OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Friday, 28 October 2011

The Council continued to meet at Nine o'clock

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

THE HONOURABLE ALBERT HO CHUN-YAN

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

THE HONOURABLE LEE CHEUK-YAN

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

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

DR THE HONOURABLE MARGARET NG

THE HONOURABLE JAMES TO KUN-SUN

THE HONOURABLE CHEUNG MAN-KWONG

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

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

THE HONOURABLE LEUNG YIU-CHUNG

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

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

THE HONOURABLE LAU KONG-WAH, J.P.

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE ANDREW CHENG KAR-FOO

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE WONG KWOK-HING, M.H.

THE HONOURABLE LEE WING-TAT

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE CHIM PUI-CHUNG

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

THE HONOURABLE KAM NAI-WAI, M.H.

THE HONOURABLE CYD HO SAU-LAN

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

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

THE HONOURABLE CHAN HAK-KAN

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

THE HONOURABLE CHAN KIN-POR, J.P.

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

DR THE HONOURABLE LEUNG KA-LAU

THE HONOURABLE CHEUNG KWOK-CHE

THE HONOURABLE WONG SING-CHI

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

THE HONOURABLE IP WAI-MING, M.H.

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

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

DR THE HONOURABLE PAN PEY-CHYOU

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE LEUNG KWOK-HUNG

THE HONOURABLE TANYA CHAN

THE HONOURABLE ALBERT CHAN WAI-YIP

THE HONOURABLE WONG YUK-MAN

PUBLIC OFFICERS ATTENDING:

THE HONOURABLE STEPHEN LAM SUI-LUNG, G.B.S., J.P. THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

THE HONOURABLE JOHN TSANG CHUN-WAH, G.B.M., J.P. THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY

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

THE HONOURABLE MICHAEL SUEN MING-YEUNG, G.B.S., J.P. SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION

MR LAI TUNG-KWOK, S.B.S., I.D.S.M., J.P. SECRETARY FOR SECURITY

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

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

THE HONOURABLE TSANG TAK-SING, G.B.S., J.P. SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS

THE HONOURABLE MATTHEW CHEUNG KIN-CHUNG, G.B.S., J.P. SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE

PROF THE HONOURABLE K C CHAN, S.B.S., J.P. SECRETARY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND THE TREASURY

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

THE HONOURABLE EDWARD YAU TANG-WAH, G.B.S., J.P. SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

THE HONOURABLE EVA CHENG, G.B.S., J.P. SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING

THE HONOURABLE GREGORY SO KAM-LEUNG, J.P. SECRETARY FOR COMMERCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

THE HONOURABLE RAYMOND TAM CHI-YUEN, J.P. SECRETARY FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AND MAINLAND AFFAIRS

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

MISS ADELINE WONG CHING-MAN, J.P.
UNDER SECRETARY FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AND MAINLAND AFFAIRS

CLERKS IN ATTENDANCE:

MRS CONSTANCE LI TSOI YEUK-LIN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY **GENERAL**

MRS JUSTINA LAM CHENG BO-LING, ASSISTANT SECRETARY **GENERAL**

MRS PERCY MA, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Council shall now resume the meeting and continue with the debate on the fourth session.

MEMBERS' MOTIONS

MOTION OF THANKS

Continuation of debate on motion which was moved on 26 October 2011

DR LEUNG KA-LAU (in Cantonese): President, I will speak on the healthcare initiatives featuring in the Policy Address. There will be nothing new in my speech as most of it has already been covered by other Members. Besides, the paragraphs on healthcare in the Policy Address are mostly devoid of new ideas. I have thought of starting with the land for hospital development. However, after hearing yesterday that many Members were very concerned about healthcare manpower and the development of medical services industry, I shall begin with manpower issues.

Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong and quite a few Members have expressed grave concerns over the healthcare insurance system and development of the private medical sector. They are worried that the latter will lead to high manpower wastage in public hospitals. While the situation seems dire, another issue has crossed my mind. Most Members, I believe, have taken out medical insurance on their own and visit private doctors. Some 10 years ago, the Harvard Team published a consultancy report on healthcare reform. The survey conducted revealed that 75% of the people in Hong Kong preferred private hospitals while those preferred public hospitals only accounted for 25%. As for family doctors, 85% of the respondents chose private doctors. Why do so many Members — Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong has just come back — seek private medical services for themselves but pushing other members of the public to public hospitals?

Coming back to the manpower issues, the considerable public relations efforts made by the Hospital Authority (HA) recently give us an impression that HA has lost all its doctors. But in fact, after checking with the statistics, we find that the number of HA doctors increases every year and has reached some 5 270 this year, representing a 37% increase as compared with that of 10 years ago. The authorities claimed that doctors were in oversupply 10 years ago and

encouraged them to leave their jobs with the implementation of the voluntary retirement scheme in 2003. Why do the authorities now insist that there is a "shortage of doctors" when their number has already risen more than 30% over the past 10 years?

Moreover, some Members have mentioned about the long waiting time for certain out-patient medical services — almost two years for urology services. What shall we do? Must there be a problem with manpower supply? I have some statistics at hand. Let me cite an example. For ear, nose and throat services, the waiting time in the New Territories West Cluster is 92 weeks, which I find unacceptable, but the waiting time in Kowloon Central Cluster is just one week. Would the Secretary please explain the reasons? For ophthalmology services, the waiting time in the Kowloon East Cluster is 135 weeks, which is way too absurd, but the waiting time in Kowloon West Cluster is just six weeks.

Mr Vincent FANG mentioned yesterday that the waiting time for some urology services might take two years. If Mr FANG runs a business consisting of two departments, and one of them faces severe manpower shortage and asks the boss to hire more staff while the staff of the other department just read newspapers and enjoy coffee every day, will Mr FANG, as the employer who has to pay, consider this as manpower shortage?

Recently, the issue of doctors with limited registration has given rise to extensive public discussions. According to an article written by HA's Chief of Service (Accident and Emergency) published in *Ming Pao Daily* two days ago, the service volume of various accident and emergency (A&E) departments has increased by 5% over the past four years while the number of his colleagues, that is, A&E doctors, has dropped by 4.6%. The work pressure has become so immense that the proposal of recruiting doctors with limited registration gives no cause for much criticism. After checking with the statistics, however, I discover that although the number of A&E doctors has dropped by 5% over the past four years, the total number of doctors has increased by 5%. Why has HA not allocated resources to each department on an equal basis? If we look at the real picture, it is simply because A&E departments are being bullied.

Let us take another careful look at the numbers. Is there really an increasing demand for A&E service? Perhaps the Chief of Service and the Secretary will point out later that the more than 4% increase in the number of

attendances over the past five years justifies the provision of additional manpower. Nevertheless, if we take a more in-depth look, we will find that the number of attendances fluctuates throughout the years. Between 1998 and 2003, the number of attendances at A&E departments was stable, ranging from 2.3 to 2.4 million, with the highest number at 2.5 million. During the SARS outbreak in 2003, the number of attendances was 1.8 million only. In recent years, the number of attendances has remained at around 2 to 2.2 million. While the number of attendances at A&E departments has dropped by 6.2% as compared with that of 10 years ago, HA's overall manpower has increased by 37%. We all know that 70% of the patients who attend A&E departments are non-urgent patients. The cost of A&E departments is very high, with the unit cost per attendance standing at \$800. Whether the patient suffers from acute illness or not, the cost is \$800 anyway.

Why can't these services be outsourced? The authorities previously set up 24-hour out-patient clinics operated by private doctors adjacent to A&E departments at a fee of \$200 on a trial basis. The scheme failed eventually. Why? It is because the difference in fees between A&E departments, which provided free services at that time, and 24-hour out-patient clinics was probably too wide. Most patients would rather spend five to six hours on waiting in order to receive free services. Nowadays, however, A&E departments charge \$100. If the above arrangement is re-introduced, that is, setting up 24-hour out-patient clinics adjacent to A&E departments at a fee of \$200, patients who pay the extra \$100 can save five to six hours waiting time in return. Why don't we give this a try?

The Secretary has also mentioned the issue of medical practitioners with limited registration. He said that medical practitioners with limited registration will not pose any impact on the private medical sector, nor will they lead to competitions. I wish that Honourable colleagues would show their understanding for the existing private practitioners. As the saying goes, "Once bitten, twice shy." Why is that so? The turnover in the HA is not necessarily a result of some practitioners' choices to quit. In 2002 and 2003, many practitioners did not have their contracts renewed by the HA, and were forced to leave upon expiry of their contracts, in the same situation as Vice Chancellor TSUI Lap-chee. They were forced to leave. Therefore, if the HA introduces a limited registration system, I would say that, leaving aside the issue about quality of service first, the HA will be in a very advantageous position in terms of

employment relationship, as it can claim that there is serious turnover, which render it necessary to hire Mainland practitioners without examination. This is so wonderful. Yet, it was involuntary for many of the practitioners who had left. The HA hires medical practitioners in contract terms, and practitioners have to leave when their contracts are not renewed upon expiry. This is what I wish Honourable colleagues would understand. I would like to give an example here. Assume that there is a patient, or someone bleeding in the street, what would we do in the first instance? We would stop the patient from bleeding. conduct blood transfusion? We do not have the equipment, so the most practical way is to stop the bleeding. Is the HA making any effort to stop the bleeding? Then why are there so many practitioners leaving the HA? It is because their working hours are so long that their bodies cannot withstand, and they cannot take care of their families. Indeed, the HA simply needs to prescribe standard working hours in contracts, then many practitioners would not leave, as they would like to avoid the trouble and the "inclement weather" in the private However, many practitioners who have their children growing up, especially those female practitioners in their thirties, have to spend more time on their families. They just cannot stay away from home to work overnight shifts once in four or five nights. Why has the HA not implemented any retaining measures so far?

Moreover, the private sector has substantial manpower in surplus, and the costs of private medical service are in fact not higher then those provided by the As I have once pointed out, the HA has mentioned in the Budget that the cost per A&E attendance is \$800, and is as high as \$950 per specialist out-patient attendance. In the private sector, a family doctor charges around \$200 per attendance in general, and many specialists in Kowloon charge only around \$500 to \$600 per attendance. If the HA outsources such services, the waiting time can be reduced immediately, as long as the number of patients and service demand Many commercial institutions in Hong Kong have remain unchanged. outsourced their services, why does the HA not do so? Mr CHEUNG also spoke on this yesterday, that is, the very poor response from part-time practitioners. He attributed this to a few reasons, one of them being the hourly rate offered by the HA to part-time practitioners. For instance, the hourly rate of a part-time practitioner in the A&E department is merely 70% of that of a full-time practitioner, or 66% to be precise. Why does the hourly rate of a part-time practitioner amount to just 66% of that of a full-time practitioner? This is fundamentally a violation of market rules. Normally speaking, part-time salaries

should be set at higher rates. Secondly, some practitioners have lodged applications to express their wish to work in central Kowloon area, but the HA says that vacancies are available only in western parts of the New Territories, instead of in central Kowloon. If so, how can it be possible for the candidates to apply for such vacancies? There is one more important thing, which is my personal experience. I have lodged an application in August, but received no response after three months to date and the authorities have claimed that responses have been lukewarm — my application form is still here; I have kept a copy.

About excessive number of practitioners in the community, if it does not cause any adverse impact to the public, I would not care whether there are too many practitioners. I would consider that, if the number of practitioners is not related to public interest, there is no harm to have more practitioners. does it really cause no harm to have too many practitioners? I would like to tell you a few things. Firstly, practitioners need training indeed, and materials with real training value are limited. For example, about the treatment of cancer cases, the College of Surgeons requires that surgeons under training have to handle six to eight "big cases". But where do the "big cases" come from? Only those cases that require actual treatments can be regarded as "big cases" and cases with training value. A doubled number of practitioners would mean that the amount of experience accumulated will be halved. In fact, the ideal condition is that practitioners can fill up their working hours with exact amounts of workload so that they can gain experience and achieve optimal efficiency. There are at present many experienced practitioners in the private sector who have abundant amounts of idle time. Why does the HA not hire such surplus manpower? Quality is one concern. Secondly, when practitioners have plenty of idle time, it is unavoidable that they would "create cases" or lower the threshold of medical inspections, that is, the so-called "supply-induced demand". This would result in escalating medical expenses for the whole society. Members can refer to many overseas countries as Members like to compare the ratio between population and number of practitioners in foreign countries with the ratio in Hong Kong so as to demonstrate Hong Kong's excessively low ratio. However, other countries are, in contrast, considering themselves "idiotic" to have too many practitioners, which leads to excessively high medical expenses. Many countries in Europe and America have more practitioners than Hong Kong, but their medical costs doe not seem to be any cheaper than Hong Kong's. Indeed, the medical costs in most of these countries are more expensive than those of Hong Kong. The United States is the most extreme example — it has more practitioners than Hong Kong does, yet its aggregate medical expenses are three times of Hong Kong's.

Furthermore, even though I have not created "supply-induced demand", well, that's to say, I do not act irresponsibly. Let me illustrate my point with an example, which is a personal example of mine. Just think about this: would it be an advantage or a disadvantage if there were too many medical practitioners? For example, I run a clinic in Prince's Building with the overhead expenses amounting to \$60,000 per month. In fact, my business is fairly small, with six cases of medical treatment per month. The charge for each case is \$20,000, which is very reasonable, isn't it? That is to say, of the total amount of \$120,000 received per month, \$60,000 is spent on the overhead expenses, leaving me a profit of \$60,000, as well as an additional sum of \$60,000 provided by the Legislative Council. If the number of medical practitioners is doubled, resulting in more competitors in the market, a clinic may be set up next to mine to compete with me, and I will have one more competitor. As I am a better qualified doctor, the number of my cases per month will possibly be reduced from six to four only, or three only, unfortunately. Then how much do you think I should charge for each case? Can I still charge \$20,000 for each case, thereby leaving me living in poverty?

Having said so much, I am not going to talk about the manpower issue further. Let me talk about the land for healthcare services. I have said earlier that the progress in this respect has been too slow, too little and under too many restrictions. The Chief Executive proposed in the 2008 Policy Address — three years ago in October 2008 if I remember it correctly — to reserve four sites for our use, but no tender has been called so far. This has been further deferred month after month, year after year. The date of the tendering originally scheduled for the end of the year as said in the Budget published early this year is now, at the end of the year, re-scheduled for early next year.

Moreover, the supply is also far too small. You may not know that at present, some cancer patients who want to have operations in private hospitals at their own cost cannot be operated on immediately. Instead, they have to wait for one week or so for their operations. If a patient approaches me and asks me to do a surgery on him immediately, I cannot do so, either. Many Honourable colleagues have commented on the excessively low transparency of fees charged

by private hospitals and their exorbitant fees. Take the Hong Kong Sanatorium and Hospital as an example, I advise people that they should not intend to go to the hospital for treatment because beds are not available there even if you have money. If there is such a shortage, what is the point in discussing monitoring and control? What is the point in discussing transparency? Why is it necessary to have transparency? How many private hospital beds are exactly needed? Given that 3 600 private hospital beds are currently available in Hong Kong, if the healthcare industry is to be developed and voluntary healthcare insurance to be implemented, there should be as many private hospital beds as possible. There will not be any problems with 9 000, 10 000 or even 20 000 private hospital beds. How many hospital beds will be provided from the four reserved sites? The answer is 2 000. What is the expected completion time? Probably after five or six years. Will there be enough hospital beds for use then? The answer is in the negative.

I have asked quite a number of officials of the Development Bureau and the Chief Executive whether such large sites are necessary for the construction of hospitals. The area of each of the current sites granted by the Government is not less than two hectares. At times, the Government handles things frivolously. The site for building the largest hospital among the 13 private hospitals covers an area of 0.7 hectares while the smallest one covers an area of 0.3 hectares. In fact, sites with an area of 0.3 to 0.7 hectares should be numerous. Why did I talk about too many restrictions imposed by the Government just now? In developing tourism by building hotels, the Government did not impose any restriction on the construction of three-star, two-star, one-star or four-star hotels under the Conditions of Grant of the land for the development of hotels. A few years ago, nine sites designated for hotel development were included in the Application List. People who identify them as suitable lots may apply to trigger them

In paragraph 197 of his Policy Address, the Chief Executive said that, on the development of Hong Kong, "...... we have to be pragmatic in this regard. Macro planning, market intervention and favourable industry-specific policies should strictly follow the principle of capturing opportunities and capitalizing on strengths." (unquote) In fact, if one intends to launch hospital development if I ever have the chance to start a new hospital, I will build one with over 100 beds, and I will only operate the Colorectal Department. Please do not ask me to run the Maternity Department or other departments as I do not know how

to run such departments. But if I am only asked to operate the Colorectal Department, which is my specialty, I will put all the most advanced technological equipment and skills into this hospital and I can promote it to the entire country of China. In doing so, I can certainly attract many patients to my hospital. But if you ask me to run a general hospital, the costs will escalate to a very high level and it is really not easy to assess the costs involved. I must recruit experts from different specialties before I can start operating a general hospital. What should I do then?

In fact, there are different investors and operators in the market. They have different networks and plans for running their businesses. If the Government wants to develop an industry, it must provide different options for the choice of different investors and operators. How can the Government specify a certain mode of operating the business and make others follow it in running the business?

Secretary, you are not a businessman, and in fact you have left the front line for quite a long time, and there are few chances for you to take care of patients. As you have never worked in the private sector, there is no way for you to find out how the operating environment of the private sector works, so why should you lay down so many rules? In fact, the role of the Government should be supervising the quality of services and professional ethics. With regard to the transparency of the operation of the market and the charging of fees, as long as adequate land supply is provided by the authorities, the market will find its own way to strike a balance. How can the Government exercise regulatory control?

Let me give one more example. I do not know why so many people have expressed grave dissatisfaction towards private hospitals — saying this is not good or that is very poor. Taking the Baptist Hospital as an example, anyway it is ultimately a hospital belonging to the church and the revenue generated also goes to the church and is devoted to other services. The management of the Baptist Church may not be very sensitive to the media — just like what happened last time when the Government said that a quota must be set for accepting pregnant women from the Mainland. So the Government was saying that it would refuse to accept pregnant women from the Mainland or reduce the number of such cases. In fact, the main point is that public hospitals would reduce the number pregnant women from the Mainland to 3 400, and it might not be able to take care of all those whose husbands are Hong Kong residents. As a result,

complaints came flooding in. However, the Baptist Hospital said that it could assist the Government in accommodating such pregnant women and the fee it would charge was only \$39,000. Guess whether the Baptist Hospital will incur any deficit by charging only \$39,000 a case. Of course not. It will only earn less. If it does not charge \$39,000 a case, if it does not accept those pregnant women whose husbands are Hong Kong residents, the hospital will earn even more. Perhaps it can make more money by charging something like \$60,000 to \$70,000 a case.

This case demonstrates social responsibility and conscience. Why does the Baptist Hospital or other I am sorry. Let me make it clear first — not just the Baptist Hospital, as I should not do so much publicity for it, there are one or two other private hospitals that are willing to do so, too. Why can private hospitals provide the service at \$39,000 without experiencing the mass resignations of their medical and nursing staff? Why does the HA keep saying that the situation is real bad, with all its medical and nursing staff quitting? It is due to the poor management of the HA. There are problems with the system. Since the HA does not allocate the \$39,000 it receives to the two departments that provide the manpower — that is, instead of channelling the money to the Maternity Department and the Paediatrics Department, the money is spent elsewhere. In that case, it is only natural that these two departments find it difficult to operate. Furthermore, the HA has not introduced work-more-earn-more mechanism, so all those colleagues can only keep working incessantly. When more and more pregnant women from the Mainland turn up — regardless of whether their husbands are Hong Kong residents — that is, every extra pregnant woman from the Mainland the HA has given care to, the more deficit it will incur, so how can it carry on with its operation?

Finally, I wish to talk about a new initiative announced in the Policy Address. Elderly people residing in the Guangdong province may receive the "fruit grant" without coming back to Hong Kong. It also mentions how medical services can be provided to the elderly people residing in the Mainland, and that the authorities will consider encouraging Hong Kong doctors to practise in the Mainland through CEPA arrangements. Is the Government showing a "dual personality"? On the one hand, the Government says there is a shortage of local medical practitioners, but on the other hand, it is encouraging Hong Kong doctors to go practising in the Mainland.

Are there some better ways in the Mainland to take care of the elderly people, especially in medical services? There are medical service providers in the Mainland, and the medical services provided in the Mainland are anyway less costly than those in Hong Kong, though the quality of such services in the Mainland may vary. A simple approach that does not entail too much effort on the part of the Government is the adoption of healthcare vouchers, which can be operated on a reimbursement basis. If elderly people use medical services in the Mainland, the Government may subsidize a certain percentage, such as 70% or 80% of the costs involved. In spending such a huge amount of money as subsidies, it will involve rather substantial expenditure of the public coffer, so it is not a problem to implement a means test in the application procedure. If elderly people residing in the Mainland want to consult Hong Kong doctors, and they are subsidized by healthcare vouchers, local private doctors are actually also willing to go practising in the Mainland.

However, if the Government just intends to identify more opportunities for local private doctors via the CEPA arrangements, it may meet with considerable difficulties. This is because, for other professional disciplines, such as accounting, legal or other professional services, clients of their professional services are usually institutions. They can charge fees at a level that is comparable to that in Hong Kong, which will present no problem as this is related to commercial operations. However, the clients of medical services are mostly individuals. On the whole, fees should be set at a level according to the standard of living of the local community. In the Mainland, if we look at the figures — I do not know why there are so many wealthy people in the Mainland — on the whole and on the average, the standards of living or the cost of living index at the moment is only one third of that of Hong Kong.

Finally, I wish to bring up one point, that is, the cross-boundary transfer arrangements in support of medical services provided in the Mainland. The Government often says that the issue requires further discussion. I do not know why there are so many issues that require discussion. On patient transfer arrangements, why can't the Government give priority to taking care of local patient transfer arrangements? Local patients completely rely on public ambulances managed by the Fire Services Department, and this service is completely lack of flexibility. Patients must be transferred to public hospitals. Even if the patient is a rich man, he will still be sent to a public hospital, and lots of difficulties have to be overcome before he can be transferred to a private

hospital. Even if a patient has consulted a certain private practitioner in a private hospital on a regular basis, the Government still has formulated lots of rules, requiring a lot of paperwork before the patient can be transferred to the private hospital. For example, by the time a patient has reached the boundary, a private doctor has been arranged to go and pick up the patient, but the ambulance will still send him to a public hospital — the North District Hospital. result, the North District Hospital is overloaded, because every patient is sent there. Furthermore, in introducing additional manpower to a hospital, usually only the A&E departments, instead of the wards, would be provided with additional manpower. Why can't the authorities make proper arrangements with private local ambulance services in the territory, thereby allowing the market to solve the problems in its own way? I have conducted a study to assess the viability of providing private ambulance service in Hong Kong because there is such a demand in the market. But Government departments have been "passing The Transport Department says there is no such a category of vehicle licences, with the additional remarks that it does not know what kind of requirements should be in place, and that the Food and Health Bureau should be asked to set the standards. When someone approaches the Food and Health Bureau to inquire about the vehicle licence in question and whether it should set the standards, the Bureau says it has no ideas. What should we do? Government not a team?

Very often, the Secretary says that the issue of cross-boundary patient transfer requires discussion, and that such patients are usually in need of the escort service of medical and nursing personnels. How can those medical and nursing personnels acquire the relevant licences in both Hong Kong and the Mainland? Secretary, if arrangements can be made to issue some licences for private ambulances, then you need not worry about anything at all. In addition, if there is such a service demand in the market, naturally many Hong Kong doctors and nurses will find their ways to acquire the licences through CEPA arrangements. Furthermore, not all patients require the escort services of medical and nursing staff. Let me give an example. How many ambulances in Hong Kong require the escort services of medical and nursing staff when they are transporting patients? A patient requires such escort services only when he is in very unstable conditions.

I hope the Secretary can contemplate what the Chief Executive has said in the policy address, "..... instead of being dictated by dogma or the wishes of senior officials". I am more familiar with systems, knowing that the provision of medical services is not dictated by the wishes of senior officials, but by the wishes of the Secretary instead.

Thank you, President.

MR ANDREW LEUNG (in Cantonese): President, in this session I would like to talk about my views on the proposed education development in the Policy Address. I have to make a declaration first. I am the Chairman of the Vocational Training Council (VTC). I am glad to see that the Policy Address proposes to provide young people with multiple study pathways, including a provision of HK\$500 million to the VTC for setting up an International Cuisine College, establishing one more youth college, and offering 1 000 training places in respect of the pilot scheme for extension of apprenticeship arrangements to service industries. The VTC has long been aware of the truth that it is better to teach someone how to fish than to feed him with a fish.

Over the past few years, about 25% of Secondary Five graduates were admitted into the VTC each year. Bearing in mind that "education should incorporate training and training should incorporate education", we offer advancement pathways with different modes of education for young people who are not suitable for studying traditional curricula, so that they can acquire a specialty and pursue their own development in society. I understand that in Asian societies, parents have high expectations of their children and look forward to their children's university degrees. However, in reality, not all students are suitable for receiving education in the traditional mode.

In fact, university education is not the only choice for young people. On the contrary, they can be inspired through vocational education and acquire specialized expertise. For example, aircraft repair and maintenance, Chinese cuisine training and hospitality industry are technical specialties, while food technology, maritime services certificates are in greater demand than degree diplomas from university graduates. The VTC has been working hard over the past 10 years. Today, students with appropriate standards may start from vocational education, bridged through higher diploma courses to attend degree programmes. They may also start with their career first, then pursue their goals through continuing education. The "Outline of China's National Plan for

Medium and Long-term Education Reform and Development (2010-2020)" previously announced by China points out that vocational education development is an important way to promote economic development, increase employment and improve general living standard of the society.

In Hong Kong, vocational training has been playing quite a significant part in education. Switzerland is one of the countries with the longest history of apprenticeship. More than two third of its young people aged between 16 to 21 choose to become apprentices, who can then select the specialty they like from over 300 recognized programmes, such as clocks and watches, chocolate production, chemistry and pharmaceutical industry. Countries around the world start paying attention to vocational education. One reason for Germany to have remained a relatively stable economy amid the European debt crisis is vocational education in the country. The unemployment rate of young people in Germany is only 5% because most of them can make a specialty through vocational education which enables them to find jobs more easily in different fields. This in turn lowers unemployment rate and keeps supporting the country.

Recently, there has been a significant increase in tertiary education fees in England. Young people who cannot afford such increase choose to become apprentices. The government, education and business sectors give full support to vocational education. Currently, there are over 40 000 students in the country. Vocational education in the country is centralized and handled by the National Apprenticeship Service (NAS). Students living in England, over 16 and not in full time education may apply to NAS, and NAS will help apprentices search for suitable organizations or companies. On the other hand, employers may advertise to recruit apprentices through the website of NAS.

NAS is also supported by different government departments, human resources training organizations, educational institutions and labour unions, and a system which involves national vocational qualifications and key skills and techniques consideration is established. Training providers and employers are responsible for skills and knowledge education and on-the-job training respectively. Examination and assessment are further included in the system. There are three levels of apprenticeship available, namely the intermediate, advanced and higher levels, which provide pathways for development. Moreover, NAS adopts an "Earn and Learn" approach, under which students are

paid while they learn and develop their skills. This is the best way since students graduate with enriched experience, not financial burden.

According to a study of the University of Warwick in England, there are 11 merits in apprenticeship, which include a wider choice of suitable employees for enterprises, a stable supply of experienced talents and a better sense of belonging. Compared with other modes of education, this can cater for business needs better, bring in new ideas and encourage creativity with a lower overall cost of training.

Let me take a look at the Policy Address again. The International Cuisine College will provide 2 000 places covering higher diploma, diploma and certificate courses with an objective of providing training for people aspiring to become professional chefs proficient in international cuisines and enhancing employability of young people. The VTC will also arrange exchange with chefs from Japan, Germany, France and Italy, and students may increase their competitiveness with in-service training overseas. One more youth college will be established and provide specialized support for non-Chinese speaking students and those with special educational needs. Language training on the use Chinese in workplace will also be given to help ethnic minorities enhance their language ability for further studies.

President, the society is in need of diversified talents. I believe that an additional advancement pathway for students today is going to bring us more capable persons we need tomorrow. Some young people these days think that they lack opportunities for upward mobility and are becoming more dissatisfied with the society. The VTC is looking forward to providing young people with a choice with value. We hope to bring them a clear understanding that vocational education is not only on-the-job training but also an opportunity for them to study and even work towards a degree. I hope that we can help them unleash their potentials so that they have more confidence in their future. This is going to ensure sustainable development of our society and economy. I also hope that the relevant courses can train up more young people and promote the development of related sectors, such as tourism, catering, retail and wine trading.

What I would like to bring out from my speech is that I am asking the government to continue supporting the young people of Hong Kong through vocational education. In addition, I have also mentioned apprentice training just now. The VTC is responsible for apprentice training. However, the relevant

legislation was established in 1976. At that time, the Hong Kong economy was mostly supported by manufacturing industries, while service industries account for 93% of our economic activities today. I, therefore, appeal for amendment of the out-dated legislation as soon as possible so that they can better cater for the needs of Hong Kong young people.

President, I so submit.

DR PAN PEY-CHYOU (in Cantonese): President, this morning I wish to speak on the shortage of healthcare personnel. To begin with, as medical care has to do with the life of every Hong Kong citizen, the issue of inadequate manpower in healthcare services has been of great concern to the community recently. Just now when Dr LEUNG Ka-lau discussed the same issue, he seemed to think that manpower resources in public hospitals are unevenly and unreasonably distributed rather than inadequate. I approve of his point, too. Yet, in my view, what he said can only explain part of the problem. Actually, the insufficiency of manpower in public hospitals is also attributable to the fact that the "pie" of the medical services industry has been made bigger, so much so that private hospitals and private healthcare services have to compete for talents. In fact, Hong Kong is short of medical talents.

First of all, let me point out that the shortage of medical talents is not limited to such professional fields as doctors, nurses and occupational therapists. Colleagues of supporting grades as well as staff at basic ranks in the hospitals are likewise faced with the problem of brain drain and insufficient manpower indeed. We have recently come into contact with various trade unions and are aware of the severity of the situation. In some cases, some people simply quit their jobs soon after taking up the posts. In the face of insufficient manpower, the heavy workload has to be taken up by those who are still in service. This has further aggravated the poor working environment, bringing an increase in the number of work injuries and a further loss of talents. A vicious cycle is resulted. As such, we should deal with this problem in a solemn manner.

Next, I wish to focus on the shortage of physicians. There are no more than two ways to increase their number. The first one is to expand the training places. In his Policy Address, the Chief Executive does propose to increase the number of places at medical schools, to which we cannot agree more. The other

way is, of course, to take in non-local doctors. That said, I have to express my opposition to the current arrangement of the Hospital Authority (HA) in attracting overseas doctors to work in Hong Kong under the limited registration system. I understand that certain departments of the HA are particularly hard hit by the acute shortage of manpower. This arrangement, however, is a retrogressive move.

As far as I can remember, overseas doctors were allowed to practise in Hong Kong with limited registration a few decades ago. Should we put the clock back with the implementation of a limited registration system? Such a system offers no guarantee. If we affirm the eligibility of an applicant merely on the basis of a certificate or a curriculum vitae without asking him to pass any examination, how can we ensure that this applicant is really eligible? In some overseas places, such as the United Kingdom, the examination and training systems have undergone substantial changes in recent years. We are now rather worried about the standard of specialist doctors trained in the United Kingdom, let alone the standard of those trained elsewhere.

In addition to offering no guarantee, a limited registration system is unfair. Under the system proposed by the HA, only doctors from certain countries and regions are allowed to practise in Hong Kong. Why does the Government only allow doctors from these countries but not others to practise in Hong Kong? What are the justifications for doing so? This is the first point. The second point is: given an abundance of doctors on the Mainland, why only overseas doctors but not those from the Mainland are allowed to practise in Hong Kong. Again, what are the Government's justifications for this? As such a system will cause gross unfairness, we object to it and the proper way to recruit talents is of course through examinations.

At present, the Medical Council of Hong Kong (MCHK) administers the Licensing Examination every year. I wonder why the passing rate of the examination has been dropping year by year since the Reunification. Few people have overcome all the hurdles and passed the examination with the overall passing rate of the examination being a mere single digit. I find it strange to see such a phenomenon. I think the MCHK should respond to public concern by reviewing, *inter alia*, whether the marking scheme of its Licensing Examination is stricter than those of other countries and whether there are any unreasonable requirements. I consider it necessary for the MCHK to conduct such a review.

I would also like the Government to pay attention to and show concern for this matter, with a view to putting in place a robust mechanism for allowing overseas doctors to practise in Hong Kong.

I so submit.

DR JOSEPH LEE (in Cantonese): President, I wish to speak on healthcare policy in this session.

The Policy Address has made some mention on healthcare services. Healthcare financing, as mentioned by the Secretary, is the first example. Secretary is present with us now. Certainly, as far as financing is concerned, a Health Protection Scheme (HPS) is naturally the hottest topic for discussion. fact, the main purpose of introducing HPS is to strike a proper balance between the public and private healthcare markets, so that those who can afford private healthcare services but are now using public healthcare services can go back to the former. But that will depend on can HPS achieve this purpose? Secretary, we will be able to answer that question if the next term of the Government will continue to implement such a scheme. At this stage, one important question is how we can effectively monitor the market of private healthcare services, that is, the market of private hospital services, so that people will have confidence in its operation and are convinced that they can get the services that they deserve after taking out the insurance policy. The discussion on the handling of medical incidents in private hospitals two weeks ago has just reflected that regulation on the handling of medical incidents and other aspects of private hospitals is not satisfactory. For example, the Department of Health, as the regulator, has the responsibility to explain clearly to private hospitals the regulations to be followed and the responsibilities to be performed at the time of granting the licenses to them. The incident of how a medical incident has been handled this time reflects that the incident may have been caused by possible differences in the interpretation of regulations and responsibilities among the regulator, front-line users and service providers.

Therefore, I believe the Secretary needs to step up his regulatory efforts. If he would like HPS to be successfully implemented, he should first monitor the private hospital services properly and the Department of Health should work much harder, too. The Secretary would also like to use the same hospital

accreditation mechanism to assess public and private hospitals so that their standards will be on a par with one another. In fact, that would create a greater need for regulation. In short, the Secretary hopes to achieve better healthcare financing by setting up HPS. But how can that be achieved if he has not properly monitored the quality of healthcare services in the first place?

That leads us to the third point on healthcare policy mentioned in the Policy Address, namely, enhancing market transparency. In this respect, the Policy Address is in fact silent on how that objective can be achieved. I believe the Secretary may well have a plan to enhance transparency of all markets of healthcare services in Hong Kong, particularly the market of private healthcare I am not sure if Dr LEUNG Ka-lau was joking when he said just now the charges for protecting against each illness was \$20,000. If insurance charges can really be itemized as \$20,000 for covering one illness and \$30,000 for another, then insurance charges will be very transparent and everyone will know what protection has been paid for. The Policy Address has, however, only made one statement in this regard, without going into details. I hope the Secretary can elaborate on this later. If he wants to achieve better healthcare financing and hopes that the private market can share out in the provision of healthcare services for Hong Kong, he has to bear in mind the importance of regulation and transparency. I hope that this policy will be implemented through practical proposals so that the people will have confidence in using the services provided by private hospitals. Those are my views on healthcare financing and on transparency.

Another point covered in the Policy Address which has also been mentioned by the Secretary is that more resources will be allocated to primary care to enhance its services. Examples are increasing the value of the Health Care Voucher and opening health centres. We welcome this approach. However, such an approach will apparently change the overall structure of healthcare services in that, instead of allocating resources mainly to the third tier, which is hospital services, more attention is now put on primary care. This is good in that a balance can be achieved and, with more people putting their attention on primary care and becoming more health-conscious, utilization of the third tier of hospital services will eventually be reduced. This concept has our total support, but an important issue that it brings about is resource allocation. In the past, very little resources have actually been allocated to primary care and people relied mainly on services provided by private medical practitioners. I

think the Secretary knows about that very well. President, the Secretary knows equally well that primary care services are predominantly provided by the private healthcare market and only a small portion is provided by the public healthcare market. If we have no confidence in private healthcare services if we do not properly monitor and even promote the market of private primary care services and encourage the general public to use more of work in this area is This brings out another point which I have mentioned on other very important. occasions and would like to remind the Secretary once again now. Department of Health is responsible for taking care of the health of millions of Hong Kong people and our population is approximately seven million. Certainly, I believe that not many people are sick and many of us are actually healthy. However, the Department of Health has very little resources and a small number of healthcare staff has to take care of the health of millions of people. If we have to promote primary medical care or primary healthcare, we have to allocate more resources correspondingly. If not, it will be hard for the Department of Health to cope, and as the Chinese saying goes, "No housewife can prepare a meal without rice." It simply would not do if you ask the Department to do more without giving it the funding. Corresponding arrangements are actually required in this respect.

Certainly, we welcome the expansion of primary care because if a balance can be achieved, the people of Hong Kong will be healthier and the whole city will become healthier. However, whether we are talking about working on healthcare financing, or expanding the size of the private healthcare market by introducing HPS, or trying to strike a balance between the private and public markets, or even expanding primary care, it would directly involve the issue of staffing which my colleagues have been discussing in the last few days.

I would really like to talk about the planning on the staffing of nurses because it is a very important topic. The Policy Address has actually mentioned increasing the number of psychiatric nurses by 40 and allied health professionals in different fields by 160. We certainly welcome this initiative, but we should not forget that even when the number of these positions has been increased now, the staff concerned will only be able to report duty in 2016 or 2017. The Secretary said there was no need to worry and there would be about 2 000 nurses annually in the future. In this regard, I do not know whether I should worry or not. I have been arguing on this issue for years. Over the years, we have been arguing on what is adequate and what is not. I think the Secretary would know

how many psychiatric nurses will actually be available for employment by 2017 although there is an increase of 40 psychiatric nurses this time. Although there is an increase of 160 allied health professionals this time, how many physiotherapists and occupational therapists offering allied health services will be available for employment and can work in the entire market by 2016 or 2017?

My question is: Secretary, in fact, under the circumstances, what is adequate and what is not? Just now I have conducted an online search to see what level is considered adequate and what is not. Most countries have their own planning on the basis of service demands and manpower supply. The Secretary should be well aware of this.

President, I would like to ask the Secretary through you — this is in fact a frequently asked question — whether we have an indicator to determine how many nurses, doctors and allied health professionals should be regarded as adequate. I am not quite clear about this so far. The Secretary said that there would be about 1800 nurses available from next year onwards. But is this In fact, what I am asking is the respective nurse-to-patient ratios in enough? acute hospitals and rehabilitation hospitals in Hong Kong starting from 2012. Will it be one nurse to 10 to 12 patients as it is at present? We should bear in mind that the international standard is one nurse for every four to six patients. The Secretary said the situation in Hong Kong was special. But we do not want to hear this. Secretary, I hope you will once again explain the ratio of nurses to the average population in Hong Kong to be achieved by that time, taking into account that there will be 1 800 to 2 000 nurses joining the healthcare workforce annually as a result of the allocation of extra nursing places and manpower resources. How many patients will a nurse have to take care of in a hospital? We hope we can be convinced by statistics. It is because there will be further demands for nurses, doctors and allied health professionals after the completion of a number of hospitals in future, including those redeveloped public hospitals and newly built private hospitals. Will there be sufficient manpower? Will healthcare workers be paid more to work overtime when there is a serious shortage of manpower? Certainly, as far as nurse training is concerned, there is much to dispute as to whether nurses should receive training in universities or in hospitals as practised previously.

President, I understand that starting from 2012, nurses will be trained in four universities but such training takes five years. Some people say that instead

of paying such a high cost for the five-year university training, the training should be conducted in hospitals which only takes three years and the cost is relatively These arguments, however, is not focused on whether it costs more or less, but rather on how many nurses, allied health professionals and doctors are necessary. I hope an indicator can be set, otherwise the arguments will go on forever. As Dr LEUNG Ka-lau has said just now, whenever there is a lack of funding, staff are not offered contract renewal but are simply told that sufficient manpower is already in place. These are not desirable from the administrative and planning perspectives. I believe the Secretary should formulate a long-term plan for healthcare manpower resource allocation to minimize disputes and allay public concerns and let us know that there will be adequate staffing provision for the first, second and third tiers of hospital staff in the years ahead. About being adequate, I mean it is in line with internationally recognized standards. Although the situation in Hong Kong is special, there should still be a corresponding indicator with which we will feel at ease. It is because we, as professionals, are obliged to deliver the best quality of care to our clients. can cope at a manning scale of one nurse taking care of six patients. But if a nurse has to take care of 12 patients, we cannot cope and will feel frustrated with very low staff morale. If this happens to public hospitals, their staff may feel they had better find a new job in private hospitals.

This also brings up another issue: Why have there been so many disputes in the past and what are the factors leading to the shortage of nursing staff in the public healthcare sector? In fact, as an Honourable colleague has just said, it is mainly due to the chaotic administration and poor retention policy of the Hospital Authority (HA). Over the past six months, the HA has been doing very badly with its policy for retaining nurses, which is in effect driving nurses away instead of retaining them. For example, the existing policy is very strange in that new recruits are not offered any salary increase for the first two years of service no matter how well they perform. The first contract has brought down staff morale and hence staff members are prompted to quit as they know that they will not get any salary increase no matter how well they perform their duty. personnel management policies are very strange indeed. Of course, I do not know why the HA has to get rid of its employees or whether it is due to insufficient funding or otherwise. Even a permanent employee will have to work on contract terms upon his promotion. I wonder if these policies exist in a commercial society. Such strange policies of the HA have certainly contributed to its slow progress in staff retention. Of course, the manpower shortage now

seems to have been relieved as new graduates join the workforce right after the conclusion of a semester. However, the most important thing is to stop bleeding, that is to retain staff of suitable calibre. I hope the Secretary would face this problem squarely to prevent public hospitals from suffering a loss of experience.

Apart from these, there is another issue I would like to discuss. I hope the Secretary can take the following into account in its move to retain nursing personnel. At present, due to the strange funding practice of the HA which requires that any additional staff and funds should be justified by the provision of new services, different clusters have resorted to using many strange tactics to keep launching new services in a bid to secure new funds. However, as they lack the manpower and have done nothing to retain staff, the existing staff have to stretch themselves very much to cope with new services and are thus under increasing pressure. It is also a problem in public hospitals. Secretary will look into the matter to see whether funds can be allocated in response to current demands without asking hospitals to launch new services in order to seek funding for additional staffing resources, which is undesirable indeed. If all the above issues are addressed properly, it will boost public confidence in the standard of Hong Kong's public and private healthcare as well as policy implementation so that the public will feel at ease in using public and private health services.

MRS SOPHIE LEUNG (in Cantonese): President, regarding education affairs, I would like to review, from a forward-looking perspective, the issues on what sort of talents are required for the 21st century, and what kind of education system should be established for producing talents with an agile mind.

We have discussed e-learning for years. In this year's Policy Address, the issue of developing electronic textbooks is proposed once again. People have different levels of understanding towards e-learning. Using computers to replace textbooks only represents a basic level of understanding. We should be more imaginative and see how we can nurture agile and innovative talents.

What makes e-learning most valuable is that it creates a boundless world. Some recent views have suggested that the Administration should adopt the concept of "cloud computing" as it provides unlimited database access which facilitates teachers to select suitable teaching materials. Theoretically, such teaching materials may contain substantial folk wisdom.

On the other hand, students can access global information via the Internet and gain profound historical and contemporary knowledge. Moreover, e-learning requires self-motivation and interaction. It inspires students to explore, examine and ponder on issues they are interested in.

In the film "WALL-E", there is a very interesting episode. The film portrays that all human beings have left the Earth for centuries and have no knowledge about botanical and biological organisms. When the Captain sees a little green plant, his curiosity is aroused. He then discovers the life on Earth bit by bit by surfing on Wikipedia. The more he discovers, the more he is excited. This is the intended effect of e-learning: beginning with limited knowledge, becoming curious, getting enthusiastic, searching for answers spontaneously, and resulted in an abundance of correct information, and finally feeling excited for having acquired new knowledge. This is what we should include in the education system.

At the same time, the mode of learning needs to be changed. It is crucial for the next generation to learn how to learn. The teachers' role should not be confined to transmitting knowledge. Instead, they should inspire students to learn continuously with the aid of technology and the materials available on the basis of their interests.

E-learning enables teaching and learning to go beyond the constraints of curriculum. Teachers may alter the teaching materials to cater for the needs of different students. Students need not learn the same thing when they study the same topic.

E-learning is an interactive activity. An online platform enables people with different backgrounds around the world to prepare teaching materials and discuss among themselves. We should consider seriously how the system can support e-learning to optimize its advantages.

In the New Senior Secondary (NSS) Curriculum, the distinction between Arts and Science classes is removed. Students are given more flexibility in subject selection. Nevertheless, I consider that this approach still imposes

considerable constraints on students. Let us think about it. To nurture talents in the new era, it is necessary to reduce constraints and allow students to discover their interests and have new exposures.

In my view, students — I mean students at senior secondary level — should be allowed to select different topics offered in the curriculum of certain subjects, except core subjects. A student who prefers to study topics relating to natural environment may not necessarily prefer those on urbanization. If he is forced to study the whole curriculum of Geography, he may lose his interest in the subject. Instead, it is better to split the curriculum into a number of modules, and allow students to select their own combination of modules freely according to their interests, like that in a university. This may, on the one hand, maintain students' interest in learning, and on the other hand, enable students to have new exposures at secondary level, so that they are able to identify their aspirations earlier. If there is such a free atmosphere, the burden on teachers may be alleviated.

The number of such short modules can be increased where necessary. For example, courses on Philosophy or Psychology may be included to foster diversified development of students. In each semester, students may acquire different types of knowledge. Moreover, it is a new era of rapid changes. Some courses can even be removed to save the schools from the trouble of reshuffling the whole curriculum, and enable schools to accommodate changes flexibly.

I understand that many issues have to be addressed to materialize this idea. In particular, teachers should be flexible in teaching, and have a flexible mindset. If we do not bring up the issue for discussion early, it will not be possible for us to respond to the changing environment of the society in the future.

While talents in the new era should have a multitude of skills and a wide range of knowledge, it is essential for them to have every part of their brain exercised before they join the workforce. More importantly, they should have proper attitude and a relentless desire to learn. Once we identify the right way forward, we should overcome all difficulties and problems and put the good ideas into practice, so that we can provide the best for our next generation.

President, I present my views, which are based on my imagination, with the intention of inviting my colleagues to put forward their valuable opinions. By speaking on this topic, I wish to invite my colleagues to consider what attitude we should adopt when addressing the issue of education in future.

I would like to raise another point. I believe that students educated in this way will not be satisfied to study at local tertiary institutions. I do not mean that the standard of our tertiary institutions are inferior, or that such students cannot catch up at local institutions. What I mean is that these students will broaden their horizon rapidly. They will figure out which schools suit them best and which disciplines are worth their continuous efforts. Therefore, I also believe that talents of the future will travel all over the world, no matter to study or work.

We should be glad when students wish to pursue their study at overseas tertiary institutions. We should not force them to stay in Hong Kong to work for the success of other people. I think that we should adopt a student-oriented approach for development and give them opportunities to acquire the essence of other places.

