the 500 000 as estimated by the organizer, it was a very large number anyway. The Liberal Party is very much concerned that so many people have resorted to taking to the streets to air their aspirations.

Although the organizer has a theme for the march, not all the participants were necessarily in opposition to Article 23 legislation. They might have complaints about Article 23, perhaps due to the fact that they did not realize the meaning of Article 23, could not understand or simply did not want to understand it, or they really had doubts about it. However, if the public could not realize or understand or if they have doubts, it is the Government's responsibility to make responses and to address it.

Furthermore, we can note from various placards, clothing, tools made by participants, to the conversation between them and reporters that people who took part in the campaign have different demands, numerous demands. However, the conversation between a participant and a reporter impressed me most, that is, when the reporter asked, "You come here today because you have expectations of the Government?" The participant replied in a determined way, "Yes, I do have expectations of the Government, I hope it can hear and see what we wish to express and respond to us proactively."

Madam President, we believe participants of the march do not oppose the Government. They all love Hong Kong and have high expectations of the Government, that is why they came out and used a peaceful way to express their demands. If they do not love Hong Kong, if they have lost all hope in Hong Kong, they may have chosen a different way of expression. If they choose to remain silent and keep the problems to themselves, seeds of social instability will only be sown.

Some of the newspapers have analysed different aspirations of the people. The Liberal Party could not turn a blind eye to them, and we believe the Government will not ignore them. The Liberal Party hopes the Government will respond to them as soon as possible, in order to restore the peace and quiet of society and enable us to stride forward in together.

Madam President, I so submit.

MR TAM YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): Madam President, due to the prevailing economic doldrums and high unemployment rate, in addition to the devastation of the SARS outbreak, the people are dissatisfied with the Government and they have a lot of grievances. The 1 July march was born against such a background. For that reason, according to the analyses by various parties, with the exception of some who strongly opposed the implementation of Article 23 of the Basic Law, most of the participants of the march wished to express their discontentment with various policies of the Government. Among these people, some became owners of negative assets after the financial turmoil, some had lost their jobs, some had their pay and fringe benefits cut, some were disgruntled about the words and deeds of senior government officials and some were discontented about the way in which the Government had dealt with the SARS epidemic. For that reason, the Government must respond to these varied and wide-ranging demands of the people by continuously improving its policies and measures and keeping abreast of the times. It can win the understanding and support of the people only by doing all of these.

However, it would be totally unfair if one should insist on equating the people's discontentment and grievances about the Government to opposition to the national security bill.

The direction adopted by the SAR Government in enacting the national security bill to implement Article 23 fully manifests the spirit of "one country, two systems". The bill also fully complies with the Basic Law, stipulations of the two international covenants on human rights as applied to Hong Kong, and the principles of common law in Hong Kong. The Government issued a consultation paper in last September. After comprehensive consultations with various sectors, the Government put forward the legislative proposal with nine points of improvement, which was welcomed by various sectors at that time,

including the Bar Association. In the past four months, the Legislative Council conducted a painstaking scrutiny of the Bill and a number of amendments were made by the Government during that period, such as limiting sedition to situations where a person intends, and is likely to, induce other to commit treason, subversion or secession, or to engage in violent public disorder and imposing a three-year time limit for prosecuting an offence of handling seditious publications. All of these amendments were made after careful study.

MR CHAN KAM-LAM (in Cantonese): Madam President, on 1 July, hundreds of thousands of people took to the streets, and to this we should certainly attach importance. The Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong (DAB) also attaches great importance to this major march after the reunification. However, we understand very well that in the past six years, the people have been going through an ordeal in the wake of the economic doldrums. The financial turmoil and the economic transformation have dealt a heavy blow to every one of us. Especially after the launching of the accountability system last year, everyone has high expectations of the Government, which were even higher than that of the past. For that reason, problems that emerged in the past few years had induced them to take to the streets to express their views. We very much appreciate this. Fortunately, we can see that no conflict took place during the 1 July march, as the people were rational enough to express their views with their feet. However, we feel that the sentiments of the people were utilized by a lot of people for some political motives, such as opposition to Article 23 of the Basic Law, the request of toppling Mr TUNG and replacement of Mr TUNG's cabinet. I believe not every member of the public has a clear understanding of all of these issues. We can see from some television interviews that a lot of people took to the streets, especially those who opposed Article 23, because they had been seriously misled. For that reason, I hope the Government can understand by now that all of the efforts it made in the past in terms of publicity and education were inadequate. I hope that after learning the lesson from this incident, we can master how to better communicate with the people and make them understand why some problems cannot be solved. With regard to the content of Article 23 legislation, we should also conduct more extensive publicity. Thank you, Madam President.