Our students should not be deprived of the freedom to choose for themselves due to a lack of means. Therefore, I opine that an overseas learning fund should be established in future. The fund, no matter how it operates, should aim at providing support for students to study abroad. Students who wish to study in Mainland China, Europe, the United States, or even the Middle East, should be provided with certain degree of financial support.

After studying abroad, the talents will return to Hong Kong to work, and to make contributions and bring about changes to our society as well. They will be able to make Hong Kong more diversified, and put forward good ideas.

With these remarks, President, I intend to inspire valuable opinions from my colleagues.

Thank you, President.

MR CHAN KIN-POR (in Cantonese): President, it is stated in the Policy Address that the authorities are preparing to implement the Health Protection

Scheme (HPS) and will provide financial incentives to be funded by the \$50 billion set aside for healthcare reform. I fully support this initiative. There has been extensive discussion in the community on various incentives, such as subsiding the insurance premiums for high risk patients, the first batch of participants enrolled for HPS and retired policyholders, as well as providing tax deduction for insurance premium.

As a matter of fact, the major targets of HPS are the middle-class people who can afford private healthcare services. Among these middle-class people, the vast majority of them are required to pay tax. Therefore, the authorities should actively consider implementing the incentive of providing tax deduction for insurance premium, in order to alleviate the heavy burden of tax on these people. Meanwhile, provision of tax deduction for insurance premium will also convey an important message to the public that the Government will take concrete action to encourage the public to prepare for their future, instead of paying lip-service only.

Although tax rebate will inevitably result in the loss of some public resources in society, the estimated expenditure will not exceed \$0.2 billion each year and thus have limited impact on the public coffers. On the contrary, tax concession can motivate the public to commit themselves to their future healthcare expenditure, so that they need not rely on the public healthcare system when they are sick, and the Government will then save more resources. So, this is a smarter bargain than it appears. It is of fundamental importance that when more middle-class people can enjoy the private healthcare system, the limited resources from the public healthcare system can then be released to the grassroots most in need.

Concerning the \$50 billion incentive of the Government, I must talk about the problem of medical inflation. The total healthcare expenditure around the world (including Hong Kong) has soared in recent years. In the first half of this year alone, the amount of claims under medical insurance schemes in Hong Kong was 16% higher than that of the same period last year. However, in as early as the first stage of public consultation on healthcare reform, the Government proposed spending \$50 billion for the promotion of healthcare reform. During the seven years or so before HPS comes into force in 2015, the actual value of the \$50 billion for healthcare expenditure will shrink to around \$30 billion in 2015, if healthcare expenditure in Hong Kong increases by about 10% each year.

Therefore, the Government needs to re-examine whether the above commitment of \$50 billion will be sufficient for the long-term operation and ongoing development of HPS when the scheme comes into operation in 2015, so as not to fall short of the public expectation that the Government can implement a feasible and sustainable health protection system.

Apart from expenditure, I would like to talk about the demand and supply problem in HPS. Although the quality of the private healthcare system in Hong Kong is among the best in the world, it is well known that the provision of bed spaces has become a major problem of the private healthcare system in Hong Kong. Given that the Government has been actively boosting medical services in recent years and there have been a great number of Mainland mothers-to-be giving birth in Hong Kong, bed spaces in Hong Kong private hospitals are in serious shortage, and over the past year, the bed occupancy rate of individual hospitals reached as high as 100%.

With services in the private healthcare market almost reaching saturation, there have been phenomena where patients in Hong Kong have to wait for about seven days to get admitted to private hospitals recently. With a shortage in bed spaces in private hospitals, patients have to return to public hospitals as they cannot be admitted to private hospitals. This situation is extremely detrimental to HPS and even to the long-term development of the overall private healthcare system.

In response to the problem of shortage in bed spaces in private hospitals, the Government usually gives two replies: firstly, several private hospitals have planned to provide 250 additional bed spaces by 2013; secondly, the Government has allocated four sites for tender among private hospitals and 70% of the services provided in these hospitals have to be reserved for Hong Kong residents.

However, the problem is that, firstly, although bed spaces in private hospitals have been in serious shortage over the past year, the four new hospitals are not expected to be commissioned until six years later, that is, 2017. How can Hong Kong residents suffering from sickness get bed spaces in private hospitals during these six years?

Secondly, while the requirement of reserving 70% of the services provided in the new private hospitals for Hong Kong residents is worth supporting, why do

the authorities not propose legislative amendments at once to apply the same requirements to the existing 13 private hospitals? Why must they wait until the new private hospitals come into operation in 2017 before considering regulating the existing hospitals?

Thirdly, why will the authorities grant only two sites in the first quarter of 2012, instead of granting all the four sites in one go, or even making available more sites for tender among private hospitals?

To meet the urgent needs of patients, there is a need for the authorities to give an account to the public for the above problems as soon as possible. I certainly welcome some measures for solving long-term problems, but short-term problems cannot be disregarded. I hope that the Government will introduce solutions in a practical manner.

President, I so submit.

MRS REGINA IP (in Cantonese): President, I remarked in the first session that when the Government talks about infrastructure, it normally focuses on civil inadequate investment engineering projects, with in knowledge-based infrastructures including the grooming of talents and the institution of educational infrastructure. As I also mentioned in my remark, the World Competitiveness Report published by the world-renowned World Economic Forum pointed out that the first negative factor affecting foreign business to invest and run business in Hong Kong is, first and foremost, inflation, a problem Hong Kong, Singapore and many other places have been facing. The second factor affecting their investment and business operation in Hong Kong is inadequately educated talent. That is to say, the educational level of our human resources is actually not high enough, and that is what I always hear in the community too. For example, when the economy of Hong Kong is robust with many multinational companies and financial institutions investing in Hong Kong, we will find that professionals and well-qualified experts in the financial field are suddenly in short supply, and wages soar. As a matter of fact, compared to other international cities, Hong Kong has not got that many highly educated top-notch talents. I once again urge that the Government, the next term of Government in particular, should make bigger investment in education and come up with more long-term planning.

In this session, I would like to discuss some education issues of a more microscopic nature. First of all, it is about the debundling of textbooks and teaching resources. Complaints against expensive textbook fees and students having to go to school with heavy school bags are frequently made not only by parents and teachers but also by students themselves. In view of this, the Education Bureau has come up with some solutions, which are the debundling of textbooks and teaching resources and e-learning. I very much agree with Mrs Sophie LEUNG that there is ample room for development in e-learning. I know that the Government conducted a review on the school curriculum in 2000 and introduced a number of integrated studies and Other Learning Experiences in the hope that students will be able to learn in a more interesting atmosphere. E-learning indeed offers a lot of room for students to develop their creativity and increase their interest in learning.

Regarding the debundling of textbooks and teaching resources, many publishers have told me that the high and upgoing textbook prices are attributable to a number of objective factors. One of them is the low birth rate, which has led to a decreasing number of students and a rapidly shrinking market. I believe that Mr SUEN knows it pretty well too. Secondly, the publishers believe that the education reform initiated by the Education Bureau is the mother of all such For example, prescribed text has been abolished in the subject of Chinese Students are only required to read, write, pronounce and identify relaxed pronunciation in the Cantonese language. Now, this requires a massive amount of learning resources — unlike the time when we were kids, when all we had to do was simply reading a number of selected Chinese proses. Of course, that was many years ago. If designated textbooks for the subject of Chinese Language are available, then teachers would not need that many teaching materials. Furthermore, the Education Bureau has introduced many integrated subjects such as Integrated Science, Liberal Studies and Integrated Humanities, and so on, which require the teachers to prepare many teaching materials. being the case, if the Government is saying that teaching materials are to be debundled "across the board", what kind of resources will be available to the teachers then? They could only ask for government subvention. So, I hope the Government will look into this matter. I have all along believed that prescribed text should be taught in the subject of Chinese Language, and I believe the President will agree with me on this too. He is highly proficient in Chinese, as evidenced from the literary allusions he frequently make — and that is because he recited many prescribed text when he was a kid. Chinese culture has a long

history, and many classical writings of the ancient time are easy to recite. I can still recite the essay "Jin defeated the army of Qin at Xiao" (晉敗秦師於殽) to date. These writings are our cultural treasure, and we should let our kids read it, should we not? As a matter of fact, recital is perfectly acceptable. The Britons who study English literature have to recite Shakespeare, and they have to recite Act 1, Scene 1 in full, which they do with fun. It is just a matter of how the subject is taught and assessed. So I urge Mr SUEN to resume the practice of teaching prescribed texts. Prescribed texts need not be difficult writings and the subject could be divided into Part A and Part B so that students who are particularly interested in classical writings can study the subject in greater depth.

The Savantas Liberal Arts Academy run by me offers a course called "The Reformation of Chinese Culture", which has attracted many students. I am very impressed that so many people are willing to come to take a course on the reformation and changes of Chinese culture after they have finished their work at seven o'clock in the evening. Lessons on history can be more than simply the teaching of the rise and fall of dynasties in chronological order. Culture relics can also be used to illustrate the culture and the institutional system of a particular point in history. In fact, many people do find this interesting, so I very much hope that consideration will be given in this respect by the Education Bureau.

Furthermore, I have also written several complaint letters to the Secretary requesting that Chinese History be a compulsory subject. The letter I last sent to the Secretary was a long one with more than a thousand words, but the Secretary has not got the time to give me any reply yet. In the letter, I referred to a number of essays written by professors of famous colleges on the importance of Take the United States as an example, where American learning history. History is a compulsory subject. American students studying in primary school have to learn the history of the state, and when they are in secondary school, they will have to take a course on national history. By the time they are in Grade 12, they would have read the history of America two or three times. Chinese history has a time span of more than 5 000 years, and it is difficult to teach them all in one single year or to go over it twice during the four years in secondary school. Even if it is possible to go over it twice, which is to say, the first time at a general level, and the second time at a more advanced level in preparation of university education, it is still a matter of how teaching can be conducted in a way that can stimulate the learning interest of the students. After the introduction of the New Senior Secondary (NSS) academic structure, Chinese History is no longer a

compulsory subject, and the number of students taking this subject has dwindled from tens of thousand to several thousands, which is very worrying. I believe the Secretary is well aware of that too.

I greatly support the Government's introduction of national education. Having read the government papers, I understand that the essence of national education is to encourage students to love our own country, culture, history and nation. But how can students learn these without learning history? Without contextual understanding of historical events, they will never come to appreciate the unique characteristics and the development process of the nation and its As far as I know, the NSS academic structure has just been culture. Certainly, it is not possible for the Government to make implemented. substantial changes in the near future. However, I hope that the Education Bureau will seriously consider making Chinese History a compulsory subject for junior secondary education. As Liberal Studies is mandatory in senior secondary curriculum, many schools require junior secondary students to take the subject of Integrated Humanities. Such articulation serves so well that there is no need to abolish Chinese History from the junior secondary curriculum. Education Bureau may well say that the lesson time is almost the same. lesson time is not the only thing that counts; the contents, integrity and continuity of learning should also be the focus. For this reason, I think that if the government wishes to implement national education seriously, it should consider resuming the teaching of prescribed texts and Chinese History.

I know that many criticisms have been made against national education. In fact, they are mainly technical issues such as difficulties in increasing lesson time, or the teachers' belief that students' interests cannot be cultivated in the absence of examinations. Moreover, I have learnt that some people teased national education as patriotic education. There is really nothing wrong with the Government's promotion of national education, and I know many other governments promote national education as well. As students pursuing studies in the United States may tell you, the national anthem is usually sung, or the Declaration of the Constitution recited at school events, be it a soccer match, a concert or a major inter-class debate. The national flag and state flags fly in schools as well. The national flag even flies in many families. As far as I remember, during the British rule in Hong Kong, we similarly hung the portrait of "Her Majesty", didn't we? Is there anything wrong to support one's own country? Hence, Secretary, it does not matter even if someone teases it as patriotic education. What really matters is how students can be taught to look at

things objectively, and in what ways debates can be conducted in a fair, objective and open manner in the promotion of patriotism.

Last but not the least, I wish to reflect the complaints of many members of public about the Government's lack of genuine concern for the middle class. The Government has not addressed the concerns of the middle class, such as healthcare and bedspace problems already mentioned by a number of colleagues. As a member of the middle class myself, I would like to tell the Secretary that education is of utmost importance to the middle class. Not many middle-class people are able to get their children a place in Direct Subsidy Scheme schools and international schools or even send them abroad for further studies. Hence, to the middle class, it is essential to maintain a good public education system.

They also complain to me about foreign domestic helper services which are badly needed by the middle-class families. Over the past five years since my return from the United States, I have contacted the Labour and Welfare Bureau time and again. Maybe the Labour and Welfare Bureau, as its name suggests, focuses only on matters relating to labour and welfare, thus not showing the least concern for the middle class. The demands and suggestions from middle-class families are minute and humble ones. For instance, the contract system for foreign domestic helpers which has been in force for years may be outdated. For what reasons a probation period is provided for local workers but none for foreign domestic helpers? Unlike other workers, foreign domestic helpers stay with the employers and their families. Thus, in the event of infectious diseases contracted after arrival, pregnancy or serious illnesses found afterwards or simply the failure to maintain good relations with employers or adaptability problems, the provision of a probation period will allow employers to buy them air tickets for their departure after the probation period. No arguments or explanations will Isn't that more convenient? For years, the Government has be necessary. never attached due importance to such minute and humble suggestions.

In fact, to the middle class, food, clothing, accommodation, transportation, the next generations and family harmony are all essential. Hence, I hope that in the remaining months, the Government, or for that matter, the next term of Government, will really consider the needs of the middle class and respond to their demands.

I so submit.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Are there any Members who want to speak in this session?

MR PAUL TSE (in Cantonese): President, as this session also covers the topic of immigration policy, my speech will focus mainly on this aspect. But President, before I go into details on this topic, please let me spare some time to raise some issues related to tourism. Rather than going into great lengths, I will just briefly touch on these issues, without requiring the authorities to make response here.

President, the Policy Address, as always, only devotes one paragraph, that is, paragraph 167, to issues related to tourism. As Mrs Carrie LAM pointed out yesterday, it was probably that "no news is good news". That is to say, no discussion is required if nothing special happens. However, this only highlights the fact that the Government has, for years or all along, only paid lip service in promoting tourism as one of the four economic pillars of Hong Kong. As a matter of fact, the Government has not spent much thought on boosting the tourism industry, leaving the industry to survive on its own. How much thought could possibly be spent on it if one paragraph is long enough to cover that? It contains no more than just the upcoming initiatives of the Hong Kong Disneyland or the Ocean Park. It is nothing but empty talk.

As for the regulatory framework, we have been seeking for a major reform for years, hoping that the Government will take prompt action and translate it into reality. The cruise terminal is also what we have long been yearning for. I very much agree with the Government's plan to enrich Kowloon East with other facilities. Although the plan aims to transform the area into another core business district, we believe the city will also become a major tourism attraction along with the construction and development of the cruise terminal. I have moved a motion in this regard to discuss ways to incorporate tourism element into the development of Kowloon East so as to enhance the prosperity of the district. I will go into details on it later when opportunities arise.

President, while "no news is good news", we seems to have put too much emphasis on Mainland tourist figures and the benefits they brought to Hong Kong. As a result, we are losing sight on the long-term arrangement and the maintenance of proper balance. We all may have visited some restaurants which were often crowded with customers and therefore cared little about environmental

hygiene and food refinement. With deteriorating restaurant environment and food standard, their businesses subsequently closed down soon afterwards. not want Hong Kong's tourism industry to be like that, which is to rest on laurels with the present achievement in numerical and monetary terms, without thinking properly as to which category of tourists Hong Kong needs most, or whether it is appropriate for Hong Kong's tourism facilities to just cater for the majority of Mainland tourists, and casually provide some sightseeing spots like the Golden Bauhinia Square and the Avenue of Stars. They are all too vulgar for Hong Kong people or even foreigners. These are tourism spots that even Hong Kong people would not feel worth recommending. The Avenue of Stars was recently ranked second as one of the world's most disappointing tourism spots on a CNN This is an alarm reminding us not to be complacent, with our eyes just website. fixing on figures, stressing over and over again the annual growth of tourists coming to Hong Kong. These figures are problematic in a number of ways. Take the case of Mainland tourists who arrive in Hong Kong en route to Macao as an example, they are counted as visiting Hong Kong twice. These figures are thus somewhat deceiving. Therefore, I would like to remind the Government once again to avoid the mentality of "finishing homework" in the short run. should go beyond empty talks and take tourism industry seriously as an important economic pillar. This is a pillar that not only generates incomes, but also creates lots of employment opportunities, especially for those with low education level and the new arrivals. I will talk more on this when opportunities arise.

As both the Secretary and Under Secretary for Security are present here, I would like to talk about some tourism-related issues, especially the Outbound Travel Alert (OTA) System. I welcome the authorities' issuance of the red OTA for Thailand two days ago, although it has been much belated. The soundness of the system and its implementation, however, still comes under fire. To date, there are still criticisms as to when an alert should be issued, which levels of alert should be issued, and for which places or countries should the alert be issued, and so on. It has not only caused nuisance to tourists, but also spelt much trouble and economic loss to the industry. I hope the authorities will review the system again and fine-tune it as soon as possible.

Another tourism-related issue does not directly involve tourists but may be regarded as the ordeal experienced by Hong Kong people outside our territory. The latest incident is related to two Hong Kong people who had been detained in the Philippines for over a decade before receiving a trial. They were found

guilty of participation in drug trafficking and were sentenced to 40 years of imprisonment. Can you imagine how long 40 years of imprisonment lasts? Such is not a rare isolated case, but would happen time and again, particularly in East Asian countries or the Mainland. Hong Kong is an affluent city which champions human rights and respects the rule of law, with frequent talks about ways to have better care for Hong Kong people. Even so, I have noticed that, whenever something happen to Hong Kong people outside our territory, we become indifferent and react slowly. As in the case of these two Hong Kong Chinese residents in the Philippines, they have literally been left in limbo for years, with little concern from us. The Security Bureau, of course, has indicated that it would keep an eye on the situation. But it is far from enough to just keep The concern shown by the Security Bureau is still low an eye on the situation. when compared to that of the British Embassy and Chinese Embassy there. really care for the interests of Hong Kong people, we should allocate adequate resources and make sufficient effort to show more concern for them and see if there is anything we can be of help to them. I hope the authorities will consider offering assistance to Hong Kong people via the prisoner exchange programme so as to bring an end to their unnecessary ordeal in other countries or dismal places.

President, turning back to the issue of immigration policy, the Policy Address this time goes into great lengths to talk about the issue of an ageing population. It is of much regret that the relevant contents, which span a total of 28 paragraphs (paragraph 53 to paragraph 81 are about an ageing population), only touch briefly on the issue of immigration policy in paragraph 57. As we all know, Hong Kong by now has three programmes in place for the integration of foreign immigrants into our society. However, the system is riddled with problems. Despite the lingering questions about the quality of immigrants, the 150 quota set for family reunion is acceptable from a humane perspective, as it serves to allow Hong Kong citizens to apply for their family members to reside in Hong Kong with them. In fact, the number of such applications in recent years has not yet reached the quota limit.

Attracting talents is all the more important instead. Should we consider not to accept the so-called celebrities like superstars, singers or athletes simply in view of their fame? It is because these people would not reside here after becoming permanent residents of Hong Kong. They just see it as a symbol of identity and simply want to "keep up with the Joneses" in order not to be outshone by others. They completely lack the commitment and sincerity to live

in Hong Kong. On the investment front, they very often just speculate on property, which can do nothing to boost the employment opportunities in Hong Kong. Therefore, this scheme begs many questions from me.

The second question is about huge amount investment. In the past, they could choose among property, stock or fund investments. This certainly helped further boost the investment amounts in Hong Kong, but did little to enhance job opportunities and optimize our demographic structure. They are simply a symbol of identity for top officials, or, as some people even said, for the greedy corrupt officials or tycoons, hoping just to gain a Hong Kong residence. They may not be as discerning as to buy properties in the Mid-levels, or there are simply not many choices left now. Therefore, most of them will see buying properties near the "Elements" shopping mall in West Kowloon as a symbol of identity. This situation is indeed very unhealthy. Since we need to tackle the ageing problem and attract talents to settle here, we should work towards this direction rather than just opening the door for Mainlanders to feed their vanity.

President, next comes the latest hot-button issue about foreign domestic helpers, which is known to everyone of us. My long-held stance is against the granting of right of abode to foreign domestic helpers. But that does not mean I am absolutely against it. I hold such position in view of the loopholes of the existing system and legislation. These loopholes may lead to over a hundred thousand of foreign domestic helpers being able to meet the application requirements for right of abode all at once, owing to historical reasons and over-estimation of the effectiveness of our policy.

For a system to be truly legitimate and healthy, there should be a proper and systematic vetting mechanism which allows those foreign domestic helpers who really have contribution, commitment and sense of belonging towards Hong Kong to apply for right of abode here via a point-based vetting system. Only then can the system be operated on humanitarian grounds and be accepted as the long-term immigration regime for an international cosmopolitan city likes Hong Kong. That is different from the existing system which we originally considered to be able to serve adequately as our immigration defense but later found to be rife with loopholes. That is why I am opposing it.

As such, I believe we must stand firm on our principles and plug the legal loopholes as soon as possible in respect to the immigration system. As for the

question of how we are going to tackle the problem, I have stressed repeatedly that relying solely on the existing legal system, or the so-called judiciary system, is not enough to plug the loopholes effectively. I will go into details about it later when opportunities arise, or raise further opinion on this issue in the next session. What I would like to say at this moment is that although I oppose the system that allows foreign domestic helpers to settle in Hong Kong "by chance", I think we can consider a policy which allow foreign domestic helpers to apply for right of abode in Hong Kong and integrate into our society in an orderly, systematic and legitimate manner. This is also in line with the humane practice of an affluent city likes Hong Kong.

By grasping precisely when "to grant or not to grant" such right, it will serve as a well-justified policy for Hong Kong to handle the issue reasonably, while meeting the international requirements. This allows those foreign domestic helpers who have made contributions to Hong Kong to gradually integrate into our society based on assessments with respect to their duration of stay in Hong Kong, academic background and past work performance, while those who are lazy, have committed theft and child abuse, or simply are "taking advantage on Hong Kong". In Macao, for instance, there are often cases of foreign domestic helpers forcing their employers to terminate service with them These foreign domestic helpers can also take advantage of the recently. loopholes to gain permanent resident status in Hong Kong. This is exactly what we all are and should be against. I believe we should put in place a proper mechanism to justify when "to grant or not to grant" such right, so as to handle this issue in a legitimate manner. This should be the right direction for us.

President, as regards the handling of the foreign domestic helpers' issue, I hope I will be able to discuss it with the Secretary for Justice later, as he is absent from this debate session, if we have the opportunity to discuss legal matters. I would like to see why he stands so firm on this issue and takes all the troubles to appeal to the Court of Final Appeal, even with an already known outcome — we both are lawyers I am not talking as if we are battling neck and neck, but at least we understand what each other is saying — why still pushing it this way for the Hong Kong community? Allow me to talk more on this in the next session. Thank you, President.

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

MISS TANYA CHAN (in Cantonese): I will use up the approximately 10 minutes left in this session to talk about education. Prior to the release of the Policy Address, the education sector mainly had three major demands. The first demand was the provision of 15-year free education. Secondly, small class teaching should also be implemented in secondary schools. Thirdly, the limit of university places for publicly-funded programmes should be raised. It is quite unfortunate that these three major demands are not entertained at all in this Policy Address entitled "From Strength to Strength" with a butterfly yellow cover.

On the shortage of tertiary places, I dare not say that last year's Policy Address was "selling big buns cheaply", as the "buns" have certainly failed to fill your stomach and are not as delicious as the "crunchy bun with butter slice" sold on the fifth floor of this building at all. Has President eaten the bun yet? It is heard that the crunchy bun with butter available on the fifth floor is very tasty, but I have not tried it yet. It is well known that the 14 620 places have been maintained for about 10-odd to 20 years. At last, the number of places has increased by 380, but the percentage it accounts for is really miserable.

According to the results of this year's Hong Kong Advanced Level Examination, 18 900 students have attained the qualification for university education, but ultimately there are still 4 000 of them refused admission. The figure of this year seems to be less compared with those in the past, but as far as students are concerned, it is still an impact. Why do I say that? The utmost reason is that they have to look for self-financed programmes instead but, as we all know, not everyone can afford a self-financed programme. Even loans are provided under the "non-means" tested scheme, it will be very hard in deed to repay them in future.

All of us know that I do not own any property, so at least I have no debt Don't you know that? Yes, I have no debt. But a youngster just over 20 has run a debt of one to two hundred thousand dollars. President, this is, I really think, unimaginably queer. The goal of my life is not to have a default in credit card payment as far as possible, apart from the possibility of being in debt because of buying a property. As such, if a young man just over 20 has already

run a huge debt, to put it in a favourable term, it may be a driving force, or in unfavourable words, it is a burden, to his personal or family development. In particular, this young man's future development may be affected. He may not be able to try a lot of things as the burden of the outstanding debt will be transferred to the whole family. In any case, he has to stick to the rules and fails to pursue many of his dreams.

As to student financial assistance, which I mentioned just now, the Secretary has in fact stated since his assumption of office that he would follow up, study, consult and further consult on the matter. The relevant consultation exercise has been conducted thrice, just like the West Kowloon Cultural District and it is not known when the results will be available. On the issue of interest rate risk, many of my colleagues think that consideration should be given to put an end to it as soon as possible, as for many students, especially those who are docile, the interest rate risk is just like a kind of punishment. If no review is conducted, the number of victims will become increasingly more and the snowball gathers as it rolls on. Students graduate with a heavy debt. Even in a singles dormitory, it is necessary for two or three graduates to crowd into in a room, just like the situation in a university hostel, let alone saving money to buy a home. It would be better if it were an extension of university life. What is the significance for youngsters who still have to lead a life just like the situation in a university hostel after taking up a job in society?

I think that the provision of 15-year free education is only a very humble request. Why is Hong Kong with large resources and favourable conditions not able to provide 15-year free education when even Macao can do so? However, it is heard that the Secretary seems to have revealed recently his intention by implying the possibility of doing so. I very much hope that I can hear good news from him later. Although the term of the current Government is going to expire, good news will never be late. Such as in this Policy Address, there is at least a little bit of good news. As to who is responsible for it and "pays the bill" at last, it depends on who the next Chief Executive is. However, I believe that the provision of 15-year free education will absolutely not be a very big burden. Furthermore, I believe that the undeclared Chief Executive candidates, no matter who they are, should make a rather long-term undertaking for the future community. The provision of 15-year free education is very reasonable. Is it right, Dr LAM Tai-fai? Therefore, I think that the Secretary should proactively consider working toward the provision of 15-year free education.

Then, of course, I have to talk about the subject on Moral and National Education (MNE). Very long and constant public hearings have been held but, frankly speaking, the majority of views put the blame on the Government. Recently, all of us have noticed some problems in the Overview of the MNE Curriculum. For example, what people will think of when they see the national flag and then marks are given on it. Recently, I have seen a flag-hoisting ceremony at half past seven somewhere from time to time, as the flag-hoisting ceremony is held there at that time every day. When I saw the national flag, I suddenly thought of the marking scheme for the MNE subject instead of my country without knowing why, as well as many other matters. For instance, when I see the national flag, should I be moved to tears or weep out of sorrow? Should I feel honoured or stride forward? In fact, many things have not been done enough yet. When I saw the national flag, I really had a mixture of feelings crowding upon my mind. I, of course, would also think of how the MNE subject will end up at last. Some amendments still seem to be needed at present, but I have not heard of any change for the time being. We understand the importance of national education, but as mentioned by a Member just now and even insisted by Ms Audrey EU all along that Chinese history can hopefully be explored. I have felt very remorseful so far that I did not study Chinese History during my secondary school years. Of course, I have other channels to know about Chinese history but, as a Chinese, I think it is a flaw. I very much hope that secondary school students can, during their growth, understand history through a formal channel, whether it be China's early or modern history, with reference to its pros and cons or think critically about it as it is very important for personal growth and self-cultivation, and has an effect on personal analytical ability and judgment.

My mother has said that we should not repeat the same mistakes of our predecessors and the historical development serves as a reference for us. To learn from the historical development and to think from different perspectives is very important for both the personal judgment and self-cultivation of an adult. What the Civic Party is most objected to is "brainwashing" national education, so I very much hope that the Secretary would persist in absolutely refraining from implementing "brainwashing" national education. This is a principle that must be upheld.

At last, I have to talk about the resources for Non-Chinese speaking students with special educational needs. I have always been very concerned

about this issue as I met with a group of parents of students with such needs soon after I had served as a Member of the Legislative Council. All along, these parents feel rather helpless since integrated education is not suitable for their children who do not know how to speak Cantonese at all. As a matter of fact, there are few resources in this respect in Hong Kong. We note from this year's Policy Address that a Youth College will be established. I remember that Ms Audrey EU asked that day and I have also asked at a meeting of the Panel on Education whether Non-Chinese speaking students with special educational needs would be included. To my understanding, they will be included, but there will only be three hundred-odd places and the targets are teenagers, who are older. Then, what about the group of children who are younger?

Some parents have relayed to me that at present there is a school wholly devoted to looking after Non-Chinese speaking students with special educational needs in Kowloon but there is not one on Hong Kong Island. I know that some parents have moved to the Kowloon side because of the needs of their children. Hong Kong Island and Kowloon seem to be very close to each other, but for students with special educational needs or their parents, to travel every day is time consuming and worrying for their parents, so the removal to Kowloon is necessary. I very much hope that the authority concerned can establish a school of this kind on Hong Kong Island or in the New Territories, so that the parents and students can enjoy comprehensive care and the Youth College can really help this group of students integrate into the community.

I so submit. Thank you, President.

MR PAUL CHAN (in Cantonese): President, I would like to give some feedback on the education-related part of the Policy Address. We may say that this year's Policy Address does not give us any surprises in regard to education, and it has not made any commitment yet.

President, as I have pointed out in the remarks I made earlier on, while our economic growth since the Reunification has amounted to 55%, the increase in recurrent government expenditure so far still falls short of 30%. As regards the education-related part of this year's Policy Address, the only thing new is a proposed \$5 billion increase in expenditure, which will be injected into the Research Endowment Fund. But then, the investment income of the \$2 billion

out of this \$5 billion injection will replace the existing recurrent research provision of \$100 million per annum. Hence, in this Policy Address, the resources devoted to education has actually increased \$3 billion only, and self-financing tertiary institutions have to compete for such funding among themselves.

Moreover, President, I would like to express some views on the Moral and National Education Curriculum. In last year's Policy Address, the Chief Executive put forward the proposal to implement the Moral and National Education Curriculum, arousing fervent discussions among the community and the education sector. Many members of the education sector and colleagues in this Council have pointed out that while the Government insists on implementing the National Education Curriculum and making it a compulsory subject in both primary and secondary schools, Chinese History is no longer a compulsory subject in schools, thus causing subjects like Chinese History and Chinese Literature to lose their importance gradually. Under the circumstances, I am afraid the Government is putting the cart before the horse in insisting on implementing the National Education Curriculum.

Actually, President, the National Education Curriculums implemented in other countries are mostly focused on the history, geography and literature of their own countries. The students are all required to study, at least in junior secondary schools, the country's history, geography and classic works of But what is the picture in Hong Kong? Chinese History and Chinese Literature are not compulsory subjects for students. organization has made some analysis and found that out of the 421 secondary schools in Hong Kong, only 313 have included Chinese History as an independent subject for their Secondary One to Secondary Three classes. other words, about a quarter of the schools do not have a Chinese History subject. Among the remaining schools, many simply include Chinese History as an element of Liberal Studies or Integrated Humanities, grouping Chinese History, History and Geography together as one single subject. Some schools even adopted English as the teaching medium for this subject. Under these circumstances, President, Chinese History is a gravely marginalized subject in schools. Some secondary school teachers have pointed out that many students have thus lost interest in studying Chinese History.

The situation in senior secondary schools is even more worrying. During the period between 1999 and 2010, among the day school students sitting the Certificate of Education Examination for the first time, the percentage of the students taking Chinese History examination declined every year, dropping from 38.5% to 31.3%. In 2011, the number of candidates sitting the Chinese History examination for the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education has dropped further to only 16.4%. No wonder some scholars have described this phenomenon as catastrophic.

President, I agree with the original intent of implementing a National Education Curriculum in that our younger generations should have a certain degree of knowledge about their own country and national identity, and that it is not appropriate for them to brush aside any concepts of the state. Nevertheless, I believe we should at least make Chinese History a compulsory subject in junior secondary schools. The curriculums offered in schools should at least provide students with some basic understanding and perceptual knowledge of our country. If we refuse to take even this small step, how can our younger generations have any concepts of state in their mind? How are they going to learn the concept of "no households can survive without a state, no eggs can survive when the nest is upside down"? President, in view of the existing way that the Government is forcibly implementing the National Education Curriculum, one cannot help but suspect that this is some form of "brainwashing".

In addition, President, I suggest the Government allocating more resources to enhance students' interest in Chinese History and Chinese Literature, such as setting up scholarships or offering project awards in relation to these subjects. The proposed scholarships and awards can serve as an encouragement to students and help them cultivate more interest in these subjects, with a view to counterweighting the existing commercialized social values of Hong Kong, which give rise to the phenomenon that parents generally do not encourage their children to study such subjects. If subjects like Chinese History and Chinese Literature can become popular subjects among students, our National Education can be considered a success. I hope the authorities will take my views into consideration.

President, it is pointed out in the Policy Address that the "School-based Educational Psychology Service" will be extended to all public sector secondary and primary schools by the 2016-2017 school year, providing schools with

regular visits by educational psychologists. But then, the Government has disregarded the long-term request made by education bodies for an increase in school-based counselling manpower, including the provision of at least one school-based guidance and counselling teacher and one school social worker for each school. The work of these personnel can hardly be replaced by the regular visits made by some experts. This is particularly so for the target clients of the "School-based Educational Psychology Service", as they are students with learning, emotional or behavioural problems. These students are in need of in-depth counselling and long-term follow-up efforts, and such work must be developed on the basis of the mutual trust between the respective counsellors and students. The said relationship cannot be built up overnight, nor in a casual manner.

President, let us think about this. If a primary school student feels unhappy with matters at home, say, the parents are getting a divorce, will this student pour his heart out to a stranger who visits his school occasionally? To the students, an expert who only makes official visits to their schools is of no meaning at all.

The present world is totally different from the past. Students today are faced with various forms of seduction and pressure from outside, such as drugs, family issues, pressure arising from the new academic structure. Moreover, their value standards are also subject to heavy impacts from many phenomena in society today, such as compensated dating and premarital pregnancy. The original counselling manpower is certainly insufficient to cater for the needs of the present society. The authorities should increase the number of school social workers in a target-oriented manner and earmark school funding for the employment of full-time counselling personnel, so that students can get the right service when such need arises.

I so submit, President.

MR IP WAI-MING (in Cantonese): President, pardon me. The speech I am going to make is supposed to focus on the topic to be discussed in Debate Session 3, but I had to handle a case of labour dispute yesterday, so I missed the time to speak in that session. Therefore, part of what I am going to say later might not conform to the topic to be discussed in this session. Nevertheless, I

wish to express some of my views on the Policy Address. The government officials who should respond might not be sitting here. Excuse me, President.

President, I think that during the debates in the past two days, several of my colleagues from the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions (FTU) took the chance to express some of our views on the Policy Address. In fact, soon after hearing the Policy Address, we summed it up in two clauses, that is, the Policy Address did respond to some of the citizens' demands, but it failed to tackle deep-rooted problems. In fact, this is the last Policy Address from the Chief Executive during his term of office, and so we have seen some response to many of the aspirations we kept fighting for in the society or in this Council over the past few years such as concessionary fare for the elderly and people with disabilities who need to take a ride on public transport. This gives people an impression that before he leaves office, he is "selling big buns cheaply" once and for all as his thanks to everyone. Many of such demands are those we have been pursuing. However, on the question of tackling some deep-rooted problems, neither viable solution nor unique insight has been proposed.

Therefore, I think that this Policy Address is indeed a chicken rib, which has little to be tasted but bad to be wasted. In particular, when it comes to deep-rooted problems, what disappoints me is that the Chief Executive has not vigorously responded to the problems of alleviating poverty and tackling retirement protection. Premier WEN and President HU have always admonished the Government to tackle deep-rooted problems in Hong Kong, but we read from the news earlier that, when the Chief Executive held a dialogue with a group of young people, he said that deep-rooted problems meant irresolvable problems. This gives me an impression that the Chief Executive seemed to be bickering with Premier WEN and President HU before leaving office, which is an act that did not seem to be a good example.

If deep-rooted problems were irresolvable, then what are the duties of the Government? Alternatively, what kind of work it should do in order to alleviate the problems in this respect? I believe that most people in our society do not demand a full solution to the problem of extreme disparity between the rich and the poor. I believe that if the Government could achieve this, the Chief Executive would have been awarded the Nobel Prize for economics. However, does it mean that since the problem cannot be solved, the Government may turn a blind eye to it and do nothing? I am disappointed with this.

Indeed, the problem of poverty, apart from being a problem of income as we have described, is occasionally a matter of the citizens' perception; and that is, a matter of how people look at the disparity between the rich and the poor, or the antagonism towards the rich, as we have often talked about it nowadays. Why do we feel that in the past decade or so or just in the past several years, Hong Kong people became more hostile to the rich? In fact, the answer is simple, President, quite often it might really have something to do with our system.

When we walked into a bookstore some 10 or 20 years ago, we might come across some biographies of the so-called local rich, in which there were detailed descriptions of how they got rich and how they strived for the success they had in those days. However, we might as well pay attention to this kind of books if we happen to walk through a bookstore today. Can you still find them? Chances are that you cannot. What kind of trend is reflected in this phenomenon?

Why should I mention the citizens' perception? As we look at the statistics from the Government over the past decade, we can see that the wages for the income earners of the lowest 10% have been dropping all the time. Instead of increasing, their wages have been decreasing. I get some figures here. In 1998, the average monthly salary for workers with income of the lowest 10% was \$4,500, and their average monthly salary in 2008 was only \$3,400. Indeed, instead of sharing the wealth, these workers would feel that their conditions deteriorated year after year should they take a look at their own wages.

Why have I dwelled on this matter? It all started from my feelings. Yesterday, I handled a case of labour dispute, which involved the relocation of a production plant by the Maxim's Group to Tai Po. A group of workers refused to move in because they would have to spend more on travelling expenses and journey time after the relocation. Why do these workers remain so resolute? Most of them have been engaged in transportation and delivery work for 10 years on average. Some workers who have worked for eight to 10 years are receiving a basic salary of \$5,800 to \$6,200, and some of them received a meager wage of \$5,000 in the year when they were first employed. How much have their wages been increased over the past 10 years? Most important of all, we will think that the amount between \$5,800 and \$6,200 does not seem to conform to the standard of minimum wage, because the hourly wage is now \$28. Indeed, they have other allowances, such as travelling allowance and over-time allowance, but the \$200 travelling allowance for them has not seen any increase for more than 10

years. The over-time pay is \$30 per hour, just like what it was 12 years ago. In addition, their over-time work why must I delve into such details? The company gives them over-time pay for only three hours each day, but the number of hours they work over-time is not necessarily three. Even if they work four, five, six, or even 10 hours over-time, they will receive over-time pay for three hours only, which is \$90.

Sometimes, I wish I could describe the resentment of these workers through these details, but their anger can hardly be put into words. They have seen the company make big money. But how much is their wage? They have worked hard, for an amount of only \$8,000, or \$9,000, or at best \$10,000 that comes from their basic salaries plus other allowances, and that is their take-home wage with which they need to support and feed the whole family. If they take a day off, or if they have a headache or fever and need to rest for a day, their wages after deduction would be smaller than the amount mentioned above, and they would not be able to bring \$10,000 home. Why are the workers so angry? Why do people hate the rich? The Chief Executive must answer these questions. Should the Chief Executive really think about the things which are unfair to the workers in the current system?

President, returning to the main point, I have always stressed in this Council that some employers' representatives and some government officials doubted why we often demand legislation to do this and to do that. For example, we demand legislation for standard working hours. Think about this: the over-time pay is \$30 per hour, and you are allowed to work three hours over time each day, but nobody cares about how many hours you have actually worked, and all you can get is that \$90. Do we need to have legislation for standard working hours? Do we need such unpaid work? On many occasions, some government officials told us that legislation would not be necessarily useful, and discussion between workers and employers would be needed. What is discussion between workers and employers? Do the workers have power in negotiation? Are the employers willing to negotiate?

President, we have seen lots of these labour disputes, in which the workers have to stand on the street under the scourging sun or in torrential rain, eating in the wind and sleeping in the dew. Sometimes they shout a slogan or two. In fact, all these to them are hardships. What would be your experience if you try to stand for one, two, or three days? Sometimes, some employers are not

willing to pay a single cent, saying that they have no responsibility under the law, that the law does not have the requirement, and that the term "mutual consent" says it all, just like what they often claim that things are determined by the market and that is final. However, is this system fair? We do not hope to legislate for everything. Nevertheless, the fact is that if there is no law, some employers will not care about their employees, nor the appeals of their employees. As such, these labour disputes will continue to erupt.

President, the Financial Secretary said yesterday that Hong Kong faces the risk of a downturn. I am afraid that our labour relations are tense and will become more so in the future. In fact, the Government and employers in Hong Kong should be grateful that they have the most diligent workers in the world, who are very docile, too. In times of economic downturn, they are often the first ones to be affected, seeing cuts in their wages and benefits. economic prosperity, however, they are always the last ones to share the fruit of economic success. I have said during an interview in a programme that their shares of the economic success are most likely to be the kitchen waste left behind by some big businessmen. If indeed there is a risk of economic downturn in the future, I believe that the first ones to bear the brunt would be our workers. scholars have even pointed out that Hong Kong faces the risk of stagflation, that is, on the one hand, there is sluggish economic growth or even economic recession, and on the other hand, there is high inflation. The wages earned by our workers are getting insufficient for making ends meet day after day. If the Government does not address this problem seriously, I believe that our labour relations will keep worsening, and disputes will keep multiplying.

President, in the current Policy Address, the Government's statement on standard working hours says only that a report will be submitted in June. We are a little disappointed about this. We hope that when the Government submits the report, a committee should be set up to study the feasibility of legislation on standard working hours.

Another issue is retirement protection. I want to briefly talk about my views, as I believe that my colleagues have already spoken on it. To me, the most disappointing part of the Policy Address this time is the Chief Executive's statement on retirement protection. Although the Government refrains from a clear stand of negating universal retirement protection, its statement causes doubts. I feel that the Government should make clarification in this respect.

In fact, many colleagues have raised the issue of universal retirement protection. We have always pointed out that more than a quarter of the population in Hong Kong would be over 65 years of age by 2030. By then, how would our retirement protection safeguard our senior citizens' benefits or their lives after retirement? The Government has always avoided this question, whereas the Central Policy Unit has carried out a number of studies over the years. Many Members of this Council have also followed up on this issue up till now. Please allow me to use a colloquial expression, and that is, we all have talked about this for so long that our "mouths stink", but the report is not out yet. We have always heard steps on the staircase, but have never seen someone coming down.

President, on this issue of retirement protection, I think that the Government has a responsibility to lead the discussion among the whole society, and that it should not close the case just by saying that the middle class and other people do not accept this method of redistribution of resources. If we do not accept this method, what other methods will the Government adopt? pillars have been a subject for discussion for a long time, but we have all along criticized these three pillars of the Government as the "three canes one after another." The Mandatory Provident Fund (MPF) Scheme is full of loopholes, as The welfare for our elderly, their "fruit money" or the we all know. Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) for them, are things we have fought for repeatedly, resulting only in this moment a "Guangdong Scheme" as an experiment. As for personal savings, I have just mentioned that based on the monthly salaries earned by the majority of workers at grass-roots level. Mainland expression, they belong to the "monthly-cleansed clan", that is, their incomes are "cleansed" every month. How much money is left for them to save up after meeting their basic needs? Therefore, we are indeed doubtful when the Government keeps emphasizing on the three pillars as ways to solve the problem of retirement protection.

On the other hand, however, the Government has evaded universal retirement protection and also avoided the question of what can be done when universal retirement protection is not pursued. The Government does not take the lead to discuss the question among the entire society. What it says is that it will continue to improve the MPF Scheme. However, last year, when the MPF Scheme ushered in its 10th anniversary, the FTU demanded the Government conduct a full review of the Scheme, only to be rejected categorically by the

Government, who said the Scheme would be improved. But how will the Scheme be improved? Until now no one can tell us clearly. Therefore, I think that in the matter of solving the problem of retirement protection, the Administration has consistently avoided it and does not want to deal with it. Is it true that the Administration has no intention at all, or that it thinks its term will end soon so it would be better to hand over the bomb to the next Administration and let the next Chief Executive handle it? If that is the case, can it do a good job in the next six months?

Regarding the system of apprenticeship, I wish to talk about the issue of employment for our youths. The unemployment rate announced last month was the lowest in a decade, but we could still see high unemployment rate among our teenagers. From July to September, the unemployment rate for teenagers aged 15 to 19 stood at 16.6%, a double digit figure as it was before. One reason for the youths' difficulty in securing employment is that some employers do not want to hire green hands. Hence those who have just stepped out of school, especially the teenagers who have low educational qualifications and low skills, will not have much say in determining their wages. Sometimes it is even more difficult for them to get full-time jobs. Furthermore, some of the young people who have just joined the workforce might not have a clear idea as to what career is suitable for them; nor have they received vocational training. Even if they had found a job, they might show reluctance to work any more after a short while. In this case, they do not want to work, nor do the employers want to hire them, and a high unemployment rate among the young people is resulted.

In fact, some people from the grassroots or some teenagers who really are not interested in reading books would like to receive some skills training. However, the courses in this regard can be rather expensive in Hong Kong and beyond their means. Moreover, some of these courses are more theoretical and less practical. If we ask the youths who were reluctant to attend a secondary grammar school to study in a theory course now, they are really unwilling to do so. Instead, they prefer to take courses that allow them to practice. Therefore I think the Government should continue to consider how to promote and implement the apprenticeship programme.

In fact, we have a wrong impression all along, thinking that there is no need for apprentices since Hong Kong has no more industry. In fact, many business sectors still need them. For example, sectors like air-conditioning and

public utilities still need the participation by apprentices and technicians. Therefore, I hope that the Government will expand the existing apprenticeship programme. In particular, comprehensive consideration should be given to amending the current Apprenticeship Ordinance, which has not been amended for several decades.

We should not think that apprentices seem to have lost their value. According to a reply to my question in June from the Labour and Welfare Bureau, at the end of March in year 2010-2011, the number of apprentices who registered themselves on a voluntary basis had reached 1 341, indicating a rising trend. Furthermore, we have talked to a number of organizations, especially some public utilities, and find that in some public utilities regretted that they had abolished their apprenticeship systems over the last decade, to the extent that there was succession gap among their technicians. Therefore, we see that some public utilities have begun to restore, or are planning to restore, their apprenticeship systems, in the hope that they can attract some young people to work with them. Therefore, I hope that the Government will give the existing apprenticeship system and Apprenticeship Ordinance a full review, to see if they should be amended, so as to let our young people have proper protection.

The new plans mentioned in the Policy Address start out from two professions, namely beauty service and hairdressing, and provide trainees with basic courses in the first year, as well as professional skills courses in the second year. I think that the nature of the new plans bears some resemblance to an apprenticeship programme. I feel that this is a good, conducive beginning, albeit a much delayed one. In my view, the authorities should carry out a study on how to effectively promote these plans to their targets of service. In addition, I hope that a review of the result can be conducted at an opportune time after one year or upon the graduation of the first class of trainees and that these plans can be extended to other service industries which can then be included as designated professions under the Apprenticeship Ordinance.