MISS MARGARET NG: Madam President, when 500 000 people marched for six hours in the streets in sweltering heat, determined to be counted, their demands deserve a prompt and full response from the Government.

Two demands stood out: put back Article 23 legislation and bring forward democracy. I urge the Government to accede to both. With respect to Article 23 legislation, it was the Government's blind determination to push through the national security Bill in next week's meeting of this Council which sparked off the anger of the people. They are not just worried about the contents of the Bill but also angry with the process, because time has not been allowed to win the consensus of the community.

It is not good enough for the Government to be convinced that the provisions do not infringe rights. It has to be able to convince the public that they are so, and to show the international community that the law is accepted by the people of Hong Kong. The march of the 500 000 people is conclusive proof that this has not been achieved.

Madam President, this is not the time for details. Everyone is waiting for the reply of the Government. I remind the Government that a law passed in the teeth of demonstrable opposition of the people can have no legitimacy. It will be worse than no law at all.

Accepting the major amendments we have proposed may be one way of addressing the concerns of the people, but now the issue is not in our hands alone. It is with the people, and the people have demanded time for dialogue. They do not just want an amendment here and there. They have spoken in no uncertain terms.

I urge the Government to respond in such a way as to leave the door open for further discussion. The people have been patient and peaceful. The Government must take advantage of the opportunity. Thank you.

MS AUDREY EU (in Cantonese): Madam President, it has been 72 hours since the 1 July march, but the Government has yet to make any concrete response. I believe the later the Government responds to this matter the bigger the political crisis it will develop. Just now we saw the Chief Executive say on the television that the legislative proposals in respect of Article 23 of the Basic Law would not undermine the freedoms and the rights of Hong Kong people. It is obvious that 500 000 people do not believe that; they only feel that the Government wishes to hastily pass the legislation on Article 23. I believe that the public outcry could not be mollified even if the Government now proposes

some piecemeal amendments and makes some small concessions. Only shelving the legislation and the conduct of a comprehensive and genuine public consultation can appropriately address public concerns.

The Head of the Central Policy Unit (CPU), Prof LAU Siu-kai, once estimated that only about 30 000 people would join the 1 July march. It was obvious that the Government had kept wrong tabs on the public pulse, or there was something wrong with its antenna. Besides failing to grasp the public sentiments, the biased attitude of government officials in dealing with the legislation provoked public indignation. A lot of people who joined the march told us that they had in fact been fed up with the contemptuous and arrogant look on the face of the Secretary for Security. She did not only refuse to answer questions raised by Members, but also defame those who opposed the legislation of having been misled. Just now Mr CHAN Kam-lam said that even 200 000 people taking to the streets would not bring any pressure to bear on the Government, and he also said that some people had participated in the march with the mentality of joining a holiday activity. All of these remarks have aroused public indignation.

Since Hong Kong has now implemented the accountability system, and given the development of events, I hope the Government can actively respond to the question of whether Secretary IP should be held partially responsible for the march by 500 000 people. The opposition to Article 23 legislation has in fact carried with it the expectation of expeditiously electing the Chief Executive by universal suffrage of "one person, one vote". The Government should start reviewing the political system. Thank you, Madam President

MR MICHAEL MAK (in Cantonese): Madam President, I can tell Honourable Members that the number of people who took to the streets on 1 July was not 500 000, it was 650 000, clearly 650 000. On that day, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan said he had underestimated the number, because he could not see the people among the crowd, and many people were standing on the sidewalk to show their support. Besides, some people left the march early due to various reasons. In fact, 650 000 people accounted for one tenth of the total population in Hong Kong. They waited for hours in sweltering heat of over 30 degrees Celsius, can the Government not respect their demands? How could the Government persist in pursuing a wrong course? "Having a sense of shame is akin to courage"; I urge the Government and relevant officials to shelve the legislation. I think that

is the only way out for them, and my demand is crystal clear. I hope officials will convey our demand loud and clear to the Government. My personal demand is to shelve the legislation. At present, I am not concerned about whether or not Mr TUNG Chee-hwa would step down, I just wish to teach Mr Donald TSANG and the relevant officials how to fight this battle. What they have to deal with is to shelve the legislation. If they fail to do so, I can tell them, our demand is that we oppose Article 23 legislation, we want the legislation shelved. I estimate that hundreds of thousands or even 1 million people would come to this place on 9 July. I have to warn them that, with hundreds of thousands or even 1 million people participating in the campaign, the consequences will be inconceivable. We hope that we can deal with this matter in a peaceful manner, but I am concerned that some people, such as Mr CHAN Kam-lam or Secretary IP, may rub salt into the wound. Thank you, Madam President.