President, finally, I wish to briefly express my views on the issue of the elderly. In the Policy Address, the Government indicates that it will increase the number of nursing home places for the elderly, which is a move we appreciate. However, the supply of places in these nursing homes is far from meeting the demand, and we hope the Government can do more work in this respect. Indeed, the Policy Address mentions one point, which says that because due to

some senior citizens' specific demands for the district location of nursing homes, it takes a longer time to find places that match their demand. In this regard, we hope the Government understands that we do not find such demands of the senior citizens excessive because they have emotional attachment to the places which they have lived in and are familiar with. When they uproot themselves for a strange place, they will find it hard to adapt. Most importantly, they will lose almost all the social contacts they previously have, making it hard for them to adapt to the life in a new place. Therefore, we think that the Government should set up nursing homes according to the level of ageing of the population in a district, with more such homes established in districts where the level of ageing of the population is higher.

Another issue is the promotion of home care services by the Government. In fact, we have always welcomed home care services, and we hold that such services should be implemented because in most cases neither the elderly want to go to a nursing home nor their families want to place them there, except as a last resort or when there is no other choice. The Government proposes in the Policy Address to provide subsidies under the CSSA scheme to senior citizens aged 60 or above who stay at home; we think that this can lessen the burden for the recipients and their families. However, I hope the Government can understand that in many families with senior citizens, some family members may have to stay home to take care of the elderly who have chronic illness or who need a high degree of attention and care. They have no support from the Government at this Financially, at best they enjoy tax allowances for caring for their parents, but when there is a family member who needs to stay home to take care of an elder, the effect is that one family member cannot work outside home. the light of this situation, I hope the Government can provide financial support to these families. I believe that this is also an incentive making it unnecessary for some people to prematurely hand over their parents to the nursing homes. would also alleviate the condition of long waiting for places in the nursing homes, as well as the demand for them. The FTU has always hoped that the Government can introduce some form of subsidies for these caregivers who look after senior citizens so that they can stay home to look after the elderly.

Another issue of concern to us is that, at the same time when places are being increased in the nursing homes, hopefully the number of caregivers can also be greatly increased. Take occupational therapists and physical therapists as example, that is, caregivers of the professional grade, we hold that the Government should increase their numbers correspondingly. Although the number of caregivers for ordinary nursing homes can be increased through retraining programmes, given the increase in the number of these nursing homes and their workload, we hope the Government can lower the ratio of caregivers to those being cared. According to the provisions of the regulations governing residential care homes for the elderly currently in force, in the residential care homes that provide intensive attention and care, the ratio of ordinary caregivers to those being cared and the ratio of assistants to those being cared, are respectively 1:20 and 1:40 during daytime. In our view, these ratios should be lowered, especially in the residential care homes that look after senior citizens who have special illnesses, such as those who suffer from dementia. Training should also be strengthened. These are our views, which we hope the Government will consider.

President, I am sorry, because I needed to handle a case of labour dispute yesterday so I missed the debate session yesterday, and I have interrupted things a little bit today, please excuse me. I so submit.

DR LAM TAI-FAI (in Cantonese): President, since I have only five minutes of speaking time left, I am keen to use these five minutes to talk about education. President, before I speak, I would like to declare that I am the Supervisor of Lam Tai Fai College, a Member of the Council of The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, as well as the Chairman of the Clothing Industry Training Authority.

President, I was acquainted with the Chief Executive only after I became a Member of this Council, so I have acquainted with him for just three years. I do not have frequent contact with him ordinarily but I believe the Chief Executive is undoubtedly a "smart person". I know that he joined the Government as a civil servant after completing secondary school education. During his career in the civil service, he kept on studying and striving for success. He has also been sent overseas by the Government for further studies. Since then, he rose steadily in his career and has finally assumed the position of the Chief Executive.

While personal strengths and unremitting endeavours contribute partly to the remarkable achievements of the Chief Executive, the key to his success was the many opportunities provided by the Government for his upward mobility. The Government has nurtured him by giving him numerous chances for further studies to enhance his value. Therefore, I deeply believe that the Chief Executive should share the same feeling that every person needs opportunities for upward mobility. Only by pursuing further studies to add value can one achieve accomplishments. This will also have an impact on the development of his life.

However, today's secondary school-leavers in Hong Kong are not as lucky as the Chief Executive. As we all know, every year, there are at least 5 000 to 6 000 secondary school-leavers who meet the university admission requirements are denied entry to the universities to enhance their value because of a shortage of university places. As we all know, while they want to look for jobs in society, the unemployment rate among those aged between 15 and 19 constantly hits double digits with the latest figure close to 17%. The situation has directly jeopardized the chances of upward mobility of these secondary school-leavers.

Secretary, with such a huge fiscal reserves, the Government should and need to devise ways to increase the number of universities places without any delay. Otherwise, it would only result in many people's talent being wasted year after year.

President, Mainland universities will launch a scheme next year, under which Hong Kong students are exempted from taking examinations for admission to these universities. I believe that nowadays, quite a number of Hong Kong students are interested in furthering their studies on the Mainland. I suggest that the Government should consider providing subsidies in the form of education vouchers for qualified students to study at universities on the Mainland. I believe such a move could solve the problem of inadequate places at local universities right away. What's more, it also helps nurture more talents with proficiency in both Mainland and Hong Kong affairs to tie in with the policy of greater integration between Hong Kong and the Mainland advocated by our nation.

I strongly support the policy of 15-year free education. At present, while kindergartens are supported by the voucher system, there are inadequate university places for secondary school-leavers. This problem cannot be resolved for the time being. Therefore, Secretary, while the provision of 15-year free education may be a task for the next Chief Executive, the problem of inadequate university places, as I believe, should be tackled within this term of Government without delay.

President, leaders of our country always say that human resources are of prime importance. During his visit to Hong Kong, Vice-Premier LI Keqiang said in all earnestness that we should step up efforts to provide quality education. Today's world is highly competitive. Competition between cities is indeed a competition over education and a contest for talent. However, it seems that the Chief Executive has not paid heed to Vice-Premier's warming as this year's Policy Address fails to allocate more resources on the area of education. Indeed, I am a bit disappointed by this.

The Government frequently says that the expenditure on education has accounted for 23% of its total expenditure, the largest spending area of the Government. However, Secretary, when compared with other countries, it is found that Hong Kong's spending on the area of education is actually not enough. For example, government expenditure on education is estimated at \$68.7 billion this year, accounting for about 3.7% of our GDP. This figure is on the low side when compared with those of other developed countries. In the United Kingdom, the United States, and Switzerland, education spending makes up 5.4% of their GDP. The figure is 6.4% for New Zealand, 4.8% for South Korea, and 4.5% for Taiwan. Even for the Mainland, it targets its education spending at 4% of its GDP. In comparison, Hong Kong's spending in this area is obviously To catch up with the economically advanced countries such as the United Kingdom and the United States, I think education spending should at least reach 5% of the GDP. On the basis that the current GDP stands at \$1,800 billion, expenditure on education could reach \$90 billion. In other words, there is still some \$20 billion which we can spend on education.

In fact, in terms of the current reserve level of the Hong Kong Government, the amount is absolutely affordable. Education is an investment, not expenditure. It is an investment in the future, which will have a direct impact on the prosperity of society.

President, I so submit.

MS AUDREY EU (in Cantonese): President, as I do not have much time left, I can only talk briefly about healthcare and education in these two sessions.

President, on the healthcare front, I want to point out that there are always contradictions on the part of the Government. You may recall that Chief Executive Donald TSANG called upon Hong Kong families to have three children each, and in this Policy Address, at least two paragraphs have mentioned low fertility rate and encouraged Hong Kong people to raise more children. However, Hong Kong does not have enough manpower and beds for pregnant women, and as a result, local pregnant women have taken to the street not just once but several times. I think this really has revealed the contradictions in administration.

However, I find one point in the Policy Address comparatively positive. It is stated in paragraph 60 that we should regard Mainland pregnant women giving birth in Hong Kong in a positive manner, as this helps alleviate the problem of an ageing population in Hong Kong. However, it is a pity that I do not see much positive effort made by the SAR Government to clarify and encourage the situation. I only find comments in the society that these pregnant women giving birth in Hong Kong have snatched the benefits available to Hong Kong people, thus creating problems for Hong Kong. Although the Chief Executive points out in his Policy Address that we should view this problem in a positive manner, I fail to see much publicity launched by the Government in this regard.

Moreover, the Policy Address also mentions the shortage of healthcare personnel and the Government's intention to provide more degree places, but at the same time, we see that the Government encourages healthcare personnel to go to the Mainland to develop business as well as attracting people from elsewhere to Hong Kong to use the medical service. On the other hand, the Government makes no effort to address the problem of staff wastage either. We have in this Council talked about the unfair distribution of staff establishment and resources among hospital clusters but all these problems have not been dealt with, thus giving rise to a shortage of manpower. Establishment is very important and the Government has never clearly explained the manpower ratio between patients and healthcare personnel.

Dr PAN Pey-chyou and Dr LEUNG Ka-lau are experts in this regard. They have talked about the manpower problem and I certainly agree with some of the points they made. But I want to highlight a point. In Dr LEUNG Ka-lau's speech he mentioned paragraph 197 of the Policy Address. He said that

entrepreneurs are smarter than the Government as they know the market, and therefore, the Government should not impose too many restrictions on the land grant for hospitals. It is better to let people seize the business opportunities and build hospitals that are needed. This is a point to which I can never agree. From what I heard, he is an expert in the treatment of large intestine, and if a hospital specializing in the treatment of large intestine is set up to attract Mainlanders coming to Hong Kong for taking such operations, this of course is business opportunity and can make money. However, I would be very worried if I were a patient who needed to undergo colon surgery, and if by any unfortunate chance that during such operation, I suddenly suffered from a stroke, heart disease or cardiothoracic problems, what could I do then? Of course I know that there are specialist hospitals, hospitals for the elderly, children's hospitals, mental hospitals, but I really do not hope that the Secretary just goes for hospitals that create business opportunities for medical practitioners.

President, furthermore, on the education front, since I have served as a legislator, the two policies among others that I want to strive for are small class teaching and fifteen years of free education. I remember that in 2007, during the Chief Executive Election Debate between Mr Alan LEONG and Mr Donald TSANG, the latter said that if he were elected Chief Executive, the first thing he would do was to implement small class teaching in primary schools. Of course, small class teaching for primary schools has now been implemented right from primary one, but I will continue to strive for the implementation of small class teaching in secondary schools. Secretary Michael SUEN told me that if small class teaching was to be implemented for secondary schools, it would cost \$40 billion and therefore it could not be implemented. The issue would be left to the next Chief Executive election. Secretary Michael SUEN, we now see the hot candidates for the next Chief Executive election repeatedly saying that there is a need for implementing 15-year free education and small class teaching in secondary schools. I want the Secretary to tell us in his response later whether the \$40 billion he described is an exaggeration or those undeclared Chief Executive candidates are making "kiting cheques".

President, we often hear comments saying that we should not politicize issues and should focus on people's livelihood instead. I think Hong Kong people actually understand that any policy, be it medical or educational, involves the allocation of money and in fact has something to do with the political structure. Mr Alan LEONG stated in the 2007 Election that "You are the boss

when you have choice". Of course, Hong Kong has only small circle election at present. However, if we really want to take forward policies that have the consensus of Hong Kong people, we really have to implement dual elections by universal suffrage in the political structure and develop party politics.

As regards the theme "From Strength to Strength" in the Chief Executive's current Policy Address, I find it very ironic. Under the existing Chief Executive election system and political system, how can we develop "from strength to strength"? The tea cools down as soon as the person is gone. We simply do not know how things are done in the next term. Therefore, I really wish Hong Kong people to understand that we have to strive for dual elections by universal suffrage and implementation of party politics as soon as possible. Thank you, President.

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): If not, I will call upon three public officers to speak. They may speak up to a total of 45 minutes.

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Cantonese): President, I thank Members for their views on various policy areas. I would like to speak on the policies of the current Government on healthcare services first.

Over the past five years, the Government has been very generous in injecting resources into healthcare services. Since the year 2006-2007, we have substantially increased our healthcare recurrent funding on a yearly basis to a total of 34%, and that is over \$10 billion in 2011-2012, from constituting 15% of the Government's recurrent expenditure to 17%, of which funding for the Hospital Authority (HA) has increased by one-fourth.

With regard to manpower, we have increased the number of medical school places from 250 each year to 320 starting from the year before, and this will

further be increased to 420 next year. There have also been increases in the numbers of nurses and allied health professionals school places. In order to supply the additional manpower required, the HA has also reopened the nursing school.

Meanwhile, we have also conducted in-depth studies on how to meet challenges to our healthcare system in the next few decades arising from demographic changes and rising healthcare costs in Hong Kong. We also put forward proposals on a comprehensive healthcare reform and financing arrangements in 2008. After two phases of public consultation, the healthcare reform proposal has generally obtained the support of members of various sectors in the community.

The Government is also making proper use of the increased healthcare funding for promoting various healthcare reforms, including the enhancement of primary healthcare services, the promotion of public and private sector collaboration, the creation of an electronic health record exchange system and the strengthening of the public and private sector safety net.

The objective of our reforms is to establish a sustainable healthcare system, so as to enhance the level of our healthcare services and public health in Hong Kong. I would now like to specifically mention our work in the following major healthcare areas.

We would continue to adopt a "three-pronged" approach for promoting the Health Protection Scheme (HPS) within the coming two years or so in accordance with the outcome of the second stage public consultation on healthcare reform.

First of all, we will establish a HPS working group under the Health_and Medical Development Advisory Committee by the end of this year to formulate detailed proposals, including the supervisory and institutional framework on the implementation of the HPS. As the Government has already set aside \$50 billion in our fiscal reserve for supporting the healthcare reform, we will consider how best the fiscal reserve can be used for launching the HPS.

Secondly, we will also establish a high level Steering Committee for conducting a strategic review on healthcare manpower planning and professional development, so as to ensure that the supply of healthcare personnel can meet the known and anticipated healthcare needs of the community, and to maintain and enhance the quality and standards of various healthcare professions.

Thirdly, we will promote and support the development of healthcare services and supporting facilities by allocating land for the development of private hospitals, as well as enhancing the transparency and competitiveness of private sector services in respect of their quality and charges.

We anticipate that the three tasks mentioned above will be completed by the first half of 2013, and we will then move on to the necessary legislative procedures, in the hope that the HPS can be implemented as soon as possible.

While taking forward the HPS, we will also continue to improve our public healthcare services, so as to maintain the public healthcare system as the cornerstone of our local healthcare system and universal healthcare safety net. We will continue to enhance our commitment towards public healthcare by further increasing the allocation of funding for healthcare services, improving the services of the public healthcare system, and implementing various services reform proposals.

We are now working through a number of measures to ensure that there will be an adequate supply of healthcare personnel to provide various services.

The HA has always attached much importance to the problem of brain-drain of healthcare personnel. In order to retain talents and raise morale, the HA has adopted a series of measures, including enhancing recruitment (such as recruiting part-time staff and qualified doctors from overseas), providing additional posts at promotion ranks and strengthening professional training.

Regarding recruitment, the HA plans to recruit a total of about 330 doctors, 1 720 nurses and 590 allied health professionals in 2011-2012.

Regarding training, the HA provides systematic training for allied health professionals through the Institute of Advanced Health Studies, and increases the number of training quotas for nurses, as well as sponsoring healthcare personnel on short-term overseas trainings or attachment.

The HA has also reduced the workload of front-line healthcare personnel through re-engineering work processes, streamlining processes and employing additional support staff. For example, it has reviewed the work of doctors, improved their work hours, and recruited additional clinical support staff to support the work of nurses and reduced the amount of non-nursing duties undertaken by nurses, and enhanced the efficiency of allied health professions by replacing their medical instruments and equipment.

With regard to increasing the supply of healthcare professionals through local training, as the Chief Executive has indicated in this year's Policy Address, for the three years starting from 2012, the Government will allocate \$200 million to increase the number of first-year first-degree places in medicine by 100, nursing (including psychiatric nurses) by 40 and allied health professions (including medical laboratory technologists, radiographers, physiotherapists, occupational therapists) by 146.

Furthermore, the HA and self-financing post-secondary institutions will also enhance the training of nurses in order to sustain the supply of manpower.

I would now like to respond to a recent issue which has been quite controversial, and that is, whether we should recruit suitable doctors from overseas or not.

There is no doubt that it is Government policy to ensure an adequate supply of healthcare personnel, including doctors, in the public healthcare system. If there were an insufficient supply of doctors in a certain specialty or hospital, then we must start recruiting, which will include local recruitment exercises. We will also consider recruiting suitable personnel from overseas through restricted registration. This is not a new policy as many medical graduates from the Mainland served in designated organizations of Hong Kong back in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. We also recruited a considerable number of Burma medical graduates to come and work in Hong Kong in the 1960s and 1970s.

I was a graduate from that period and had worked with these doctors for many years, and I also understand that with time and the necessary co-ordination, these doctors can provide this kind of services in Hong Kong. We will certainly not see these doctors as primary staff. In order to sustain the relevant services in times of need, these additional doctors are necessary. The HA has now proposed to recruit about a dozen or so to a few dozens of such doctors and there are over 5 200 doctors within the HA. In other words, the number of doctors to be recruited is only less than 1%.

As such, I do not think that this will have any impact on internal competition, let alone competition with the private healthcare system. Therefore, I do not think that any medical concern groups or physician groups need to have any concern over this issue.

Faced with the growth and ageing of our population, as well as the rapid development of medical technologies, the HA will continue to deploy the allocated additional resources to improve its services to the public.

In the coming year, the HA will increase the number of neonatal intensive care beds by 10%. It will also enhance haemodialysis services for end-stage renal disease patients, and magnetic resonance imaging and computerized tomography scanning services for the diagnosis of critical illness. The HA will also continue to provide more drugs with higher efficacy through the Hospital Authority Drug Formulary.

In terms of hardware, we will consider constructing new hospitals or carrying out redevelopment or expansion works to existing hospitals in accordance with demographic changes, healthcare needs and the overall healthcare services of various hospital clusters.

With regard to the construction of new hospitals, the Tin Shui Wai Hospital and the Centre of Excellence in Paediatrics are now under active planning and the North Lantau Hospital will also be completed in late 2012.

On the issue of hospital redevelopments and expansions, the expansion of the Tseung Kwan O Hospital will be completed by 2013; the second phase redevelopment plan of the Caritas Hospital will be completed by 2014, and the redevelopment works of the Yan Chai Hospital will be completed by 2016. Furthermore, in preparing for the expansion works of the United Christian Hospital, we plan to call tenders and apply to the Finance Committee for funding next year.

In addition to enhancing our overall public healthcare services on a continued basis, the authorities have also continued to enhance healthcare support for the elderly. For example, in order to enhance primary care services for the elderly, the authorities have introduced the Elderly Health Care Voucher Pilot Scheme (the Pilot Scheme) for three years and so far more than 370 000 qualified elderly persons have benefited through the Pilot Scheme. Starting from next year, the Pilot Scheme will be extended for three years with the value of the vouchers being doubled to \$500. The Elderly Vaccination Subsidy Scheme which offers subsidies to the elderly for influenza and pneumococcal vaccination has already entered into its third year.

Moreover, in order to further encourage preventive healthcare for the elderly, the Government is planning to introduce a pilot scheme in conjunction with voluntary agencies so as to motivate the relevant agencies to provide health assessment services for the elderly.

In order to cater for the dental healthcare needs of the elderly, the Government will introduce a three-year pilot scheme in co-ordination with non-government agencies starting from this year to provide primary dental and oral hygiene out-reach services, including dental check-ups and scaling for elderly people in residential homes and day care centres. It is anticipated that about 80 000 elderly people will benefit from the scheme.

I have to mention that the Government is very concerned about the development of Chinese medicine, and will continue to identify sites for developing Chinese medical clinics in 18 districts. To cater for the needs of Chinese medicine graduates and their professional developments, the Government will also offer them more assistance so as to facilitate smoother professional operations. Such measures include "Hong Kong label" testing and certification for Chinese medicine raw materials in Hong Kong, and this will also be generally completed by next year.

The Government is also committed to promoting mental health and ensuring that people who require mental health services will be provided with a series of comprehensive and coherent services which include prevention, early detection, treatment and rehabilitation.

In recent years, we have introduced various measures to enhance our community support service for patients suffering from mental illness, in order to facilitate their rehabilitation and community re-integration. Such measures include outreach intervention service for the extremely high-risk patients, implementation of an integrated mental health plan, providing assessment and treatment services for general psychiatric patients at the primary healthcare level, enhancing psychogeriatric outreach services and extending the Early Assessment Service for Young People with Early Psychosis, which currently targets at teenagers, to cover adults.

As regards children suffering from autism and patients suffering from dementia, we will provide treatment and suitable support. Currently, about 6 000 children suffering from autism are receiving treatments from the HA. The HA will continue to expand its professional team in the year 2011-2012, so as to offer treatments and trainings for more diagnosed children.

The HA will also continue to offer support and education on autism to parents and caregivers of sick children and will maintain close contacts with schools and early education training centres, so as to provide appropriate referral and support services.

As regards patients suffering from dementia, the Government will provide appropriate services in accordance with the clinical needs of patients through a multi-pronged approach. The Neurology will identify the condition of dementia patients through clinical diagnosis, blood tests and diagnostic radiology, and drug treatments will be offered. Some patients will be referred to memory clinics for drug treatments, cognitive training, nursing needs assessments and rehabilitation services.

The Psychiatry will provide in-patient, out-patient, day training and community support services through a multi-disciplinary team made up of doctors, nurses and allied health professionals.

Furthermore, in order to enhance the effectiveness of treatments, the HA has increased the use of new anti-dementia drugs in recent years. From 2008-2009 to 2010-2011, the number of HA patients taking anti-dementia drugs have increased to about 3 400 on a continuous basis.

In promoting the development of private healthcare, the Government has reserved four sites in Wong Chuk Hang, Tseung Kwan O, Tai Po and Lantau respectively for private hospital developments. We are now formulating arrangements on land grants and tenders will be called by stages starting from the first quarter of next year.

In order to ensure that the new hospitals will provide good quality services, the Government will set some special conditions for development, for example, on the scope of service such as types of specialist services, standard of service such as the number of hospital beds, certification of hospitals and transparency of hospital charges. As such, detailed designs and legal advice are required before tender conditions can be drawn up. We plan to put up two sites first for tender in the first quarter of next year.

As regards the regulation of private hospitals, the Social Welfare Department will register private hospitals which complied with the registration conditions on accommodation, equipment and staffing in accordance with the provisions of the Hospitals, Nursing Homes and Maternity Homes Registration Ordinance. The Department of Health has also laid down standards of good practice for the use of private hospitals in accordance with the Code of Practice for Private Hospitals, Nursing Homes and Maternity Homes.

In order to monitor the performance of private hospitals, the Department of Health will enhance its efforts on conducting regular or surprise inspections on private hospitals. Furthermore, we implemented the hospital accreditation pilot scheme (the Pilot Scheme) in 2009, with the intention of enhancing the quality of services in private and public hospitals, and to ensure that a uniform accreditation standard on the quality of hospitals which is up to the international standard is in place for assessing the performances of hospitals on various aspects.

Currently, three private hospitals have joined the Pilot Scheme and passed the assessment, and was awarded a four-year accreditation. In order to strengthen the monitoring of private hospitals, we will also continue to look into the room for amendment to the existing legislation, if any.

President, I have listened very carefully to the speeches of Members, in particular to the speech of Dr LEUNG Ka-lau earlier, for he represented the views of doctors. I believe that he has given full play to his functions as a Member

returned through his functional constituency. He has talked about whether there will be additional doctors in Hong Kong and what problems will be brought about by such doctors to the community.

I certainly agree that Hong Kong will have to deal with additional problems if there are additional doctors, but in the light of our current circumstances, I believe that we still have a long way to go before there are surplus doctors in Hong Kong. We must increase professional training and manpower supply, and enhance quality training in all areas.

I am particularly concerned about the views which the doctors' representatives have continued to express recently, among which there was a letter from the Hong Kong Medical Association (HKMA) to the Chief Executive, and I believe that copies of the letter have already been given to Members.

I must first declare that I am a member of the HKMA. I am a senior member and joined the HKMA 40 years ago. There is an important provision in the charter of the HKMA, to the general effect that the HKMA has to protect the health and safety of the public. The motto of the HKMA is "safeguarding the health of the people", meaning that the main consideration of all medical organizations and members of the Medical Council of Hong Kong should be the interests of the community and the well-being of patients and the community. The interests of any sector should not be placed above that of patients.

I remember that the emblem of the HKMA is very "special". When I joined the HKMA 40 years ago, I was told that if we bought the emblem and hanged it in the front of our cars, then we have less chances of receiving a fixed penalty ticket.

I also remembered that I was occasionally deployed to the United Christian Hospital and the Caritas Hospital and had to take up the work of other hospitals when I worked at the Princess Margaret Hospital in the 1980s, and thus had to drive from hospital to hospital. One day, I was stopped by a traffic policeman at Lung Cheung Road and he asked where I was going. I told him that I had to rush to the hospital. The policeman was very friendly and even acted as my escort. I have talked to other senior doctors recently and learned that nowadays, irrespective of what kind of emblems we displayed or even when we were

wearing white gowns or carrying stereoscopes, the police will still issue penalty tickets if necessary.

Though doctors should not enjoy any preferential treatment, I think the fact that doctors and many professionals are respected and loved by the community is attributed to their professional spirits, words and deeds. As such, I hope that our colleagues will live up to the expectations of the community in this regard, in particular with reference to their words and deeds.

Here, I would like to thank everyone again for their valuable comments.

This is the last policy address of the current Government. Looking back to the previous years, we can see that in meeting with the challenges of the ageing population on healthcare services, the Government has done a lot of work, which ranges from the injection of resources to system reform, and our healthcare reform has also moved into the phase of full implementation.

The problem of an ageing population, however, is a long-term issue and healthcare reform is also an ongoing task. We will continue to adhere to the direction of the healthcare reform, and continue to work hard for the sustainable development of Hong Kong's healthcare system in the future on the basis of the existing system.

Thank you, President.

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION (in Cantonese): President, the Chief Executive points out in his Policy Address that education not only enhances the quality and competitiveness of our population but also promotes social mobility. As such, the current Government has allocated substantial additional resources to improve the quality and quantity of education. Such measures include 12 years of free education; subsidized pre-school education; progressively implemented small class teaching in primary school; implementation of "the three-three-four" academic structure for integration with the international mainstream structure; and the substantially relaxed criteria for application for student financial assistance, whereby the number of students eligible for full assistance has been doubled. Such measures fully demonstrate our commitment and the importance we have attached to education.

In regard to post-secondary education, we have strived to open up multiple study pathways for young people through promoting complementary development of public and self-financing institutions. We will continue to inject substantial resources to subsidize institutions with public funds, and progressively double University Grant Committee (UGC)-funded senior year intakes to 4 000 each year starting from the 2012-2013 academic year. At the same time, we will increase the number of UGC-funded first-year undergraduate school places to 15 000. As the last batch of Form Seven graduates and the first batch of graduates under the new academic structure will be enrolled into the universities in the 2012-2013 academic year at the same time, we will offer a double number of first-year-first degree places, that is 30 000 places, in the year.

We have introduced various measures with regard to the self-financing post-secondary education sector for promoting its sustainable development. Such measures include land grants at nominal premiums; interest-free loans for supporting the construction of new premises by the institutions and so far \$5.2 billion in loans have been approved; the introduction of a \$100 million Quality Enhancement Grant Scheme for subsidizing quality enhancement programmes of the institutions; provision of accreditation grants; and the launch of a \$2.5 billion Self-financing Post-secondary Education Fund to provide scholarships and help institutions to enhance their qualities. We have also offered financial assistance to needy students of the self-financing institutions. The Policy Address further proposes to further extend the ambit of the Start-up Loan Scheme to offer financial support for the development of student hostels by self-financed degree awarding institutions and increase the total commitment of the Scheme by \$2 billion.

Furthermore, we propose to set up an International Cuisine College under the Vocational Training Council. The College will provide training for people aspiring to become professional chefs proficient in international cuisines. It will attract outstanding members of the culinary profession from around the world, and promote the development of related sectors, such as tourism, catering, retail and wine trading. We also proposed to establish one more youth college to provide alternative progression pathways for young people and to provide specialized support for non-Chinese speaking students and those with special educational needs.

The abovementioned measures will help promote a flexible and diversified education system with multiple entry and exit points to provide our young people with multiple study pathways. We anticipate that by the year 2015, more than one third of our youngsters within the school-age population group will have the opportunity to pursue degree courses. Together with the sub-degree places, the number of our young people attending post-secondary degree courses will be more than two thirds.

Some Members propose that 15 years of free education should be implemented. I have to point out that the Government has recognized the importance of pre-school education and have thus invested a lot of resources. The resources committed in the 2011-2012 financial year are more than \$2.5 billion, of which \$2.05 billion will be spent on the Pre-primary Education Voucher Scheme.

Local pre-primary education has all along been provided by private institutions and the Voucher Scheme dovetails the flexible and pluralistic features of our local pre-primary education which offers diversified options. In fact, since the implementation of the Voucher Scheme up to the current academic year, over 80% of the parents of kindergarten students have chosen to enrol their children in schools which have joined the Scheme. In addition to the vouchers, families with financial needs can also apply for additional school fee remission. Furthermore, we have also offered rent and rates subsidies to kindergartens located in areas with shortage of school places.

The proposal to implement free pre-primary education or incorporating kindergartens into the subsidized education mechanism will have profound impacts. We must first elucidate our goals so that the conditions which create quality pre-primary education can be prolonged and a number of technical issues also have to be addressed. Currently, the number of kindergarten students is less than 80% of the total number of kindergarten school places, and the number of students attending different kindergartens also varies greatly, from less than 10 to nearly 1 000. Kindergarten education services will become standardized if a flat-rated school fee is applied or if all tuition fees are covered by public funds. In that case, how can we maintain the diversified nature of pre-primary education? Should a limit be set on the minimum and maximum number of kindergartens and students in each class? How can we ensure that parents can have diversified options in their selection of kindergartens? We will continue to

maintain contact with the stakeholders, look into the impact of the relevant issues and find solutions.

Members have also talked about the issue of small class teaching in secondary schools. According to the recently released population projection figures by the Census and Statistics Department, the number of students attending Form One in Hong Kong will drop in the coming few years, and rise again after the 2016-2017 academic year, but further assessments are required at a later stage before we can learn about the actual situation. Before considering whether small class teaching should be implemented in secondary schools, we should learn from the experience of small class teaching in primary schools, and make careful consideration with regard to four aspects, namely the existing conditions of secondary schools, the teaching and learning environment of and available support in secondary schools, overseas experience and the allocation of resources. We cannot commit to small class teaching in secondary schools simply to meet the community's demand for small class teaching and before we can ascertain its effectiveness.

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

Small class teaching involves long-term structural changes, and will have a far-reaching impact on the adjustment of teaching models and the injection of secondary school education funding. In accordance with the implementation of the New Senior Secondary academic structure, we will take advantage of opportunities provided by the schools' participation in the "Voluntary Optimisation of Class Structure Scheme" and work with the education sector to research on a set of comprehensive flexible measures which will not only meet with the needs of the students, but also stabilize the education sector, so as to optimize teaching and learning in schools in the long run.

The Government is dedicated to helping non-Chinese speaking students to learn Chinese so that they can adapt to the local education system and integrate into the community as soon as possible. Support measures implemented since 2006 are developmental in nature. With the increasing number of non-Chinese speaking students attending local schools, we are now reviewing the support measures which have been implemented and consulting the views of

stakeholders, in order to more effectively improve the learning effectiveness of non-Chinese speaking students.

With regard to student financial assistance, we are now reviewing the operations of various non-means-tested loan schemes. We conducted the first phase of public consultation in 2010 and received a total of 600 or so written submissions. Many people are of the opinion that repayment arrangements, including interest rates, repayment period and the mechanism for extension, should be improved; the scope of eligible programmes should be appropriately tightened; and more effective measures should be adopted against defaulters. We are now working on the formulation of a comprehensive improvement plan and relevant proposals. It is anticipated that the second phase of public consultation will be conducted by the end of this year.

The Policy Address has also covered the issue of implementing national education. During the consultation on the Curriculum Guide on the Moral and National Education this year, although the education sector generally agrees with the idea of introducing the subject itself, it has offered many valuable comments in relation to certain implementation details, such as how this subject is related to other subjects, arrangement of teaching hours, learning and teaching strategies, learning assessments and learning and teaching resources. The Moral and National Education Ad Hoc Committee of the Curriculum Development Council (CDC) is now considering the views of various parties and developing implementation strategies, specific curriculum contents, as well as the mode and timetable of delivery, before submitting the revised proposals to the Government. With regard to how the subject is to be implemented, the Government will consider the proposals of the CDC in detail.

The Education Bureau will also provide more than 4 000 additional places under the "Passing on the Torch" programme starting from this school year to offer subsidies for students to participate in Mainland exchange programmes in order to achieve our target of subsidizing every primary and secondary student to join at least one Mainland exchange programme by the 2015-2016 school year, so as to enhance their knowledge of and experience in our national conditions. We will also further organize seminars and workshops for secondary and primary school teachers, enhance the development of relevant teaching and learning resources, and organize a teacher network to support the professional development of teachers.

Deputy President, the Government has always attached great importance to education and has made a lot of financial commitments. Our target is to enhance the quality and competitiveness of Hong Kong's manpower resources, so as to meet the challenges of a knowledge-based economy. We expect to continue to maintain good communication and effective co-operation with stakeholders to promote various education policies and measures in the coming year.

Thank you, Deputy President.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, Hong Kong is an Asian tourism and service industries centre. In view of the increasing number of visitors to Hong Kong, in particular those from the Mainland, we appreciate that Members and the public would expect us to provide more convenient customs clearance services.

In response to the above concern, the Immigration Department (ImmD) will expand its e-channel service to allow registered Mainland visitors who come to Hong Kong regularly to use the e-channel service for tourists at the Lo Wu and Lok Ma Chau Spur Line Control Point first, starting from January next year. This service will gradually be extended to other major control points. The ImmD will offer pre-register service for Mainland regular visitors to Hong Kong at the land crossings of Lo Wu, Lok Ma Chau, Lok Ma Chau Spur Line and the Shenzhen Bay in December.

Apart from opening new ports in the years to come, we are now carrying out improvement works to the Man Kam To and Lok Ma Chau Control Points by doubling the number of e-channels and improving the facilities in the passenger terminal buildings. It is anticipated that the relevant works will be completed by 2012 and 2013.

Regarding the issue of travel alerts which Mr Paul TSE has talked about earlier, I will respond to it in the next session. The SAR Government is very concerned about the recent case where Hong Kong residents were sentenced to imprisonment in the Philippines, which Mr Paul TSE has also mentioned. The ImmD has been offering assistance to the persons in question through the Office of the Commissioner of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic

of China in the Hong Kong Special Administrative and the Chinese Embassy in the Philippines (the Embassy). The Embassy has tried to find out about the situation and progress of the case by repeatedly contacting the local judiciary. The Embassy has also sent its staff to visit the persons concerned in the prison. The ImmD will continue to actively monitor the case.

In order that Hong Kong residents who are serving sentences overseas can adapt more easily to the prison lives and help with their rehabilitation, the policy of the SAR Government is to help transfer them back to Hong Kong to serve the remainder of their sentence, so that they can move back to a familiar environment with no-language-barrier. Their relatives and friends can visit them regularly, too. This is conducive to their rehabilitation.

The two Hong Kong persons in question can apply to the SAR or the Philippines Government if they wish to be transferred back and serve their sentence in Hong Kong. We will deal with their application in accordance with the provisions of the Transfer of Sentenced Persons Ordinance, Cap. 513 of the Laws of Hong Kong and the bilateral agreement signed between the SAR and the Philippines Governments on the transfer of sentenced persons. Generally speaking, the conditions for transfer back to Hong Kong include: (a) the conduct of which the sentence has been imposed would constitute a criminal offence according to the laws of Hong Kong if the offence has been committed in Hong Kong; (b) the sentenced person is a permanent resident of Hong Kong; (c) the judgment is final and no further proceedings relating to the offence or other offence are pending in that country; and (d) the SAR Government, the Philippines Government and the sentenced person all agree to the transfer.

On the issue of talent admission arrangements, with the global economic integration, changes in the external economy will easily pose risks to an export-oriented economy like Hong Kong. In order to maintain or even enhance our competitiveness, Hong Kong must attract talents around the world and continue to strive for a leading position in the knowledge-based economic development. As such, like other world cities, Hong Kong will make every effort to recruit talents in order to promote growth in the economy and trade, and bring in more local employment opportunities.

Hong Kong's attractiveness to overseas talents depends on a number of factors, such as the quality of local life, as well as employment and business

opportunities. The Government will maintain its existing open immigration policy to facilitate the admission of global talents to Hong Kong. Currently, no restrictions on the quota, industry or types of work have been laid down in the professional employment programmes of Hong Kong. Talents around the world may apply to Hong Kong through the "Quality Migrant Scheme", under which no prior approval of local employment is required.

In 2010, Hong Kong has attracted more than 39 000 overseas and Mainland talents. We will review the relevant immigration arrangements from time to time, and continue to strike a balance between attracting talents to Hong Kong, safeguarding the rights of local workers and meeting the development needs of the Hong Kong community.

Deputy President, I so submit.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): The fourth debate session ends. We now proceed to the fifth debate session, the theme of which is "Developing Democracy and Enhancing Governance". This session covers the following five policy areas: Judicial and Legal Affairs; Constitutional Affairs; Home Affairs (district administration and civic education); Civil Service and Government-funded Organization Staff Affairs; and Security Affairs (other than immigration and anti-drug policies). Members who wish to speak in this session please press the "Request to speak" button.

MR TIMOTHY FOK (in Cantonese): Deputy President, in the Policy Address of this year, which is the current Chief Executive's last one in his term of office, Donald TSANG points out that "to strengthen students' sense of national identity and commitment to national development, we should help them gain a comprehensive understanding of our motherland from different perspectives through systematic study."

I agree totally with the Government's idea to promote national education and believe that after adopting the suggestions of the education sector and youth groups, the revised package will facilitate successful implementation of national education and contribute significantly in nurturing a new generation of youths with a sense of responsibility and commitment.

While schools are an integral part of national education, they are not the only component, nor all of it. Anyway, school education forms only a part of a youth's growth. Physical education, culture and art may affect the development of teenagers more extensively, especially in inducing and shaping their character, morality and values. Moreover, sports and culture are essential to the quality life of the people and sources of adhesion and creativity. They display the soft and comprehensive power of a nation. The spiritual inspiration of an outstanding sportsman, sportswoman or culturist far exceeds that from the books. We can remember WONG Wan-yiu, the cyclist who won the silver medal in the Asian Games last year by persisting in hopping on a replacement bike and dashing to the finish despite her wounds from a pile-up. The sportsmanship she displayed was inspiring indeed.

The Sixth Plenary Session of the 17th CPC Central Committee has decided to enhance transformation of the cultural system by specifying promoting the cultural industry and boosting influence internationally as the state's strategy to construct a "cultural power".

Hong Kong should make an effort to promote traditional Chinese culture, especially in the heritage and exploration of Southern Chinese culture. While strengthening exchanges in the economic field with the Mainland, cultural exchanges should also be enhanced. In particular, the Government should give regular support to interflow activities among the youths in the Mainland, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macao. Moreover, the youngsters in Hong Kong do not have sufficient understanding of Chinese culture, which gives rise to disagreement and differences in many issues. The Government should focus its efforts on educating the youth on traditional values and cultivating in them a national sense.

I so submit in support of the motion.

DR MARGARET NG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, the last Policy Address of Chief Executive Donald TSANG in his term sounds similar, making one think of the last Policy Address of the last Governor, Mr Christopher PATTEN, but a closer look reveals a big difference. Mr PATTEN set out on the right track by on the one hand summarizing the political achievements of the colonial government in the governance of Hong Kong, including his own deeds since he assumed office; and on the other hand anticipating how the handover of

sovereignty would lay a foundation for the next page of Hong Kong history. He did not forget to thank civil servants and the people of Hong Kong for their contributions and he also made use of the opportunity to criticize the various directions of the Chinese side which, he thought, were wrong. He highlighted the proud growth of Hong Kong economy since 1961 when data were available. He gave a few words to the Chinese side: Hong Kong was such a small place, but its Gross Domestic Product (GDP) had reached HK\$1,105 billion, accounting for 20% of China's GDP. He also made a humorous comment on his homeland by saying that Hong Kong's per capita GDP amounted to US\$23,000, higher than that of the United Kingdom.

In those days, Mr PATTEN was arrogant, which properly reflected the complacency of Hong Kong people then. Today, however, Chief Executive Donald TSANG started his speech with the birth of public housing arising from a big fire in Shek Kip Mei in 1954, aiming to stress how the Hong Kong Government has made progress in developing housing policies. Unfortunately, the reality is that the biggest problem lies in the housing policies. He himself has to admit in paragraph 5 that "people have become frustrated because it is more difficult for them to own a home". Apart from housing, he has to admit at the same time that "despite sustained economic growth in recent years, the widening of the wealth gap is still a source of social discontent". Government is rich while people are poor, so on the page where he makes his conclusion Chief Executive Donald TSANG highlights his achievements. example, the size of our economy expanded by 55% in real terms between 1997 and 2010; the number of jobs increased by 500 000; and Hong Kong's credit rating was upgraded to "AAA". He feels good himself, but he fails to appreciate the feelings of people at all. Therefore, the more Hong Kong people in desperate straits hear from him, the more disgusted they feel. Will such a Policy Address be satirized as a mechanical imitation with the opposite effect?

Deputy President, as the title of this Policy Address is "From strength to Strength", we might as well have a close look at what precedence the TSANG administration has set for the future of Hong Kong and what institutional system it has inaugurated. First of all, I have to point out that as a matter of fact the practice of combining the Policy Address and Budget consultations initiated by Chief Executive Donald TSANG is not right. The Policy Address contains policy proposals formally put forward by Chief Executive Donald TSANG to this Council. They will be discussed by Members and relayed to the community

before being finalized. In the Budget, these policy proposals will be prioritized according on our financial strength. A combined consultation reflects Chief Executive Donald TSANG's self-righteous mindset. What he says is final.

Of all the paragraphs in the Policy Address, the one which Chief Executive Donald TSANG feels proudest of is paragraph 183, under the heading of so-called "Political Ethics". Unfortunately, the real content under such a big heading is flimsy stuff meaning no more than that there should not be confrontation and vulgar language. If Members of political parties insist on confrontation and refuse to make compromise, it is in violation of political ethics. In fact, the real specific creation of Mr TSANG in HKSAR's political ethics is an ideology of differentiation according to affinity. In implementing the idea, he made his final strike before departure from office by recommending the promotion of a Director of Bureau who excels in fawning upon the wishes of his superiors but scores low popularity to the top post of Chief Secretary for Administration. The promotion of such a person made thousands take to the streets. It might not dismantle the city but it will stay in history.

It is an old saying that "there should be differentiation according to affinity and priority according to seniority". To distinguish affinity, seniority and gender is the foundation of social courtesy, but the saying does not teach people to let a close relative's interest override public interest. However, Chief Executive Donald TSANG has a unique interpretation of his. In his view, attachment to government policies is "close" affinity, while objection to them is "distant" affinity. In social intercourse and dealings, and even the appointment of public posts, those who are close enjoy additional attention, while those who are distant should be disfavoured and rejected. Such practice violates Hong Kong community's core values of making a clear distinction between public and private interests and attaching importance to different views. It may be described as a loud announcement of a crooked idea.

In the past, the motto of civil servants is "speak truth to power". Frank remonstrance is the first principle of loyal and dutiful civil servants. But Donald TSANG, once head of civil servants, has demonstrated personally how to show loyalty to superiors. He will bow and greet when he sees leaders, and take out his notebook to make notes carefully. This is really amazing. Superiors' examples are excessively followed by inferiors. When Vice Premier LI Keqiang visited the University of Hong Kong, a large number of police officers were

deployed to offer strict protection. It was not strange for these over-sensitive police officers to detain members of the public. Chief Executive Donald TSANG naturally takes it for granted that respectful salutation will come from Hong Kong people, just like the way he treats leaders. In the past, Hong Kong governors only needed the escort of a policeman for security purpose when they moved around. Today, officials moving around need attendants crowding round. Such style of these officials is unusual, even in the times of TUNG Chee-hwa. If it is described as mainlandization, why should it be enhanced and glorified by an old official left behind by the previous reign?

Deputy President, some kindhearted members of the public believe that Chief Executive Donald TSANG is not his own master in many matters and his personal wishes are good. The first Chief Executive TUNG Chee-hwa accomplished nothing and left a dilapidated system behind in his term of office, which reminded people of the good old days. So Donald TSANG assumed duty with high expectations from members of the public. But the fact is that the higher the expectations are, the greater the disappointment is. Donald TSANG has expanded the Political Appointment System by casually appointing Deputy Directors of Bureau and Political Assistants with attractive remuneration packages. Mainlandization has intensified in the arena of officialdom.

In his Policy Address, Chief Executive Donald TSANG claims to "have set the timetable for universal suffrage" (quoted from paragraph 207). In fact, the "timetable" given in response to the report submitted by the Government to the Central Government in 2007 was a big regression. Prior to that decision, Hong Kong people, including the Democratic Party, had no doubt about the definition of universal suffrage and only had disputes over the time to implement it. when the National People's Congress (NPC) declared the universal suffrage for the Chief Executive in 2017, it also changed the universal definition of universal suffrage, paving the way for the permanent retention of functional constituencies. In the past two years, the voice of the functional constituency has become more and more peremptory and fought for power and benefit. A Director of Bureau has just pointed out that a Member has set an example of bringing the functional constituency into full play. This is obvious to all. The Constitutional Reform Proposals not only increase functional constituency seats, but also retain the narrow and black-box voter coverage of the so-called traditional functional constituency seats. All of us know well whether Chief Executive Donald TSANG has or has not tried his best to fight for democracy for Hong Kong.

regrettable that he has destroyed quite a large number of government recorders before his departure from office and I am afraid that history has been turned into ashes.

The replacement mechanism is a tactic used by Donald TSANG to most nakedly deprive Hong Kong people of their election rights with an aim to ensure that even the Government is ruthless, directly elected Members cannot bring public opinion into play in the most direct and clear way through by-elections after resigning from their posts. I really do not know which region claiming to believe in democracy in the world would deprive voters of their by-election rights for an amount of HK\$160 million.

The Government hurriedly introduced a bill on the replacement mechanism without conducting any public consultation at all in an attempt to have it passed in a few weeks with the majority votes from the pro-government camp, which includes Members elected by functional constituencies in contravention of democracy. It is really absurd to veto the decision of how to fill the vacant seats through direct elections with the strength of functional constituencies. Association released four statements one after another, specifying that the replacement mechanism contravened the Basic Law and the International Covenant on Human Rights and refuting it, but the Government remained unmoved, which led to the protest staged by over 200 000 people in the street on 1 July. The pro-government camp was swayed, which forced the Government to The Government acknowledged but still had not corrected its suspend it. mistake. In disguise, it issued the so-called consultation paper, introducing an unconstitutional proposal, together with three other ornamental options. But it has stated clearly that it does not guarantee that they are constitutional. I do not know which self-respected government in the world would say such words.

The Government has totally lost its credibility, no matter whether it is viewed from any perspective of democracy, the rule of law, human rights or freedom. Although the outcome of the "consultation exercise" is still not known, Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs LAM Sui-lung committed to promoting the replacement mechanism has already been promoted to a prosperous post under the generous recommendation of Chief Executive Donald TSANG. The replacement mechanism incident is not mentioned in the Policy Address, but history will not forget it.

In the Policy Address, there is only one sentence about the rule of law, in paragraph 207, which reads, "We have upheld the rule of law, with our sophisticated common law system winning worldwide acclaim". As a matter of fact, human rights and the rule of law are being undermined in all aspects. Hong Kong's common law system may be acclaimed worldwide, but the pro-China camp has kept attacking it, considering that it is a stumbling block to the administration of SAR. Requests for the interpretation of the Basic Law by NPC have become nothing special and the emergence of problems are readily attributed to the common law. The provisions of the Basic Law are read without heeding the legislative intent. In the judicial review on foreign domestic helpers' right of abode in Hong Kong, pro-government parties assert that the problem can only be solved by seeking the interpretation of the Basic Law by NPC.

In the mind of Chief Executive Donald TSANG, the most important function of the rule of law is to punish members of the public for expressing their views disorderly and challenging the authority. In particular, if Chief Executive Donald TSANG is offended, strict orders will be given to bring the criminal to justice and an appeal will be instituted if the offender was not convicted in the court even in a minor criminal case. This kind of theory has upset the true sense of the rule of law.

The basic idea of the rule of law is that the powers of the Government are subject to law. The lawful rights of members of the public are entitled to the protection of the law. The judicial review is a procedure where this legal principle is most basically realized under the common law system. Any executive organ which claims to uphold the rule of law has to make itself an example and take the lead to respect it. However, when the judicial review case regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment reports of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge was still under judicial proceedings, Chief Executive Donald TSANG led his officials to severely criticize the institution of the judicial review and the judgment of the court at a Council meeting. As such, the Bar Association and the Law Society had to release a joint declaration to remind the Government to respect the court proceedings.

"Winning worldwide acclaim"! But this Council has suffered a massive attack by Members of the pro-government camp. Deputy President, the rule of law in the Mainland is far inferior to that in the HKSAR, so the thought of the civilian to pursue the rule of law is stronger. On the Internet, a civil rights

activist upholds the right of citizens to resort to the courts to require the Administration to fulfil its legal duties. He says (I quote): "Anyone who has no right to institute legal proceedings is not a citizen, but a slave".

Article 35 of the Basic Law stipulates (I quote): "Hong Kong residents shall have the right to confidential legal advice, access to the courts, choice of lawyers for timely protection of their lawful rights and interests or for representation in the courts, and to judicial remedies. Hong Kong residents shall have the right to institute legal proceedings in the courts against the acts of the executive authorities and their personnel." (unquote)

Everyone is entitled to institute legal proceedings, but whether he or she can obtain legal aid is subject to examination and approval by the Director of the Legal Aid Department (LAD) in accordance with the law. He or she has to pass the means test and prove that he or she has sufficient legal grounds. Whether he or she can pursue a judicial review depends on the judgment made by the court in accordance with the law. The subject is entitled to have legal representation, as well as to choose and change his or her lawyer. The Code of Conduct of the legal profession provides that barristers cannot refuse to accept any case irrespective of how the litigation concerned is not accepted by the community or the client is being discriminated against. Barristers must be committed and do all they can, be responsible to the court and work for the maximum interest of their clients. They carry out their duties without fear of and regard to any impact on themselves. These have been the basic principles of the legal system in Hong Kong for over a hundred years, but they are now being tramped unscrupulously. In 1999, Hong Kong people were extremely nervous about the possible influx of a large number of children born to Hong Kong parents in the Mainland, but the Government still respected the system then and no one attacked the lawyers, among whom I was one, representing them.

In the Link REIT incident in 2004, LO Siu-lan pursued a judicial review, which forced the Link REIT to delay listing. In the court, the barrister representing the Hong Kong Housing Authority criticized politicians for using the PRH tenant to manipulate the whole case behind the scenes for the purpose of obtaining political benefits by abusing the judicial proceedings. The so-called "反政客亂港大遊行(Great March against Disruption of Hong Kong by Politicians)" promoted by the financial sector were joined by Members, including Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr CHAN Kam-lam and CHIM Pui-chung. The then Chief

Executive TUNG Chee-hwa said in high profile that the Link REIT incident was excessively politicalized. The judicial review case was intentionally instituted to affect the international financial centre of Hong Kong. As regards the judicial review case regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment reports of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, in the same manner, the Government, after the lawsuit was won, made no introspection at all, but merely grumbled about the additional cost of construction needed. In a few years, the consciousness of the rule of law in the SAR has degenerated to that level. Maybe Secretary for Justice WONG Yan-lung can explain the reasons for that later.

There are at least several hundred lawyers in the Government. The Judge Over Your Shoulder published by the Department of Justice last year shows officials how to face judicial reviews in a positive manner. Officials should understand that the judicial review is a body check of a law-abiding government as the ground of pursuing a judicial review is always the same, that is, to prove that the government has broken the law. If there are no grounds, the court will not accept the case. If the applicant wins, that means the government acted in contravention of the law. If the government really attaches importance to law-abidingness, it should take the opportunity to improve itself. If it did not break the law, it should be confident that the court will rule in its favour. does the Government get angry when it is said to be at fault? challenging the Government contrary to public interest and why does winning a lawsuit represent abuse of the rule of law? Is the rule of law not a core value of Hong Kong? When has Chief Executive Donald TSANG said anything to uphold the rights mentioned in Article 35 of the Basic Law? How will panic occur in the community easily if the Government faces legal challenges in a humble and law-abiding manner?

Deputy President, in any court case, the Government always stands in the most favourable position as it has the power to allocate a large amount of resources directly. On the contrary, members of the public challenging the Government have very limited means and legal aid is not free of charge. Many litigants themselves have to bear expenses which are very heavy for them. If Members of this Council do not know the legal aid system, they should, I suggest, refer to the introductory materials issued by LAD to members of the public.

Deputy President, perhaps there is one thing for which we should thank Chief Executive Donald TSANG. That is, he enables the Council to enjoy unprecedented freedom of speech with his own strength. Speeches by Members are originally subject to the Rules of Procedure (RoP), which also apply to officials. Chief Executive Donald TSANG used the terms of "chav's behaviour" and "gangster's place" in his speech in the Council two weeks ago. As ruled by the President, such terms are not offensive. In other words, Members can use the same terms to criticize Chief Executive Donald TSANG, officials and other Members in future without having to worry about breaching the Rules.

The President explained clearly to outsiders that he made the ruling based on the language criteria already accepted by this Council. Dr PAN Pey-chyou criticizes that pan-democratic Members "have no sense of shame" and such words are not offensive. To call Mr LEE Cheuk-yan a "thief" is also not offensive. The words "to get benefits for oneself by means of champerty" do not arguably imply that the Member has an improper motive.

However, these are individual examples, which are nothing compared to the comprehensive contribution of Chief Executive Donald TSANG. Never before has there occurred such a scenario that, as far as Governors or Chief Executives of Hong Kong deliver speeches in this Council is concerned, the President of the Legislative Council has to consult the Legal Adviser on whether he can expel the Chief Executive from the Chamber if his speech breaches the Rules. Nevertheless, Chief Executive Donald TSANG has made it and the answer is interesting. It is reported that the President, considering that Chief Executive Donald TSANG has a constitutional duty to fulfil in this Council, cannot expel him from the Chamber. But Members also have a constitutional duty to speak in this Council.

RoP must be enforced impartially and the punishments for Chief Executive Donald TSANG and Members should be the same. Why should Members respect RoP, if they can be enforced preferentially? Is it not necessary for all of us to be polite and courteous, and should we instead scold each other severely in future? So Chief Executive Donald TSANG has made great contribution to the emergence of such Council culture and "From Strength to Strength" has its place in history. I so submit.

MR PAUL TSE (in Cantonese): Deputy President, before I speak, I would like to make some response to what Dr Margaret NG has said just now. I have always

emphasized that I am one of those who resent rather strongly the behaviour of some colleagues. However, the reactions of some colleagues, such as Dr Margaret NG's earlier, appeared to have highlighted a certain attitude, that is, only to rail on others but fail to reflect on their own actions. In fact, what has become of the culture of the legislature today? The culprit who started all these, I am afraid, was not the Chief Executive or government officials but some Members of this Council. Although Dr Margaret NG loudly denounced the Chief Executive's differentiation according to affinity, I find that our colleagues of the Civic Party also practise such differentiation at this critical point. They cry out loud, championing the rule of law and regulation, but at a certain critical points, such as the moments when they are defending those from their own camp, there is definitely differentiation according to affinity.

I have earlier mentioned that I wish to discuss at this debate session the cases concerning foreign domestic helpers (FDH) and the issue of the rule of law that Hong Kong is now faced with. Dr Margaret NG strongly criticized the people who propose to resolve this crisis by means of interpretation of the Basic Law, including, I believe, me. I always wonder why people of Hong Kong consider it a breach of the rule of law whenever the interpretation of the Basic Law is brought up. Is this because there are so many people of various backgrounds, including the legal profession, Members of this Council and even some government officials, have always considered the interpretation of the Basic Law a great scourge that jeopardizes the rule of law, and it is equivalent to imposing the set of uncivilized, backward and even corrupt systems of the Mainland onto the advanced, forward and noble culture of the rule of law in Hong Kong?

I am also a barrister myself practising as a solicitor now. I once joked that my qualification as a barrister might even be higher than Dr Margaret NG's and I fully understood what viewpoints a legal practitioner should have, especially when both of us had been in the legal profession for many years and were trained in countries practising the common law. When we wee what is happening in our neighbouring places, including the recent case in which two Hong Kong residents were sentenced to 40 years of imprisonment in the Philippines, we are well aware how the people of Hong Kong are frightened by the rather backward and improper justice systems of such places. People of Hong Kong always emphasize the importance of the rule of law but we have to understand that once something is overdone, the result will not be desirable. I think that the power of

the rule of law has been overestimated today. The rule of law is very important in protecting an individual's rights and interests. It is very important that everyone is protected by law in civil and criminal matters but striving for our rights and interests is equally important.

However, some issues cannot be resolved by the legal system, especially those involving political matters. Justice Andrew LI, The former Chief Justice of the Court of Final Appeal (CFA) who is now retired, has commented on many occasions, even at official forums, that there have been too many judicial review cases in Hong Kong in recent years. Some issues which should be resolved by political or administrative means were often presented to the court and the court is forced to handle them. Why did he say so? In respect of the rule of law, I believe that no one would query the determination and capability of Justice Andrew LI in upholding the principle of rule of law and safeguarding the rule of law itself, but even he himself has repeatedly presented such a view.

That is because many issues are to be taken care of at the political and administrative levels only, instead of being presented to the court in the hope that the judge would hand down a judgment on these political and policy issues. Even in developed countries such as the United States of America which attach great importance to the rule of law, there have been great public objection towards the fact that there are far too many cases that are litigious in nature. When society is keen to bring cases to court, the justice system will fail to cope, which will in turn cause great damage to society. Hence, the rule of law is like water, which can carry the boat and also overturn it. Nothing is absolute. It all depends on how we use it.

For those colleagues who consider the rule of law almighty, they are like the metaphor that I cited earlier. Among the many tools such as the hammer and screw driver, the hammer is of course best suited for knocking nails. However, we cannot use the hammer for everything. Similarly if we tackle every problem by the same means, it will not be in the best interest of Hong Kong. This is a misunderstanding of the spirit of the rule of law and treating it with short-sightedness and narrow vision because the rule of law itself is not absolute and cannot resolve all problems. Otherwise, everything in the world will be much simpler.

As regards the cases about the right of abode in Hong Kong of FDH, since the Secretary for Justice is present here, I wish to take this opportunity to clarify some points. I know that the Secretary is strongly in support of the justice system in Hong Kong and he should not and does not wish to take any action before the CFA hands down any verdict on the cases lest it will jeopardize or be considered as jeopardizing the spirit of our rule of law. However, since the Secretary is present here, I would like to point out that there are four major precedent cases behind those cases, namely the NG Ka-ling case, the CHONG Fung-yuen case, the Prem SINGH case and the Fateh MUHAMMAD case.

Given these four major piles laid down by the CFA, if we continue on this old path, it is apparent that we will not be able to break through the four major barriers imposed by the interpretation of Article 24 of the Basic Law according to the common law system and perspective. What I am going to say will not influence the ruling of the court because it will only touch on the analysis and I have no intention to put pressure on the court. I mean we will very likely follow an old path, which is to interpret Article 24 of the Basic Law from the perspective of the common law, and the conclusion will be that the conditions have been laid down literally and there is no need for further argument. The domestic law of Hong Kong cannot override the Basic Law. As a result, even though there is another provision relating to immigration control, because of the precedent Prem SINGH case (if I remember correctly), that provision cannot be invoked in the interpretation of Article 24 — the so-called irrelevance to the present context.

Under such circumstances, the result of following this old path can very well be anticipated. As the example I cited earlier, this is like playing a music record. No matter what type of record it is, if its contents are the same, when it comes to the same spot, it will play an identical tune. Hence, the Government's present choice is either to continue with the same path and wait till the CFA hands out a verdict causing an uproar in the community, then to be forced to request for an interpretation of the Basic Law by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress (SCNPC); or to take early action in anticipation of the crisis and courageously put forward the necessary and ultimate solution to the problem.

Surely, this solution is based on the fact that interpretation of the Basic Law is in total compliance with the Hong Kong legal system and the rule of law. We should not embrace the idea held by those barristers who have a political as

well as a legal background that interpretation of the Basic Law means a breach of the rule of law. The fact is far from that because the present system has changed. If we always view such issues only from the perspective of the common law, the conclusion will be very narrow. On the contrary, if one can open his mind and understand the system after Hong Kong's reunion with China and the situation under the "one country, two systems", he can see that the legal system in the Mainland can work hand in hand with that of Hong Kong and can even override the local one under certain circumstances.

I think that we should not run away in the face of fear. Sometimes, the cases reported in the news such as those concerning the human rights activists would scare us and make us harbour a deep and serious misunderstanding or even resentment towards the interpretation of the Basic Law, simply because it is not like our existing system. The interpretation of the Basic Law itself is part of the local system and is perfectly legal as well. Therefore, I hope that Mr WONG Yan-lung, SJ, will take the necessary action. Mr Stephen LAM has just entered the chamber. I have no intention to intercede for any government official but I Sometimes someone may, out of their loyalty to team think we should be fair. spirit or in order to safeguard Hong Kong's interests, take actions or measures that may not be acceptable or even objectionable to the public. By the same token, I also consider that some government officials just want to play it safe and lack the team spirit, so much so that they would even go against the overall interests of Hong Kong and lack the courage to bear the consequences, which is also inappropriate. To strike the right balance in this regard, if some government officials personally find a certain policy unacceptable, he should resign. However, if certain measures suit the overall needs of the Hong Kong Government or even the whole nation, the government official needs to have the courage to stand up for them because this is the natural consequences of his political appointment.

Another point I would like to mention is that although the Government has organized many publicity activities about the Basic Law after Hong Kong's reunion with China, such as teaching the public the contents of the Basic Law provisions on television, those programmes tend to be partial and superficial, and the messages that they deliver only involve knowledge that can be grasped even by a primary pupil after reading the Basic Law. I remember that Mr WONG, SJ, explained a little about some broad principles of the Basic Law when attending a students' seminar on the Basic Law but soon switched to the topic about the spirit

of the rule of law in Hong Kong. I have no intention whatsoever to blame him because I would do the same because we as the general public have no concept about it. As regards our knowledge about the Basic Law, more often than not, we just stay at the level of reading the wording and contents of the provisions. Have we ever studied the importance of the Basic Law under the "one country, two systems" principle? How should it be interpreted? Far too often we seem to have entered the automatic mode, in which whatever we are talking about, very soon and without realizing it, we would slip back to the explanation level. However, the common law is only one part of Hong Kong's system in one country.

It is like driving a car. Hong Kong people are accustomed to driving right-hand-drive vehicles for years. On the north side of the Shenzhen River, however, all vehicles are left-hand-drive. Of course, in every country and region, to comply with its own system is apparently right, which is right according to custom and law. However, after the vehicle has crossed the border — especially with the heavy cross-border traffic at present — we will have to accept the fact that vehicles have to run on the right side of the road. Vehicles from Hong Kong are still right-hand-drive which may cause inconvenience and danger but we have to understand this is a reality under "one country, two systems" and it is also provided and tolerated by law. Under this circumstance, we cannot resent seeing left-hand-drive vehicles in Hong Kong and criticize them as backwards, judging from the viewpoint of our local system.

Another example concerns the view about using forks and knives as compared with chopsticks. Those who are accustomed to eating with forks and knives may think that this way of eating is proper and civilized. When I was young, I heard some foreigners criticize using chopsticks as unclean, dirty and inflexible, and many other negative comments about it. However, we all know that it is inconvenient to pick up green vegetables with forks and knives and it may be better to use chopsticks to handle certain dishes. Be it chopsticks or forks and knives, they have their own advantages. We have to use the right tools at the right time and cannot lightly pass an inappropriate judgment when faced with something that we are not accustomed to.

I may have sidetracked too far but I wish to emphasize that we should properly handle the way we deal with the Basic Law and educate the public how to understand issues related to the Basic Law. Regrettably, although the Basic Law Committee has been established, its members are not authoritative figures in the mind of the general public. Since there is no constitution court established between the Mainland and Hong Kong, should the Administration consider how to improve this mechanism now so that when Hong Kong people deal with the Basic Law, especially when the need for interpretation by the SCNPC comes up, they will not have such a negative sentiment and realize that this approach is only to clarify some unclear points in the Basic Law provisions? In fact, there are many proper and authoritative jurists, including the SJ and other judges such as the former Chief Justice, Mr Andrew LI, who can participate in this work.

All in all, if there is any way that can enhance the authority of the Basic Law Committee, it should be carried out as soon as possible as many provisions of the Basic Law, other than Article 24 regarding the issue of FDH, were drawn up too hastily, and together with those concerned with principles, there are often great difficulties in implementing them. If the conflicts and restrictions concerning these provisions are not ironed out properly, the present problems we are faced with today will very likely continue to happen. The Hong Kong Government always insists on hearing the cases in accordance with the common law first and seeking other resolutions afterwards. This, however, is not a problem that should be solved by judicial means. Instead, it should be handled by administrative or even legislative means. For example, in some countries, if the court at any time makes an inappropriate ruling, the parliament may enact a new bill the next day to overturn the ruling so as to eliminate the negative consequences thus created. That is a common practice. However, as Hong Kong is not a sovereign state, the same cannot be done here. The amendment of the Basic Law also creates many practical difficulties, making it difficult to carry Hence, the only feasible way is to straighten out the points concerning the Basic Law Committee and the Basic Law which need to be rectified. Only by doing so can the people of Hong Kong gradually accept a proper view on the "one country, two systems" principle in the long run.

Similarly, the intent of Article 82 of the Basic Law is "the CFA may as required invite judges from other common law jurisdictions to sit on the CFA." However, in practice, we do not take legal action "as required" but have taken litigation as a routine practice. Does this constitute a loop-hole? If someone challenges certain acts of the Government, there may be another litigation case just like the case of the right of abode of the FDH or the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge case. What matters here is that although it is clear that some situations are not perfect, we should not lightly challenge it by legal

means as that will do damage to Hong Kong. Since it is a political issue, it should not be dealt with by legal action. However, some colleagues always resort to using the hammer, knocking on anything along the way even at the expense of wrecking everything. That is because they do not know how to use other tools and they do not understand politics.

Perhaps it is like what Miss Tanya CHAN said, which was that she had not studied history and thus lacked a broader perspective. For those who only have the legal background, they may skew heavily toward the legal point of view. Nevertheless, even though lawyers represent a very important sector in society, they do not represent everyone. But far too often we attach too much importance to the aura of the law. That may be the result of their professional needs and the strength of their background. But may I point out that these solicitors and barristers have never suffered the damage done by law? If they have had such experience and they have the courage to get a taste of being tried in court as the defendant like Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, they would know that the legal system itself is fraught with problems and it is not absolutely just. Actually, there are many cases of injustice. However, with the lack of a better system, the existing system is by and large acceptable but it is far from perfect. Therefore, we cannot say that as long as there is rule of law in Hong Kong, everything will be fine. We cannot stop moving forward because there is much room for improvement in the system and rule of law in our country and use the law as a protective talisman. This only shows our childishness and immaturity. It is a sign showing that we cannot handle and rectify the right attitude and direction towards the principle of "one country, two systems" in Hong Kong.

Deputy President, I so submit.

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): If no other Member wishes to speak, I would like to ask if any Government Official needs to

(Mr Alan LEONG raised his hand to indicate a wish to speak)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Alan LEONG, please speak.

MR ALAN LEONG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, if Hong Kong were to become part of the Mainland as far as possible expeditiously, just as what Mr Paul TSE hoped for, I must beg to differ.

Deputy President, I would like to make use of my speaking time to talk about an incident reported in the press yesterday, in which local students and those from the Mainland living in a student hall of the City University of Hong Kong (CityU) were involved in a war of words. It all started when local students perceived that the food residues found unattended in a wash basin inside a CityU student hall were left by the Mainland students, they wrote the words "Mainland Dogs" on the notice board, hence triggering a battle of words on the democratic wall between students from the Mainland and the local students. Some local students wrote that the Mainland students who had snatched the resources of Hong Kong should return to China as soon as possible.

Deputy President, it is a pity that students from the two places should engage in such a war of words, which was just like sliding into mud wrestling. A trivial incident in the daily life of a student hall of a local university could induce such vigorous confrontation. What does it tell us at all? In Hong Kong, young people who are able to pursue tertiary education are the more advantageous and better-off ones in the society, and they just dare to lose confidence in themselves and have no hope for the future. Needless to say, those who are unable to pursue tertiary education would see even a dimmer future. No one can endure to see our young people come to such a deplorable state.

Deputy President, I remember that we were puffed up with pride in our university days and hoped that with our strengths, we could accomplish the mission we owed to the country and materialize our dreams for the future. Where can we find the ambition we had at that time in the university students nowadays?

Deputy President, I believe that most Honourable colleagues of this Council and government officials of this generation are proud of being Hong Kong people, and regard Hong Kong a place where we were born and would stay

for long. Here in Hong Kong, we can be baptized with its unique culture featuring the East and the West, get a good job or become rich by setting up our own business so as to ascend the social ladder gradually, and gain a sense of satisfaction from what we are doing. Let us forget the qualities such as politeness and broadmindedness that a well educated youth should have first. From the way local students behaved in this war of words, it seems that people nowadays no longer feel the same confidence and pride in being Hong Kong people. It is just so sad.

Deputy President, the last chapter of the Policy Address is "Believing Ourselves", in which Donald TSANG cites a lot of figures to illustrate our achievements. He even mentions that life expectancy is now three years longer than that in 1997. Nonetheless, why do young people not believe as the Chief Executive Donald TSANG does that "Hong Kong would go from strength and strength and build a brighter future"? It is strange.

What has actually happened? Over the past seven years, young people have never gained a sense of recognition, nor hope from the statement made by the TSANG Administration on the values and visions of Hong Kong. It is so unfair because we have our special strengths in many aspects, much of which we should take pride in.

Over the years, our contribution to foster the economic growth and the development of market economy of modern China has been obvious to all, and we also have a role to play in promoting democracy, human rights, freedoms and the rule of law. However, like many young people, I have worries about the future of Hong Kong. Several years later, when Beijing and Shanghai might have become international financial centres and Renminbi a currency which can be circulated and freely convertible in the international market, with what could we identify ourselves and highlight our status of being Hong Kong people? If we do not adopt a positive attitude, enhance our competitiveness, and at the same time uphold our values, we will be faced with much difficulty. If we are to set an example in the economic and political aspects, we have to proceed even farther, safeguard our open and free economy, and implement dual universal suffrage as soon as possible. Only by doing this can we capitalize our advantages and become a testing ground for the country's development.

Deputy President, I truly believe that there is an urgent need for the Chief Executive to safeguard our core values and systems, and we cannot only count on our past achievements in economic development. Several years later, as I said just now, should Shanghai and Beijing have actually become international financial centres, and Renminbi a currency which can be circulated and freely convertible in the international market, it is indeed necessary for us to change the finance-oriented economy and develop other industries. Nonetheless, the Chief Executive did not have any clear representation in this regard in the Policy Address. As for the six industries, if you ask those engaged in the industries, they would all say that the SAR Government is indulged in empty talks without any actual action.

Recently, some senior government officials have leaked out information that the Government of the next term would like to create two posts of Deputy Secretary of Department and two new bureaux. If the posts are created successfully, it is believed that, on the basis of differentiation according to affinity, those appointed must include members of the pro-establishment camp. Nonetheless, if we leave out whether it is right for the Government to squander public money to expand its "stables" without reviewing the appointment system of Deputy Directors of Bureaux and Political Assistants, will such "inflation" of the accountability system be actually useful in guiding Hong Kong to achieve its future goals, as I said just now? If so, the mentality of the Government will only remain on the level of how to achieve the purpose of sharing political spoils and enhancing the idea of differentiation according to affinity by means of the appointment system.

Deputy President, at present, it seems that there are two potential candidates who are either preparing or ready to run for the Chief Executive election. Both of them hope that they will be the next one to stand here in this Council and release the Policy Address in front of all the seven million people of Hong Kong. But unfortunately, what we can see is that the two candidates just superficially respond to the aspiration of the "groups with a vote" when they attend all kinds of activities day and night. What is their vision for Hong Kong? What are their expectations towards young people? What role do they want Hong Kong to play in the Mainland and the Greater China Economic Zone? How can young people feel good about themselves? Such ideological expression is hardly found in the recent campaign activities of the Chief Executive election. In fact, we should act now with concerted efforts instead of

relying only on what our forerunners did for us. We should also think about what the Hong Kong that we will leave to the next generation should be like.

Deputy President, I hope that the development of Hong Kong in the next five to 10 years would not be all in vain.

Deputy President, I so submit.

MS LI FUNG-YING (in Cantonese): Deputy President, in this last debate session on the Policy Address, my concern is about the development of our civil service. What has been said about the civil service in the Policy Address is completely irrelevant in that the Government has totally disregarded calls by civil service unions to stop recruiting Non-Civil Service Contract staff, stop outsourcing and stop engaging intermediary companies.

As a matter of fact, the Government has created through its offer of different terms and conditions of employment a situation where civil servants and their non-civil service counterparts doing the same jobs are paid differently, resulting in various forms of unfairness, which is becoming increasingly serious. For example, there were 3 984 government outsourcing contracts back in 2006, but the number rose to 5 121 in 2010. The Government also recruits thousands of staff through intermediary agencies each year.

This year's policy agenda has stressed that the Government will continue to control the size of the civil service by providing the necessary management tools to assist bureaux and departments to make more effective use of manpower resources and enhance efficiency, but it has not promised that it will not employ additional staff outside the civil service establishment to meet the needs for delivering new and improved services. The Government simply lacks sincerity in addressing the increasing discontent within the civil service with "unequal pay for equal work", which will affect government services to the public.

The management of civil service has to keep abreast of the time, and I do see some concrete measures to improve the rights and interests of civil servants, such as the "Five-day week arrangement" and paternity leave proposed in the Policy Address. However, these improvement measures at the implementation level have polarized the civil service. For example, the "Five-day week

arrangement" has been implemented generally for civilian posts, but there is still a long way to go before the implementation of the same arrangement for many posts in the disciplined forces. To put it bluntly, the key to the full implementation of the "Five-day week arrangement" in the civil service lies in resources rather than the types of work. Take the Ambulancemen for example, they have been fighting for meal time for more than 10 years, but to no avail so far. The problem has dragged on for more than 10 years due to unwillingness on the part of the management to increase resources for ambulance services.

Moreover, Deputy President, the improvement in the rights and interests of civil servants is closely related to the rights and interests of the staff of subvented The implementation of the Lump Sum Grant Subvention System organizations. has dealt a serious blow to the morale in subvented organizations. The adoption of the "Five-day week arrangement" in the civil service does not necessarily mean that the staff of subvented organizations will enjoy the same work arrangement. The Government has proposed the provision of paternity leave, but the staff of subvented organizations are worried that such a leave will be very difficult to implement in their organizations. The Lump Sum Grant Subvention System as a whole has been implemented under a disguised pretext that the staff of subvented organizations will be able to use resources in a more flexible way. What has The pay adjustments for the staff of subvented happened in the end? organizations have also been made flexible by their organizations. direction the management of subvented organizations should take is a subject which I believe should be comprehensively reviewed.

Deputy President, my second point concerns the political appointment system. The Chief Executive has said in his Policy Address that the Government introduced the political appointment system to enhance the accountability of principal officials for their respective policy portfolios and maintain a permanent and politically neutral civil service. However, the fundamental problem with this appointment system has not been solved. We have strict rules and regulations to govern the post-service employment of civil servants of different ranks, but our principal officials are subject to much more lenient regulation in terms of their post-service employment. Such a problem of putting the incidental before the fundamental and double standard in our system has remained unresolved.

At the same time, it is highly disputable whether our principal officials have been truly accountable to their respective policy portfolios. Even a major issue such as an about-turn in the Budget has remained unsettled. Those responsible for promoting certain controversial policies have been the civil servants whom the Chief Executive has described as politically neutral, instead of the principal officials concerned. All these are indicative of the lack of accountability and responsibility in our political appointment system.

The above is my general comment on the political appointment system mentioned in the Policy Address. From a more micro perspective, the arrangement for the supporting staff of principal officials has created many conflicts with civil servants. For example, the employment of personal drivers by political appointees has reduced the need for government chauffeurs. Such an arrangement has aroused strong dissatisfaction among government drivers. How can we address these problems arising from the implementation of the political appointment system? The Chief Executive has not given a firm response in this respect yet. These difficult problems will probably be left to the next Chief Executive.

Deputy President, I so submit.

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

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Deputy President, with regard to this year's Policy Address, I think the number of speeches and speakers are the lowest over the years, as it is a rare scene in this Chamber that there are so many empty seats at around 1 pm on Friday, and Members seem to have completely stopped speaking. I do not know whether it is because fellow Members are in a hurry to have lunch, or just wish to lose no time in their electoral work, so much so that they have forgotten to monitor the administration of the Government, and become so indolent and lazy, paying no attention to this policy paper, even though the paper will have much impact on members of the public.

Deputy President, I would like to talk about the behaviour of the Chief Executive and some issues relating to security arrangements in the remaining time, as last time I already spent 22 minutes to elaborate in detail my overall

assessment of the Policy Address. When the Chief Executive was criticized for his inability to express himself effectively earlier, he had defended himself by saying that he was not good at expressing his feelings, that his smiles were a little bit "embarrassing" and "stiff", and he even put a "grim face" on at times. In this Chamber, especially when facing me and Mr WONG Yuk-man, the Chief Executive has always been like that. Particularly to those people criticizing him, he not only puts a "grim face" on, but also nakedly reveals such an attitude and a sense of hostility.

However, if we take a look at how he behaved when he met leaders of the Central Government, we can see that there had been no such "stiffness" and "embarrassing" attitudes. He has made six duty visits altogether in the past to report to President HU and Premier WEN, together with the meetings with them on other occasions, including those at the leaders' meetings of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, he has met the national leaders a total of eight times. Let us look back at the time when he made his first duty visit on 27 December 2005. According to media reports, Mr Donald TSANG "shook hands with Mr HU Jintao fervently for about 10 seconds. When President HU Jintao went back to his seat, Mr Donald TSANG then tactfully approached other leaders of the Central Government, including Vice-President Mr ZENG Qinghong, State Councillor Mr TANG Jiaxuan, and Mr LIAO Hui, the Director of Hong Kong and Macao Affairs Office of the State Council, and so on, and shook hands humbly with them one by one, showing great courtesy to them." The reports went on to say that he had been smiling all along. Mr Donald TSANG even behaved in an excited manner when he went to Beijing to receive his appointment in April 2007, as he first got on board the flight hand in hand with his wife at noon in high profile; and when he walked out of the cabin, he "promptly approached in quick steps Mr CHEN Zuoer, the Deputy Director of the Hong Kong and Macao Affairs Office, State Council, who was waiting for him at the airport, and shook hands with the latter fervently with an ingratiating smile, as excited as meeting an old friend after a long separation." When he was received by President HU and Premier WEN, he even "was all smiles all the time, 'grinning from ear to ear', which was a rare sight to see indeed." He had behaved similarly when he met the leaders on many occasions.

Deputy President, we can see from such behaviours that leaders in the top echelons and political figures in Hong Kong treat the general public as enemies when they see them. Any of such leaders and political figures will regard people who do not agree with his ideas or even criticize him as mortal foes. However, he will behave like "lackeys" whenever he meets those in higher positions than he or officials from the Central Authorities. We can see that it is not that he does not know how to smile or show a friendly attitude. The point is that it is all about his personal value judgment, isn't it? To those who are useful to him or have advantage to offer, he can kowtow numerous times; but to those who are dissatisfied with him or considered useless to him, he will regard them as rubbish and foes.

I remember that when I first met Mr HO Hau-wah, the then Chief Executive of Macao, he cited some personal examples and experience to share with me, which made me think that the quality of the leaders of Hong Kong and his were beyond comparison. When Mr HO Hau-wah was the Chief Executive, he once made a visit to the local communities he told me in person about this story once the motorcade of his Macao is a small place you know, when the motorcade passed some very crowded places, many residents saw the vehicles passing by and some of them made loud boos and catcalls toward him. He asked his bodyguards to stop the car, but his bodyguards, naturally, advised him it might not be too appropriate to do so. Nevertheless, he said, "That's okay. Stop the car." When the car stopped, he opened the car door himself before his bodyguards did so for him and got off. He went straight to the people booing at him and said, "Speak to me directly if you have any problems. There is no point to express such disapproval in public and make boos and catcalls after my motorcade has passed. Just tell me if you have something to say." He then stood there and had a direct dialogue with those residents.

What does the Chief Executive of Hong Kong do, then? Just see how many G4 staff he needs when there are vehicles staging a protest rally. Our Mr Stephen LAM, our "Eunuch LAM" even goes further than that. He arranged his staff to use umbrellas to shield him when people hurled paper planes at him. Even under bright sunlight, a "battery of umbrellas" was used as a barrier to isolate himself from the people. That is the Hong Kong leaders' way: total indifference towards "meeting the people". The most remarkable feat was having a cup of milk tea under the escort of his retinue in a new town's café, using "stimulating the economy" as a pretext, with a view to creating an atmosphere of mixing harmoniously with the public. If he really was that remarkable at all, he should have acted like Mr HO Hau-wah and walked straight into the markets, or

responded in person to the people when they snapped at him during his visits to the local communities. Nevertheless, they do not do that. They behave just like "lackeys" when they meet senior officials or leaders of the Central Authorities, but they think they are "local despots" or "warlords" when they are in front of the people.

Therefore, the situation in Hong Kong now is that the ineptness and distorted values of the leaders in the top echelon have already caused much discontent among Hong Kong people and made them very furious with the Government. Thus, if these problems are not alleviated or addressed, new leaders, including all undeclared Chief Executive candidates, will still act like "lackeys" when they are in front of the officials of the Central Authorities, and will have the same attitudes as Donald TSANG does when they face those from the oppositions. All in all, the essence of them will remain unchanged. Therefore, as long as there is no democratic system open to all (*The buzzer sounded*) there will never be any improvement to these problems, and Hong Kong will always be ruled by "lackeys".

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN, your speaking time is up. Does any other Member wish to speak?

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Deputy President, the title of my speech today is "From Strength to Strength — What an oddity!" The Policy Address this year is entitled "From Strength to Strength". "From strength to strength" implies "inheritance". Such a title therefore reflects the unrepentant attitude of the Government of the Special Administrative Region (SAR). During the time of TUNG Chee-hwa, the disparity in wealth in Hong Kong deteriorated, and the poverty population increased drastically in size. The present SAR Government led by Donald TSANG now talks about "inheritance". Does this mean that it wants Hong Kong to fare more badly than it did during TUNG Chee-hwa's time and its people to suffer yet greater misery?

The titles of the Chief Executive's successive policy addresses, such as "Strong Governance for the People", "Proactive, Pragmatic, Always People First", "Embracing New Challenges", "Breaking New Ground Together" and "Sharing Prosperity for a Caring Society", are all underscored by an economic

emphasis, and economic development is invariably given treatment in the first chapters. References to "The National 12th Five-year Plan", the "six major industries with competitive edge" and the "10 major infrastructure projects" can fully illustrate its belief in "economic development as the overriding principle". Cutting across all such references is the Chinese characteristic of "falsehood, haughtiness and empty talks". Economic development is accorded overriding importance, and all other matters are brushed aside. Cutting across all its governance concepts is an insistence on the so-called neo-liberalism dogma of "big market, small government" and a superstitious belief in the "trickle-down theory", which holds that the fruit of economic prosperity will somehow trickle down to the lower strata, so people will all be able to extricate themselves from poverty as long as they work hard.

Such a philosophy admittedly enabled Hong Kong to attain a Gross Domestic Product (GDP) worth some \$1,700 billion in 2010, but it also brought forth the alarming figures of 1.26 million poor people and 470 000 poor households as well as a very high Ginni Coefficient, making Hong Kong a city with the greatest disparity in wealth among all developed places. The number of those living below the poverty line increased from 835 400 in 1996 to 1 160 400 According to the figures provided by the Census and Statistics in 2006. Department, the monthly median household income in Hong Kong in 2010 was \$18,000, with only \$14,000 in such poorer districts as Sham Shui Po and Kwun Tong, and \$15,000 in Wong Tai Sin. As the SAR Government upholds exploitative capitalism, the distribution of social resources is unfair, and the middle classes and the grassroots all end up in the same fate despite their class differences. With the manipulation of capitals under developer hegemony and financial hegemony, wealth is overwhelmingly concentrated in a handful of people. Is this what Donald TSANG meant when he remarked that the disparity in wealth is an unavoidable phenomenon in a capitalist society?

Oblivious of the situation, the SAR Government has continued to stress economic development, pay scant attention to people's livelihood and well-being, and run counter to the world trend. Economically, the Government upholds "big market, small government", conniving at the oppression of Hong Kong people by developer hegemony and financial hegemony and adopting passive policies on social welfare and social security. Politically, the opposite is the case. Economically, as described by people, it upholds "less government is the best government". But politically, it believes that greater power means higher

efficiency. Flaunting "executive-led government", it practises totalitarian politics and frequently implements policies that antagonize the people. With the combination of the two, Hong Kong people's modest hope of having a comfortable home and a good job has become altogether elusive. What is meant by "people's livelihood"? Some frequently lecture us that we must not talk so much about politics, must not make any attempt to split society, but must instead bear in mind the utmost importance of people's livelihood. Dr SUN Yat-sen also remarked years ago that construction hinges primarily on people's livelihood. But people's livelihood must be based on democratic politics. What is "people's livelihood" all about? It is about people's living, the nation's living conditions, and society's survival.

One cause of the disparity in wealth in Hong Kong is the housing problem. Residential properties are the main form of assets possessed by Hong Kong people. Property owners' wealth will increase as the property market appreciates. But the incomes of the propertyless are incessantly eroded by rising rents. There exists an unbridgeable gap between those who own properties and those who do not.

During a radio programme on 8 October, Donald TSANG admitted that there was something amiss in his housing policy and this was the biggest cause of public discontent. If his remark had really been a kind of self-examination after a rude awakening and had been followed by certain rectifications, we would have expressed our welcome. But this is not the case. He does not intend to do anything after so admitting.

The new Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) and the improved My Home Purchase Plan (MHPP) Owing to time constraint There are many more issues I want to discuss, and my points are clearly explained in my scripted speech. His actions are basically meant to "jack up the market". Why does he want to "jack up the market"? The Policy Address states clearly: "When there are enough reasonably priced small and medium flats in the private market, we will adjust the number of subsidized flats to be built and sold for the year. We may even stop building and selling such flats." The Government deliberately tries to delay and suppress the supply of HOS flats while seeking to boost transactions by introducing a new arrangement on premium payment for HOS resale and improving the MHPP. Its intention to "jack up the market" is evident to all.

At present, some 100 000 people in Hong Kong are living in bedspace apartments, sub-divided units and cubicles, and many of them are waiting for allocation of public rental housing (PRH). Such "N noes", due to the long waiting time for PRH allocation, must in the meantime put up with soaring rents and appalling living conditions. They are all living in great misery.

As at December 2010, there are some 145 000 applicants on the Waiting List. "PRH allocation within three years" is nothing but just a forlorn hope. The Policy Address vows that in the next five years, about 75 000 PRH units will be completed, and this is roughly the same as the projected construction volume of 75 800 units between 2011 and 2016 disclosed previously in the Housing Department's website. The completion volume of PRH units has been on drastic decline since 2002, and it has never climbed back to the level of 20 000 units a year in the 90s of the last century. The number of applicants on the Waiting List has all the time remained very high, meaning that "N noes" must continue to be battered by high property prices and rents. The needs of these people are completely ignored by the Policy Address.

In respect of the education policy, education as a social welfare benefit is now treated as "an industry with competitive edge" by the SAR Government. This is indeed "downright utilitarianism and an insult to knowledge". Education is a major means which enables the impoverished masses to extricate themselves from poverty, and which makes the upward mobility of the grassroots possible. In Hong Kong, however, it is reduced to a means through which profit-oriented schools fleece the underprivileged and a mere by-product of economic development. An imbalance in social development is inevitable.

By adopting policies such as the Self-financing Post-secondary Education Fund and Start-up Loan Scheme, the Government seeks to encourage institutions to offer self-financing post-secondary programmes, thus gradually turning education into a market commodity. The Government's approach of offering education with an industrial management mentality has led to the dominance of commercial disciplines and the shrinkage of the liberal arts in university education. The transformation of education into an industry has added to the already heavy burden of students, making it necessary for them to shoulder huge tuition fees and repay their student loans well before they even enter the labour market. It is thus extremely difficult for them to shake off poverty.

Education is to instill knowledge and cultivate personality, and assist students in identifying directions suitable for their future development. The SAR Government's attempt to foster education as an industry with competitive edge has led to an increasingly narrow range of programme choices, thus restricting students' personal development. The principle of education has been discarded completely.

The Government has recently been advocating what it calls "national education". Having read the consultation document, I frankly think that no one is capable of teaching this subject. Secretary TSANG Tak-sing is present now. What should national education be all about? Since the beginning of this year, I have given talks on the Xinhai Revolution in 29 secondary schools. be regarded as national education? Or, should this be regarded as a mere attempt to compete with you in "brainwashing"? Regarding Hong Kong's connection with the Xinhai Revolution, what has the Home Affairs Bureau said and done? It has only organized a simple exhibition in the Hong Kong Museum of History as a mere ritual, bringing exhibits from Hubei and distorting the facts of history. The task of publicizing such an important revolution so closely connected with Hong Kong is however entrusted to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department. I have browsed through its website, and I am filled with Therefore, I have sought to do the task myself. What I have done is national education in its true sense. Since the beginning of this year, I have delivered talks in 29 secondary schools. Have I received any funding from you? Do I need your encouragement? I do not see any such need.

During one such talk, I explained to the students the meaning of national education. Deputy President, suppose national education is now part of the senior secondary curriculum, suppose it begins in primary school and continues into the senior secondary curriculum, what will a teacher of national education say when he and his students pass by Tiananmen Square during a study tour in Beijing? Will the teacher tell his students that on 4 May 1919, right there in Tiananmen Square, Beijing, a group of tertiary students chanted the slogan "Eradicate traitors internally and resist foreign subjugation externally" in a bid to oppose the Beiyang government's selling out of Shandong in the Paris Peace Conference? Will the teacher go on to say that when those university students paraded past government offices afterwards, they set fire to Zhaojialou, battered government officials and ended up in detention by the police of the Beiyang government? Will the teacher also say that CAI Yuanpei, the then President of

Peking University, protested to the police chief, demanding the release of the students? Will he also say that subsequently, the Peking government — the Beiyang government is sometimes also called the Peking government — was cowed by the pressure of public opinions into releasing all the students?

Will this teacher of national education continue to disclose that at the very same place, 70 years later, in the small hours of 4 June 1989, the People's Liberation Army, which had entered the city earlier, opened fire and killed many students, students who similarly voiced a very significant aspiration: "Down with official corruption and strive for democracy"? These two governments in Beijing are 70 years apart, but Secretary TSANG Tak-sing, isn't it very clear which one is civilized and which one is savage? When teachers of national education pass by Tiananmen Square with their students, will they say anything like this? Or, will they only tell their students that the Motherland is thriving, its future is very promising, and we are now the second largest economy in the world? National education is to enable students to develop a dignified voluntary awareness of their national history and culture. It is only when they have such a dignified voluntary awareness that they can understand what patriotism is all about. In the absence of a dignified voluntary awareness of one's national history and culture, how can one talk about patriotism? Which country should one love in that case? Recognition of one's national identity must be based on rational cultural cognizance, rather than any moral impulse. Secretary TSANG Tak-sing, speaking of your arrest in 1967, may I ask whether yours was moral impulse or rational cultural cognizance?

The Government's scant attention to people's livelihood and well-being and its neglect of Hong Kong people's life after retirement can be aptly illustrated by its handling of places in residential care homes for the elderly and universal retirement protection. Through oral questions at Council meetings and meetings of the relevant Panel, I have repeatedly questioned Secretary for Labour and Welfare Matthew CHEUNG why there is still a shortage of places in residential care homes for the elderly. Secretary Matthew CHEUNG has over and over again emphasized his grave concern about the shortage of such places and his determination to shorten the waiting time. But in the meantime, more and more elderly persons continue to die while waiting for residential care home places, and the waiting time for such places has not turned any shorter. Since they find it so difficult to construct residential care homes for the elderly, I must question them why they are able to launch property development projects such as the West

Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD), the express rail link (XRL) and the redevelopment of old districts so quickly. The SAR Government should be strongly condemned by elderly people. Compared with those of Taiwan and the Mainland, Hong Kong's per capita income is always the highest. However, when it comes to the treatment of the elderly, Hong Kong is the meanest.

In 2009, the numbers of elderly persons who died while waiting for subsidized places in nursing homes and care-and-attention homes for the elderly were respectively 1 822 and 2 716. Last year, respectively 1 823 and 2 971 elderly persons died in the course of waiting before they could be allocated any places. These figures show the meanness of the SAR Government and its total reluctance to solve the "elderly care problems" generated by population ageing.

The Government's repeated attempts to adopt the policy objective of "ageing in place" are tantamount to shifting back the social responsibility of "elderly care" to the public. In paragraph 10.2.23 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, which sets out the criteria for determining the scale of various land uses and facilities, it is stated: "There should not be a pre-determined standard of provision for residential care places for the elderly based on population as not all elders who have long-term care needs require residential care services." Such a viewpoint is extremely absurd. On the one hand, Government officials brag about their concern for the elderly, but on the other hand, they adopt a policy to negate justifications for increasing the supply of places in residential care homes for the elderly. They simply say one thing and do another.