MR FREDERICK FUNG (in Cantonese): Madam President, on 1 July, over 500 000 people took part in a peaceful march. There was no mishap on that day, thus demonstrating the self-motivation and rationality of the public. One can see that they are people of high quality. The people are in opposition to Article 23 legislation, they are dissatisfied with the administration of the SAR Government in the past six years, and they are displeased with Chief Executive TUNG Chee-hwa and some of the senior officials. On the whole, there are towering grievances against the Government.

It is time for the Government to respond to the aspirations of the people by taking some actions to show its sincerity. The Government may take the following actions:

- (1) Negotiate the way of dealing with the matter, and shelve Article 23 legislation;
- (2) Meet with people and groups of different political views;
- (3) Establish a human rights commission which has the authority to ensure the administration of the Government is in line with human rights standard and to ensure that the people of Hong Kong will continue to enjoy their freedoms;

- (4) Establish a committee to prepare for the election of the Legislative Council and the Chief Executive by universal suffrage; and
- (5) Reform the existing policy agenda by pinpointing current social problems, unemployment in particular, and put the accountability system for principal officials into effect seriously by rewarding those who should be rewarded and punishing those who should be punished.

Madam President, among the 500 000-odd people who had taken to the streets, there were elderly people as well as teenagers, there were people of lowly occupations and there were more professionals. Can Chief Executive TUNG Chee-hwa opt not to respond? Can he turn a blind eye to all this?

Madam President, I so submit.

DR RAYMOND HO (in Cantonese): Madam President, after conducting extensive consultations lately, I have learnt that the mainstream opinion of the engineering sector is to shelve the legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law.

Fundamentally, the engineering sector supports Article 23 legislation for the legislation seeks to defend national security and maintain the stability and prosperity of Hong Kong and in effect manifests the return of sovereignty.

However, people in the sector find the consultation during the legislative process has been inadequate, while the Government should make further explanations on certain important provisions in order to dispel the concerns of the public. Perhaps there are still some deficiencies in the content of individual provisions, such as proscription of organizations, the issue of police powers, public interest, and so on. And people are unhappy about the hastily completion of the scrutiny of the Bill. In the face of hundreds of thousands of people having taken to the streets on 1 July to show their dissatisfaction with the administration in the past six years, and since there is no urgency, perhaps the Article 23 legislation could be slowed down. Premier WEN Jiabao encouraged the people of Hong Kong, "what Hong Kong needs now is understanding, trust and unity, confidence, courage and action."

The SAR Government should review and amend the controversial provisions and try its best to win the recognition and support of the public in a patient manner, with a view to completing the Article 23 legislation eventually. "Give in for the time being and you will find much leeway afterwards", so I hope the SAR Government will think twice. Madam President, I so submit. Thank you.

MR FRED LI (in Cantonese): Madam President, after listening to the speech of Mr TAM Yiu-chung, I thought he had joined the march, since he knew clearly the objectives of the participants. However, I think it was just his pure guess. He did not participate in the march; therefore he is basically not qualified to comment, as he is only a bystander. I really wish to thank Mr CHAN Kam-lam, for he mentioned once again that the public had been utilized and misled by a small group of people. I believe that after he made this remark, more people would come out to join the rally on 9 July in order to show that his remark is ignorant and shallow. Will the people take to the streets just because Members of the democratic camp have led them astray? I daresay neither Members of the Democratic Party nor the democratic camp are capable of misleading 500 000 people to take to the streets, we absolutely have no such power. I have to thank Mrs IP, the DAB, Mr Jasper TSANG *et al.* Miss CHAN Yuen-han is not in the Chamber today. She is just like a chameleon. She has expressed a lot of views over Article 23, but I really do not know how she will cast her vote eventually, I hope Miss CHAN Yuen-han will have the opportunity to speak.

Does the SAR Government really know what has gone wrong with itself? It is a matter of significance that 500 000 people had taken to the streets, but does Mr TUNG know that the greatest resentment and loudest slogan chanted on that very day was not against Article 23? I wish to tell my honourable friends in the DAB, they were the stepping down of TUNG Chee-hwa and the exposition and condemnation of why the Legislative Council had failed to speak for them in the past six years. Since we only have 22 votes at most, therefore our power lies absolutely not in this Council, instead, we need the support of the general public. Some Members enjoy vested power, with the backing of the Beijing Government as well as the SAR Government, so they are pro-government legislators and royalists. The amendment suggested by Mr Jasper TSANG alluded to public interest and proscription of organizations. In fact, Members of the democratic camp have raised similar opinions for numerous times in dozens of meetings in this Council, but the Government just will not listen. After 500 000 people

have taken to the streets, now he raises these views. Is this not a manifestation of people power? Long live people power.