It is announced in the Policy Address that the supply of nursing home and long-term care places will be increased, and sufficient funds have been earmarked to increase the numbers of such places by more than 50% by 2015. However, administrative procedures are not streamlined and no specific numbers of places are mentioned, so all is just like the issuing of a bad cheque. Elderly persons in Hong Kong have worked very hard for a good part of their lives, making many contributions to society, so when they have no support in their twilight years, both society and the Government have the duty to look after them. The SAR Government simply fails to enable elderly persons to live with dignity in their twilight years, and it has not made adequate efforts to construct nursing homes and residential care homes for the elderly. It is indeed extremely mean and unfeeling.

The concessionary fare of \$2 proposed in the Policy Address for elderly persons looks like a measure that can effectively promote respect for the elderly and help out the poor. But it must be noted that many major public transport operators have already been offering half-fare concession to elderly persons. This means that the Government will only have to make up for the differences between half-fare amounts and the concessionary fare of \$2. This is extremely absurd. All public transport operators in Hong Kong are franchised, enjoying guarantees of outrageous profits. But they have not discharged their social responsibility. Having looked at other places in the whole world, including the Mainland, can we find any places where elderly persons are required to pay transport fares? And, in order to provide the subsidy, the Government must still delve inside taxpayers' pockets to get the money for reimbursing public transport operators before announcing this transport subsidy for elderly persons. Not only this, the measure is to be left to the next Government for implementation. not be implemented until the end of next year. Many elderly persons have told me that they could not wait that long because they might have passed away by that time.

The Policy Address maintains that "as it is still at an initial stage, the MPF system requires continuous improvement". This means that MPF managers can continue to rob employees of their hard-earned money. For the past 10 years, employees have been forced to accept a 10% discount of their wages and salaries, and fund managers have been able to line their own pockets at the expense of the people. But the Government still allows the continuation of this phenomenon.

The SAR Government, which possesses astronomical fiscal reserves amounting to \$600 billion, simply refuses to establish any universal retirement protection system on the excuse that "the middle class and professionals would generally not accept it now". Middle-aged people who are hard up must continue to worry about their life after retirement. The Government is prepared to spend as much as \$40 billion on hosting the Asian Games, \$66.9 billion on building the XRL, and even \$100 billion on constructing the third runway of the airport. And, it also considers that even several dozen billion dollars is not enough for the WKCD project and will not hesitate to inject further subsidy. However, when the Government is requested to establish a fund of several dozen billion dollars for implementing universal retirement protection, it is unwilling to comply. The Government regards human lives as nothing, and thinks that vanity

projects showing economic development are more important than people's livelihood. Have this very wealthy Government and all those huge consortia, may I ask, ever shown any slightest concern and care for society?

The Policy Addresses of the past few years all contain some small favours, such as government payment of PRH rent, double payment of Comprehensive Social Security Allowance and increased funding for food banks. But the question is: if all such small favours can really help alleviate the poverty problem, why has the poverty population in Hong Kong still kept on rising all the same? The concept of "big market, small government" is already dated. The SAR Government's idea of "From Strength to Strength" is actually the same as the preservation of the outworn. Therefore, the "six-year reign of Donald" is synonymous to people's increasing destitution!

This year marks the centenary of the Xinhai Revolution. Five score years ago, in an attempt to deliver the nation from their plight and suffering, Dr SUN Yat-sen united people with noble ideals and determination, eventually succeeding in overthrowing the autocratic rule of the Qing monarchy. It is a pity that following the founding of a republic, the dreams of democracy and republicanism could not be fully realized. The republic thus formed has lasted 100 years, with 62 years in Taiwan and 38 years on the Mainland. The republic thus formed is called the Republic of China; it is a republic as its name suggests. Another republic has had a presence on the Mainland for 62 years. It is called the People's Republic of China. But it has failed to hold China properly together as It is a people's republic in which the people have no say. a country. Nowadays, Taiwan can already be compared favourably with liberal democracies in the West in terms of democratic politics. But myopic Hong Kong people still refer to democracy in Taiwan as a negative example. But the President of the Republic of China in Taiwan is elected by "one person, one vote". By mere coincidence, the upcoming year of 2012 is going to be an election year. Taiwan, it will be necessary to elect the President of the Republic of China. Hong Kong, it will be necessary to elect the Chief Executive. The Chinese names of the two Presidential candidates of the Republic of China in Taiwan both contain the character "英". One is called MA Ying-jeou (馬英九), and the other TSAI Ing-wen (蔡英文). Both the two undeclared Chief Executive candidates in Hong Kong also have the character "英" in their Chinese names. One is called TANG Ying-yen (唐英年), and the other LEUNG Chun-ying (梁 The "Ying-Ing" duo of Taiwan must first undergo the test of the

23 million people in Taiwan, and the decision on whether the sissy MA Ying-jeou or the tomboyish TSAI Ing-wen is to be the President will be made by the In Hong Kong, the 1 200 members of the Election 15 million electors. Committee are to make a choice between the "Ying-Ying" pair and decide which "Ying" is to be the Chief Executive. This is really absurd. What right do we have to criticize the democratic politics in Taiwan? In 2012, the Chief Executive will continue to be returned by a coterie election, "thanks" to the pro-establishment and pro-democracy Members in this Chamber. Democratic Party claims that the improved package it put forward aims to create five additional functional constituency (FC) seats as a means of "diluting" and eventually abolishing all FCs. Only idiots will believe such an argument. they forget one thing. Since they support the selection of the Chief Executive by a coterie election in 2012, how can they still have the face to oppose coterie elections? The present political ecology is like this: full of impostors who are so brazen as to brag about their efforts to promote the cause of democracy in Hong They not only support the selection of the Chief Executive by a coterie election but also endorse the addition of five more FC seats without introducing any changes to the existing FCs. Stephen LAM, you are now present. may not be the arch-culprit, but you are certainly one of the "architects" of Hong Kong's political regression.

In 2003, the SAR Government attempted to forcibly enact a piece of legislation on implementing Article 23 of the Basic Law, so as to bring into Hong Kong the Mainland's approach of suppressing dissidents and preserving totalitarian rule. Both in 2004 and 2007, the Central Government gave an interpretation of the Basic Law regarding the procedures to amend the methods for selecting the Chief Executive and for forming the Legislative Council, lengthening the "three-step" process under the Basic Law to a "five-step" one, and denying Hong Kong people their hope of implementing dual universal suffrage in 2007. Totalitarianism is the true face of the Central Government and any autocratic governments.

In 2010, four other Legislative Council Members and I resigned with the aim of triggering a "five geographical constituencies referendum", so that the people could directly exercise their civil right of going to the ballot box to voice to the Central Government and the SAR Government their demand for the immediate implementation of dual universal suffrage based on "one person, one vote". But this led to a boycott by other pan-democratic political parties and an

avalanche of suppression by the SAR Government and the pro-establishment camp.

On 25 June the same year, the Legislative Council passed a farcical constitutional reform package proposed by the Democratic Party and entitled "Methods for Selecting the Chief Executive and for Forming the Legislative Council in 2012", thus depriving the majority of Hong Kong people of their right to nomination and to be elected, consolidating the evil FC seats in the Legislative Council, and even heralding an electoral system marked with the screening of Chief Executive candidates by a coterie of people. The development of democracy in Hong Kong has since entered a dark age. The SAR Government claims that this is an important stride and a significant milestone for our But in reality, all is just "false democracy", constitutional development. something that misleads and confuses the people. The Democratic Party and the Hong Kong Association for Democracy and People's Livelihood supported this farcical constitutional reform package, betrayed the cause of democracy and abandoned their electors. The disintegration of the democratic camp is already a law of physics.

What followed were a series of measures aimed at suppressing civil rights and liberties. On 11 May 2011, the Legislative Council Committee on Rules of Procedure, with the support of the Democratic Party and pro-establishment Members, proposed a motion on amending the Rules of Procedure for extending the Legislative Council President's power of expelling Members to the Chairmen of the various Panels, so as to restrict people's representatives in expressing public opinions and suppress political protests in the legislature.

Several days later, the Government put forward a replacement mechanism that abolishes the holding of by-elections for filling vacancies in the Legislative Council. Dr Margaret NG has already offered an in-depth analysis of this arrangement. The aim of such an arrangement is to deprive us of our electoral right.

In a recent blog article, cultural critic CHAN Wan writes (and I quote): "One of the assessments underlining Hong Kong communists' increased attempts to suppress and deal with protesters by invoking criminal laws and stirring up talks about safeguarding law and order is whether stronger police suppression will induce Hong Kong protesters to stand more united and stage fiercer

struggles. The answer to this question depends on how much strength protesters can muster and whether people's organizations can stand on the same front. The Democratic Party's defection to the Chinese Communists on the constitutional reform package in 2010 has led to a softening of stances and doubts among the anti-Communist camp in Hong Kong, and the Democratic Party still embraces large numbers of docile and moderate middle-class people in Hong Kong. All this may have a divisive effect on Hong Kong people's will of protest, inducing the Chinese Communist Party to conclude that it can clamp down on dissidents." (End of quote) This viewpoint indeed hits the nail on the head.

LI Keqiang, a member of the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and also a Vice-Premier of the State Council, paid a visit to Hong Kong in August. 18 August, LI Keqiang attended the centenary ceremony of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) held at Loke Yew Hall. His visit reminds me of one thing. When LI Keqiang visited Loke Yew Hall at HKU, the entire HKU campus was guarded by 2 000 policemen, put under tight security, and caught in an atmosphere of white terror. Student protesters were repressed, and we have already discussed this matter at two special meetings of the Panel on Security. The Government claimed that LI was a very important person (VIP) from China, and since it was necessary to protect such a VIP, tighter security measures must be adopted. However, this was not the case 88 years ago in the spring of 1923 when Dr SUN Yat-sen returned to HKU, his alma mater. Dr SUN Yat-sen likewise delivered a speech at Loke Yew Hall. His speech, which was delivered in English, carried the title "Why I Became a Revolutionist". He answered the question on the origin of his revolutionary ideas. He explained that during his period of studies in Hong Kong Dr SUN Yat-sen studied in Diocesan Home and Orphanage, Central School and Hong Kong College of Medicine for Chinese. During this period, he saw that Hong Kong under British rule was marked by a clean government, with protection of people's livelihood and well-being. However, on Mainland China just a stone's throw away, under the autocratic rule of the Qing government, there were destitution, corruption and collusion between officials and merchants. As a result, he started wondering why Hong Kong should not be used as a base for reforming the evil politics in China. On 3 June this year, I wrote an article in *Ming Pao* entitled "Hong Kong has always been a base of subversion". From the "Double Tenth" to "1 July" and 2012 After Dr SUN Yat-sen's speech at Loke Yew Hall in 1923, the students there all

expressed very warm welcome to his amiability and friendliness. They gave him a toss, and afterwards, he posed with students for pictures.

Years ago, was it necessary to station 2 000 policemen on the HKU campus as a security measure? Eighty-eight years later, on 18 August this year, another VIP visited HKU. But the visit ended up in the unlawful detention of students, the suppression of peaceful protests and the transformation of the university campus into a place of martial law. Is this progress or regression? Therefore, when I discussed the Xinhai Revolution in schools this year, I also touched upon all these issues. Secretary and Chief Secretary for Administration, I have been to 29 secondary schools to give talks. I intend to do so in more schools later.

Last time in this Chamber, I asked the Chief Executive why he should have openly antagonized the people by appointing a Bureau Director with the lowest popularity rating as the Chief Secretary for Administration, telling him that this ran completely counter to political ethics. I talked to him about Mencius, but he accused me of using foul language; he did not even listen to what I had to say. To him, any insolence shown to leaders or autocratic rulers must be treason and heresy. When I talked about Mencius, he refused to listen and dismissed me as a "chav". The line I quoted is "What I have heard is only the slaying of a despot named Zhou, never any regicide". When Mencius once conversed with King Xuan of Qi, the king asked him: "Is regicide allowed?" King Xuan had in mind the revolutions staged by Tang and Wu, and he wondered whether regicide was Mencius thus replied: "He who does harm to humaneness is a knave; allowed. he who does harm to righteousness is a savage. He who does such harm to both humaneness and righteousness is a despot. What I have heard is only the slaying of a despot named Zhou, never any regicide". A "despot" is an "autocrat". GADDAFI, a dictator who once ruled Libya for several decades, has eventually failed to resist the people's uprising against his tyranny, faced his retribution, and ended up losing his family and his own life. Government is currently executive-led, so the Chief Executive is a "despot", because he has all the powers. Having defied all political ethics and taken on swindlers of all sorts, the SAR Government will surely be spurned by the people and punished by history.

I so submit.

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

MR RONNY TONG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, with regard to the Policy Address this year, apart from the part on universal retirement protection which, as I mentioned yesterday, has aroused extreme anger, the paragraphs on democratic development have aroused even more widespread public anger.

In paragraph 183 on political ethics, Deputy President, it is stated that "...... an accommodating political culture is essential. If political groups refuse to make the slightest compromise or even resort to fierce confrontational tactics, social progress will be stifled." It is indeed bewildering for our Chief Executive, whose central idea is to treat people differently according to their affinity with the Government, to advocate the nurturing of an accommodating political culture. As for his criticism about the refusal to make compromises on the part of political parties, conclusion can be easily drawn from Chief Executive's attitude in the two constitutional reform exercises that it was actually he himself but not any political group who has refused to make compromises. Therefore, I absolutely agree with some colleagues, Mr WONG in particular, in commenting that the political ethics preached by the Chief Executive is nondescript. In my opinion, it is both against political ethics and irrational for the Chief Executive to include such a paragraph in his Policy Address.

Deputy President, the Chief Executive has cited in the paragraphs on democratic development his achievements in three areas to prove his commitment to democracy. Let's see what such areas of achievement are. The first measure put forward is the development of Political Appointment System and Deputy President, I have to say that this is indeed a very shocking remark. Democratic system actually runs counter to appointment system and for someone who has promoted the development of appointment system, how can the Chief Executive dare claim that he has enhanced democracy during his term of office? Furthermore, there are strong and unanimous calls from all sectors of the community for the Government to abolish District Council (DC) Appointment System and the Chief Executive himself has mentioned in various occasions that consideration would be given to abolishing the system. During discussions on constitutional reform when he was running for re-election as the Chief Executive, a clear remark, if not a promise, has also been made to indicate his recognition of the immense contradictions between DC Appointment System and the

development of democracy. Yet, what do we have today? Not only has the Special Administrative Region Government failed to embark on a total abolition of the Appointment System, it is not even willing to offer us a timetable for this. How can a further safeguard to the Appointment System be regarded as an achievement in promoting democracy?

The second accomplishment he has mentioned is the increase of the number of elected seats in Legislative Council and DCs but Deputy President, it is in fact unimaginably queer in saying so. Although a proposal has been endorsed last year to increase the number of elected seats in Legislative Council and DCs, and no matter how controversial it is or how divergent are the views of the pan-democrats on this proposal, it is after all an amendment proposed by civil political groups and the Chief Executive has all along objected to the proposal. Deputy President, I have mentioned on the first day that from what I recall, one week prior to our voting on the constitutional reform package, the Chief Executive still kept a poker face and said to me, "Ronny, give up that wishful thinking of yours!", meaning that he will make no compromise. What he has stated in the paragraph cited just now on "an accommodating political culture" and "the slightest compromise" is totally contrary to his political ideas. Only after agreement has been secured from Beijing did he take all credits to himself for the passage of the proposal and claim that this is what he has successfully fought for. Comparing with some of our colleagues who have put up banners containing similar messages, it is even more shameless for him to handle the matter this way.

Deputy President, increasing the rate of financial assistance for candidates running in DC and Legislative Council elections is the third area of achievements mentioned. It is true that the subsidy for each vote will be increased by \$1 but the most important point is that the subsidy provided by the Government so far will still not exceed half of the prescribed amount of election funding. Let's take for example the situation of Legislative Council Members to be returned from a single territory-wide DC functional constituency under the proportional representation system and see how ridiculous it will be to adopt such a subsidizing policy. The maximum amount of election funding for candidates running in the election will be \$6 million and in other words, the maximum amount of financial assistance to be received will only be \$3 million. Such being the case, candidates running for these Legislative Council seats will have to spend at least \$3 million for the election. How much do we get each month for

serving as a Legislative Council Member? For how many months of volunteer service we will have to engage in Legislative Council in order to earn sufficient funding for the election? For professionals like me who have some savings, it may not be a problem but after all, I have to use my own money to support my political career. However, for those who do not have much savings, does it mean that they can never run in Legislative Council elections? Frankly speaking, I find it grossly outrageous for the Chief Executive to regard developments in these three areas as his political accomplishments in democratic development.

(THE PRESIDENT resumed the Chair)

Moreover, I would also like to point out that supporting software is required. However, what kind of software do we have? The fact is, President, participating in democratic elections nowadays is becoming increasingly difficult. Under the present regulatory mechanism, we are not allowed to put up pennants and banners or erect easy-mount frames, and all democratic elections will pass into silence. The results of democratic elections will be achieved through the giving out of daily necessities, electric rice cookers and electrical heaters. What will be the software behind? The real objective is smothering elections of a truly democratic nature through the adoption of such tricks. President, it is my opinion that the Chief Executive Donald TSANG should instead feel ashamed and shameful for this.

Thank you, President.

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

MS EMILY LAU (in Cantonese): President, this is the last Policy Address in Donald TSANG's term of office. Some of the proposals put forward are welcomed by the people, and indeed much sought after by them for many years. Many of the proposals have admittedly been sought after by the people for many years, but the Administration must still be criticized for rolling them out at so late a time. Most of the proposals cannot possibly be implemented until after

Donald TSANG has left office, nor do we even know whether the new Chief Executive will continue with their implementation. Many people therefore want to ask Donald TSANG why he has chosen to roll out these proposals only when he is about to leave office and when just several months is left, after all his refusal to heed the opinions of the public and the Legislative Council over his long years as Chief Executive. Most of the proposals will not have been implemented when he leaves office on 30 June next year. What is he up to? What is he up to, President?

The Government's policy blunders abound, and the public are getting more and more indignant at the Government's governing performance. I must raise one point, a point on its governing approach, about the so-called governing team. Therefore, President, I will move an amendment a moment later, and the objective of the amendment is to point out that the accountability system has proven itself to be an utter failure after many years of implementation.

President, when did the whole story begin? You may remember that it was in July 2002 that TUNG Chee-hwa initiated this accountability system for principal officials. At the time, the idea stirred up huge controversies in the legislature, and not much support was expressed in the community either. TUNG Chee-hwa himself went ahead with the implementation of the system in the several years that followed, but in 2005, he had to step down in disgrace. However, some time after Donald TSANG's rise to power, in the middle of 2008, he still went ahead with the expansion of the accountability system, and this accounts for the presence of some of the government officials here today. accountability system is a complete departure from any correct practices in democratic constitutional development. Stephen LAM, the Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs at the time, explained that many places in the whole world where democracy was practised also followed the same practice of identifying outsiders for political appointment as government officials. President, what he said was only half of the truth, and the other half was concealed. It is true that in other places, ministerial posts are not filled by civil servants, and we are in support of this practice. But how are ministers identified in other places? Through elections based on universal suffrage! elections based on universal suffrage, ruling parties or ruling coalitions are Then, the most senior ones in ruling parties or ruling coalitions are returned. appointed ministers, while those on the second rung are undersecretaries or political assistants. But this practice was not followed at that

time, and the last segment was removed, thus depriving the whole accountability system of any public opinion support. This was further compounded by the Government's lack of legitimacy and public mandate. Then, they proceeded to put together a ragtag team whose members might not even know one another at the beginning. Some of these people were appointed Bureau Secretaries and others Undersecretaries, with each earning some \$100,000 a month. This led to huge public outcries, and the public all thought that this was downright robbery.

President, in particular, I must mention the expansion of the political appointment system in 2008. If you bother to do any research, you will notice that according to the University of Hong Kong's poll findings, during the period from Donald TSANG's rise to power in 2005, to the end of 2005 and up to 2006 and late 2007, the popularity rating of the SAR Government all the time lingered around some 30% and 40%. But after the expansion of the political appointment system, its popularity rating immediately dropped to some 20%, with the disapproval rate rising by 100% without showing any decline ever since. Even though he announced various measures last year, such as the freezing of pay, he could not restore people's confidence and support. This therefore shows that the system is not of any help to society and the public. And, what is the other thing that has enraged the public even more? It is the fact that the whole system is devoid of any accountability. Honestly, if I am to enumerate all the defects of this system, I cannot possibly finish the job even when darkness falls. President, you and I should know all such defects only too well.

But let me still talk about several incidents frequently mentioned by people. Thailand has recently run into trouble again. In November 2008, there emerged in Thailand the Red Shirts and the Yellow Shirts, and over a thousand Hong Kong residents were stranded in that country. But no one cared about them. It was not known where Ambrose LEE had gone to. He might be in South Korea or somewhere else at that time. At a meeting held by the Government, there was not even any representative from the Security Bureau to speak on this incident. Secretary Stephen LAM was Acting Secretary for Security at that time, but he was nowhere to be seen despite his acting appointment. Chief Secretary for Administration Henry TANG likewise paid no heed. President, do you know who assumed full responsibility in the end? In the end, NGAI Wing-chit, a Deputy Secretary for Security, took control. Alas, what a complete mess! The public thus could not help wondering what kind of accountability system the Government had put in place. But no one had to face any consequence after this

respond to this incident afterwards? President, he simply emerged to reply that it was a collective decision, and the responsibility would be borne by the entire team. In that case, I must say, this team should step down! It did not do anything at all. No one ever stood forward to admit their mistakes and how they would be held responsible. Absolutely nothing was done.

Some time later, in 2011, there was the issue of unauthorized building structures. It transpired that as early as 2006, when Secretary Michael SUEN was Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands, his property was already encumbered by the Buildings Department for the existence of unauthorized building structures, but he had ignored the encumbrance over all the years. Later, it was discovered that Secretary Stephen LAM had also erected an unauthorized building structure, and so had Under Secretary Kitty POON and Gregory SO. The discovery of Gregory SO's unauthorized building structure came last. Many civil servants therefore said to me: "What's wrong with him? So many people have been talking about this issue, but he hasn't taken any actions." It was not until his unauthorized building structure was discovered that Then, it was further discovered that the Chief Executive had also erected an unauthorized building structure. Well, President, did anyone stand forward to assume responsibility for all this? I therefore think that the behaviour of this very Administration is really infuriating.

In June last year, Secretary Stephen LAM rolled out the replacement mechanism on the excuse that when the five Members who had resigned ran in the ensuing by-election, the public did not show much support for them, as indicated by the turnout rate of merely 17%. It may well be argued that the turnout rate was on the low side, but the main problem is that he did not consult the public, President. Many people admit that they did not cast any votes, but they also assert that they do not want to be stripped of their right to vote! That is President, they were totally unwilling to conduct any really infuriating! consultation, thus leading to an outburst of anger in the whole city. It was not until large numbers of people took part in the march on 1 July that the Government hastily withdrew its proposal. The behaviour of those "royalists" was even more ridiculous. Initially, they urged the Government to implement the proposal as early as possible, but later, they criticized it for not conducting any consultation. They simply want to snatch all possible benefits, but we do not find this unusual at all. With such people in the legislature, with such a

Government, how can the public believe that the duty of governing Hong Kong can be properly discharged? Therefore, President, regarding this accountability system, my demand is the conduct of a review by them. After the completion of the review, an analysis of the findings must first be carried out. Nothing should be done in the meantime because people are really very angry.

One reason for the absolute necessity of conducting a review is that since as early as two years ago, the University of Hong Kong has been conducting an opinion poll on those Under Secretaries and Political Assistants. Surprisingly, the findings reveal that people were totally unfamiliar with more than 90% of these appointees, meaning that their recognition rate was almost zero. One of the Under Secretaries, however, received commendation. He was Gabriel LEUNG, and now he has been promoted to work in the Chief Executive's Office. President, I do not know whether you are aware that Gabriel LEUNG's initial performance was in fact very poor. People criticized that when he first attended the meetings of the Panel on Health Services, his manner was very poor, even more bureaucratic than the high-ranking civil servants. However, he soon awakened to the situation and made adjustments.

I believe that to err is only human. He was willing to accept criticisms and make adjustments, so more people are now familiar with him. But we cannot notice the existence of his peers, and no one is familiar with them either. After looking at the opinion polls on the Government's popularity, I frankly do not know in what ways these appointees have helped the Government. Maybe, they have instead done disservice to it, which explains why their recognition rates are so low. But their salaries are all very high, with each earning some \$100,000 a month. The public have thus asked: "Should we waste our money in this way?" And now, it is even disclosed in the Policy Address that they will continue to develop the accountability system.

President, this is his usual practice. Whenever there is any news, he will disclose it to the press. Recently, he has been talking about conducting a review, proposing — President, can you guess what he proposes — to increase the number of such appointees during the term of the next Government. He even thinks that the present number of such posts is not large enough. He wants to create two posts of Deputy Secretary of Department respectively under the Chief Secretary for Administration and the Financial Secretary, while changing the number of Policy Bureaux from 12 to 14 and keeping the number of Under

Secretaries unchanged. As for Political Assistants, he thinks that they should not be paid so much money, saying that lump sums should be allocated to individual Policy Bureaux, allowing them to make their own decisions. In that case, more money may be paid to them. He also talks about increasing the salaries of principal officials under the accountability system. But has he ever consulted the Finance Committee?

Actually, the Administration should carry out a comprehensive review of the accountability system. This explains why my amendment asks for a review by the Administration, President. But having made such a disclosure to the press, the Administration seems to think that it has already conducted a review. Maybe, the Secretary can explain later on whether this is really the case. the time when TUNG Chee-hwa rolled out the accountability system, over all these years, the Legislative Council has been asking the Administration to conduct a review. But the Administration has been reluctant to do so, refusing categorically to heed the advice of the public and the legislature. Now, it even talks about increasing the salary of this or that person. What is wrong with it anyway? Even if I am not saying that the task should be left to the next Chief Executive He should at least conduct a review before the term of the present Government comes to an end, shouldn't he? After the review, he can then gauge the opinions in the legislature. And, in case there are any new issues, he can leave them to the next Government. He must not simply sound out the ideas to the press and then think that he has conducted a review. No, he must not belittle the Legislative Council in this way. President, I therefore think that the Administration must learn a lesson and review the whole accountability system. Before the completion of the review, please do not take any further moves, please do not make any further changes because it simply should not do anything at this stage. People are already so discontented with the system, so why should the Government still increase their salaries and take so many moves? This is entirely unacceptable.

President, just now, some Members criticized the Democratic Party for supporting the constitutional reform package last year, which gives each elector two votes in the election next year, increases the number of seats in the Legislative Council from 60 to 70, and creates five additional Functional Constituency (FC) Members to be returned by all Hong Kong people (though such Members must themselves be District Council members and nominated by 15 of their peers). The Democratic Party does not think that this is universal

suffrage. This is of course no universal suffrage. This is only a compromise. But at that time, we were able to grasp what many people thought, knowing that they were highly displeased, fearing that if we voted down the package again, we would have to mark time for five more years, as what we were forced to do in 2005. The Democratic Party therefore agreed to support the creation of 10 additional seats, and as a compromise, we also supported the arrangements pertaining to the Chief Executive Election. We have already made this point very clear. We hope that we can thus break the deadlock and move towards universal suffrage. Such is the conviction of the Democratic Party. Some in society may disagree, and we do respect their views. But we also hope that they can appreciate that many Hong Kong people, be they middle-class, grass-roots or very wealthy people, do strongly approve of the Democratic Party's decision, in the hope that the deadlock can be broken.

However, President, I do not cherish any illusion. We will of course continue to promote the enactment of legislation in one go, but we also realize that the Central Government is very ruthless. We understand that its change of mind last year must have been based on some reasons, because prior to this, the Central Government and the SAR Government had already announced that they would not accept the Democratic Party's proposal and would proceed with the Second Reading of the Bill as scheduled. But for some reasons, it subsequently changed its mind. Therefore, President, we intend to continue to strive for universal suffrage for Hong Kong. We really hope that the matter can be settled once and for all, rather than being brought up for disputes at intervals of several This sort of internal attrition will not do any good to Hong Kong, not to mention the fact that in its reports to the Central Authorities, the SAR Government has repeatedly attested and admitted that the majority of Hong Kong people are keenly looking forward to the arrival of universal suffrage. We therefore think that even though Donald TSANG will leave office in a matter of months, he should still honestly relay this message to the Central Authorities. And, anyone who wants to become the Chief Executive should see even greater reasons for relaying this message.

President, speaking of the Chief Executive Election, I think you are also aware that some people are meeting the press every day. But so far, no one has dared to declare any intention of running in the election. As usual, they are just waiting for Beijing's indication. This means that the entire situation in Hong Kong is under Beijing's control, much to our indignation. If a person thinks that

it is possible for him to run in the election, if he thinks that he is capable, then he should by all means take part and compete with others. But now all of them are constantly looking over the shoulder, just to guess Beijing's intention and check whether there is any approval, because while one may be allowed to run in the competition for a little while, the approval may suddenly be withdrawn a few weeks later, or there may suddenly be talks about who has been preordained and how others will therefore stand no chance at all. Such a practice has time and again turned Hong Kong into an international laughing stock. Therefore, we really hope that proposals on the enactment of all required legislation in one go can be put forward as soon as possible. Since the Central Authorities have already said that the Chief Executive will be elected by "one person, one vote" in 2017 and all Legislative Council Members by universal suffrage in 2020, all people should be qualified to stand in the Chief Executive Election, and there should not be a high threshold for screening candidates. When all Legislative Council Members are elected by universal suffrage, all FC seats in the Legislative Council should be abolished. Whether Members are to be elected in one single constituency covering the whole of Hong Kong, whether several constituencies are to be delineated, or whether a mixed-mode approach is to be adopted, this remains a matter that must be tackled.

President, I have repeatedly pointed out that the development of democracy in Hong Kong must be based on party politics, a multi-party system with competition and checks and balances. However, as mentioned by some Members just now, the Administration has never sought to assist political parties in their growth. Rather, it frequently argues that since party politics in Hong Kong are not well-developed, it is not a suitable time to implement universal suffrage. When will it be regarded as "well-developed", President?

If even the Chief Executive is not allowed to have any political affiliation This is also one of the problems. Save when Western District rings them up, gives them a dressing-down and forces them to cast their votes, the Chief Executive has practically no voting support in the legislature. In many cases, even "royalist" Members are not consulted individually on the policies formulated by the executive authorities. I do not know whether the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB) knows a bit more, but even the DAB will sometimes lash out at the Government. Didn't Mr TAM Yiu-chung also criticize the Chief Executive for adopting a perverse policy last time? Therefore, because of its own behaviour, the Government sometimes

ends up being totally deserted in the legislature, with no one giving it a helping hand. Honestly, no help means no pity. But our objective is to fight for the interests of Hong Kong.

President, in any civilized place, the head of the executive authorities invariably commands very stable support in the legislature. But this must not be perceived as something sure to happen. Such support is mainly due to common political affiliation and collaborative efforts. The head of the government leads the executive authorities, and in the legislature, he is supported by his principal officials or political allies. In the course of the government's policy formulation, the head of the executive authorities will consult these people in the legislature, making compromises and amendments along the way. In the end, they will emerge as a team "lining up side by side" to account for their policy proposals on education, healthcare, housing and so on.

This should be the way to get things done. In this way, he can command support in the legislature because his proposals will also be Members' proposals, in marked contrast to what some government officials have told us: once they enter the Chamber, they will be treated as targets of darts, with all Members, including "royalists", chiding them. And, some "royalists" are much fiercer critics than others. But sometimes, when they meet with residents in the communities, they will behave differently. President, you really must find out what is going on and exercise some sort of party discipline.

The question is: what is to be done? The Government does not want to co-operate with the legislature. Basically, even under the existing system, there should still be one possibility. Even though there is no universal suffrage — President, having universal suffrage, being able to elect a government by universal suffrage, is of course most wonderful. But even in the absence of universal suffrage, the Government may still form a coalition with them and rationalize the relationship. President, this means that political parties in the legislature will be in the same boat as the Government. In this way, they can be prevented from continuing their present practice of "having their cake and eat it". At present, whenever they are displeased, they will chide the Government because even though they do so, they will still get benefits, and when they meet with residents in the communities afterward, they can even explain to them that they have done something. Members of the public are sometimes confused by

their behaviour. So, if it is possible to form a ruling coalition, they should really go ahead.

President, your liking for expressing views in public has turned greater these days, and I notice that you have recently dismissed a ruling coalition as not feasible. I really want to ask you why it is not feasible. Its formation is not ruled out in the Basic Law. But if the executive authorities refuse to share power and responsibility with political parties and the legislature, President, how can governance be rationalized? Therefore, you must not First, I do not know why you like expressing your views so much; second, what you have said is actually meant to stir up an argument with me. In that case, I would rather you came down to sit among us, and handed over the Presidency to another Member. Why is it not feasible? I frankly cannot understand why. Mr LAU Kong-wah is present, so he may perhaps say a few words. But, well, he is not Jasper TSANG himself.

This is the only way to rationalize the governance of the SAR, but you "royalists" have openly dismissed it as not feasible. If this is not feasible, what else is? We are now offering a solution, one which can give them both power and responsibility, rather than just placing Mr LAU Kong-wah in the Executive Council. I for one cannot see what functions he has succeeded in performing. What I have seen is only that sometimes, when all Members of the legislature cast negative votes, the two of them instead cast positive votes. What is the point of such an arrangement? What use can there be? President, Donald TSANG has scourged Hong Kong for so many years, so we in the Democratic Party will not support his Policy Address.

That said, we do understand that the public still support some of the proposals in the Policy Address although the Government has delayed their rolling out for such a long time. Resuming the construction of Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) flats has long since been overdue, of course. Likewise, they should have long since rolled out the fare concession of \$2 for the elderly and persons with disabilities. But even now, it must still take quite some time to prepare the implementation of all these measures. Therefore, the Democratic Party will abstain from voting. We will not support the Policy Address. I know some government officials hope that there can be a more dignified ending for them. But sorry, we cannot help them on this. There is actually nothing complicated about our stance — if you people can do a good job and enable the

public to enjoy many different benefits instantly, the Democratic Party will not stand in your way.

However, in many cases Especially at this very time when an election is approaching — President, I know you visit your constituency very frequently — the public are very upset. People all wonder: "God, what is wrong with the SAR Government?" Of course, people may sometimes also say: "God, you people please do not hurl so many objects around in the Chamber! Please ask Jasper TSANG to ensure better order in your meetings!" We have declared very clearly that the Democratic Party is in total support of a peaceful, sensible, non-violent and foul-language free approach to policy discussions. We have conveyed this message to the public unequivocally. But President, the public all want to see results.

However, the present political situation actually forces There may be many divergent views in this legislature. But well, even if all in the legislature are in total agreement — Mr LAU Kong-wah is present. Last year, he moved a motion on elderly housing. Seven, eight or nine amendments to his motion were moved at that time, and all of them were passed. But even so, what has happened? What has the Government since done? Therefore, one can say that when Members cannot come to any agreement, the Government will of course do But even when something commands Members' agreement, the Government will not take any action either. Do Members agree that such behaviour should be severely and sternly condemned? And, who elected them to office anyway? Who asked them to govern Hong Kong anyway? They were preordained by all those plutocrats and Beijing. In contrast, we were elected by the people, and the democratic camp actually got more than half of the votes in the general election, President. But in the legislature, we are the Outside the legislature, we are the majority, but this extremely arrogant Administration simply does not listen to our voices. They simply despise us.

A couple of days ago, we met with the Chief Executive, and I suppose people all know how he behaved towards us. Therefore, President, we will carry on our fight in the legislature. I know that Hong Kong people do not want us to stir up a revolution. I know that most people would like us to help them achieve universal suffrage and improve governance by peaceful, sensible and non-violent means. I am not saying that universal suffrage is a panacea for all ills. This is

not what I mean. But we have put forward many opinions. These days, many foreign visitors asked the Democratic Party for its views. We told them our opinions, and after listening to us, they commented that our views were very reasonable. They wondered why so many members of the Democratic Party should have been barred from entering the Mainland over the past 20 years, and why the SAR Government refused to listen to us. These visitors even made it a point to say that the SAR Government was not elected by the people. They all wondered why the Government refused to heed all our reasonable, moderate and progressive views.

President, please look at people's housing problem. Most people's homes are impossibly small. Should Hong Kong treat its people a bit better? Housing is such an important issue, and people are all seething with grievances now. These foreign visitors were here at the Government's invitation, but they still asked us, "Why is the situation in Hong Kong so strange? Your views are so sensible and Hong Kong is so well-equipped for universal suffrage. But why have you been denied universal suffrage?" I told them that all was because of Beijing and the handful of plutocrats.

President, honestly, we may well be conveying an erroneous message to society when we condemn the Administration for colluding with the business sector, because as my observation goes, many businessmen, especially proprietors of small and medium enterprises, are strongly against the Government, as shown by their outrage in meetings. Well, then, with whom does the Government collude? It colludes with a handful of consortia and property tycoons. And, property development is not their sole business. Many aspects of our life — clothing, food, housing and transportation — have already come under their control.

President, for years, the Democratic Party has been demanding the formulation of a competition law, and so have the Consumer Council and many in the legislature. A bill has been put forward at long last, but attempts are made to knock off a tooth from it here and there. Mr Albert HO of our party has remarked that the bill will soon be reduced to "a tiger with missing teeth". Can "a tiger with missing teeth" be of any help to the people? The most important thing now is to find out how we should deal with those huge consortia and gigantic corporations that exploit Hong Kong people. These are also the things we want to do, but he is not present. Up to now, we still do not know how

Gregory SO will eventually deal with this issue. Therefore, how can it be possible to rationalize the Government's governance? How can it be possible to convince the public that even though the Government is not elected by them, it will still listen to their opinions and roll out policies to better their well-being?

Therefore, President, I strongly hope that the Administration can carry out a review of the accountability system as quickly as humanly possible. speaking, I simply do not think that the present approach is at all proper. instead think that our development should be in the direction of party politics. The President of the Legislative Council does not think that this is feasible, and I do not know why he thinks so, but I maintain that co-operation with political parties is essential. President, if the Administration is willing to let political parties have more power and responsibility, more people will want to become political party members, and more people will want to make political donations. President, you are also aware of the recent row over such donations. in the DAB are really something because the donations you received are many times ours. But my point is that people are a bit apprehensive about such Therefore, we must try to reshape the whole situation, telling people donations. that the development of political parties is inevitable, healthy and necessary, and that the Administration is in support of such development. I also think that apart from encouraging people to make political donations, the Administration can learn from the practices adopted in other countries. In other countries, the respective proportions of votes received by various political parties in general elections are used as the basis to determine the proportion of assistance to be offered to each political party. Such assistance is offered to political parties and put directly into their pockets. This is rather unlike our current practice of offering a candidate \$11 or \$12 per vote. Such a practice is of no help to political parties. Rather, it can only offer assistance to candidates. But even in the case of assisting candidates, I must still say that the Secretary is very mean because the maximum level of assistance cannot exceed half of a candidate's election expenses. In other words, a candidate must raise funds to cover the other half no matter what. In this way, how can it be possible to assist the political parties?

I therefore hope that the Administration Even though only several months is left in the term of office of Donald TSANG's syndicate, he should still actively consider ways to foster the development of political parties. But most importantly, the sword must be removed to allow the Chief Executive's political

affiliation. This restriction is nowhere mentioned in the Basic Law. It is only something invented by the Administration and "royalists".

As long as political parties are unable to develop healthily, it will not be possible to induce more people to join political parties or make political donations. It will not be possible for Hong Kong's political system to develop healthily and prosperously. The so-called accountability system invented by the Administration runs completely counter to public opinions. It leads to a waste of public money, and cannot help improve governance either. For such reasons, we will not support the Policy Address. But even though it is going to be a complete waste of time, President, we must continue to express our views because this is the right way forward for Hong Kong. We therefore hope that in the remaining months, the Administration can make as much progress as possible. Please do not put any papers on post creation before the Finance Committee. We will surely vote against them.

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

MR LAU KONG-WAH (in Cantonese): President, just now Ms Emily LAU mentioned my name several times, and therefore I have to make some response. She said that the issue of housing for the elderly raised by me was widely supported by different political parties and camps, but the Government did not seem to care about it. Nevertheless, the fact is not like that; perhaps she has a faulty memory. In fact, I proposed in the preceding motion debate the idea of launching a reverse mortgage plan for the elderly, so that the singleton elderly may get some kind of monthly subsidies by joining such a reverse mortgage plan. In fact, the plan has been implemented, and the Government is not ignoring all of our proposals.

Moreover, even prior to the issuance of the Policy Address this time, the Chief Executive has gauged views of various political parties and camps. The DAB pointed out that at present, elderly people are enjoying a concession of two-dollar fare for riding a bus two times a week, and we hoped that they can enjoy such a concession every day. The Chief Executive has also accepted our suggestion; therefore he is not ignoring all the suggestions.

However, one thing I appreciate what Ms Emily LAU has just raised, that is, concerning the culture of the Legislature

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LAU, have you put the microphone on?

MR LAU KONG-WAH (in Cantonese): I have put the microphone on, President, perhaps I am speaking in too low a voice, and I can speak louder, but I am too soft-spoken. President, we in the Legislature should speak softly. Your good self say that the power of language lies in its substance, not its decibel, don't you?

President, I consider that the culture of the Legislature should start with upholding rational, peaceful, non-violent behaviour and refraining from using abusive language. Ms Emily LAU repeated many times that even if she was scolded by many people in foul language, she would still insist on this, which I consider vital. I also consider that this is something everyone of us should uphold.

On the contrary, I have heard Dr Margaret NG mentioned particularly in her speech just now about the issue of scolding and humiliating. She mentioned the notion of differentiation according to affinity, no matter whether they are public officers or Members. In fact, according to my observation, Dr Margaret NG has never stood up to make any accusation against the ever growing ferocity of violence in the Council and language violence in recent years, even when her fellows threw things around and used foul language. Is this the notion of differentiation according to affinity, or just as Mr Paul TSE has said, she was simply protecting her fellows?

President, Dr Margaret NG mentioned that as the representative of the legal sector, she raised the issue of the judicial review on Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge again. In fact, the issue has taken deep root in the minds of the general public. The public are resentful of the behaviour of the Civic Party or this group of barristers like Dr Margaret Ng herself. I believe that whenever they make a visit to their own constituencies, they will hear the heartfelt wishes of the public. She cannot simply wipe that off. What is the reason for that? In fact, the public are not objecting to the personal right of initiating a judicial review; that is

not the case. The fact is that the public frown upon the intervention of political parties in judicial reviews, or even the provision of services in a "one-stop" model, which leads to the question of a conflict of interest. This is what the public resent most. The public disapprove of, and the retired Chief Justice Andrew LI also disagrees with, the reliance on the courts to resolve political issues as it has politicized the judicial review mechanism. As to this point, I wish to remind Dr Margaret NG that she should be vigilant in her future speeches that the public are resentful of such behaviour, and this has nothing to do with the protection of the right of individual citizens to initiate a judicial review. With regards to this, I consider every lawmaker should uphold.

President, the public also resent legislative violence or the widespread radical behaviour in society. I have frequently made observations, or during the past three or four years, since some Members joined our Legislature who have conducted

(Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung stood up)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LAU, please stop for a while, Mr LEUNG, what point of order do you wish to raise?

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): He talked about legislative violence. In your capacity as the President of this legislature, do you consider

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Please repeat it again as I cannot hear what you have said. Have you put the microphone on?

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Sorry. My colleague Mr LAU Kong-wah repeated many times about violence in the Council. In your capacity as the President of this legislature, do you consider that there is violence in this Council?

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, what you have raised is not a point of order, please sit down. Mr LAU, please go on.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): That is to say, he is given the free hand to talk nonsense.

MR LAU KONG-WAH (in Cantonese): President, as a matter of fact, members of the public can see it clearly. With an increasing number of them watching the live broadcast, they can make clear judgments themselves. Over the past few years, we have witnessed the conduct of some Members after their entry into this Chamber, seeing that their speeches and behaviours are increasingly violent. Hurling objects, knocking items off the table and speaking foul language take place frequently, seeming to have become commonplace. Some Members hurl objects two minutes after coming to a meeting, and then walk away from it and call it a day. Many kaifongs share the same view, thinking that this is unfair to Yet, they do not need to think so, as we Members are obliged to deliberate political matters in this Council in a decent manner. In fact, these improper behaviours in the Council have engendered sheer copycats, as evidenced in the numerous acts of confrontation outside it, which are getting even more intense in We have seen that the acts of violent confrontation, such as pushing mills barriers, occupying the roads for vehicular traffic, wrecking the doors and grabbing necks, have escalated in a step-by-step manner. Under these circumstances, our Police Force still had to maintain law and order for the sake of public peace. Even when our security personnel were working to maintain public peace, they were still accused by those who identified with these rioters of claims that cropped up from nowhere, such as political suppression and excessive police powers. I find it unfair to the Police Force and the police officers on the front line, and consider these accusations are grossly unjust.

The Police Force is duty-bound to maintain peace for the public at large. As to this kind of radical actions or those which amount to criminal offences, some Members of this Council have in a sense condoned or even beautified them. Under this circumstance, the society is sometimes at a loss in distinguishing what is right and wrong. As a result, when we bump into kaifongs on the street, they often tell us that such actions have definitely set a bad example for the children. Many of them notice that their children have begun to hurl objects like chopsticks

and pens. Who do they model upon? They learn from the television that it is alright to confront their patents this way, and that such confrontation is well justified. With this in view, do I consider such confrontation justified? Under this circumstance, I believe it is worth thinking twice. Some fellows inside or outside this Council may have the term "democracy" engraved on their forehead, "freedom" on their right arm and "human rights" on their left arm, but they do not follow the rule of law. No matter how high-sounding their remarks on human rights, freedom and democracy are, this will just be empty talk if the rule of law is neither based upon nor abided by. This is very important to me. I also hope that under public support the Police Force can maintain law and order — please be assured that members of the public support their work very much — and that members of the public can step forward more often to condemn these radical acts in future. It is also my wish that Dr Margaret NG can more often condemn acts which amount to criminal offences and contempt of the rule of law.

But regrettably, President, you may remember that in a meeting of the Panel on Security where I moved a motion condemning the act of grabbing other's neck by a person donning the "V for Vendetta" mask to the support of a number of Honourable colleagues, including those from the Democratic Party, it was opposed by Dr Margaret NG to my regret. If these violent acts are not condemned, how can one point an accusing finger at others?

President, in this Policy Address of Chief Executive Donald TSANG titled "From Strength to Strengthen", there is a special section where he shares that as a public officer, he has been working for the Government for 40 or so years, seven of them dedicated to the office of Chief Executive. From my point of view, the way that he makes such a conclusion is both important and valuable. The reason is that in the approximately 14 years since the Reunification, which is just a very short time, we have got to govern or administer our own homeland well, and there is much experience, including perhaps faults and mistakes, to be learnt. Nevertheless, this is still the home that we all hope to improve. This is why I think it is important to make a conclusion. I am also of the view that apart from the Chief Executive himself, it is worthy for every one of our Honourable colleagues to ponder on it — we have been through 14 years since the Reunification witnessing changes in society, the world and the political culture in this Council — we need a conclusion to see what our next step is on the road ahead.

Of course, Ms Emily LAU earlier raised some proposals on what should be done, namely the idea of a ruling coalition and so on. It is not the case that there is no room for deliberation on the matter, and I think it is worth discussing. I am not sure when she has learned that there is no room left for discussing the matter. As a matter of fact, in taking the step forward, it is very important for us to make use of the experience gained in the past as guidance.