MR AMBROSE LAU (in Cantonese): Madam President, the topic of today's motion on adjournment is how we should deal with the demands voiced at a large-scale public procession, so as to avoid Hong Kong sinking into a political crisis. Just as I pointed out in this Council in last week's motion debate on the 1 July march, in the past few years, many people, who were dissatisfied with the Government, wished to take to the streets to express their demands after the impact of the financial turmoil, the bursting of the bubble economy and the ravage by the SARS epidemic and other ordeals. A responsible government should certainly look squarely into various demands of the people. Demands of the march this time around are varied, so the Chief Executive and the Government in fact need time to digest, comprehend and carefully deal with them all; nobody wants the Government to muddle through them. What the people want most from the Government is not the so-called panacea which will only win a momentary applause to the neglect of long-term results, but a good solution after careful consideration which can help Hong Kong extricate from itself the predicament.

Madam President, some people pointed out that Hong Kong would sink into a political crisis this time around. I think they have underestimated the peaceful and rational tradition of the people of Hong Kong. I was born and brought up locally. I have been working and living in Hong Kong for several decades. I have witnessed numerous mass campaigns and I have tided over many difficult times with the people of Hong Kong. I trust the people of Hong Kong will give the SAR Government adequate time and room so that the Government can draw on the lesson, rally its forces after the defeat, and unify and co-operate with the general masses to create a beautiful and harmonious community with sincerity, courage and action.

Madam President, I so submit.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Since a number of Members have not used up their two minutes of speaking time, we therefore still have some time left. Any Member who wishes to speak may press the button to indicate a wish to speak.

MR WONG SING-CHI (in Cantonese): Madam President, we saw 500 000 take to the streets on 1 July. In fact, I did count the number. I counted the number myself, and there were at least 600 000 people because I had been staying at the end of the march where some people joined the march from different directions. I clearly counted that there were 600 000 people. Their goal was very clear. They told me that they opposed Article 23 of the Basic Law, they were extremely dissatisfied with the administration of TUNG Chee-hwa, and they demanded a democratic system. These three demands were very clear, they were not misled by anybody, and those were not careless remarks. On that occasion, it was obviously that not just Martin LEE was bad-mouthing Hong Kong, instead, 500 000 people came forth to bad-mouth TUNG Chee-hwa. Why could the Government not hear that? The Government fails to respect the rational and order expression of opinions by these 500 000 people. I really want to ask, "Will they be heard only when riots or violence breaks out?" I wish to ask the TUNG Che-hwa administration to consider that carefully and not to set Hong Kong up, and I wish the Article 23 legislation could be withdrawn and the political power returned to the people! Thank you, Madam President.

MR ANDREW CHENG (in Cantonese): Madam President, I always say that a primary student can elect a class monitor and a small tenant can elect the chairman of an owners' corporation, but it is a pity that the general public are not qualified to participate in the election of the Chief Executive. I hope that the political rights of the people of Hong Kong can surpass the United Kingdom and catch up with the United States as Mr TUNG said. However, Mr TUNG keeps on saying in public that the Government of the United States has been misled by a small group of people. I also hope that Mr TUNG can be misled by the 500 000 Hong Kong people who have taken to the streets and that he can think it over.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam is a representative of the DAB, and the DAB keeps on saying that 500 000 people have been misled. He made this same remark just now. I urge the DAB to mislead 500 000 people or more to support the Government, to support Mr TUNG and to support Article 23, then I will give them the thumbs up.

Madam President, 500 000 people took to the streets, the procession was peaceful and no violence took place. It is obvious that this could be registered in the Guinness Book of Records. The fact that 500 000 people have taken to the streets so peacefully and rationally demonstrates that the people of Hong

Kong are peace-loving and rational. We need a leader who is rational, not one who knows only saying "good morning". We do not need some unbecoming people to lead us, as I think that we should select our leader ourselves by means of our ballots.

I really hope that even if our democratic election will not necessarily help us select the best person, it can at least facilitate the stepping down of an inapt or incompetent leader. At present, we cannot do that. We could only tolerate TUNG Chee-hwa, the one appointed by the so-called "one-person, one-vote" system, hand-picked by JIANG Zemin. The general public could no longer tolerate that situation. The Government which ignores and looks down upon public opinions will certainly be despised by the people.