As politicians, we have noticed or witnessed from the past that if we take an opposing or defiant stance for every matter, members of the public may not find it acceptable. Similarly, those politicians who fully support all the ideas put forward by the Government with no exception cannot gain public recognition. In my view, every politician in this Council has to rethink how we are to affirm what is right and what is wrong, and put forward counter-proposals that are constructive in nature, with a view to gaining public support.

We will move towards the goal of dual universal suffrage in future. In the 10 years between now and 2020, which is a period in preparation for the implementation of universal suffrage, how are we going to craft the period, to take part in it and to make improvement to it? Given that we can all be part of it, this is quite an important issue. President, I would like to put forward several suggestions. In the Policy Address, the Chief Executive has extensively dealt with the work of making a conclusion on the roles played by the Government. In fact, the crux of it is how to handle the relationship between the Government and the market well. "Big market, small government", as he has mentioned, is of course the Government's mindset of administration all along. But in case of market failure, the Government should intervene as appropriate.

Over these 14 years, we have seen occasions of government intervention in extreme situations. I am fine with it, but it may not be enough in some cases. In my opinion, it will be too late to intervene if the market has already failed. Many a member of the public has relayed to us that there are problems in several areas, including housing, where some fine-tuning has now been done to make it more acceptable. As for healthcare, if market adjustment is the only rule in place, many people will be suffering in case of market failure, as evidenced in the waiting time for healthcare services and the exorbitant drug prices. Nowadays, it is financially challenging to be sick, particularly for those in serious conditions. As for transport, amid the annual hikes in transport fees and the absence of subsidies from any fund, members of the public will to a certain extent be

victimized if the market fails to adjust and their affordability is out of sync. So in my view, it is essential for the Government to make some form of intervention as appropriate prior to market failure.

President, the other point is on election politics. The Chief Executive states in paragraph 201 of his Policy Address that with a humble spirit, we should study and compare the experience of other democratic countries in implementing their democratic systems. This is an important point. On our way towards the implementation of dual universal suffrage, what experience can we learn from other countries, regions or democratic political systems? President, recently we can see that in Europe and America, particularly in European countries and the United States where full-scale democratic systems are in place, there is serious fiscal deficit at the same time. Of course, I am not saying that democratic systems are to blame for all problems, but conversely speaking, it is wrong for some Members of this Council to resort to the electoral system as the panacea for all problems. Therefore, when election politics is on its way towards full-scale universal suffrage, I believe that if some in fact, in consolidating their experience, people of insight in the United States have begun to conclude that fiscal deficit is the natural outcome in a bipartisan system where the two political parties, one advocating tax reduction and the other increased welfare provision, come to power in turns. We can see that people in European countries have been severely victimized, since their successive governments are of the belief that fiscal surplus should all be expended while fiscal deficit should be made up for through loans that can be settled by the next government. This results in a piling up of liabilities that will remain insolvent for the generations to come. Under this circumstance, we have to be vigilant that financial discipline should be held fast. In my opinion, the administrations both before and after the Reunification have stuck to this discipline. But under this discipline, how can intervention be allowed in the areas of housing, healthcare services and transport as appropriate, with a view to helping members of the public? This is going to be a test of ability for the future SAR Government.

President, there may be another point to note in election politics. As in the case of other countries, political parties not only have to compete with each others in an election, there may also be bitter battles among them afterwards, and this may worsen the political ecology. We can see that in the United States, political parties are very often hindering each other. In the eyes of the discerning, all these have something to do with the presidential election next year.

Members of the public will suffer under such a scenario. Looking back to Hong Kong, if we as members of political parties battle bitterly and hinder each other, it may not be in the interest of the public. Some political parties have even gone as far as resorting to tactics that are radical, fierce and violent. Therefore, in designing the political system for the future, in particular, as mentioned by the Chief Executive, the roles of political groups, the relationship between the administration and the legislature, political ethics and so on, I believe there are much experience and lessons over the past 14 years for us to learn from.

Of course, given the importance of how the Government is run internally, I hope that in future the election campaign for the future Chief Executive has actually begun. I perceive that competition is very important, as it allows candidates or those who intend to run in it to make their ideas known for extensive discussion by members of the public. Some people have tried to classify previous Chief Executives according to their professions, to see if it is good to have a businessman to govern Hong Kong, or if a civil servant or a political figure is a better option. As a matter of fact, it is not a matter of what the person, his surname or his profession is, as this is not a one-man job *per se*. In my view, it is very important to see if the future Chief Executive has political capacity, which comprises his political ideas, the governing team, his relationship with other political groups/parties and how the political alliance is put to work. They all are important factors.

As to the interaction and collaboration between political parties/groups and the Government, given the possibly wider exposure in the Executive Council over the past few years, I can definitely see some room for improvement. In my opinion, government policy formulation may have to go through five dimensions: the first dimension is that members of the public express their opinions and views for the making and formulating of a policy within the bureau concerned; the second dimension refers to the deliberation among the policy committees and departments of the Government on how to formulate a policy; the third dimension refers to the gate-keeper's role played by the Executive Council, which vets a policy to see if it is in line with public sentiments and aspirations before it is unveiled; the fourth dimension is introduction of the policy to this Council for vetting and deliberation by various parties and groupings; and the fifth dimension refers to the actual implementation of the policy, where members of the public may have different points of view.

To link up these five dimensions, I hold that political parties/groups should have room to make the best of themselves to cross swords across the five dimensions, but similarly, there can also be a process of collaboration across the dimensions. If a five-dimensional collaborative process can be sought among the majority of political parties/groups in this Council, I believe it should benefit the future SAR with regard to its governance. As a matter of fact, I also think the Executive Council should include more directly elected representatives or those from political parties/groups, and I hope there will be participation and collaboration among them in the early stages of the decision-making process for policies in future.

The Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong has organized a workshop, where we shall state our views in detail on the future Chief Executive's governance, the economy and people's livelihood. We have made public the episodes on people's livelihood and the economy. In the episode on governance, we will detail our ideas in this respect, with a view to making our opinions known in a proactive and positive manner under the premise that Hong Kong is our home.

President, I have made a response to some Members' views, and stated my opinions on matters pertaining to such areas as security, administration of justice and governance. Thank you, President.

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

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): President, the Chief Executive tries to draw a conclusion in the Policy Address for the work he has done in his term of office over these several years.

Which initiative of the Chief Executive would he wish members of the public to remember most from his term? Would it be his rolling out of the resumption of building Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) flats at extremely favourable prices for members of the public to take part in the "lucky draw" — though the actual quantity of flats cannot help the public in materializing their wish for home ownership — and solving the youngsters' problem of purchasing their own homes? Or would the Chief Executive wish the elders to remember in

the future that it was his merit that they can enjoy the two-dollar concessionary fare?

President, as regard Donald TSANG's recent promotion of Stephen LAM to be the Chief Secretary for Administration, which was against people's wish, I think the impression it gave to the public was tantamount to a relentless slap on their faces. I recalled that when the Chief Executive announced this appointment, he said the reason for his appointment of Stephen LAM as the Chief Secretary for Administration was that the key tasks in the remaining term would be strongly political, thus he needed a co-ordinator — a person who can have his missions accomplished amidst tough situations and rise to challenges. He also stated that since there would be highly controversial issues to handle, it would not be possible to achieve both loving Hong Kong and treasuring popularity rating in everything.

President, what on earth are the strongly political tasks in the remaining months of the Chief Executive's term of office? I cannot see any indeed. Is it to push through the replacement mechanism? Is it the Competition Bill? Not really. That legislation has already become "a tiger with missing teeth" — for a "consensus" has already been reached. Is it his worry about a situation that HOS flats to be sold at extremely favourable prices would still induce objections? Is it the consultation for the enactment of legislation for Article 23 of the Basic Law that I worry most (no matter whether he is willing or unwilling to do so)? Or is it some other policies which are even more seriously against people's wish and very offensive to the public, so that one has to rise to challenges?

President, why did he promote Stephen LAM to be the Chief Secretary for Administration? This move may well be called an adherence to the pseudo-accountability system for principal officials. He not only failed to be accountable to the public, but also promoted the official most hated by people. The more the public detest a person, the more the Chief Executive finds that person love Hong Kong; the more a policy provokes public grievances, the more the Chief Executive considers that policy a good one. What is the point to promote him? The appointment is only for a tenure of several months. Even I cannot help but ask myself: do we have to spend such a long time for discussion?

I woke up with a start at about four o'clock last night, and had since then been preparing this speech until after five. Should I not have this speech made today, I would not be qualified to represent the voters who have elected me with their ballots. The appointment in question concerns such fundamental issues as the mind-sets on policy of people in politics, the accountability system for principal officials, whether the Government respects people's wish, and also the core values and basic ideas that the Government upholds.

Does the Chief Executive know about people's impression of Stephen LAM at all? How lightly the Chief Executive takes public views! Why did he give the public such a face-slapping insult? Why did the Chief Executive appoint a person who most upsets the public as the Chief Secretary for Administration?

By the way I put it I aim not at Stephen LAM's personal characters but at his political performance. The political performance he makes is objective and explicit. Does the Chief Executive have his people on his mind at all? Does he have an ounce of respect towards public views? It is hard for me to imagine that the Chief Executive had such a mind-set and appointed such a person.

President, even if the Chief Executive genuinely believes that Stephen LAM possesses the ability of a "Superman" at work while other Directors of Bureaux are lagging far behind, is this man who upsets the public most really worth appointing as the Chief Secretary for Administration? Was it the Central Authorities' idea to appoint him? Or was it the Chief Executive's idea instead?

It is said that the Chief Executive has intended to make this appointment long before, but it was delayed by the Central Government for a few days. Is it true? Is it the case that the Chief Executive made this appointment because he wanted to cater to the wishes of the Central Authorities as whichever choice the Hong Kong people dislike more, the more correct it would be? Does this appointment by the Chief Executive imply that the Central Authorities wish to have a smooth transition so that Stephen LAM was designated to be the successor for the post of the Chief Secretary for Administration — despite his political performance as such — no matter who the Chief Executive is? Or was it for achieving smooth continuation of policies that the Chief Executive has made this appointment?

Someone said jokingly that the Chief Executive appointed a person whose popularity rating is lower than his so that he can feel better because that person may serve to take the first blows in case something happens. What kind of political morality and logic is this?

President, the deep-rooted conflict of society springs not only from income disparity, housing problems, monopolization by consortia and real estate hegemony, but also from whether the Government has demonstrated a minimum level of respect towards public views.

Speaking from the perspective of law and order, I am quite worried indeed. Although it is beyond the Government's control in some circumstances, such as changes in global economy and external environment, the Government should at least be capable of giving the public an impression that it respects public views. We are not asking the Government to follow public views blindly. We merely request the Government to respect public views at the least, and refrain from the case that the more loathsome a person is to the people, the more he is to be appointed as the Chief Secretary for Administration. Can the Government do so?

President, what will be the consequence if this scenario goes on? The consequence will be a progressive increase in public acceptance of violent behaviours and radical protests. What good will this do? To my understanding, the findings of an opinion survey revealed that 25% of the interviewees considered the storming acts rendered to the consultation session on the replacement mechanism in September non-violent and acceptable. Having learned this finding — I believe that the Central Policy Unit of the Government knows it as well — I am very worried.

President, I have been observing the stability of law and order in Hong Kong for a long time. When the so-called "critical mass" in society runs up to a substantial number that 25% of the public would consider certain behaviour non-violent and acceptable, our society has actually reached a very dangerous stage by then.

Certainly, I do not want the Chief Executive to brush away the problem of income disparity lightly. This move by him gives people an impression that he sincerely believes that the problem is the very nature of capitalism, which is a necessary consequence that cannot be overcome.

President, we are not demanding for a complete solution of the problem of income disparity. Instead, we are asking for the narrowing of disparity between the rich and the poor. When income disparity becomes considerably serious, it may set off a chaotic situation, in which a small move can affect the whole. When youngsters cannot see much hope in their future, and parents can neither see much hope in the future of the next generation, what should they do, as far as buying home, getting married or having offspring is concerned?

In Central, there are even office workers dressed in suits who have to take "second-hand meals", although they are not willing to do so. They just take a glass and fill it to the brim with water, pretending as if they were waiting for someone. Once they see that the customers at the next table have finished with their meals, they will act immediately to take and eat the leftovers before the leftovers were cleaned up.

Due to high transport costs, some people who work in Causeway Bay have to work from early morning until late at night before they return to their home in Tuen Mun, but they have one "meal" only. What do they have for the meal, then? The case is that the cheapest place for their meal turns out to be the refreshment bar of a certain furniture chain store, as they only need to pay nine dollars for several pieces of fish-ball and a cup of tea with milk there. They usually add four sachets of sugar into their tea with milk because they may pass due to low blood sugar levels if they do not do so. Is the Government aware of their plight?

President, such a situation calls for profound skills and political wisdom on the part of the police in matters such as crowd control as well as in addressing the public's aspirations. When members of the public comment on the police's ways of handling certain situations, they will consider whether the measures adopted by the police under the circumstances concerned have been excessive. Should that be the case, it will cause resentment and the public will think that the police have become a tool for political suppression.

When protestors have completely blocked the roads or "main artery" of the traffic, thereby making it necessary for the police to clear a place within two hours, it will not cause any public resentment. Nevertheless, if there are disruptions whenever demonstrations are being carried out at some sensitive locations (such as outside the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government

in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region) or on the streets, say, processions of protestors are constantly being cut off by the police, or that protestors carrying out demonstrations peacefully at first are arrested by the police, brought to the police stations and given pointless warnings, the police should then bear in mind that the public can judge for themselves and they are very impartial. The police cannot blame the media, the pro-democracy camp or "someone" for incitement. No matter how the police may try to state it, their efforts will be in vain. In my experience, the yardstick in the heart of the public is just and fair.

Although Hong Kong people are very moderate in general, 25% of those interviewed now consider actions taken to storm the consultation forums on the replacement mechanism in September as non-violent. As such, the police should have more wisdom in handling relevant situations.

Over the past few years, I have only raised security issues more on the details and the technical aspects. I really hope that the police would not feel discouraged. When I attended the anniversary reception of the Junior Police Officers' Association of the Hong Kong Police Force yesterday, I learnt from the speech of the Commissioner of Police that he was confident as efforts to maintain law and order have been fruitful in general. Overall speaking, Hong Kong is a safe city and our crime rates have declined drastically as compared with that of 20 years ago. Such an achievement is remarkable.

Having said that, the Government should not cause the police's popularity rating to decline. If the police's popularity rating should really go from bad to worse, it will not only be harmful to the law and order of the society, but will also be extremely unfavourable to the co-operation between the police and the public. We should not take any chances in this respect.

Despite the police's pivotal roles in maintaining law and order as well as enforcing the law, their popularity rating has been on the decline. Such a situation is attributable to not only the Commissioner of Police, but also to the Hong Kong Government. When the Government gives unreasonable orders and demands that the police should clear any places by force during the state leaders' visits to Hong Kong, so as to prevent the voice of opposition from being heard, the police force will then be in great trouble. It will also be difficult for front-line police officers to discharge their normal duties in any respect, as their

image has declined. As a result, they will end up getting half the result with twice the efforts.

President, even though the incumbent Chief Executive may have already chosen not to take heed of my words, I hope that the next Chief Executive will listen to my views. What I have just said is from the bottom of my heart and I would like to share it with the people of Hong Kong. The pro-democracy camp can tell right from wrong and we also have our yardstick. Whenever there are outrageous happenings, we will definitely voice our opinions. It is the understanding of the community of Hong Kong that the Government should have the capacity to listen to the views of the public before it can handle any matters properly.

President, what I have said is meant to be words of mutual encouragement.

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

MR CHIM PUI-CHUNG (in Cantonese): President, I still have about seven minutes of speaking time.

President, almost 14 years and four months have elapsed since the Reunification of Hong Kong. Why have both administration under businessmen and administration under civil servants made such a big impact? President, we understand that before the Reunification, the governor was the "general manager," that is, the CEO, England sent to Hong Kong. All policies had to be comprehensively assessed by England before being implemented in Hong Kong under the watch of the Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs. In other words, the Hong Kong governor reported all matters to England, or rather England already knew every matter. As such, the impact was not so big in terms of both strength and magnitude.

Following the Reunification, everything regarding Hong Kong comes under the Hong Kong and Macao Affairs Office. In order not to give people the impression that the Chinese Government is interfering with the "Hong Kong people ruling Hong Kong" policy, all the planning, implementation, assessments and even reviews of Hong Kong matters are all self-managed by the SAR

Government. Consequently, there is, of course, greater power as well as heavier responsibility. I can say that as Hong Kong is to abide by "one country, two systems", not being independent, it is necessary to keep in line with China's development in many matters, such as the 11th Five-Year Plan and the 12th Five-Year Plan. The SAR Government cannot function as smoothly as it would like, and this is understandable to us all.

Under such circumstance, the Central People's Government cannot disclaim all responsibility. As the Chief Executive is appointed by the Central People's Government, it must, to a certain extent, be held responsible as to whether or not that person can measure up to the task. So, we need not use "one country, two systems" or "self-government by Hong Kong people" as an excuse.

President, just now I said that regarding political system, the SAR Government is not independent, and that it is a special administrative region of China. So, there is no need to cover up all the responsibilities. Hong Kong people are very reasonable. For matters beyond one's capability, one shouldn't take them up single-handedly. Just bravely tell the people of Hong Kong so as to let everybody know the rule of the game.

President, within the composition of our Legislative Council, there are functional groups. This is unavoidable. If people are disgruntled just as in the case of "one country, two systems", what are they disgruntled about? Since it is said to have "two systems", the "one country" of China will naturally allow the existence of "two systems". You have the right to doubt the existence of "two systems". However, President, I can say that the functional groups in the Legislative Council definitely will definitely not be abolished in the foreseeable future. As such, why does the SAR Government not bravely and honestly tell the people of Hong Kong the truth so that the Legislative Council need not frequently make use of such opportunities to start up quarrels here?

President, to have functional groups within the Legislative Council is just like "one country, two systems." Whether it is good or bad is entirely up to us. It has nothing to do with other people. As such, how are we going to get the seats of the functional constituencies returned by universal suffrage in 2020? Although 2020 is nine years away, it is still necessary to let the people understand the procedures involved as soon as possible.

I, of course, have my own design and idea. In 2016, apart from those forming the original functional groups, members of the professions and those concerned are going to take up the remaining 50% of the votes. In 2020, this 50% of the votes can be transferred to Hong Kong voters wishing to participate. In other words, in 2020, all Hong Kong voters will each have two votes: one vote to be exercised in the direct election of a geographical constituency; the other vote to be exercised in the election of a self-picked functional group.

President, politics in Hong Kong evolves with the world forces. We understand that one force of the world is headed by the United States, with Japan as its aide-de-camp. It has different compositions at different times. The objective is to go against the Central People's Government of China. The SAR Government is just one shooting target.

I must extend my congratulations to the pan-democratic legislators. have been so good at "cashing in on the same capital" with China's June 4th Since the occurrence of the incident, 22 years have elapsed. Incident of 1989. This capital is really huge. However, I wish that, apart from "cashing in on the same capital," they can also use their influence to forge better opportunities for the people of Hong Kong instead of using the opportunity to turn Hong Kong into a base for "going against China and disrupting Hong Kong". We notice that there is a certain market for "going against China" as some Hong Kong people are not totally supportive of the Communist Party. However, "disrupting Hong Kong" is to drop a bomb on Hong Kong people. I am convinced that Hong Kong people's eyes and votes are most discerning. In the forthcoming elections, those "disrupting Hong Kong" are going to reap their own fruits. My wish is for the SAR Government to re-organize the Executive Council in the coming days so as to have better communication with the Legislative Council.

President, I have exhausted my 30 minutes of speaking time.

MR ANDREW CHENG (in Cantonese): President, I wish to use the remaining 30 minutes to voice my views on this year's Policy Address in one go. The theme of this debate session is "Developing Democracy and Enhancing Governance", so the issue of how the SAR Government's administration can be enhanced, as raised in the other four sessions in the past two days, can all be included here.

As a member of the pan-democratic camp, it is my conviction that a system of representative government elected by genuine universal suffrage and representative of public opinion can certainly improve its governance. However, Members seated here have different views on how to improve governance. In particular, some Members of the pro-establishment camp mentioned just now some issues relating to the legislature, political parties and the culture of violence. In this connection, I wish to use these 30 minutes to give my responses at ease.

I now feel very much at ease because before I withdrew from the Democratic Party, it would ask me to comment on several policies. Moreover, it would often specify and restrict the speaking time spent by me on various policies. Therefore, this time, I have written down more than a dozen main points, hoping that I can share my views with Members at ease in these 30 minutes.

First, Mr James TO is not here now. His behaviour just now was also quite agitated. He said that after waking up with a start at four in the middle of last night, he had begun to write his speech at five. I poked fun of him, saying that maybe because he was about to be a father soon, he was too tense and could not sleep. I hope he will not be too excited on account of becoming a father soon, thus compromising his energy for taking care of his baby. Moreover, there is no need for him to be agitated because my experience of working in the Legislative Council for 17 or 18 years tells me that the more agitated you are, the more disappointed you will be. The more worked up you are, the less the Government cares about you, regarding us as only talking nonsense.

Therefore, in the four debate sessions earlier on, on government policies, I had no intention of in fact, there have been discussions for many years, but the Government did not introduce the policies that it should have introduced but the policies that it should not have introduced were all implemented. We have put forward many proposals but unfortunately, the Government has been unwilling to take them on board. Often, it even accused us in the pan-democratic camp of being anti-China and subverting Hong Kong. All these accusations pained us quite a lot. If some Honourable colleagues continue to accuse Members of the pan-democratic camp of relying on old capital and that the June 4 incident is our old capital, in that case, do functional constituencies not

represent collusion between Government and business, the enjoyment of free lunches and reliance old capital?

Therefore, we should not criticize other people for using their old capital; rather, we should see if they are using it in a shrewd and wise way. However, since functional constituencies have the patronage of "Grandpa", their system will never change and the constitutional reform package passed last year, will make them even more long-lasting. Not only is this using old capital, this is tantamount to having meals that will be supplied for eternity and continuing to have free lunches. President, actually who will be the victim? It is none other than Hong Kong.

President, the Chief Executive and I are both Christians and I will address the "seven sins" in the book of Proverbs to him. In fact, the Chief Executive is certainly very unhappy. Often, when he was criticized, he gave me the impression that he felt hurt. Of course, after I have talked about these "seven sins", when he speaks although I cannot quote the words spoken by him after my meeting with him, I can tell Members that he once said, "Andrew, if I have the time, I really have to talk with you in length." I was pleasantly surprised by such treatment because during the 10-odd years in which I have served as a Member, from the era of the former Legislative Council to present, and from the time he was serving as the Financial Secretary and the Chief Secretary for Administration, to his present position of being the Chief Executive, only on two occasions did he say that he wanted to meet me privately, one being the occasion when I said I wanted to contest the post of the Vice-chairman of the Democratic Party. When the Chief Executive threw a lunch for all, he told me in particular that he wanted to find time to talk with me. Of course, in the end, I was not elected Vice-chairman, and he did not contact me again. This is the same with the "seven sins". For this reason, before I left that day, I wrote the Chief Executive a note, saying he was really too busy because although he said he wanted to meet me privately, on each occasion, it was all futile.

The Chief Executive's policy address on this occasion struck me strongly. Just now, an Honourable colleague also talked about the CEO of colonies, so I was suddenly thought of the colonial culture. Many people say that before colonial rulers leave, they would hand out all sorts of things. As a result, only shambles are left to the people in colonies to tidy up gradually. The Chief Executive has been in office for seven years and in his last policy address, he also

keeps handing out things and introduces many measures, so he really has the style of knighthood in a British colony. However, is he really like this? Does he really want those candidates to tidy up the shambles bit by bit?

Frankly speaking, what is actually in the mind of Donald TSANG? Why is it that in these seven years, although many members of the public wanted him to do his job properly — of course, the most important thing is to resume the HOS — yet he just flip-flops, citing many reasons when he was unwilling to resume the HOS, but when he is willing to do so, he also cites many reasons. This is precisely "government officials can say whatever they like". What is the intention of Donald TSANG in playing the card of public opinion? Only he and heaven and earth would know.

From the angle of Hong Kong's overall development, of course, we hope that the Chief Executive would propose with sincerity some good policies to resolve the housing issue and the wealth disparity in Hong Kong. However, does he really have the sincerity to do so? He has little time left and in fact, up to now, Donald TSANG still says all the time that he does not care too much about public opinion, saying that public opinion is just like the floating clouds. We find that in the past seven years, many Honourable colleagues and members of the public said that in the past, Donald TSANG enjoyed great popularity, yet, although he took office amidst great popularity, he is going to leave in low popularity. In that case, Members can see that it makes little difference whoever becomes the Chief Executive, so this can serve as a revelation to those who prepare to run for the post of the Chief Executive.

I remember that when Donald TSANG met members of the Democratic Party in his capacity as the Chief Executive for the first time, I was the spokesman on labour policy in the Democratic Party. I asked the Chief Executive why a minimum wage had still not been set. At that time, Donald TSANG fumed, "Ah Foo, don't talk about a minimum wage any more. Impossible." I still remember that he used this English word. He said that it was impossible, asking me not to talk about a minimum wage with him. At that time, my first response was to say to him immediately, "Donald, I believe that had someone said half a year ago that you would become the Chief Executive, no one would have believed it." Members can try and recall if, half a year or nine months before Donald TSANG became the Chief Executive, did it occur to anyone that Donald TSANG would become the Chief Executive?

Then, with some vanity, he took out a comb from his pocket and following the example of our former President of State, JIANG Ze-min, combed his hair. He then said, "Really? Is my place really so low in the eyes of the leaders of the Central Authorities?" Members, I think this is really a dark joke in my political career. He made me think about what was in the mind of the Chief Executive. It was: So long as "Grandpa" likes it, so long as it pleases "Grandpa", so long as doing something will win the agreement and satisfaction of "Grandpa", what does the public matter? He would not even look at us from the corner of his eyes.

Just now, I heard Mr Albert CHAN speak with great agitation. He is always agitated and today, he is already not so agitated. I wonder if this is because back then, he nominated Donald TSANG. If I remember it correctly, this should be the fact. Mr Albert CHAN once nominated Donald TSANG. However, of course, he is now very worked up. I do not know what was in his mind when he nominated Donald TSANG back then. However, he once criticized Donald TSANG for being servile when visiting Beijing and in response, Donald TSANG said to him that this was the political culture in Hong Kong and our officials were like this.

Here, I wish to offer a piece of advice to Mr Albert CHAN. I hope he will understand that when nominating a person, he has to see clearly what sort of person the nominee is. Of course, he has to ask his own conscience. If he hopes that the nominee would offer him some benefits but after nominating that person, he continues to criticize him, that is not too good. This is called "having one's cake and eat it". I hope that political integrity can be clear-cut. For this reason, we can see that in this legislature, the pro-democracy camp is seated on this side and those who are the most royalist in the DAB are seated the closest to the Government, and of course, I know that most of those seated in the middle belong to the ruling coalition. This is because there are only 23 so-called pan-democratic Members. There are 23 of them in 60 Members, just exceeding one third.

However, no matter what, the camps in the legislature are very clear-cut and the most important principle for political parties is to have a clear stance. They must not be fence-sitters, nor should they "have their cakes and eat it", lambasting someone as they nominate him. President, I make this appeal here because another nomination process is coming. This is the conscience and duty

of each Member. Only in this way will they be respected by their adversaries. It is necessary for political parties to differentiate among themselves very clearly.

Just now, Mr LAU Kong-wah said, "You people in your political parties should not cause chaos in Hong Kong or try to trip each other." It is not a problem to trip each other. So long as Members are devoted and sincere, just like the DAB's slogan of "work sincerely for Hong Kong", if one is really sincere, one will surely be respected by the public as well as the Members in other political parties. However, I am sorry that on one point, I must fire a shot or two at Mr LAU Kong-wah. If I had not mentioned him, I would have forgotten about it. He mentioned the fare stabilization fund. As soon as I heard him say that, my anger flared.

He said that political parties should not trip each other. However, back then, when the two railway corporations was about to merge, on behalf of the Democratic Party, I took the lead in proposing that the MTRCL should establish a fare stabilization fund first but unfortunately, my proposals were all struck down by the ruling coalition led by the DAB and none of my proposals was supported. However, suddenly, he now proposes, in circumstances that have no binding effect, that the Government should allocate \$30 billion to establish a fare stabilization fund. It turns out that it can be so strange. Therefore, I hope Members will understand, and I also hope the public will also understand that it does not matter if people pull hind legs. However, one should not refrain from lending support to something that can help resolve the wealth disparity and the problem of excessively high transport fares in society when binding effect can be achieved. But when no binding effect can be achieved, he is painting such a rosy picture of this matter, as though he was inspired by godly love. This really hurts my heart. Having worked in the legislature for so many years, such kind of behavior makes me think it may be time I withdraw from politics gradually. To continue to work in this muddy environment and together with a group of chameleons who preach one thing and practise another is a downright waste of There are other more meaningful things waiting for us to do out there. time.

However, last time when I stood up to speak, looking at this Chamber, a lot of thoughts and feelings rose up in me. This Chamber is more splendid, bigger and more imposing but if Members' hearts have not changed, just as we are now, our distance has even become greater. With this growing distance, an unearthly feeling is created. In my eyes, the heads of government officials have become

very small and I cannot see their expressions. Are they actually laughing at me or being cross with me? In the past, our eyes could convey a lot of emotions. In particular, the faces of some officials were very expressive and one can tell from the expressions of their eyes whether or not they were angry and in fact, that was very interactive. Now, when I look up, thousands of lights hit my eyes, making me feel very uncomfortable. Therefore, I will propose to the Legislative Council Commission that there is really no need for so many lights. Being too brightly lit will hurt one's ocular nerves.

President, when I see some undeclared candidates canvassing for votes continually, I feel as though great importance was attached to the voices of the people, yet we cannot vote, so this is very unreal and elusive. How painful it is to feel this way! It turned out that these undeclared candidates want to win public opinion and popularity, so as to win the approval of "Grandpa" in a circuitous way. The public are only a tool and public opinion is only a tool. After listening to public opinion — just as I criticized the decision not to abolish appointed District Council seats on the last occasion, if we continue to support the constitutional reform proposal put forward by the Government last year, I really hope that Members of the pan-democratic camp can open their eyes wide.

I found that Emily was fuming when she spoke just now. She said, "The Government wouldn't even listen to such a moderate proposal from the Democratic Party." I would say this is not true because the most radical view of the Democratic Party was to support the constitutional reform proposal and the Government accepted it. The Government has taken on board even the most drastic about-turn. This has actually given the SAR Government a big leg up.

President, I have no intention of criticizing my former fellow party members here because all along I do not want to dwell too much on this but I am hurt by this. Given the existing political system, if Honourable colleague of the pan-democratic camp think that the past efforts of the present Government have made some contribution and will stand by public opinion, and some good policies will be introduced, I really think that we are getting more and more naïve.

President, because of my two daughters, I have known Secretary Stephen LAM for a number of years and we became acquainted with each other long ago in a parent-teacher association. For many years, of course, I do not have any negative opinion of Mr LAM as an individual because I do not want to launch

any personal attack. I find such moniker as "Eunuch LAM" used by some Honourable colleagues very repulsive. Anyway, all people have their principles and dignity, so why has the decision to promote Secretary Stephen LAM to the post of Chief Secretary for Administration aroused such great public discontent? If the present Government and Donald TSANG do not reflect on themselves, thinking that merely listening to views would do, you will know that in fact, under the existing system, it makes no difference no matter who serves as the officials in the Government. Of course, you are right in saying that the system is the most important and that people are only secondary. People work in a system and in a bad one, even a nice guy may be forced to do something bad. This was said by DENG Xiao-ping and many Honourable colleagues in the Legislative Council have cited this remark before.

I find that many of the Secretaries sitting opposite me now in this world, there can never be big villains and I believe that human nature is good. Therefore, even though I address the "seven sins" to Donald TSANG, I only hope to remind each other as fellow Christians. In particular, since we are fellow Christians, we believe that to err is human. It does not matter if one makes mistakes but most importantly, one has to make confessions and pray more.

Therefore, everyone is sitting in his own position and the present system reflects the deep-rooted culture and conflict, with the Government-business collusion and their ever-changing and intricate relationships. The source of the 1 200 votes is the business sector. The skew towards business interests has existed for over a decade and it will only become increasingly entrenched. The public will be increasingly angry but the Government will be increasingly heartless and insensitive because it may think that no matter what it does, it would be criticized, so it may as well ignore everything. What is wrong for Mr Stephen LAM to take the post of a Director of Bureau? Similarly, he is also promoted from a Director of Bureau to a Secretary for Department, so what is wrong with this?

Hong Kong people are forgetful. If you think about it, on past issues, the one relating to unauthorized building works (UBW) is no longer raised. However, if the Government is truly popularly elected — Secretary Michael SUEN was the Secretary responsible for the relevant portfolio back then but even his property has UBW on it. Moreover, even though a memorandum of charge has been registered against his property, he still paid no attention to this matter.

Is this being accountable? In addition, according to media reports, the Government plans to establish the posts of Deputy Financial Secretary and Deputy Chief Secretary for Administration. I think this is a downright waste of public funds. If you take a look, you will find that the rank of the Secretaries now and the past Secretaries is set at D8 and their pay amounts to several million dollars a year, whereas the annual pay of the 18 Secretaries is tens of million dollars. Now, it is further said that posts of Deputy Secretary of Department will be established, so this is really infuriating. What kind of work requires so many Directors of Bureau to do it together? What sort of work have Permanent Secretaries got to do? I wish to ask Members if you can tell the names of the incumbent Permanent Secretaries in the 18 Policy Bureaux? I guess you may This is practically a waste of the money fleeced from the not remember them. public. However, Hong Kong people are docile, so if the Government has not said anything wrong or done anything wrong, the Hong Kong public will leave it alone. Even if the Government has done something wrong, the public will forget it after three months. This is how the situation is like now. If the Government does not even care to take a glance at Hong Kong people, at these docile people, does it still have any conscience?

President, I will also talk about the violence in the legislature and the so-called violent struggles in protests. On the non-renewal of the contract of one of the university Vice-Chancellors whom I respect — the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Hong Kong (HKU), Prof TSUI Lap-chee — my first reaction is that it was the "Chief" of the police force who forced the Vice-Chancellor of the HKU to resign and not to renew his contract. Of course, he would not admit that because as a scholar, he was a humble gentleman. Of course, I do not know if he made any mistake in the August 18 incident. In fact, in the morning of 18 August, I was driving my wife to work and I have a parking permit issued by the HKU on my car, so I have the right to enter the university. However, on the day, before I had turned the corner, I could already see a lot of police officers, so I knew there was something unusual. Next, the security guard told the police officer that it was Andrew CHENG entering. I thought he would let pass but little did I expect that after the security guard had said it was Andrew CHEUNG, it looked as though they wanted to put another gate there. Next, I saw a sergeant standing on one side report with his walkie-talkie, "It is Andrew CHENG. Andrew CHENG. Can Andrew CHEUNG be let in?" I could read his lips. I waited for full five minutes in front of the gate. Then, I said, "It's only my wife coming to work here. If you are afraid there is something wrong with my car,

you can check if I have any fighter jet or canon with me.". That kind of apprehension among them for many years, in the HKU ZENG Qing-hong also visited the HKU and on his day of visit, I also drove my car into the HKU and nothing of this sort happened. I hope the Security Bureau and the police will understand that this sort of things has become a kind of provocation. Therefore, when I drove past that police officer, I could not help but say, "I am only driving someone to work. I am not here to stage a petition, Ah Sir." Frankly speaking, this remark showed that everyone was unhappy. Therefore, on the so-called violence in the legislature, on the so-called violence in local communities, among the public or the post-90 or post-80 generation, the police want to suppress it. Frankly speaking, it is evident that the police want to step up their suppression in relation to some politically sensitive issues and this is beyond dispute. I call on Members not to lie blatantly and even act against their own conscience by saying they do not believe this. If they do not, then why could that person in Laguna City wearing a T-shirt with the slogan "vindicate the June 4 incident" on it not be allowed to go home? Why was Mr Samuel LI pushed into a staircase? There is no problem if the authorities want to do a job There is no problem if the authorities want to protect important in security. political figures either. But is it necessary to be so nervous when protecting important political figures?

There is one last point on which I could not feel at ease if I do not speak President, the press has also reported on this. Recently, there was a out. candidate called Mr LAM Hong-wah who claimed himself to be a deputy to the National People's Congress (NPC), so some residents lodged a complaint with the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC). The ICAC said that after investigation, it was found that he was a member of the electoral college of a deputy to the NPC, so there was nothing wrong. President, as a former Commission Against Corruption Officer of the ICAC, I am familiar with the anti-corruption legislation and the legislation on illegal and corrupt conduct. this leaflet had not made any misrepresentation, then nothing ever would. Someone wanted to tell others that he was a deputy to the NPC but it turned out he had deleted the words "electoral college", yet there was not even any need to open a file. Next, due to the reports in the press, that local resident was notified by the ICAC over the phone that since the incident had been reported in the press that day, they would follow this up. What has the world become? President, I now solemnly summons the Under Secretary for Security here. Although I know that complaints to the ICAC should not be disclosed, I think if I do not speak out — I find the impression that the ICAC has given me over the years very disappointing. The ICAC has gradually become a political henchman of the Government. In the past, there was a case in which the Court ruled that a corrupt conduct had occurred. Although after an electoral petition, the ruling was in favour of our colleague, the ICAC did not even carry out any investigation. It even of course, I hope it will institute prosecution but it did not even carry out any investigation. Therefore, President, such partiality in law enforcement is due to the political skew of our law-enforcement agencies nowadays, thus resulting in unfair law enforcement and this is a cause for some concern.

President, I have spent 30 minutes here to offer advice to the SAR Government. I hope that it will continue to follow its conscience in doing its work.

MR FREDERICK FUNG (in Cantonese): President, the constitutional development in Hong Kong has been weathered. Every time when it is discussed, Hong Kong society and its elites will become divided, leading to internal conflicts in society. Not only does this destroy social unity, it also wastes time and opportunities for nothing.

From the constitutional reforms in 2005 and 2010, Members can see that the Government had been holding secret talks with different political parties as there were mutual mistrust and dogfights, which caused unnecessary suspicion and mutual attacks. Besides, in order to win supporting votes, the Government was forced to make concessions to A or co-ordinate with B. We can see that in the end, there were two outcomes: everyone lost and only one party got some bits and pieces. There may be minimal progress but no roadmap. This process has created conflicts and attrition, which is unhealthy, so this situation should not continue.

However, no matter what, I believe that we all know that in order to develop a democratic political system for Hong Kong, both the Central Government and the people of Hong Kong have to negotiate sincerely instead of simply stating their own stances, still less doing whatever one likes. Therefore, I suggest that the Chief Executive and the SAR Government try to persuade the Central Government and Hong Kong people to establish a committee for the

implementation of dual universal suffrage to study, discuss and forge a consensus on abolishing functional constituencies and the screening of candidates in the Chief Executive Election in 2017 and the Legislative Council Election in 2020 in order to realize the implementation of dual universal suffrage and develop a roadmap on the ultimate model for the evolution of Hong Kong's constitutional development that will be supported by Hong Kong people. I believe only in this way can dual universal suffrage be achieved in Hong Kong. I hope that the SAR Government can tackle the issue with a more positive and proactive attitude. Thank you, President.

MR IP KWOK-HIM (in Cantonese): President, with the promotion efforts of the Government of this term, the Legislative Council passed the 2012 constitutional reform package by a large margin last year. As a result, constitutional development in Hong Kong can take a major step forward. Although some people in society demand that the pace of democracy should be such that our goal could be attained in one stride and they criticized Donald TSANG for "scoring no mark" in taking forward the progress of democracy, the public will judge this fairly. The efforts and achievements of the incumbent Government in promoting democratic development have generally been affirmed by the public.

Not only has the constitutional reform proposal passed last year enhanced the elected components of the Chief Executive election and the Legislative Council elections in 2012, it has also confirmed that the progress of democracy in Hong Kong must follow the Basic Law and the "five-step mechanism", so the farce of *de facto* referendum did not help the advancement of democracy at all.

Although only eight months remains in the term of the incumbent Government and it will be up to the next Government to deal with the issue of constitutional reform after 2012, there is still a lot that the present Government can do in its remaining term, including compiling and summarizing the views expressed by the public on universal suffrage in 2017 and 2020 in the consultation period for constitutional reform last year for consideration by the next Chief Executive, and doing its best in organizing the four important elections this year and next year, so as to pave the way and lay a sound foundation for Hong Kong's progress towards universal suffrage.

To the general public, only 1 200 people can take part directly in voting in the Chief Executive election to be held in March next year. Nevertheless, the SAR Government still has to make a lot of effort to give publicity to it, regard this election as a preparation for electing the Chief Executive by universal suffrage in 2017, encourage the public to be concerned about and express their expectations for the new Chief Executive, so that the candidates for the post of the Chief Executive can hear the voices of the public. We must understand that the legitimacy of the Chief Executive is founded not just on the votes cast by the 1 200 members of the Election Committee but also on broad-based public Each candidate for the post of the Chief Executive must face the public and seek their support. As Mr WANG Guangya, the Director of Hong Kong and Macao Affairs Office of the State Council said, the choice of the future Chief Executive rests in the hands of Hong Kong people. It can be seen that in recent days, the jockeying for the post of the Chief Executive has begun and the undeclared candidates all regard the next Chief Executive election as an election by universal suffrage. As such, they visit local communities to listen to public opinion and take part in the political affairs forums organized by various groups frequently. I think this is a positive message and development.

In order to raise its standard of administration, the SAR Government expanded the political accountability system three years ago. The original intention was to let the newly established posts of Deputy Directors of Bureaux and Political Assistants support the Secretaries of Department and Directors of Bureaux in dealing with administrative and political work in various areas, help them formulate and implement policies and practise government administration together. However, at present, there are many queries and criticisms relating to the existing Deputy Directors of Bureaux and Political Assistants, including such problems as their unfamiliarity with policies, excessively high pay and unclear delineation of duties.

The accountability system has been implemented for a decade since 2002 and it is now time for a review. The accountability system has two major objectives, the first being that the Chief Executive has the power to choose his governing team and his choices are not confined to the Civil Service alone; the second being to respond to political demands more proactively to resolve political conflicts. One of the aims in expanding the accountability system is to groom more political talents. Therefore, to some extent, the Deputy Directors of

Bureaux and Political Assistants are all political interns who learn as they work. The voices in society querying their excessively high pay are justified.

With the constant progress in the constitutional development in Hong Kong, dual universal suffrage is the ultimate goal of constitutional development in Hong Kong and it is a must to groom and provide a group of political talents with political abilities and experience in administration. If we all agree that the political accountability system cannot be rolled back in Hong Kong's political development, then, in response to the present criticisms of the accountability system, our focus should be the optimization of the system. Therefore, the DAB holds that the incumbent Government should review and study how to enhance the entire system of political appointment — the accountability system — including the appraisal and remuneration system for accountability officials and enhancement of their skills and ability in understanding policies and public opinion through training.

President, the terms of the District Councils (DCs) will end very soon and next Sunday will be the voting day of the DC elections. The election campaigns have entered the countdown stage and to the legislature, it can be said that the DC elections this year is spectacular because 17 Honourable colleagues will take part in the elections. The DCs have all along been an important partner of the SAR Government in district administration and the roots of DC members lie in their local communities. They are familiar with district affairs and public opinion, so they are very important in building harmonious and vibrant local communities.

The DAB welcomes the fact that the Government is listening to and collecting the precious district work experience of DC members and members of local communities through different channels. Starting from the DCs of this term, the Government has agreed to establish District Facilities Management Committees under various DCs and they will be specifically tasked with taking part in the management of some district facilities, such as libraries, community halls, open spaces, sports venues and swimming pools, as well as the planning of local minor works. As the facts have shown, in the past four years, over 2 000 minor works were carried out in the 18 districts of Hong Kong, so it can be seen that under this programme, delighting results have been achieved and local communities have been benefited. They can meet the needs of local residents and have won the approval of local residents and various people in local communities. Therefore, on the proposal in the Policy Address to increase the

funding for minor works to \$400 million each year so that local communities can have more resources at their disposal, I applaud this move.

However, I think that in the process of taking part in minor works, one should be able to see objectively and clearly that there is still much room for improvement in the programme, such as improving the operational efficiency and quality of the programme, strengthening the continuity of the programme and the maintenance and repairs of the works items, and so on. It is worthwhile for us to explore them in depth in society and at the DC level.

In addition, I have all along stressed one point very strongly, that is, in the process of implementing the programme, corresponding support must be available. This involves the manpower of the DC secretariats. At present, the manpower of the DC secretariats is inadequate. This is a crucial factor for satisfactory implementation of the programme. Therefore, here, I hope the Government will take this matter seriously.

President, the DCs are an important link in Hong Kong's two-tier political structure. They play the role of an interface with the grassroots as well as representing and reflecting the views of the public. As a Legislative Council Member representing the DC Functional Constituency, in my speech delivered in the debates on the Motions of Thanks on the policy addresses and on the Budgets in the past, I have time and again talked about ways to strengthen the support provided to DC members a number of times. This year, finally, I do not have to be repetitive because starting from 1 January next year, new DC members — that is, DC members in the new term — will be entitled to contract gratuity and medical allowance in the same way as Legislative Council Members, and their pay has also been adjusted accordingly. This is really a cause for celebration. Anyway, the first step has been taken and from now on, the situation of "expecting a horse to run fast without feeding it" will be gone. I hope that with the increase in resources, all DC members throughout Hong Kong will provide better service to the public.

Moreover, DCs, which serve the public, have the opportunities to carry out exchanges with various representative councils and other regions frequently to learn from their experience, which is very important for enhancing the competence of the representative councils. For this reason, I urge the Government to provide resources for visits and exchanges to all DCs in Hong

Kong. This can be modeled on the existing arrangement for the Legislative Council, in which a lump sum for overseas exchanges and visits is provided, so that the DCs can enhance their council-business capability and broaden their horizon.

Thank you, President.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): President, just now, I heard Mr LAU Kong-wah talk about setting a bad example for children and I also have a friend who once talked about setting a bad example for children. He said that his son had said he had had leg pain because he did not want to go to school. After being absent for two days, his son said his legs were so painful that he would never go to school again. Is this not what he learnt from here? TUNG Chee-hwa said he had leg pain, so all the people in the royalist camp said he really had leg pain. Frederick MA said he had a brain problem but after he had recovered, he became a leader of a listed company. If this is not lying blatantly, what is it? Who was lying blatantly together with him? Moreover, some people are so bold as to say that no one died in the June 4 Incident, even saying that those people who died in the June 4 Incident deserved it. Lying is a sin but some people lie here every day.

A member of the public gave me a leaflet and I quote, "Soon after the Reunification in 1997, TUNG Chee-hwa, in order to curry favour with the tycoons, in a stroke of viciousness, abolished the labour laws and deprived the labour side of the rights of collective bargaining and protection against unfair dismissal for participation in trade unions in accordance with the law. IP and CHOY, and their fellow party members as well, did nothing other than hovering between the two sides in the Chamber of the Legislative Council, acting like rubber stamps and casting supporting votes in the Second Reading of the Bill. In the Third Reading of the Bill, knowing well that the Bill to abolish the laws would surely be passed, the DAB voted in opposition instead, so as to absolve itself of any blame."

Next, that leaflet says, "And I (that is, the person who wrote the leaflet) found myself under the same roof, but I was not one of the honourable guests designated by the Government but someone arrested for protesting loudly. This example can already show the division between the two sides and what is right

and wrong clearly." From the text of this leaflet, the one surnamed IP was Mr IP Kwok-him and the one surnamed CHOY should be Miss CHOY So-yuk.

Next, the leaflet continues like this, "In 1999, TUNG Chee-hwa has "slain" the municipal councils and abolished the Urban Council, which was financially and administratively independent, and this resulted in the inability of the District Councils to have any say¹ in such matters as hygiene, recreation and sports, which are closely related to the public, and there was no Urban Council to implement such matters. These matters have fallen into the hands of the bureaucracy, which causes repeated delays. The gang in the DAB did nothing other than to feed the powerful and rich, acting as accomplices."

Next, the leaflet goes on like this, "In 2001, TUNG Chee-hwa, who was a scourge for Hong Kong and the public, in order to please property developers, introduced the so-called 'Suen's nine tactics", including the vicious measure of an immediate moratorium on the HOS and slowing down the construction of public housing. As a result, nowadays, the toiling public are so poor that they have nowhere to live and the middle class can only look at flats and yearn for them. There is a resurgence of 'cage homes' and a surge of 'coffin flats'. The one surnamed IP and his party underlings only complied servilely. Compared with their looks nowadays in clamouring for the resumption of the HOS, it can be seen how they are feigning kindness." One can perhaps call this hypocrisy. There is more, "In 2002, TUNG, who had been a scourge for Hong Kong for five years, sought a second term and he was so" I am quoting from an article.

(Mr IP Kwok-him raised his hand in indication)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr IP Kwok-him, what is the matter?

MR IP KWOK-HIM (in Cantonese): President, a point of order. May I ask if Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung was saying that I was hypocritical in his speech just now?

_

¹ Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung mispronounced the Chinese character "喙" here

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Please repeat the point of order that you want to raise.

MR IP KWOK-HIM (in Cantonese): President, I feel being insulted because just now, he said that I was hypocritical.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Please clarify further. What sort of insulting remarks do you think Mr LEUNG has used in his speech?

MR IP KWOK-HIM (in Cantonese): President, he used the word "hypocritical".

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): President, I only quoted it. A member of the public gave me a leaflet to read

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, a Member has raised a point of order and asked me to give a ruling. I have said before that I do not advise Members to express views using words that insult one another. However, I notice that in this debate, Members have queried each other's credibility and accused one another of hypocrisy in more than one instance. For this reason, I cannot rule that Mr LEUNG has violated the Rules of Procedure on account of what he said just now.

Mr LEUNG, please continue. Just now, you mispronounced one character when quoting the remarks. The word "置喙" should be pronounced as "zi3-fui3", not "zi3-jyun4"²("置緣").

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): "zi3-fui3"("置喙"). I have mispronounced it, sorry.

The Cantonese pronunciation system "Jyut Ping" (粤 拼) is used here. See http://www.iso10646hk.net/jp/>

I was interrupted, so I have no choice but to read this again. TUNG Chee-hwa, who was a scourge for Hong Kong and the public, to please property developers, introduced the so-called 'Suen's nine tactics', including the vicious measure of a moratorium on the HOS and slowing down the construction of public housing and as a result, nowadays, the toiling public are so poor that they have nowhere to live"..... I have read out this passage before. says, "In 2002, TUNG, who was a scourge for Hong Kong for five years, sought a second term and he was so shameless as to seek to secure all the nominations available and as a result, other people could not reach the nomination threshold of 100 people, thus giving rise to the disgraceful situation of his being returned The DAB spared no efforts in fulfilling TUNG's wish, thus uncontested. insulting Hong Kong people's wisdom, so this can be described as self-deception. This resulted in an illusion that the Chief Executive had won the hearts of the whole world, and he brutally defied the wishes of the public by embarking on a blitz legislative exercise on Article 23 of the Basic Law, going to all lengths to deprive Hong Kong people of their freedom and human rights, in a filthy act of collusion to please the totalitarian regime in Beijing.".

The leaflet goes on, as though recounting some past family history, "In February 2003, the 'National Security Act' was read for the Second time in the Chamber of the Legislative Council and the person in charge of this exercise was the Chairman of the Bills Committee surnamed IP, who was singing in concert with the lackey, Regina IP. Again, I had the occasion to be here and was again protesting loudly in the public gallery. Again, under the silent curses and mockery of the lot of royalist Members and senior officials, I again became a prisoner. However, this worm was forever pinned onto the pillar of shame."..... the story does not end here because we all remember that year. "On the eve of 1 July, that person surnamed IP thought that his great day had come, cursing and betting that the number of protestors would surely be very small".....

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, what is the relevance of the passage you have read out with the subject matter of this debate session?

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): It is about the changes in politics in Hong Kong. He wants to learn from experience now, so this is political ethics. I will read it out to you, so do not please stop the timer first

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I suggest that you be as concise as possible when quoting.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): I know. However, one can even quote from the Bible. The other time, Michael SUEN quoted from the Bible. He talked about political ethics I will go on reading President, I will read this out very quickly, so it is not very desirable for you to interrupt me.

"Little did he expect that he would be given a slap in the face by 500 000 people. He then spun round to vilify members of the public who had taken to the streets roaring with anger as being misled by others. However, although he softened his tone a little, he still punched away ferociously, for we could see that this person surnamed IP and the DAB still supported the TUNG regime in bulldozing the draconian law through on 9 July as scheduled, even at the cost of being an enemy of the people out and out." Does the story end here? There is actually more. What is the political ethic therein? Herein lies the most outrageous thing, "After another year, the TUNG regime introduced the so-called Link REIT programme, selling the shopping centres and car parks under the management of the Housing Department cheaply, with no regard for the commercial and residential tenants in public housing estates, as though opening the door to usher a bandit in. At this time, IP could not become a Member through the functional constituencies due to his failure in getting elected in the District Council elections. However, a centipede dies but never falls down, so he still"

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, the lengthy passage that you have read out all targets at a particular Member. I think it is not directly related to the subject matter of the debate now.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): I understand. Next, there will not be any mention of the person surnamed IP.

"It is for no other reason than answering the clarion call of the Party that it supported this lowly act of pushing the public into a trench. Now, the DAB is following other people in protesting against the Link REIT for its disregard of public living, and so on. At that time, its vicious look when joining the pro-establishment camp were just like those in its castigation of the old lady surnamed LO verbally and in writing by taking the relevant matter out of context. Nowadays, it is mobilizing opposition against the so-called right of abode for foreign domestic helpers, and the approaches are so similar and so cunning." Let us leave this here. Next, we will talk about the person surnamed TSANG and one really cannot stop despising oneself.

"With the departure of TUNG came TSANG. The DAB complained to its new master, saying that it could only get its share of blame but never its share of honour. For this reason, under the so-called differentiation according to affinity advocated by Donald TSANG, it was given several pieces of bone more to lick. First, CHAN Hak-kan was arranged to work in the Chief Executive's Office as an odd-job worker. Next, the founding member, TSANG Tak-shing, was appointed a Secretary; then Gregory SO was able to muddle through and took the post of Deputy Director of Bureau. TSANG's administration drew the wrath of the gods and mortals alike, so how can this biggest royalist party that has won his favour not seek pardon from Hong Kong people? If one does not think so, one can look at the over 600 advisory bodies, spread all over the place and dotted like stars in the sky and scattered like the pieces on a chessboard and see how, when a man gets to the top, all his friends and relatives get there with him.". I find that I really have to give them some due respect.

"I have forgotten the former Secretary for Justice, Ms Elsie LEUNG, who shot to fame for the case in which she privately let off Ms Sally AW, then went on to take charge of the legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law. It turns out that she is a founding member of the DAB.". Oh!

"There was also that Master Ka-shun of the CHENG's family, who went to the length of suing the Legislative Council to vent his anger over his being summonsed by the Legislative Council on suspicion of a conflict of interest in recruiting LEUNG Chin-man. He is also a major official of the DAB's overseeing committee. Of course, the tycoons-in-arms coming from all quarters are even more dazzling and a fine sight to behold. They gave the grassroots small favours, which are only the spittle from consortia and sugar-coated poison." I have finished reading this section.

Next, I can see several large characters, "The crime of a man who perpetuates his prince's wickedness is small. The crime of a man who induces his prince to do evil is grave. If a fatuous and self-indulgent ruler committed some evil deeds, can he do it without sycophants who induce the evil deeds of the master? Can the wealth disparity and collusion between Government and business occur without the royalist Members who act as sedan-bearers for the small-circle election?" President, I have finished quoting.

A supporter of the DAB approached me to ask who wrote the leaflet. I said it was written by me, so he uttered a foul expression and left. I am distributing copies of this leaflet and I am quoting from my own article. President, I do not wish to argue with these people to avoid debasing myself. "One would rather be killed by a swine than praised by a swine." CHEKHOV put it very well. In fact, there is also another some people say we are not gentile, so I will cite a verse.

(Translation) "When blows the autumn wind and flowers fall with moonlight fading, the General is lying drunk in the reading room. His writing has finally stopped but his heart is still full of spirit. With his lifelong reputation Silence. as a teacher, he has been on a quest. Silence. Silence. Waves and tides rose and high walls separated him. Wiping tears behind bars, his pen fell silent. The fragrance of books vanished and the words of scholars weigh light. With difficulty in pursuing the dream of the father, tears are rolling down the Drip, drip, drop." This was written by the younger brother of Mr LIU cheeks. Xiao-bo for his deceased father and imprisoned elder brother. There were three persons in the family and also the daughter-in-law, LIU Xia, who vanished merely because her husband was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. Such grievance and hatred is a disgrace for us Chinese. The DAB and the royalist camp, in sanctioning these acts of the Communist Party, is also disgraceful, disgraceful, disgraceful, disgraceful, disgraceful, disgraceful, disgraceful, disgraceful, disgraceful

Setting a bad example for children? To praise the traitor QIN Hui and lambaste YUE Fei is setting a bad example for children. This is what you do. I will not teach children to praise the traitor QIN Hui and lambaste YUE Fei.

MRS REGINA IP (in Cantonese): President, I wish to change the subject matter. Instead of talking about the accountability system or District Councils (DCs), I would like to talk about government structure review. The existing structure of the SAR Government is inherited from the era of the British Hong Kong administration. This system has been adopted for several decades ever since the McKinsey Review in 1973. In particular, after entering the SAR era, the workload of the SAR Government has increased a great deal and its work has become much more political. There is also an additional political echelon. Therefore, in June, the New People's Party proposed a review of the government structure.

Dr LEUNG Ka-lau also mentioned in his speech earlier that new industries, for example, small-scale ones such as cross-boundary ambulance service, are in fact not being taken over willingly by any department. If the ambulances are private ones, what sort of vehicles should they be and should new licenses be issued? No department is willing to take over this and no one is willing to think about new ideas. Another example is the issues that I have dealt with recently. For example, chilled poultry and pork importers said that there was nowhere in the New Territories for them to break down the goods and that the licences for chilled meat and cold store would not help. Is this actually an issue of the economic structure or purely an issue of food safety? I have approached two Bureaux. Both of them were very humble, that is, neither of them were very willing to take up the matter. Nowadays, the workload of the Government is The Government organ should be re-organized and more resources should be committed to coping with the development of human resources and industrial development, and co-ordination between Bureaux should be enhanced. Therefore, in June, the New People's Party proposed that two D9 posts of Bureau Directors under the Chief Secretary for Administration and the Financial Secretary should be created, with one responsible for human resources development and the other industrial development. We also proposed to split the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau into two, with one responsible for technology and the other for other matters.

I learnt from the Hong Kong Economic Journal that the Government also has similar ideas, that is, two posts of Deputy Departmental Secretary are proposed: Deputy Chief Secretary for Administration and Deputy Financial Secretary. This idea is similar to ours. A new technology bureau will be established. As a result, there will be 14 Bureaux. As suggested by the New People's Party, housing and land supply will be put together under the ambit of one Bureau. I hope that when officials speak later, be it the Chief Secretary for Administration or the Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs, they can respond to the question whether or not the Government really has these ideas. If the answer is in the affirmative, I will be very pleased and will not charge any consultation fee. However, I hope that the Government can give an account of this as I have heard from friends in the mass media that the Government likes to hold some informal briefings for the benefit of a couple of newspapers. is something good, it may as well tell more people in the mass media and Members, so that we can have discussions earlier with people who may join the governing team of the next SAR Government.

I so submit. Thank you, President.

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

MR TAM YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): President, first of all, I would like to respond to the speech delivered by Mr Andrew CHENG just now. One of the paragraphs of his speech seems to say that he is being influenced by the "inconsistence in words and deeds" of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong and that he is bowing out of politics as there are some more meaningful matters calling for his attention outside.

However, according to newspaper reports, Mr Andrew CHENG has been very busy these days. The reason is that his business as civil celebrant of marriage is far too good for him to cope with. Of course, the work of a civil celebrant of marriage gives one far more joy. Some people say this is "to make real money." I don't know if this is the reason. I just read this from the newspaper. However, I would like to say this: Do not put the blame on the DAB.

Also, just now Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung shouted loudly while bringing into this Council one of his district council election campaign pamphlets and bombarding the DAB by making use of the airwaves and the Chamber of our Council. The reason is that his competitor is one from the DAB. He wanted to give effect to his election campaign here. It is a pity that he has already left the Chamber.

In fact, I have a lot of things to say to him. Why? Recently I have been making frequent visits to various districts. No matter whether I was in Hong Kong, Kowloon or the New Territories, no matter whether I was in the street or canvassing building apartments or restaurants, people incessantly asked me why there were Legislative Councillors — they named three in particular, inclusive of Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung — frequently hurling things, sweeping things off tables, using abusive language, and resorting to physical violence, thus making the Legislative Council lose the look of a Council. What are you doing at the Legislative Council? Is there anyone to intervene?

I explained to the kaifongs, saying, "There is. Again and again we have expressed disapproval, made condemnations, and also jointly signed representations stating our views." But the kaifongs want to know why it is still like that, and wonder when such a situation can be changed. So, here's my advice for people like Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung. Though he is an elected Legislative Councillor, it is not advisable to go too much against public opinions. These words come from the people, not being fabricated by me. All these are true and accurate.

One day I was in the street in the Central District. It was raining. I was standing under an awning. A lady walked by and noticed me. With one hand carrying an umbrella and one hand holding a bag of breakfast, she had in fact walked past me. She still turned around to complain to me.

So, I implore the three Legislative Councillors, including Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, to observe our Rules of Procedure. Don't disrupt the order of the Council, don't affect the society, and don't set a bad example for the children. Seldom do I speak in such a loud voice. However, I really can no longer stay calm.

As the chairman of the Committee on Rules of Procedure, I have again and again received complaints from members of the public. It is not that I haven't dealt with them. Over the past three years or so, the Committee on Rules of Procedure has held repeated meetings to find ways to curb such situation or stop it from getting worse. Staff members of the Legislative Council Secretariat have been working very hard too, looking into the rules of procedure of foreign parliaments in a bid to find methods to improve the Rules of Procedure. There are quite a few options. No country allows such situation to take place.

However, it's a great pity that whenever the Committee on Rules of Procedure met to discuss ways to improve the Rules of Procedure and prevent the disruption of order in the Chamber, many Councillors from the pan-democratic camp invariably raised objection. Among them, Dr Margaret NG even stressed that so long as there was no universal suffrage in Hong Kong, the Rules of Procedure could never be tightened.

It is hoped that pan-democratic Councillors won't merely condemn remarks mentioning "chav" and "gangster," yet do not condemn expressions like "shameless bootlicker" and "incest", nor the behaviour of hurling things. This is obviously showing double standards, isn't it?

Having talked about the Rules of Procedure, I would like to say something about the charges made by Dr Margaret NG earlier in her speech. According to her, comments in the community against the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge case and the foreign domestic workers' right of abode case are intended to stop people from fighting for their legitimate rights in court by making use of judicial reviews, and this is pernicious to the rule of law. She even added that judicial review is physical check-up. Oh, that's really great. It is necessary to have physical check-ups regularly. That is to say, such things will keep coming.

However, we have carefully studied the comments in question. We in fact totally understand. There were a lot of opinions from the people when we were in touch with them. We have learned from them the reasons of their grievances. I think those people aren't just against the application of judicial reviews. Actually they are against certain people. Certain ultra-motivated political party manipulates some people to apply for judicial reviews through legal aid.

Ultimately, only members of that party or their buddies apart from getting legal fees, what good is there for the society? What benefits has been gained?

The Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge case cost us \$9 million in litigation costs. The project cost has gone up by \$6.5 billion. Is it that problems can only be solved by means of judicial reviews? Is it that suggestions can only be made to the Government by means of judicial reviews? With regard to the issue of creating additional vacancies for officials under the accountability system, Mr Andrew CHENG just now appeared to be very agitated, showing on his face every perceptible sign of his emotions. Yet, was this sum of several billion dollars spent in vain?

When I recently visited various districts, apart from residents complaining about the disruption of order in the Council by people like Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, there were kaifongs taking the initiative to express to me their deep concern about foreign domestic workers' right of abode in Hong Kong. We told them that we will ask the Government to lodge an appeal as soon as possible. However, they said, "Appeal alone is not enough. We have got to win the legal battle. The impact will be very far-reaching if the legal battle is lost. We are going to shoulder a heavy burden." As the Secretary is here, I call upon the Secretary to find ways to dispel such great concern of the public.

Because of the limitation of time, I finally would like to speak on one point only. That's about our vote on the motions. In addition to this Motion of Thanks, there are a few amendment motions. We have studied them. We disapprove of some of the amendments but there are a few which are similar to the suggestions that we put forward before. We are of the view that as this is a Motion of Thanks, it is not advisable to annex to it too many other points. The reason is that some other matters may seem to be neglected if only points that we approve of are put in.

That being so, when it is time to vote on the various amendment motions, we will vote against some of them and abstain on some of them. Thank you, President.

MR JEFFREY LAM (in Cantonese): President, constitutional issues have all along been drawing public attention in Hong Kong, affecting our long-term social

development as well as the progress of democracy in the future. Just as stated by the Chief Executive in his Policy Address, the current-term government has made two significant breakthroughs in constitutional development. First, a timetable for universal suffrage has been set. Second, the 2012 constitutional reform package has been passed, which significantly enhances the democratic elements of the electoral arrangements and makes one solid step towards the eventual realization of universal suffrage. I think this is a major achievement of the Chief Executive during his term of office.

President, politics needs compromise. The passage of last year's reform package was precisely the fruit of compromise. It also helped the community to focus their discussions and arrive at a consensus. Merely making loud cries, pushing each other and hurling accusations at each other will not get all the problems solved. In fact members of the public are already rather fed up with such acts. Teachers may teach children that one should "admit the mistake and face the music". If one cannot do that, one is even inferior to a primary school student. To blindly adhere to this confrontation mentality with a view to achieving every goal in one step cannot help the progress of matters. In my opinion, this may even lead to division and jeopardize harmony and stability.

Over the past two years, along with the change in the overall landscape of world economy, our political and social atmosphere has been affected too. Both populism and welfarism show signs of gaining ground. Businessmen and employers have invariably become the targets of social campaigns for venting people's anger. Earlier on, when the political reform package was under discussion, there were voices in the community seeking to demonize Members representing the functional constituencies. The justification for having functional constituencies and their roles were both called into question. criticisms even pin-pointed the remarks and behaviour of individual Members representing the functional constituencies, and the label of "government and businessmen collusion" was put on quite a few innocent businessmen and legislators representing the business and industrial sectors of the functional constituencies. I think many of the comments are unfair. I do not want to comment on the work of elected Members here as it is all obvious to members of the public. Just as I said earlier, one should "admit the mistake and face the music".

Functional constituencies have been introduced into the Legislative Council for years, and they play a key role in the effective running of the government. Members representing functional constituencies are professionals coming from different strata and sectors of the community. With regard to social policies in various areas covered by the Legislative Council, Members representing functional constituencies may have a deeper understanding than elected Members, and naturally have a say on professional issues. To deny outright the roles of functional constituencies or to ignore the views of people supportive of functional constituencies is holding a biased perspective.

Take as example legislators representing the industrial and commercial Given the fact that Hong Kong is a city mainly led by economic development, legislators of functional constituencies representing different industrial and commercial sectors understand very well the economic competitiveness, business environment and long-term development planning of Hong Kong. For instance, at the time of the global financial tsunami, we advised the Government to launch the Special Loan Guarantee Scheme, which ultimately achieved the goal of "preserving enterprises and stabilizing employment". I think the people were very appreciative of the scheme and considered the Government to be receptive to public opinions. That was truly a measure beneficial to the people. It has also played a crucial role in enabling the overall economy of Hong Kong to recover as quickly as possible. These matters have not only touched on people's interests but also won the endorsement of most people, marking major contributions to the community by Members representing It is indeed not right to label Members the functional constituencies. representing the functional constituencies as "sinners".

Surely, we understand that the system of functional constituencies has its shortcoming. However, this does not mean that functional constituencies and universal suffrage are not compatible. Similarly, economic development and democratic political system are not that incompatible. On the contrary, adequate economic safeguard may provide the basis for democratic political system to move forward. Election by universal suffrage is still some time away. Our wish is for the government of the next term to pool the wisdom of the masses to find ways to widen the electorate basis and improve the system of functional constituencies so that it can measure up to the principle of being universal and equal, thus making proper preparation for universal suffrage.

President, the issue of political constitution has gone through years of disputes. Hardly could one step be made to move forward. The fact that there is such a standstill is indicative, in a way, of the fact that we have not nurtured enough political talents. The study and examination of theories are also insufficient. It is also difficult to attract young people to join the Government or political groups. The Economic Synergy has long attached importance to the task of nurturing young people, and has been encouraging more young people to care about social affairs so as to prepare them for the future of Hong Kong. endorse the Policy Address with regard to the need to nurture political talents. We also agree that the Political Appointment System should be further developed and avenues of political participation broadened for people from different sectors to make contributions to the community. However, it seems that, apart from this, the Government has come up with few ideas. Our wish is for the next Chief Executive and the next Administration to make some breakthroughs in this area.

President, this is the final Policy Address of Chief Executive Mr Donald TSANG. Just as stated by me in my first speech of the current debate, although the Policy Address still leaves room for improvement, and views on it are diverse among members of the public, it has been found to be positive and practical as a whole. It also reflects the point that the Chief Executive and the Government are trying hard to respond to public aspirations. That is to say, in the words of the Chief Executive, they will work hard to the last minute. It is hoped that the points contained in the Policy Address can be put into effect and that the next Administration can get the work done.

President, I so submit in support of the Motion of Thanks.

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

MR ALBERT HO (in Cantonese): President, I am going to make a general comment on the governance of the SAR Government by making use of the remaining 10 minutes of my speaking time.

As it is known to all, the approval rate of the Chief Executive, which remained high for two or three years following his inauguration seven years ago,

began to see a downturn from the time he introduced posts of Under-secretary under the accountability system. For at least two or three years, it has remained at a level below the passing score. Recently, in response to questions from the media, the Chief Executive even said in a mocking manner that he was satisfied as he could still score some 40 points after so many years of public service. From a certain point of view, as the Chief Executive is subject to very heavy pressure, it is likely for him to get hurt. It might be beneficial to his mental health if he tried to comfort himself in the self-consoling spirit of Ah Q.

However, such a remark of his might hurt people's dignity a little. He is the Chief Executive, yet he is satisfied with his sub-standard approval rate. There are probably two reasons for this. One reason is that he looks down upon these opinion polls, treating them as something insignificant. It doesn't matter whether he scores a passing mark or not; he just makes it known that he is satisfied as a matter of courtesy. The second reason is that his fighting spirit has been eroded. Given the fact that his performance just remains like that even though he has been holding the post for so many years, he simply let the public pass their judgment on him, since you people can do nothing anyway. He has no aching legs, nor is he required to leave the post midway. His term of office will last a little over one year only. All he needs to do is to go on watching over this sunset administration. This, in the coming year, will render the entire SAR Government difficult to move forward, and lead to poor morale among members of the administration, let alone making vigorous efforts to turn the tide to push up the approval rate once again. With regard to this, I dare not cherish any high hope.

According to common sense in political science, the power and creditability of any political leader in fact are derived from two sources. One of them is authorization from a political system. Through democratic appointment by way of election, he becomes a representative. Unfortunately, our system is that of a small-circle election. He was merely elected by 1 200 persons. How can he have creditability? However, if the Chief Executive can, by taking in public opinions and showing a high degree of sensitivity to public opinions, make shrewd judgments and seize every opportunity to properly incorporate public opinions into his policies, thus putting into effect government measures with the help of public opinions, then he, in fact, may be able to convert such responsiveness and sensitivity to public opinions into a form of accountability,

and to develop it into a specific form of representativeness. Unfortunately, he has no patience to do that.

Just as stated by quite a few colleagues earlier on, the most controversial decision of recent days is the appointment of Stephen LAM to the post of Chief Secretary for Administration. Perhaps the Chief Executive has his own judgment about his competence. Or probably he thinks that there is even a greater need to appoint one who can remain cool in face of a thousand accusing fingers at difficult times. However, if we look at it from another angle, when people have very strong feelings about it, to make a decision counter to public opinion is impossible in a democratic society. So, I would like to tell Chief Secretary Mr LAM that the key issue is not that we are pin-pointing you. that members of every sector in the society want to know if there is no other choice for the Government. Why did the Government give up so many other candidates and pick for promotion a Secretary much criticized by the people and receiving the lowest approval rate to let this official under the accountability system rise to a position just below the Chief Executive as leader of the accountability team? This will only exacerbate the people's doubt as to how the Government is treating them, and whether or not there is the slightest weight attached to public opinions.

It is even more obvious that in recent years, government measures have invariably been running counter to public opinions even though public aspirations were clearly known and were all well justified requests. It was possible to find out, just by conducting brief surveys and showing understanding, that there were reasons and grounds for having such aspirations. However, the Government was still unwilling to do it. The issue of the \$1,000 "fruit allowance" is the most obvious example, as a result of which even Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Chairman of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong, also accused him of adopting a reactionary policy. He pulled a long face right away. His attitude changed only after a legislator threw a banana at him. Reluctantly he compromised, but he did not hide his displeasure in front of the people. How can he, the Chief Executive, possibly win the people's respect and support with such performance?

There are a lot of other examples, but we need not go into details one by one here. For instance, the replacement mechanism is just the same. There was no consultation even for such an important issue. The position was changed

under pressure only after the 1 July rally. There is also the Home Ownership Scheme issue. I have no wish to make further censure. After all, he has ultimately made changes here. But why paid such a high price, namely, two years of severe criticism from the public before putting forward the plan? Just now quite a few colleagues criticized that numerous political parties were having fierce fights, targeting at the Government or throwing accusations at each other. However, I would like to point out that had the Government been willing to go along with public opinions, such severe criticism would not have been necessary at all.

In a democratic society, if the governing party operates with shrewdness and vigilance, before the criticism of the opposition party befalls, it is already able to convert part of the other side's ideas into its own policies. However, our Chief Executive has totally failed to do so. Why? This is something well beyond the system. It is something to do with the lack of a relevant system. Without a desirable system, legitimacy by virtue of authorization is, of course, missing. Without the nurturing of a relevant system, he is deprived of drilling and training in politics. Thus he cannot master the culture therein, does not know how to acquire political knowledge amidst differences, and fails to realize that opponents can become his best teachers anytime. When facing his opponents, our Chief Executive only feels that they are seeking to be difficult with him, that they are trying to find fault with him, and that they do not respect him. With such mentality, how can he possibly deal with complicated political situations?

The second major factor for building up creditability and power is performance, namely, performance legitimacy in political science. In other words, so long as performance is good, there is no need to have democratic authorization. Even if every person called him king, he were still the most outstanding and wisest king. It is, however, a pity that this is also something our Chief Executive fails to acquire. Our current situation makes many other governments of the world jealous. The unemployment rate is low, financial surplus abundant, financial reserves huge, and the economy is continuously enjoying strong growth, with a lot of money to spend. What else can he say if he still fails to run the administration properly under such circumstances?

The people are most dissatisfied with the wide gap between the rich and the poor. What is the Chief Executive's response to this? According to him, it is

impossible to eliminate the disparity between the rich and the poor. These words are totally beside the point, showing a very low standard. Our request is to narrow the gap between the rich and the poor, not to eliminate the disparity between the rich and the poor is tantamount to bringing in Communism, which, in fact, is not our intention. Moreover, the disparity between the rich and the poor, together with the impoverishment of the grassroots and the stagnation of social mobility, can be very dangerous. If the Government still fails to see the problem, identify the need to make poverty issue a goal requiring urgent attention, reinstate a commission to eliminate or alleviate poverty, set a poverty line, and formulate a working agenda with social justice as the goal, then it is going to be hard for the people to respect the Government and consider the Government to be one caring for the people and attaching great weight to winning the hearts of the people.

Core values constitute another issue. We are very concerned that (*The buzzer sounded*) I think core values are also important matters. It's hoped that the Chief Executive can face up to them.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr HO, your speaking time is up. Does any other Member wish to speak?

MR CHAN KAM-LAM (in Cantonese): President, in the last paragraph of his Policy Address, the Chief Executive mentioned the achievements made by the SAR Government in the 14 years following the Reunification. In the 14 years since the Reunification, there have indeed been many difficult times. Over these years, apart from strong support from the Central People's Government, the SAR Government has also been able to meet attacks calmly and handle situations properly, to which due credit should be given. However, over the last few days in this Chamber, Members in opposition have been wantonly lashing out at the Chief Executive and vigorously smearing the achievements made by Hong Kong. Perhaps we should take a look at what the opposition has done over these 14 years: they opposed the Government for entering the market to fight back the attacks from international financial "crocodiles"; they picked up quarrels on all matters day in and day out by using political democracy as their capital.

Even though there is still room for improvement regarding the governance of the last seven years, the reasons for that are becoming more and more apparent, and the people are also keenly aware of the fact that the opposition has tried to be difficult at every turn, and has thus seriously hindered the effective administration of the SAR Government. Violent disturbance at the Government's public consultation forum was a scene clearly witnessed by all on television. people found it to be preposterous and astonishing, wondering why such things could happen. Vice Premier LI Keqiang visited Hong Kong and brought us 35 policies beneficial to Hong Kong. The opposition, however, sought to divert attention by making a big fuss over the security arrangements of the University of Hong Kong, and even placing the blame on the Secretary for Security and the Commissioner of Police. In the Chamber, the opposition has been staging one farce after another by throwing tomato, egg and banana, and using foul language. They have been whipping up public opinion at every turn, talking about the core values of Hong Kong on all matters and putting all the blames on the imperfection of political democracy. They aim at cheating the people with this chaos in the hope of bringing in universal suffrage sooner and solving all problems.

As matters now stand, Hong Kong citizens are able to see clearly the interests involved in two court cases which concern their personal interests closely, namely, the case of judicial reviews on the Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) Reports for the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (ZHM), and the case of foreign domestic helpers (FDH) applying for right of abode. the Government's administration is obstructed, it may not be beneficial to the Ultimately those who suffer will be members of the public. community. Legislators from the Civic Party are still trying to defend these court cases, alleging that criticisms made against the two cases are just intended to smear the However, the people have discerning eyes, and they know very Civic Party. well the pros and cons of the cases. Following the High Court's rejection of the Government's application for suspension of enforcement, FDHs have been pouring in their applications for the right of abode. According to some press reports, applications have gone up by 40 times. Under such circumstances, many people have told us that they are very disgusted with certain lawyers and legislators abusing legal proceedings to upset the order of our society. From these two court cases we can see clearly the true colours of this group of persons. Are they really working for Hong Kong? Many people have told us that they are against the violent behaviours both inside and outside the Legislative Council,

which have deprived us of ample opportunities and time required for dealing with matters concerning people's livelihood. Just the judicial reviews on the EIA Reports of the HZM Bridge alone have unnecessarily cost the people of Hong Kong \$6.5 billion more in construction costs. One year of construction time has gone wasted for no good reason at all.

Some legislators in opposition even brand the co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland as "the fall of Hong Kong". Even efforts by the Mainland to support our development and all other measures are being described as arrangements imposed upon us and we have to stoop to compromise. To say so is, on the one hand, excessive arrogance. Development on the Mainland is being looked down upon. On the other hand, it is also too self-degrading. The stable social structure built by us over the years will not easily fall apart because of some economic or material exchanges. The support to Hong Kong from our mother country is also firm and selfless. We can say that over the 14 years following the Reunification, the utmost care shown by the Central People's Government towards Hong Kong is there for all to see.

President, economic globalization is the trend of the world. What's more, the world is now in an economic recession. Every nation casts greedy eyes on the Chinese market, exploring every avenue to look for opportunities to co-operate with China. Why can't the democratic camp treat ties with the Mainland as a matter of course? Hong Kong citizens are, in fact, quite pragmatic, being neither haughty nor humble. Apart from being able to recognize their own strengths and give them full play while upholding their own values, Hong Kong people can also form a perspective of the whole country. While noticing the shortcomings of the Mainland, they also acknowledge the progress in the country's overall performance.

Perhaps there will be more challenges in the coming days. However, Hong Kong, having progressed from a small fishing port to the cosmopolitan city of today, has come through all sorts of crises. Blessed with the spirit to march on in the face of big waves and strong winds, Hong Kong people should have confidence, remain calm in tests, and face up to our future. Even though our society does leave much to be desired, rational discussions should be held. The reason is that we believe in the core value of rational thinking. It is hoped that Members in opposition will not create conflicts in society and upset our stability while claiming to be upholding our core values.

President, just now Mr James TO, cursing loudly with gritting teeth, asked why Stephen LAM was promoted to the rank of Chief Secretary for Administration. Why did Stephen LAM, one with such a low approval rate get promoted? President, the people have one question in return. Why must the democratic camp launch such a fierce attack against Stephen LAM? is very simple. It is that the democratic camp wants to divert attention and make the people disregard the public discontent aroused by Members in opposition who unjustifiably vacated their seats and wasted public money. Stephen LAM is the one launching the replacement mechanism to plug up the loophole. His work enjoys public support. So the opposition camp is very unhappy. Aiming the arrow of their discontent at Stephen LAM, they seek to brand him as the official with the lowest approval rate. Isn't the reason very simple? According to Mr James TO, the democratic camp has a standard telling the right from the wrong, and they also have a yardstick. However, that standard, varying from person to person, is a multi-standard. That yardstick is sometimes long and sometimes Thank you, President. short.

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

MS CYD HO (in Cantonese): President, in the case of many evil deeds or things of harm to the people, it is not possible for Donald TSANG alone to make them happen. It is necessary to have the support from some political parties and persons sitting in both the Executive Council and Legislative Council to make them happen. So, today, in addition to giving no thanks to Donald TSANG for his Policy Address, I am also going to condemn the current system as well as those delaying the progress of democracy by supporting this system.

The greatest absurdity about this group of legislators is that they only follow the wand of authority with no stance or reasons whatsoever. All that matter are benefits, only benefits amalgamating political and economic privileges. The replacement mechanism is an example. When the Government said no to consultation, he agreed to not having consultation. When the Government "turned around" — on seeing 220 000 people "taking to the streets" asking for consultation, everybody suddenly said there should be consultation. These are really absurd.

Just now, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung and Mr CHAN Kam-lam concertedly condemned violence in the Chamber. We are against storming the rules. But it is even more outrageous for the Government to storm justice and natural order. A system of violence is even more outrageous! When officials got censured in abusive language by other legislators, 12 letters were written. He even added that report would be made to the police if the matter received no attention. Yet you, fellows in beautiful clothing or so immaculately dressed, used power and law to plunder the people of their wealth, snatching from them their homes and properties like bandits. We tried in vain to stop such violence. Strenuously we tried to stop you from passing the compulsory auctions, and strenuously we tried to stop you from taking away the right to vote, it was to no avail in the same way.

The democratic camp has been fighting for universal suffrage peacefully. The people have been persuaded, in a peaceful manner, to give support. Have we been able to get response from the Government? During his term of office, Donald TSANG has changed the progress of democracy from a "three-step mechanism" to a "five-step mechanism". This is going to be Donald TSANG's lasting legacy for Hong Kong.

Rules of Procedure are handled by the President. Should anybody break the rules and get expelled from the Chamber by you, we won't intervene. Nor will we grumble. We will speak up if your eyes or ears fail you, and you still refuse to admit your mistakes. In the Chamber, it is Members of the functional constituencies that disrupt order most. While holding some 70 000 votes, they occupy 23 seats, which makes it possible for them to oppose or veto motions moved by Members.

During his term of office, Donald TSANG has also been condoning the excessive use of police power. In the past four years, those arrested for having assemblies not authorized by the police only totalled 105 persons. However, on 6 March, at a rally held in protest against budget spending, the police arrested 113 persons. Also, when LI Keqiang visited Hong Kong, people wearing T-shirts bearing the theme of the 4th June incident got arrested when appearing on the ground floor of a residential building or at the University of Hong Kong. President, why must I, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung wearing T-shirts bearing the theme of the 4th June incident take a picture with you? It was precisely because we wanted to affirm such a right to express one's views,

and see if you would summon police for our arrest or if you would support such conduct.

Fellows of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong speak of order and yet sabotage the rule of law. Is it possible to abuse the use of legal proceedings? These have to be handled by judges and accepted by the courts. You fellows are insulting the judges' dealing with the cases, which is most disruptive to social order. What's more, you fellows are dressing up fake elections. According to Mr LAU Kong-wah, foreign democratic nations are financially in the red. Our financial deficit has been there for a long time. Because of financial deficit, there comes the need to cut down social services. We have so many poor people. They have long been put under deficit-related measures imposed on them by a government holding more than \$1,000 billion in reserves. Why is there such a phenomenon? because officials and businessmen are singing in chorus. Now officials, businessmen and political parties are singing in chorus.

President, so long as there is no democracy in Hong Kong, so long as there are fellows supporting the league of political and economic prerogatives, Hong Kong people still have to live in an abyss of misery due to the wealth gap.

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

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

(Still no Member indicated a wish to speak)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): If not, I now suspend the meeting for 10 minutes. Public officers will speak when the meeting resumes.

(Mr Abraham SHEK raised his hand in indication)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Do you, Mr Abraham SHEK, wish to speak?

(Mr Abraham SHEK nodded in indication)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I have already asked twice to see if any Member wished to speak. If any Member wishes to speak, please press the "Request to Speak" button. Mr SHEK, please speak.

MR ABRAHAM SHEK (in Cantonese): I'm sorry, President. It is that I originally had no plan to speak. However, on listening to Members' speeches this morning, I feel that I have a few words to get off my chest. Today, I was most pleased to hear Mr Albert HO praise the Hong Kong Government for its economic achievements and making many countries in the world think highly of its performance. The reason is that the Government has been able to notch such economic achievements for the whole community to share. What Mr Albert HO said here is true. Not many colleagues have made such remarks.

However, while mentioning such achievements on the part of the Government, he also criticized the Government. Nevertheless, no government is perfect in every way. The path to democracy is a long one, but it is worth fighting for. We should fight for every step. Holding a seat in the Legislative Council over the last 11 years, I have seen us moving forward, step by step, along the path leading to democracy. This is not just the work of the legislators. It's that the Government, Hong Kong citizens and legislators should strive together so that true democracy will one day be achieved. However, I wonder what true democracy is. Even the United States and England, those so-called truly democratic countries, still have to make ongoing improvements before their people can live and work in peace and contentment.

When compared with many foreign countries, we in Hong Kong are indeed living and working in peace and contentment. Our problems are different from those of foreign countries. The issue of disparity between the rich and the poor that we have discussed over the last few days is very important. However, unlike the so-called democratic countries such as the United States where people

may die of hunger though may not necessarily die of hunger, the state of their poor people is worse than ours. Take a look at Europe, from which I just came back, I have seen the situation of the wealth gap in many countries in Europe. When I am back in Hong Kong, I really think that we are very lucky. We are all very blessed, but many people do not know how blessed they are. It is not that we have to accept the disparity between the rich and the poor. Of course, there should be improvement. We should work together to make improvement.

President, this morning I heard some Members criticize the Chief Executive's Policy Address for the current year, and place it on a par with Christopher Pattern's Policy Address. There is an English saying applicable to Patten, namely, "end of the chapter". Britain's history in Hong Kong has ended. How can there be comparison as we can only look back to our past deeds? With regard to this Policy Address of the Chief Executive, it is "the beginning of a new chapter". According to the criticism of many people, the Policy Address of the Chief Executive is a "lame-duck", which cannot achieve much. However, this Policy Address of the Chief Executive has considerable long-term impact.

On studying closely the Chief Executive's Policy Address, one can see that he has laid down the courses and blueprints for the future. No matter who is to take over the Administration, it has been laid down that the goal is to serve the people. The courses to be taken in different areas, such as housing and economy, are all laid down. Care is extended to the citizens as well as to the ethnic minority. All the blueprints are laid down in the Policy Address. Hong Kong probably would have developed even better had the Chief Executive delivered this Policy Address seven years ago. Don't make the criticism that this Policy Address is all empty words. It is not empty words. In the future, no Chief Executive will have the guts not to follow this Policy Address. If the Chief Executive is to be praised, then it can be said that on this occasion he has written this Policy Address with his heart and that the Policy Address has been written for the well-being of the people.

I also heard Mr WONG Yuk-man criticize the Chief Executive in this debate, alleging him What were the words used? Politics political ethics. He asked the Chief Executive why he appointed Stephen LAM to be the Chief Secretary. He said he didn't get it. Mr Albert HO just now also said that

many people were against the move. President, in the first place, according to the Basic Law, appointment of Principal Officials has to be decided by the State. In the second place, this is an executive-led government. If the appointment goes to Stephen LAM, then he shall take up the responsibility.

I think it is absolutely right to appoint Stephen LAM. Just take a look at his performance in this Chamber. Who else can be as impressively capable as he has been, debating with 60 persons all by himself, and calling it a circle or a square whenever it suited him? It was quite a show for us just by watching his gestures and motions. Someone commented that he was an mp3. However, he has really come up with a package, even that package for 2012, and got the support of the Democratic Party. This alone should warrant his appointment to the post of Chief Secretary. I really think that it is right to appoint him to be the Chief Secretary. So, we need not be afraid of the appointment of any official. What matters most is that the person has really put in efforts.

I told Stephen LAM seven years ago that he need not worry about others' views towards him when he took up the position as Secretary. What mattered most was that he had to answer to the Lord and his conscience. If he deemed certain matter to be correct, he should proceed and do that for the people. My wish is for him to go along the same path. Perhaps, there are many people criticizing you, Stephen. However, more people are supporting you. It is hoped that in the coming year we can have a good Chief Secretary to bring to us effective governance. Don't be afraid of pressure or criticism. Just work for Hong Kong irrespective of personal gains or losses. This is most important.

Thank you, President.

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now suspend the meeting for 10 minutes.

4.59 pm

Meeting suspended.

5.09 pm

Council then resumed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now resume the meeting. I will call on public officers present at this round of debate to take turn to speak. They may have up to a total of 90 minutes speaking time.

SECRETARY FOR JUSTICE (in Cantonese): President, I thank Members for their views today. Here, I would like to respond briefly to the individual issues on the rule of law raised by Members in their speeches.

First of all, earlier on, when Dr Margaret NG talked about some cases involving officials and public order, she said that the Government "must appeal". Here, of course, I would not comment on any individual case, especially when the case concerned may be pending appeal.

However, I wish to point out and stress that after the delivery of the judgment on a case and before a decision to appeal is made, the Secretary for Justice, particularly the Director of Public Prosecutions and his colleagues, will make independent and professional consideration and decisions based on the law, the evidence and the grounds of the decision, without being interfered. Dr Margaret NG is also aware that this is our established system.

Secondly, Dr NG also said that compared with the days before the Reunification, when Government officials go out these days, it seems that they are surrounded by attendants on all sides. She is critical of this. Similarly, I will not comment on individual cases. However, I wish to point out one fact which members of the public can see clearly. President, the legislature has also had many discussions on the fact that the number of rallies and protests tends to increase, and even the culture of attacking in this Council tends to intensify. I

believe that members of the public all understand that our colleagues in the police are duty-bound to strike a balance between protecting the safety of officials and protecting the basic rights of the public. In performing such a duty, it is never easy to handle the difficulties and challenges therein appropriately. There are also such a statement and understanding in the judgments of individual court cases.

In passing, I wish to talk about the complaint made by Mr Andrew CHENG on an individual case earlier on. Of course, he can take any appropriate follow-up action in this regard. However, on the matter he raised just now, Mr Andrew CHENG made a very serious accusation. He said that the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) has become "political henchmen". Mr CHENG, we cannot agree with this remark.

Members all know that the ICAC is a highly successful anti-corruption agency with great transparency. On this serious accusation, I believe that many members of the public who participate in the work of the ICAC, including the Operation Review Committee, would not agree with this.

Thirdly, Dr Margaret NG also lamented that there was a complete destruction of human rights in Hong Kong after the Reunification. I certainly understand that Members have different views on human rights and the rule of However, if one says that there is a complete destruction of human rights in Hong Kong after the Reunification, I cannot agree. Frankly, I also find such a If Members have paid attention to some independent remark not fair. commentaries, including those made by some overseas governments on Hong Kong's situation, it can be seen that they basically agreed that "one country, two systems" has been successfully implemented in Hong Kong and that the rights and liberties guaranteed by the Basic Law are respected, rather than having been completely destructed, as Dr Margaret NG said early on. For example, the constitutional reform package passed last year was a breakthrough in the constitutional reform. In its half-yearly report published recently, the British Government also welcomed and congratulated this development. Moreover, the evaluations on the protection of individual rights in the report are also positive.

Fourthly, Dr NG also talked about the issues of "judicial review" and "the awareness of the rule of law". I also wish to make some response.

President, the increase in the number of cases of judicial review reflects the fact that members of the public are more aware of their rights and that the judicial system of the SAR is able to provide independent and effective safeguards to these rights. The SAR Government, including the Chief Executive and all officials, have never said that any challenge to the Government by way of judicial review would mean an abuse of legal process.

Dr NG mentioned *The Judge Over Your Shoulder* published by the Department of Justice in October last year. I do not know if Dr NG has the chance to look at what I said in the foreword of this document. President, please allow me to quote a little here because this is a public statement made by the Government on this issue.

"It would not be right to consider judicial review a hindrance to good government. On the contrary, when the legal process is used responsibly and appropriately, it is conducive to raising and maintaining standards of government action, improving governance and decision-making, and upholding the rule of law."

However, Members will recall, and as I say in the foreword of this document and as a Member mentioned earlier on, at the inauguration ceremony marking the current legal year early this year, the former Chief Justice of the Court of Final Appeal, Mr Justice Andrew LI, has reminded us twice that judicial review is not a panacea for solving the political, social and economic problems in modern society. This reminder really merits our careful consideration.

More important still, as a matter of fact, on many occasions, members of the public in Hong Kong have obtained legal aid in appropriate circumstances and have successfully challenged the constitutional status of the Government's administration and legal provisions. These cases adequately demonstrate the awareness of the rule of law and the actualization of such an awareness.

Moreover, Mr Paul TSE also mentioned just now the judicial review case relating to the right of abode in Hong Kong for foreign domestic helpers. I respect the views of Mr TSE and other Members. However, Members also understand that I am a party involved in the litigation and we are also actively preparing for an appeal at the earliest opportunity. Therefore, I am afraid I cannot openly discuss the arguments in this case in this legislature.