DR LO WING-LOK (in Cantonese): Madam President, Hong Kong was removed from the SARS-infected Area List on 23 June. Although the public and health care workers expressed extreme discontent with the Government's appointing Dr YEOH Eng-kiong to investigate Dr YEOH Eng-kiong himself, they felt like they were survivors of a disaster and they had mixed feelings of grief and joy.

In the course of fighting SARS, the people of Hong Kong showed their composure, forbearance, courage, co-operation and solidarity. The Government should cherish and make good use of the excellent quality of the people and the anti-epidemic spirit they brought into play in the course of fighting SARS to heal the wounds of Hong Kong.

Unfortunately, the Government had failed to grasp this opportunity. As a result, eight days later, over 500 000 people took to the streets on 1 July.

Today is already 4 July I hope the Government will take this chance to restore the confidence of the people before the anti-epidemic spirit turns into resentment. The Government still have time, but it is running out. I implore Mr TUNG to listen to the voice of the people.

MR SIN CHUNG-KAI (in Cantonese): Several years ago, Mr Ronald ARCULLI, a legislator of the Liberal Party who I respected very much, withdrew from this Chamber in tears. On that day, we were having a debate of

no confidence in respect of the Sally AW case. Mr ARCULLI said "Today, whatever the result of this motion, there are no winners. The loser is Hong Kong."

Today, the Government faces yet another dilemma, that is, how Article 23 legislation should be dealt with. If this legislation is not shelved, the loser is Hong Kong; if it is not shelved, the loser is the general public. If Article 23 legislation is shelved, the winner is the Government, the winner is the public. I hope the Government can make a wise choice. We are not talking about the prestige of Mr TUNG Chee-hwa or the prestige of the Government, we are talking about the future of Hong Kong. On the subject of whether the Government is still the Government of Hong Kong people, we should have a debate on the question of whether our government knows what the people need. I hope the Government can make a choice that can enable Hong Kong to win.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): It is 3.25 pm now. Chief Secretary for Administration.

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION (in Cantonese): Madam President, on behalf of the SAR Government, I wish to speak on Dr YEUNG Sum's motion of adjournment. The Government fully appreciates the people's pent up feelings. The sluggish economy, the high unemployment rate, the buffets of the SARS outbreak, the issues arising from the legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law (Article 23), and so on, have indeed caused considerable perturbation in society and there are also imperfections in the Government's administration. In the march on 1 July, members of the public adopted a peaceful way to express their views on the legislation to implement Article 23 and on other issues. We can see that the Hong Kong public is law-abiding and self-disciplined, and that society is free and open. As a matter of fact, one valuable thing about Hong Kong is that there are the freedoms of speech and assembly.

Hong Kong has always attached great importance to human rights, freedom and the rule of law. As a result of the values we have and treasure in common, they have now become an inseparable part of our life. This is also one of the reasons for our success as an international city and financial centre. I believe that members of the public, Honourable Members and the Government

all have the will and conviction to uphold the free and open way of life and the rule of law in Hong Kong. We all hope that Hong Kong will make constant progress, society will be stable and the economy will be prosperous. In this community, members of the public and Honourable Members can all express their different opinions on public affairs. This is entirely natural, and it is the manifestation of a modern and pluralistic society. The most important point is to eventually formulate, through communication and listening to and analysing different views, public policies that are rational and beneficial to the overall interest of Hong Kong. Regarding the concerns expressed by the public on 1 July, the Government will definitely follow them up actively. The Government and the Executive Council are now carefully re-examining the National Security (Legislative Provisions) Bill and drawing conclusions from the administration of the Government to determine how best the concerns of the public can be further allayed. Meanwhile, the Government will also adopt an enlightened and equitable attitude in enhancing communication and listening to and adopting the views of members of various sectors and the public as much as possible. After collecting and analysing all views, the Chief Executive will give an account to the general public as soon as possible.

Human rights and freedom are values that Hong Kong values. The Government understands the expectations of the public and in the future they will continue to enjoy all existing human rights and freedoms, as well as continuing to criticize the Government from their own viewpoints using various lawful means. The Government definitely will not curtail the rights in this area on account of Article 23 or other legislation. The human rights and freedoms of Hong Kong people will be fully protected by law. At the same time, it is the constitutional duty of Hong Kong to implement the Basic Law and put into practice the rule of law. They do not run counter to each another. I firmly believe that by performing our present tasks with greater perfection, a balance between these two areas can be achieved. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That this Council do now adjourn.

Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(No hands raised)

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

NEXT MEETING

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now adjourn the Council until 2.30 pm on Wednesday, 9 July 2003.

Adjourned accordingly at twenty-eight minutes past Three o'clock.