President, I fully understand the grave concern of the public about this case, including the areas of concern of the general public as stressed by Mr TAM Yiu-chung earlier on. We are doing our best to prepare for the appeal. We will fight our case strongly on sound grounds with a view to persuading the Appeal Court to accept the Government's points of law. In this regard, we have been making sustained efforts and we are provided with legal advice and support from authoritative experts in constitutional laws.

As to Mr Paul TSE's reminder that an interpretation of the Basic Law by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress (NPCSC) is part of the laws in Hong Kong, we have certainly not forgotten this. I believe that Mr Paul TSE may also recall that earlier on, in the Congo case involving the Basic Law, we have successfully convinced the Court to refer the case to seek interpretation from the NPCSC.

Lastly, President, I am grateful to Members for their advice to me on performing my duties. I will listen with an open mind and do my best to fulfil my responsibilities as the Secretary for Justice.

Thank you, President.

SECRETARY FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AND MAINLAND AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): President, today, a number of Members have expressed their views on the political appointment system. In response to Members' remarks, I now wish to make a few points.

First of all, I do not agree that the political appointment system is a "complete failure", as suggested in Ms Emily LAU's amendment.

The establishment of the political appointment system is not only inevitable and necessary in the process of Hong Kong's moving towards universal suffrage, but also a positive response to the increasingly loud call from the general public of Hong Kong for governance transparency, openness and accountability on the part of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR).

Actually, in the early days after the Reunification, there were views in society in relation to certain incidents, such as the chaos at the commissioning of

the new airport and the substandard piling works incident involving the Housing Authority, that it was necessary to introduce changes to the established civilian system based on civil servants, so as to address public opinions and aspirations more directly and effectively. Besides, there was also a need to establish a firewall to safeguard the professionalism, permanence and neutrality of the civil service and protect it from political pressure.

Furthermore, with the returning of the Chief Executive by election and the moving towards universal suffrage in 2017, the Chief Executive indeed needs a team which agrees to his concepts of governance, advances and retreats with him and is willing to take political responsibilities to realize the Government's "people-based" spirit.

What is more, there are many elites with political aspirations in society who wish to join the Government in order to repay and serve society with their professional experience and expertise. Against this background, the political appointment system was first established in 2002 and further expanded in 2008. Apart from Secretaries of Department and Directors of Bureau, the layers of Under Secretaries and Political Assistants were also created to assist Secretaries of Department and Directors of Bureau and also the Chief Executive in administration.

The creation of the posts of Under Secretaries and Political Assistants has enhanced the support for Secretaries of Department and Directors of Bureau and provided them with effective assistance in respect of their political work, thereby enabling them to strengthen their connections with the Legislative Council, District Councils (DCs), various political parties, non-governmental organizations, community groups and professional bodies.

Under Secretaries can now act as Bureau Directors during the latter's overseas visits and work with them through division of labour to tie in with the ever-increasing workload in respect of the Legislative Council. This arrangement is much better and more comprehensive than the one in the past.

Under Secretaries and Political Assistants are different in various aspects, including, among others, their scope and focus of work, and quite a lot of their political liaison efforts may go unnoticed by the public, especially in the case of Political Assistants. As they are mostly engaged in providing support at the

backstage and may not have the opportunities to appear on the front stage, it is understandable that the public's recognition of them may be different.

Certainly, we have to admit that the political appointment system, which has been implemented in Hong Kong for less than a decade, requires further improvement and refinement through accumulating experience and drawing lessons from such experience during the development process, so as to better meet the needs of the times.

When the posts of Under Secretaries and Political Assistants were first created, they had indeed aroused quite a lot of criticisms in society. While some views were specifically on the nationality of individual colleagues, others concerned their division of roles and responsibilities and their work relationship with civil servants. There were also views on whether their remuneration package was too attractive, as well as opinions about their public recognition rates and so on.

Regarding these criticisms and views, we must listen to them with an open mind and reflect on ourselves. I believe all our colleagues will work diligently in a pragmatic manner and make the best of their efforts silently behind the scene to win the public's acceptance and respect with their work performance. Over the past three years, many Under Secretaries have done their utmost to perform their duties dedicatedly, thereby winning the appreciation and recognition from many members of the public. Sometimes, for the Under Secretaries, a word of encouragement or a smile from the public may already serve as a reason for them to work hard and a sufficient motivation for them to commit to their roles.

Certainly, we are deeply aware that our society has very high expectation of the political appointment system. I believe all Secretaries of Department, Directors of Bureau, Under Secretaries and Political Assistants are open to public views, and they will keep up with their efforts in the remaining months of the current term of the Government and make endeavours to the last minute for the well-being of the public.

Here, I wish to cite a quotation from the *Book of Changes* as an encouragement to my colleagues: "As the ever revolving heaven, the gentleman should persistently renew his strengths; like the sustaining power of the earth, the gentleman should practise the great virtue of kindliness to bear all things".

President, the political appointment system is still evolving and requires constant review to keep up with the times. As pointed out by the Chief Executive in the chapter on "Challenges Ahead" in the Policy Address, specifically in paragraph 202, "we need to review our administrative system to ensure it is compatible with future democratic development. Aspects to be considered include the definition of the roles and responsibilities of political appointees and civil servants; establishment and mobility; allocation of financial, manpower and land resources within the Government and the relevant procedures; further devolution of powers to district administration; division of work among heads of bureaux and their subordinate departments; and arrangements for policy formulation, advocacy and consultation."

President, the Chief Executive raises these issues in the Policy Address with a view to facilitating discussions in society. The Legislative Council and the general public will definitely have ample opportunities to discuss them in the future.

A new Chief Executive will be selected on 25 March next year. Any adjustments to the structure of and the division of labour within the next term of the Government and the political appointment system should certainly be led by the Chief Executive-elect. This Government will make arrangements and provide support during the transitional period when necessary.

Besides, regarding review on the remuneration package of politically appointed officials, the Independent Commission on Remuneration for Members of the Executive Council and the Legislature, and Officials under the Political Appointment System of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region will advise the Government on the matter. We will study and examine the views received and make recommendations for consultation with the Legislative Council in due course.

President, I would like to add a few words on the arrangements for filling vacancies in appointed seats in DCs and seats in the Legislative Council.

Regarding the DC appointment system, we agree that it can be abolished in phases. We will first reduce by one third the number of members to be appointed in the fourth term of the DCs in 2012. In other words, we will appoint only 68 members. After the DC election in November, we will embark on

public discussions on various aspects, including whether the remaining appointed seats should be abolished over one term or two terms and how the relevant legislative amendment exercise should be carried out. On this, we have an open mind. After considering public views, we will put forth recommendations on the next steps to take.

On arrangements for filling vacancies in the Legislative Council, we received a total of some 31 000 submissions during the two-month public consultation exercise conducted earlier. We are now examining all the views received thoroughly and carefully and will make recommendations to the Legislative Council on the next steps to take in due course.

With these remarks, President, I urge Members to support this year's Policy Address.

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): President, I will give some responses to the speeches delivered by Members in this session.

Just as Mr IP Kwok-him said, the District Councils (DCs) play a pivotal role in the SAR Government's district administration. Since 2008, various measures to improve all 18 DCs in Hong Kong have been implemented. They have yielded positive results in bringing cohesion to local communities, improving the environment and enriching the living of the public. The District Minor Works (DMW) Programme is one of the measures to enhance the role of DCs. In the last term, various DCs completed over 2 000 projects and participated in managing various district facilities, such as community halls and district libraries. This is welcomed by the public.

Last year, the Home Affairs Department (HAD) held the second Summit on District Administration, at which the DMW Programme was discussed and concerns for such issues as the management arrangements, recurrent expenditures and maintenance fees for the newly completed facilities were expressed. We agree that it is necessary to enhance the continuity of the DMW Programme. The Chief Executive has announced in the Policy Address that the Government will increase the annual provision under the DMW Programme progressively to \$400 million within the next two District Council terms to enable the District

Councils to improve district facilities continuously, and to manage and maintain the completed facilities after the completion of these support facilities.

We will discuss with the DCs how to enhance the effectiveness of the DMW Programme, so that the Government's funds can be used appropriately, with a view to meeting the objective of improving district facilities and environment.

President, this year marks the centenary of the Xinhai Revolution in 1911, which ended the autocratic rule of the Qing Dynasty. For the first time, it was announced on the vast land of China that the national sovereignty belonged to the people. This has far-reaching implications. Since the end of last year, many Policy Bureaux and departments of the SAR Government, together with many local communities and even youth groups, jointly organized various kinds of activities to commemorate the Xinhan Revolution. These activities include seminars, exhibitions, photo exhibitions, art and cultural activities, exchanges and visits. Through participating in these activities, members of the public can gain a better understanding of the historical significance of the Xinhai Revolution, the role that Hong Kong played in the Revolution and our nation's progress and development in the past 100 years. In March this year, the Home Affairs Bureau has launched in its website a dedicated webpage entitled "辛亥革命一百周年 紀念活動", which lists the commemorative activities organized by the Government and a number of civil groups, for browsing by the public. The information is also available in a booklet distributed in various places of all 18 districts of Hong Kong. These activities have already started and are really meaningful in terms of national education.

President, I so submit and hope that Members can support this Motion of Thanks.

SECRETARY FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE (in Cantonese): President, as the cornerstone for governing Hong Kong, the Civil Service provides stability and continuity for Hong Kong's governance and government operations. We are committed to maintaining a civil service which is dedicated to upholding core values, politically neutral, lean and efficient, professional, people-oriented and fully committed to providing the community with quality services.

During the debate on Motion of Thanks in these three days, not many views on the Civil Service management have been put forth. Regarding these views, I would like to give a brief response.

Ms LI Fung-ying said the five-day week initiative has not been fully implemented in the Civil Service. At present, President, about 44 600 civil servants still have to work more than five days per week to maintain emergency or essential services. We are grateful for the understanding of the relevant staff who are as equally committed to discharging their duties as they did in the past. The Civil Service Bureau encourages various government departments to continue to explore migrating more staff to work five days per week or allowing staff who have not been working five days per week to rotate to five-day week posts within the same department through new roster arrangements or revising the existing ones, subject to the basic principles of the five-day work initiative and where operational circumstances permit.

At present, the Government has no intention to revise the four basic principles concerning the five-day work initiative, namely no additional staffing resources, no reduction in the conditioned hours of service of individual staff, no reduction in emergency services and continued provision of some essential counter services on Saturdays.

Ms LI Fung-ying was also concerned about the manpower of the Civil Service. The Government is committed to providing quality services to the public. At the same time, we maintain a lean and efficient Civil Service in line with the principles of "big market, small government" and prudent management of public resources. Accordingly, Heads of Departments (HoDs) have to determine which type of manpower should be deployed to deliver different public services, having regard to the operational needs and the nature of the services. The manpower I referred to include civil servants, non-civil service contract (NCSC) staff, agency workers and contractor staff.

Generally speaking, for law enforcement-related duties and services which should be directly delivered by government departments, HoDs should deploy civil servants to meet such service needs. For those public services which are time-limited or seasonal in nature, or where the modes of delivery are under review or likely to be changed, HoDs may employ NCSC staff to meet the service needs. For short-term service needs which are urgent or unforeseen or where

there is an unexpected surge in the volume of work involved, HoDs may consider using agency workers. As regards those public services which may be provided by the private sector, departments may outsource the services concerned. The conditions of services, including salaries and benefits, are definitely different for different types of employees, and it is indeed inappropriate to compare the conditions of services for them.

Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Ms LI Fung-ying, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr IP Kwok-him and Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong expressed support for the Government's intention to conduct a study on the provision of paid paternity leave for civil servants stated in the Policy Address, and they hoped that the Government would implement this initiative at an early date. We have commenced giving active consideration to the implementation details, including but not limited to how to ensure the effective operation of the Government; what should be the quantum of paid paternity leave, eligibility criteria and the mode of leave-taking. We plan to publish a consultation paper next month. Besides, we will study the provision of statutory paternity leave in neighbouring regions and paternity leave arrangements already adopted by local organizations. the smooth completion of the consultation exercise and other procedures, it is tentatively scheduled that paid paternity leave can be implemented in the Civil Service in the middle of next year.

I am mindful that after the release of the Policy Address, a small number of people consider that the Government's taking the lead in providing paternity leave to civil servants would do civil servants injustice as they would easily be criticized for receiving preferential treatments from the Government. In fact, people who make such criticisms also agree that the provision of paternity leave is meaningful, just that they hope paternity leave can be provided to all employees in Hong Kong at the same time. I understand how employees feel. The Labour and Welfare Bureau will conduct a study on the territory-wide implementation of paternity leave and carefully consider the actual circumstances in Hong Kong.

I am also mindful of the view that when paid paternity leave is provided in the Civil Service, the Government should also make organizations receiving government subvention provide the same to their employees. Actually, individual subvented bodies may, taking into account their operations and other considerations, decide at any time to provide paid paternity leave to their employees, rather than waiting for the implementation of this practice in the Civil Service, because subvented bodies have the autonomy to deicide on the benefits offered to their employees. In fact, there are individual government subvented organizations in which paid paternity leave is already provided to their employees.

President, I have been the Secretary for the Civil Service for over five years. I am very honoured to be able to work with a team of civil servants who have been serving the community with professionalism, integrity and dedication. I joined the Civil Service over 30 years ago. Throughout the years, I have not only witnessed but also gained a first-hand experience of how colleagues in the Civil Service adapt to the fast-changing society and meet the ever-rising expectation of the public. All along, apart from keeping up with the times, our Civil Service has also been seeking to break with tradition and strive for excellence.

About a decade ago, the Government implemented the Civil Service Reform and tightened expenditure. Faced with streamlining and downsizing at that time, civil servants put in extra efforts and worked very hard in order to continue to provide quality services to the public. After the implementation of the political appointment system in 2002, civil servants have been examining various initiatives carefully to give professional advice to principal officials to support effective governance of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR).

In the days to come, we will do our utmost to uphold the fine culture of the Civil Service to ensure that civil servants can maintain their professionalism, honesty and integrity. I understand that the Civil Service still has room for improvement. We will keep up with our efforts and move towards a higher plane of excellence.

With these remarks, President, I hope Members will support the original motion. Thank you.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, the Fukushima nuclear incident which happened in Japan in March this year aroused global concern about nuclear safety. The people of Hong Kong are also very

concerned about the safety of the nuclear power stations in the vicinity of Hong Kong and our emergency preparedness. We are undertaking a comprehensive review of the Daya Bay Contingency Plan (DBCP). In reviewing the DBCP, we will also make reference to the latest international practices and standards and the practical experiences of advanced overseas countries in nuclear emergency, taking into account the actual situation of Hong Kong.

We plan to conduct a large-scale inter-departmental exercise early next year in the light of the revised DBCP to ensure that various departments can work together effectively to cope with possible emergency situations. Besides, we will make use of various channels, such as involving the community to participate in relevant parts of the exercise and production of Announcement in Public Interests, to enhance public education on radiation safety and nuclear emergency preparedness.

In respect of rendering assistance to Hong Kong residents travelling abroad, the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR) attaches great importance to the provision of effective assistance to Hong Kong people caught in distress outside Hong Kong. In 2009-2010, the Security Bureau succeeded in implementing 30 improvement measures to strengthen the mechanism of assisting Hong Kong people overseas. These measures include launching the Outbound Travel Alerts (OTA) System, upgrading the 24-hour "1868" hotline system; introducing online Registration of Outbound Travel Information service, and facilitating exchanges and communication between the SAR Government and the Office of the Commissioner of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China in the HKSAR (OCMFA) and the local Chinese Diplomatic and Consular Missions (CDCM).

The close communication between the SAR Government and the OCMFA and assistance rendered by the local CDCM are an integral part of our emergency response system in assisting Hong Kong people caught in distress outside Hong Kong. When any incident happens, the SAR Government would liaise with the OCMFA and the relevant local CDCM in the first instance to seek assistance and discuss follow-up actions. In handling the Manila hostage incident in August 2010 and arranging special flights to bring back Hong Kong travellers stranded in Egypt in February 2011, the SAR Government received strong support from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the OCMFA and local CDCM in providing appropriate and effective assistance to the Hong Kong residents involved. The

SAR Government will build on this solid foundation and further strengthen this mechanism with a view to doing its utmost to provide assistance to Hong Kong residents in distress outside the territory.

Just now, Mr Paul TSE expressed concern about the OTA System. I wish to make a brief response here. The OTA System covers countries which are popular destinations of Hong Kong residents for sight-seeing, business or visiting relatives. Before selecting these places, we have already consulted the travel industry and obtained information on the popular destinations of Hong Kong residents through consulates-general in Hong Kong and other public information. We have also decided to conduct exchanges with the travel industry every six months — usually in June and December every year — and collect information on outbound travel of Hong Kong residents through various channels to facilitate timely consideration of putting under the OTA coverage places which have become popular destinations for Hong Kong residents. We will also strengthen our communication with the travel industry before peak season of outbound travel to obtain information on people's travel plans to affirm that the OTA coverage has addressed the needs of Hong Kong residents. With this administrative scheme, we can flexibly expand the OTA coverage when necessary and provide the public with the relevant travel risk information in a timely manner.

Regarding the Auxiliary Medical Service Cadet Corps, in order to encourage young people aged between 12 and 17 to develop self-discipline, team spirit and practical skills through participating in healthy group activities and training, we have set up an Auxiliary Medical Services Cadet Corps under the Auxiliary Medical Services. The Cadet Corps has an enrolment of about 400 members at present and it expects to reach its target of recruiting 1 000 members in five years.

On establishing a sexual conviction record check mechanism for child-related work, the Law Reform Commission (LRC), after conducting thorough studies and public consultation, published a report on "Sexual Offences Records Checks for Child-related Work: Interim Proposals" in February 2010, recommending the Government to establish an administrative mechanism for sexual offence record checks. We have accepted the LRC's recommendation and will work in collaboration with the Hong Kong Police Force to prepare for the establishment of a sexual conviction record check mechanism whereby the employers of organizations or enterprises may check and ascertain whether

applicants for child or mentally incapacitated person (MIP)-related work have any sexual conviction records, so as to enhance protection for children and MIPs against sexual assaults.

We are now at the final stage of the preparatory work, including testing the operation of the online and automatic telephone checking system. We plan to officially introduce the mechanism for use by employers of organizations and enterprises at the end of this year. We will also launch extensive publicity before the mechanism is introduced.

The SAR Government has all along been fully committed to achieving the objective of combating terrorism and terrorist financing. The United Nations (Anti-Terrorism Measures) Ordinance was enacted in 2002 and the Amendment Ordinance was enacted in 2004 to implement the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1373 adopted by the United Nations Security Council and some of the Special Recommendations made by the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF). The Ordinance has been brought into full operation since 1 January 2011.

In 2008, the FATF published the Mutual Evaluation Report on Hong Kong's anti-money laundering and counter terrorism financing regime. While recognizing the strengths of Hong Kong's regime, the Report made a series of major recommendations. To address these recommendations, we propose to amend the Ordinance. Besides, we plan to consult the Panel on Security in November and submit the relevant Amendment Bill to the Legislative Council within this year for Members' consideration. This legislative exercise will help Hong Kong contribute towards combating terrorism and terrorist financing as part of the international community, thereby fulfilling our international obligations in this regard.

Regarding the handling of torture claims, there are about 6 700 outstanding torture claims at present, and the Immigration Department receives an average of some 100 new claims each month. Many people considered that we should speed up the screening procedures while ensuring their fairness at the same time. To this end, we introduced the Immigration (Amendment) Bill 2011 in July this year to provide for the statutory screening procedures. We expect that the proposed procedures will enable fair screening of the claimants while at the same time reduce procedural abuse to ensure that effective immigration control can be

maintained. We will actively complement the work of the Bills Committee, hoping that the legislation can be passed within this Legislative Session.

In respect of reducing the coverage of the Frontier Closed Area (FCA), we announced in early 2008 to substantially reduce the land area of the FCA from about 2 800 hectares at present to about 400 hectares. Arising from the reduced coverage of the FCA, the authority will construct a Secondary Boundary Fence and new sections of the boundary patrol road and the primary boundary fence. The project has been divided into four sections. The first phase, which consists of three sections, has obtained funding approval from the Legislative Council. Among these sections, the construction works for the "Mai Po to Lok Ma Chau Control Point Section" and the "Lin Ma Hang to Sha Tak Kok Section" were completed in September 2011. Accordingly, we will amend the Frontier Closed Area Order to stipulate the relevant reduction of the FCA. We plan to table the Amendment Order in the Legislative Council within 2011, with a view to implementing the reduction in early 2012 when more than 740 hectares of land will be released from the FCA for public access. As for the "Lok Ma Chau Control Point to Ng Tung River Section", we expect that the construction work will be completed in the last quarter of 2012.

Regarding the second phase of the project, that is the "Ng Tung River to Lin Ma Hang Section", certain parts of the project will involve the resumption of private land. We have completed the statutory land resumption procedures, and consulted the Panel on Security in May 2011. We plan to seek funding approval from the Public Works Subcommittee and the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council between late 2011 and early 2012.

Concerning fire safety in old buildings, fire safety facilities and construction of composite commercial/residential and domestic buildings built in or before 1987 are governed by the Fire Safety (Buildings) Ordinance. In accordance with the Ordinance, the Fire Services Department (FSD) and the Buildings Department (BD) have been gradually inspecting target buildings in Hong Kong which are covered by the Ordinance. If potential fire hazards caused by obstructions to fire escapes or structural problems are identified, or if there are problems associated with fire service installations and equipment, the Departments will issue fire safety directions to owners and occupiers, requiring them to enhance the fire safety measures in the buildings.

Since 2007, the FSD and the BD have inspected a total of over 4 400 commercial buildings and issued over 74 000 fire safety directions, among which over 15 000 of them have been complied with or withdrawn. We expect that the inspection exercise will be completed by the end of 2015. When the inspection of composite commercial/residential buildings is completed, the Departments will embark on the inspection of domestic buildings.

In respect of addressing the problems of outdated facilities and overcrowding in some of our penal institutions, since the commissioning of the redeveloped Lo Wu Correctional Institution last year, the overcrowding situation of female institutions has significantly improved. The overall occupancy rate of the relevant facilities has reduced to about 80%. In the coming year, we will commence the partial redevelopment project of the Tai Lam Centre for Women to increase the penal places for inmates and prisoners and enhance various facilities, such as increasing the number of hospital beds in the institution. We will continue to consider implementing redevelopment and improvement works of other penal institutions according to actual needs to address the problems of outdated facilities and meet the needs for prisoner detention and rehabilitative services.

President, Hong Kong, which is governed by the rule of law, is one of the safest and most stable cities in the world. Compared with 2009, the overall crime rate and the violent crime rate in 2010 dropped by 3% and 5.4% respectively and the overall crime detection rate was 42.8%. Compared with the same period in 2010, the overall crime rate and the violent crime rate for the first eight months of 2011 further dropped by 0.8% and 5.6% and the overall crime detection rate was 40.3%.

President, I wish to reiterate that we have always been able to maintain good law and order and keep the crime rate at a low level, thanks to the professionalism, high efficiency and dedication of the disciplined forces, which perform their duties impartially and act according to the law. The Government fully respects the rights under the Basic Law and the Hong Kong Bill of Rights to the freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, of movement, of procession and of demonstration, and will take all reasonable steps to protect the same. At the same time, a proper balance has to be struck between ensuring that those who wish to lawfully exercise the above rights are able to do so while maintaining

public order, protecting the rights of others and pursuing other legitimate purposes.

President, a stable society with law and order well maintained lays a foundation for members of the public to live and work in peace and contentment, and is also an important factor in attracting visitors and foreign investment. The Security Bureau and the disciplined forces will continue their efforts in implementing various policy initiatives to tie in with our needs for social and economic developments in the future.

President, I so submit.

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION (in Cantonese): President, after three days of debate, the Motion of Thanks debate on the Policy Address is approaching the end. I wish to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to various political parties and groupings and individual Members for their valuable views put forward here in the Chamber, be they views in support of the Policy Address or criticisms against our proposals, because it is only by consolidating Members' views can we enable Hong Kong's administration and our society to improve continually.

The Chief Executive used "From Strength to Strength" as the theme of the Policy Address this year to, on the one hand, summarize the administration of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administration Region (SAR) under his leadership over the past few years, and on the other hand, make a new host of promises to the public.

Not only has the Policy Address realized that the work of the current term Government is built on the seeds sewn by the last two terms of the SAR Government, but it will also pave the way and make preparation for the next term of Government.

Within a single term, we will not be able to solve all the problems of Hong Kong, and neither will we be able to accomplish all the tasks. However, as responsible politicians, we are duty-bound to put in the best of our efforts for the present and plan for the future.

There will soon be a change of the governing team of the SAR Government, but the policy agenda and the principal ideas are to continue to promote economic development, improve people's livelihood and promote democracy. This is an obvious option to ensure stable development in Hong Kong.

Looking back at the past four years or so, although Hong Kong was under the impact of the international financial tsunami, we were able to adopt a series of measures and policies to resist the blow. At the same time, we were able to implement the Chief Executive's election platform and his various policy addresses in an orderly manner.

Regarding the major achievements of the Third Term Government, we have already published a booklet to give an account of them. I would like to take this opportunity today to highlight a few aspects:

- (a) First of all, on promoting the 10 major infrastructure projects, many projects have been launched or are under planning. For example, the construction of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge and the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link has commenced recently.
- (b) On strengthening and enhancing traditional pillar industries, we have been constantly exploring new room for development, such as promoting Hong Kong as the off-shore centre for Renminbi and promoting the development of the six industries where Hong Kong enjoys clear advantages. We will also prepare and introduce a competition law, with the view to creating a more level playing field in business in Hong Kong and protecting the interests of the public.
- (c) To tap the historical opportunities arising from the rapid economic development in the Mainland, we liaised with the Central Government and succeeded in securing in the National 12th Five-Year Plan a dedicated chapter covering Hong Kong and Macao, supporting the regional co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland. We will sign the "Framework Agreement on Hong Kong/Guangdong Co-operation" with the Guangdong

provincial authorities to explore greater room for the joint development of Hong Kong and the Mainland in the future.

- (d) On education, we have extended free education to 12 years, started subsidizing preschool education and introduced small class teaching in primary schools.
- (e) We helped families in need and the underprivileged, smoothly implemented the statutory minimum wage to raise the grassroots' level of income, set up the Community Care Fund (CCF), which would serve to mend the existing safety net.
- (f) We have substantially increased funding for public healthcare, and after rounds of public consultation, we have achieved a consensus of the community at large on the issues of healthcare reform and healthcare financing.
- (g) On environmental protection and heritage conservation, we adopted new thinking and introduced many new policies and initiatives.
- (h) Within our term of office, we have set a timetable for the implementation of universal suffrage for the Chief Executive on the basis of "one person, one vote" in 2017, and then for the Legislative Council in 2020; last year, we also succeeded in forging consensus among different political parties and groupings in the Legislative Council on the constitutional development of "one person, two votes" in 2012.

All these achievements were not easy to come by. These concrete achievements were only possible with the spirit of seeking common grounds while preserving differences, thanks to the support rendered by this Council to the Government and the concerted efforts of the community.

Nevertheless, we will not stop at this starting point. As Hong Kong has a new starting point, we will focus our efforts on a number of areas of public concern. The new proposals put forth in this year's Policy Address include policies on public housing, the Home Ownership Scheme and the property

market, the ageing population and supporting the underprivileged. New policy initiatives are proposed on all these areas.

Since the release of the Policy Address two weeks ago, judging from responses of different sectors of the community and opinion polls conducted by universities, the community at large have accepted that this Policy Address is a positive one. We also believe that in the eight to nine months to come, we will receive considerable support in implementing these policy initiatives.

In the following, President, I wish to give an account to this Council of a few areas of work which are under my direct responsibility as the Chief Secretary for Administration.

The first one is the implementation of the National 12th Five-Year Plan.

After the release of the National 12th Five-Year Plan in March this year, we have been presented with a new opportunity to continue to strengthen and enhance the traditional industries where Hong Kong enjoys clear advantages and nurture some emerging industries to strengthen the economic co-operation with the Mainland. During his visit to Hong Kong in August this year, Mr LI Keqiang, Vice-Premier of the State Council, announced over 30 measures of the Central Government to further support Hong Kong's development into an international financial centre and the off-shore centre for Renminbi and to facilitate the basically full liberalization of the service industry in Hong Kong and the Mainland within the Five-Year Plan period.

I just returned from a visit to Europe. In Germany, I had the opportunity to meet with the German Federal Minister for Finance and a few other ministers. From them, I learnt that the German Government and various governments of the European Union (EU) member states are very determined to resolve the Euro crisis. I also told them that from Hong Kong's point of view, effective handling of the Euro crisis is crucial to maintaining the stability of and confidence in the international financial market. Hong Kong, as an open economy and a major international financial centre in Asia, hopes that the Euro debt crisis will be handled effectively, and the effective handling of the situation concerning Euro will be conducive to Hong Kong's further development into an off-shore centre for Renminbi. We have also invited Western European enterprises and banks to come over to Hong Kong to participate in a new round of financial development.

Last week, the Financial Secretary, bringing with him representatives from a few bureaux of the SAR Government, liaised with the relevant Central Government ministries as a further effort to seek the early implementation of these measures.

Within the Government, I will continue to chair an inter-departmental and inter-bureau steering committee to ensure that the measures we have secured will be implemented effectively. President, I will give Honourable Members a more detailed account of them when I attend the meeting of the House Committee on 11 November.

The second area I wish to talk about is regional co-operation. At present, apart from the National 12th Five-Year Plan and the "Framework Agreement on Hong Kong/Guangdong Co-operation", we are also undertaking many specific tasks, including the ad hoc quota trial scheme for cross-boundary private cars in Guangdong and Hong Kong and the Lingnan Tong and Octopus co-named card issuance collaboration scheme. We hope these schemes will be implemented next year.

Considering that regional co-operation between Hong Kong and the Mainland should not be confined to the co-operation between Hong Kong and Guangdong, we have proposed in the Policy Address to set up dedicated liaison units in Chongqing and Fujian respectively. This will facilitate our promotion of deeper and stronger co-operation between Hong Kong and the Chengdu-Chongqing Economic Zone in western China and the Economic Zone on the West Coast of the Taiwan Strait.

The third area is population policy.

Much of this year's Policy Address has been devoted to the challenges brought about by the ageing population of Hong Kong, and a number of long-term and short-term measures to enhance complementary services for the elderly have been proposed, with a view to giving substance to and thus realizing the traditional concept of providing for the twilight years of the elderly. These measures include, among others, the "Guangdong Scheme" relating to the Old Age Allowance and the public transport concessions for the elderly. The relevant bureaux and government departments will make great efforts to implement and roll out these measures as soon as possible.

Besides, to address the problem of Mainland women giving birth in Hong Kong, the Government has, with the co-operation of the Hospital Authority and other private hospitals, introduced over the past few months a number of restrictive measures, including according Hong Kong residents priority in receiving healthcare services. We will also pay close attention to when these Hong Kong-born children may choose to cross the boundary to attend school or live in Hong Kong in the future. While it may alleviate the problem of our ageing population, it will definitely put certain pressure on the various social policies and initiatives of Hong Kong.

The fourth area concerns the CCF and the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD).

President, it has already been more than one year since the inception of the CCF. Over a period of time in the past, we have introduced 13 assistance programmes. These programmes, which are now being implemented, include providing free lunch to students in need, enabling them to travel abroad to get to know more about the world; and providing subsidies to cancer patients who need but cannot afford specific drug. Besides, we have recently introduced a policy initiative whereby residents of sub-divided units who are affected by clearance projects will receive a removal allowance. These are some of the examples. We hope the CCF will serve to mend the existing safety net in Hong Kong. If these remedial actions are effective, the SAR Government will consider regularizing these policy initiatives so that they will become part of our ongoing services in the future.

President, work relating to the WKCD has also come to a critical moment. We conducted the third round of public consultation, and based on these public discussions, we will submit the master layout plan to the Town Planning Board, with the view to launching the tendering exercise for the project next year. We hope that the park within the WKCD will be open to the public in 2014 and the first cultural and performance facility will commence operation in early 2015.

Fifthly, in the eight to nine months to come, we have to ensure the smooth changeover from the Third Term SAR Government to the Fourth Term SAR Government. To this end, we will establish a provisional office for the Chief Executive-elect.

Although this arrangement may be similar to that in 1997, it will not be as complicated as the one back then. First of all, there will not be any provisional Legislative Council, and neither will there be considerations relating to the handover of sovereignty from Britain to China. All we have to do is to prepare for the transition from the Third Term to the Fourth Term SAR Government. We from the Third Term Government are more than happy to complement the work of the fourth-term Chief Executive-elect and his team wherever necessary.

That said, in the coming few months, we badly need the support of this Council in order to continue to implement a series of policy initiatives. In Hong Kong, all initiatives, the passage of legislation and the approval for budgets require the mutual co-ordination and regulation between the executive authorities and the legislature. We are very willing to continue to actively discuss with and complement the work of this Council.

In Hong Kong, President, the timetable for implementing universal suffrage for the two elections has been confirmed, and the coming nine years are a very critical moment for the constitutional development of Hong Kong. Over the years, my colleagues and I have been involved in work relating to constitutional development. We are certainly aware that it is a very controversial subject in the community. To date, although most of the people in the community have accepted the implementation of universal suffrage for the Chief Executive in 2017 and then for the Legislative Council in 2020, there are still many people who wish that a quicker pace can be adopted at an early date. At the same time, as this subject is rather controversial, I would like to spell out the considerations which had been taken into account over the past few years.

Actually, colleagues from the SAR Government very much hope that democracy can be promoted expeditiously in Hong Kong. The process of striving for democracy is not an easy one at all because we have to achieve a consensus inside and outside this Council. Last year, a consensus was reached on the 2012 constitutional reform package among political parties and groupings, including the pro-establishment camp and the pan-democracy camp. This consensus, which was indeed not easy to come by, plays a positive role in the future constitutional development. Apart from achieving a consensus within the society, we also have to seek a common understanding with and recognition from the Central Authorities and the Beijing authorities. I can tell Members that during this process, a group of colleagues from the SAR Government did put in the best of their efforts. The present hard-earned achievement is that a path is

available for Hong Kong to move forward. As there is already a path to move forward, we should continue to make effort to put things into practice effectively. Six years later, there will be an election of the Chief Executive by universal suffrage on the basis of "one person, one vote", and nine years later, universal suffrage will be implemented for the Legislative Council. These changes and reform of the constitutional system will bring about changes to the society of Hong Kong as well as our electioneering culture and campaigns. We need to ensure that these elections will have positive and beneficial effects on the future development of Hong Kong.

Apart from the election system, we also have to be mindful of the parliamentary culture of this Council. As part of the executive authorities, we are ready to complement and work together with the Legislative Council to build a noble and rational political culture which places emphasis on respect and President, attending meetings here, we can often find people consensus. throwing objects or making insulting remarks. We expect that this Council will make appropriate rulings, which, adding together, will become precedents and affect our parliamentary culture in the future. I believe all Members treasure the civilized and solemn parliamentary culture developed over the past few decades in Hong Kong and do not wish to see it destroyed rashly by any political parties, groupings or individuals. President, I wish to reiterate that the SAR Government fully respects the Rules of Procedure of the Legislative Council and it also fully respects the decisions made by Members here in this Council. will definitely complement Members' work.

In the Policy Address, the Chief Executive, as the head of the SAR and the SAR Government, shared his experience in administering Hong Kong over the past seven years, and he also made some heartfelt remarks. Regarding our performance over these seven years or so, we have made some achievements, and we certainly have some inadequacies, too. We will continue to listen to and accept with an open mind criticisms from members of the public and the community, in the hope that the policy initiatives put forth by us will be able to stand the test of time, and that after 30 June next year when the Third Term SAR Government ceases office, the foundation laid by us will still be able to play a positive role in the development of the Hong Kong SAR in the future.

With these remarks, President, I hope Members present will support the Motion of Thanks moved by Ms Miriam LAU. Thank you, President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): We have completed the five debate sessions.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Miriam LAU, you may now speak on the amendments.

MS MIRIAM LAU (in Cantonese): President, I am allowed five minutes, but I am sure I do not need to use up the five minutes to speak on the amendments.

According to the Rules of Procedure, Members may move amendments to the Motion of Thanks. As the amendments are proposed by Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr LEE Wing-tat, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Mr WONG Sing-chi and Ms Emily LAU in their personal capacity respectively, the relevant amendments have not been discussed in the House Committee and Members have not reached any consensus. In addition, as I am now speaking in my capacity as Chairman of the House Committee, I will not, and it is not advisable, nor is it appropriate for me to, express any views on the amendments proposed by the five Members. Moreover, I will not urge Members to support or not to support the amendments proposed by the five Members.

President, I so submit.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Frederick FUNG, you may move your amendment to the motion now.

MR FREDERICK FUNG (in Cantonese): President, I move that Ms Miriam LAU's motion be amended.

Mr Frederick FUNG moved the following amendment: (Translation)

"To add ", but expresses deep regret that the Policy Address fails to put forward measures to effectively resolve the disparity between the rich and the poor, and even rationalizes such disparity, does not make thorough reflection on past errors in governance and adamantly refuses to change the existing imbalance in governance philosophy" immediately before the full stop."

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

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr Frederick FUNG rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Frederick FUNG has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for five minutes.

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

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

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): The voting result is that among the Members returned by functional constituencies present here, six were in favour of the amendment, 11 against it and 13 abstained

(Mr LAU Wong-fat rose to his feet)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LAU, what is your problem?

MR LAU WONG-FAT (in Cantonese): I wish to cast an opposition vote, but I could not press the "against" button as it is out of order.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LAU, do you wish to cast an opposition vote on this amendment?

MR LAU WONG-FAT (in Cantonese): Yes.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Margaret NG, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Dr Joseph LEE, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che and Mr Paul TSE voted for the amendment.

Dr David LI, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Timothy FOK, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Prof Patrick LAU, Mr Paul CHAN and Dr LEUNG Ka-lau abstained.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert HO, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, Mr Fred LI, Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Andrew CHENG, Mr Frederick FUNG, Ms Audrey EU, Mr LEE Wing-tat, Mr Ronny TONG, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Ms Cyd HO, Mr WONG Sing-chi, Mr Alan LEONG and Miss Tanya CHAN voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr WONG Yuk-man voted against the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG abstained.

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

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 30 were present, five were in favour of the amendment, 12 against it and 13 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 30 were present, 16 were in favour of the amendment, 12 against it and one abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

MS MIRIAM LAU (in Cantonese): President, I move that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of the Motion of Thanks or any amendments thereto, this Council do proceed to each of such divisions immediately after the division bell has been rung for one minute.

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

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(No hands raised)

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

I order that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of the Motion of Thanks or any amendments thereto, this Council do proceed to each of such divisions immediately after the division bell has been rung for one minute.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEE Wing-tat, you may move your amendment.

MR LEE WING-TAT (in Cantonese): President, I move that my amendment be passed.

Mr LEE Wing-tat moved the following amendment: (Translation)

"To add ", and urges the Government to provide more housing land for building additional public rental housing units to assist the grassroots, including those living in cage homes, cubicle apartments and sub-divided units, in securing public rental housing allocation more expeditiously, construct more Home Ownership Scheme ('HOS') flats, re-launch the Tenants Purchase Scheme, and relax the purchase restrictions in the secondary market of HOS flats to allow eligible white form HOS applicants to make purchase applications, with a view to helping people to live and work in contentment" immediately before the full stop."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Mr LEE Wing-tat to Ms Miriam LAU's motion, be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr LEE Wing-tat rose to claim a division.

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

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Margaret NG, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Mr Paul CHAN, Dr LEUNG Ka-lau, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Mr IP Wai-ming and Dr PAN Pey-chyou voted for the amendment.

Dr David LI, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Timothy FOK, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG,

Mr Vincent FANG, Dr Joseph LEE, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Prof Patrick LAU, Mr CHAN Kin-por and Mr IP Kwok-him abstained.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert HO, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, Mr Fred LI, Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Andrew CHENG, Mr Frederick FUNG, Ms Audrey EU, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr LEE Wing-tat, Mr Ronny TONG, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Ms Cyd HO, Mr WONG Sing-chi, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Alan LEONG and Miss Tanya CHAN voted for the amendment.

Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr WONG Yuk-man voted against the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan and Dr Priscilla LEUNG abstained.

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

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 30 were present, seven were in favour of the amendment, seven against it and 16 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 30 were present, 19 were in favour of the amendment, four against it and six abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, you may move your amendment.

MR CHEUNG MAN-KWONG (in Cantonese): President, I move that Ms Miriam LAU's motion be amended.

Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong moved the following amendment: (Translation)

"To add ", but expresses regret at his lack of commitment to education and failure to make earnest efforts to take forward major education policies, such as 15 years of free education, small-class teaching in secondary schools and increasing the number of university places" immediately before the full stop."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong to Ms Miriam LAU's motion, be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr IP Kwok-him rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr IP Kwok-him has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Margaret NG, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Dr Joseph LEE and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che voted for the amendment.

Dr David LI, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Timothy FOK, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr IP Kwok-him and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Prof Patrick LAU, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr LEUNG Ka-lau, Mr IP Wai-ming, Dr PAN Pey-chyou and Mr Paul TSE abstained.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert HO, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, Mr Fred LI, Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Andrew CHENG, Mr Frederick FUNG, Ms Audrey EU, Mr LEE Wing-tat, Mr Ronny TONG, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Ms Cyd HO, Mr WONG Sing-chi, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Alan LEONG and Miss Tanya CHAN voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr WONG Yuk-man voted against the amendment.

Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Dr Priscilla LEUNG and Mr WONG Kwok-kin abstained.

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

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 30 were present, four were in favour of the amendment, nine against it and 17 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 30 were present, 17 were in favour of the amendment, nine against it and three abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Sing-chi, you may move your amendment.

MR WONG SING-CHI (in Cantonese): President, I move that Ms Miriam LAU's motion be amended.

Mr WONG Sing-chi moved the following amendment: (Translation)

"To add ", but expresses regret at his rejection of universal retirement protection, as well as his failure to face up to the disparity between the rich and the poor and make earnest efforts to alleviate poverty, and to help the socially disadvantaged" immediately before the full stop."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Mr WONG Sing-chi to Ms Miriam LAU's motion, be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr WONG Sing-chi rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Sing-chi has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Margaret NG, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Dr Joseph LEE and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Timothy FOK, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Dr LEUNG Ka-lau, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Dr Raymond HO, Dr David LI, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Prof Patrick LAU, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming and Dr PAN Pey-chyou abstained.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert HO, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, Mr Fred LI, Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Andrew CHENG, Mr Frederick FUNG, Ms Audrey EU, Mr LEE Wing-tat, Mr Ronny TONG, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Ms Cyd HO, Mr WONG Sing-chi, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Alan LEONG and Miss Tanya CHAN voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr WONG Yuk-man voted against the amendment.

Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Dr Priscilla LEUNG and Mr WONG Kwok-kin abstained.

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

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 30 were present, four were in favour of the amendment, 10 against it and 16 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 30 were present, 17 were in favour of the amendment, nine against it and three abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Emily LAU, you may move your amendment.

MS EMILY LAU (in Cantonese): President, I move that Ms Miriam LAU's motion be amended.

Ms Emily LAU moved the following amendment: (Translation)

"To add ", but as the political appointment system (also known as the 'accountability system for principal officials') turns out to be a complete failure after all these years of implementation, the officials under the

accountability system do not have to bear any political responsibility for making so many blunders in implementing policies, the Under Secretaries and Political Assistants appointed by the Administration are unable to help improve the Government's governance, and the public knows nothing about the relevant government officials, this Council expresses anger and regret at the Administration's intention of continuing with the implementation of the political appointment system, and urges the Administration to comprehensively review the system's effectiveness and not to expand it before completing the review" immediately before the full stop."

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

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr IP Kwok-him rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr IP Kwok-him has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Margaret NG, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Dr Joseph LEE and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Timothy FOK, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr LEUNG Ka-lau, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Dr Raymond HO, Dr David LI, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG and Prof Patrick LAU abstained.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert HO, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, Mr Fred LI, Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Andrew CHENG, Mr Frederick FUNG, Ms Audrey EU, Mr LEE Wing-tat, Mr Ronny TONG, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Ms Cyd HO, Mr WONG Sing-chi, Mr Alan LEONG and Miss Tanya CHAN voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr WONG Yuk-man voted against the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG abstained.

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

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 30 were present, four were in favour of the amendment, 14 against it and 12 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 30 were present, 16 were in favour of the amendment, 12 against it and one abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

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

MS MIRIAM LAU (in Cantonese): Members have spent a total of 25 hours 27 minutes on this debate on the Policy Address. This debate is divided into five sessions, and the session with the theme of "Developing the Infrastructure for Economic Growth" has taken up the longest time, accounting for 10 hours 35 minutes, whereas the other sessions have taken up comparatively shorter time. We can see that Members have fully grasped the views and comments of the public on the Policy Address. Many surveys have pointed out to us that housing is the major concern of the public at the present moment, and this is exactly the subject matter of the first debate session. Members of the public are most concerned with our economy and infrastructure.

The long time taken for this debate has allowed Members to have sufficient time to fully debate on the government policies covered in each session. During the debate sessions, I have noticed that not many Members showed appreciation for the Policy Address, and far more Members were voicing out their criticisms and disapproval. While some Members are in support of the existing measures or new measures of the Government, some are against such measures, and some have put forward their proposed measures to the Government but to no avail. All of them had enough time to raise their views to the Government during the debate. I hereby urge government officials to take heed of the views raised by Members, regardless of whether such views are pleasant to their ears. With regard to the polices and measures proposed by the Government, government

officials need to have closer co-operation with Members and listen more to Members' views on how to implement some of such policies and measures, for they are still in their initial stages and many details and particulars have yet to be discussed.

As regards the proposals put forward by Members, or the views yet to be adopted, I do hope that the Government will look into them carefully, with a view to checking out their merits before considering whether they should be adopted or not. Government officials should also discuss more with Members to find out the objectives and effects that Members wish to achieve. It is my hope that the Government will take on more of the views raised by Members.

Last but not least, I hope that the executive arm of the Government and the Legislature can develop a closer relationship. In addition to holding more discussions on government policies and measures, they should also collaborate more in conducting researches and studies, so as to ensure that the policies and measures can be implemented in a smoother manner. That way, members of the public can see that the executive and legislative arms of the Government are really working together for the good of the people of Hong Kong, and doing more real work and good work for the community.

Thank you, President.

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

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Dr David LI, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Timothy FOK, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Prof Patrick LAU, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted for the motion.

Dr Margaret NG and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che voted against the motion.

Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Dr Joseph LEE and Dr LEUNG Ka-lau abstained.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted for the motion.

Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr Frederick FUNG, Ms Audrey EU, Mr Ronny TONG, Ms Cyd HO, Mr Alan LEONG, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Miss Tanya CHAN, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr WONG Yuk-man voted against the motion.

Mr Albert HO, Mr Fred LI, Mr James TO, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Andrew CHENG, Mr LEE Wing-tat, Mr KAM Nai-wai and Mr WONG Sing-chi abstained.

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

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 30 were present, 25 were in favour of the motion, two against it and three abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 30 were present, 10 were in favour of the motion, 11 against it and eight abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was negatived.

NEXT MEETING

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now adjourn the Council until 11 am on Wednesday, 2 November 2011.

Adjourned accordingly at twenty-three minutes to Seven o'clock.