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PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will the Clerk please ring the bell to summon Members to the Chamber.

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

TABLING OF PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table under Rule 21(2) of the Rules of Procedure:

No. 95 ─ Securities and Futures Commission
Approved budget of income and expenditure
For the financial year 2015/2016

No. 96 ─ Report of changes made to the approved Estimates of Expenditure during the fourth quarter of 2014-15
Public Finance Ordinance : Section 8

No. 97 ─ Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation
Annual Report 2014

Report No. 21/14-15 of the House Committee on Consideration of Subsidiary Legislation and Other Instruments

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Retail Prices of Auto-fuel

1. MS EMILY LAU (in Chinese): President, it has been reported that members of the public are concerned about the situation that the retail prices of auto-fuel have been quick to rise and slow to drop in recent months, and the various oil companies are alleged of collusive price-fixing as they have made similar numbers of adjustments of oil prices. In addition, when the international crude oil price drops, the oil companies often do not lower auto-fuel prices by similar magnitude, and the price adjustment mechanism also lacks transparency. In this connection, will the Executive Authorities inform this Council:
(1) whether they will, by making reference to the practice of the Macao Government, set up a dedicated committee to monitor issues relating to adjustments in auto-fuel retail prices, study the operating cost structures of oil companies, and keep track of the sales cycles and the stock levels of auto-fuel; if they will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(2) whether they have plans to request oil companies to make public more information relating to auto-fuel retail prices (such as the sales cycles and the stock levels), analyze regularly the trend movements of auto-fuel retail prices, and assess if the timing and magnitude of price adjustments are reasonable and transparent; if they have such plans, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(3) whether they have plans to investigate how oil companies determine auto-fuel prices, so as to find out if oil companies have engaged in anti-competitive practices; if they have such plans, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (in Chinese): President,

(1) and (2)

Retail prices of auto-fuels in Hong Kong are determined by oil companies having regard to commercial practices and their operating costs. In a free market economy, information related to retail prices of auto-fuels (for example, inventory level and sales turnover cycle) are commercially sensitive information of oil companies. It is not within the powers of the Government to ask the oil companies to provide such detailed information. Neither it is appropriate for the Government to do so. However, the Government appreciates the impact of the auto-fuels prices on the public and has been monitoring the changes in local retail prices of auto-fuels and comparing them with the trend movements of international oil prices (benchmarked against the Singapore free-on-board (FOB) prices for unleaded petrol and motor vehicle diesel (that is, Means of Platts Singapore (MOPS)). In time of international oil price reduction, we will contact and urge oil companies to adjust prices promptly to lessen the burden on the public.
Some members of the public considered that while the international oil prices have dropped significantly in the past few months, the magnitudes of reduction in retail prices of auto-fuels are smaller than that, and there is a sign of "quick going up and slow going down". They have this impression because they compare the percentage change of retail prices against that of international oil prices directly. They perceived that when international oil prices dropped by 50%, the retail prices should be adjusted in the same magnitude. This is indeed not an appropriate analysis because current retail prices of auto-fuels comprise three components, namely:

(i) Costs of importing oil products;

(ii) Tax ($6.06/litre for unleaded petrol); and

(iii) Other operating costs, such as staff costs, transportation cost, oil terminal operation cost, land costs, and so on.

As such, when international oil prices drop, the percentage change in retail prices must be lower than that of the international oil prices given the amounts of tax and other operating costs remain unchanged. On the contrary, when international oil prices rise, the magnitude of increase in retail prices will be smaller than that of the international oil prices.

According to our observation, since the beginning of July 2014 and up to the end of March 2015, the import price of refined oil products have accumulated a reduction of about 50%. In this period, oil companies, in response to falling import prices, have adjusted downwards the retail prices of auto-fuels, with maximum accumulated reduction of over $3.2/litre. We observe that this is generally in line with the trend movements of international oil prices over the same period, and represents around 50% of the import price of its refined oil products in July 2014 at $6.34/litre. As a result of the rises in MOPS for unleaded petrol and diesel, oil companies have recently increased the retail prices of unleaded petrol and diesel. However, the magnitudes of increase in retail prices are lower than or the same as the rises in corresponding MOPS. We do not observe any sign of "quick going up and slow coming down".
The Government has all along encouraged the industry to enhance transparency on their price setting and prices. We also provide various information to enhance the transparency of the prices of oil products to facilitate consumers to make choices. In this regard, we post onto our website, on a regular basis, the movements in local import prices and retail prices of auto-fuels and the Singapore FOB prices of unleaded petrol and motor vehicle diesel. We have also added the linkage to the statistics on import and retail prices of major oil products on the Environment Bureau's website. In addition, we have commissioned the Consumer Council (CC) to launch the "Auto-fuel Price Calculator". The CC posts onto its website and smartphone applications daily the local auto-fuels retail prices and information on various types of cash and non-cash discounts offered by oil companies. Consumers can make better use of the relevant information to patronize a suitable petrol filling station.

To sum up, retail prices of auto-fuels in Hong Kong are determined by oil companies having regard to commercial practices and their operating costs. According to our observation, the trend movements of local retail prices of auto-fuels and MOPS are generally in line. In a free market economy, we need to strike a balance between enhancing transparency and safeguarding commercially sensitive information.

(3) The Competition Ordinance (the Ordinance) enacted in June 2012 provides a legal framework to tackle anti-competitive conduct (including price fixing, abuse of market power, and so on) in various sectors, with a view to maintaining fair and sustainable competition in the market. The Competition Commission, which is established as an independent statutory body under the Ordinance, is empowered to investigate into an alleged anti-competitive conduct, either on receipt of complaints, on its own initiative, or on referral from the Government or a court, and to bring enforcement actions before the Competition Tribunal. According to our understanding, the Competition Commission will conduct investigation on whether the oil companies engage in anti-competitive behaviour in setting the prices of auto-fuels. If necessary, we will collaborate with the Competition Commission to facilitate their work in this regard.
Statistical Information Provided by Census and Statistics Department

2. **MR WU CHI-WAI** (in Chinese): President, regarding the statistical information on private residential properties and domestic household incomes provided by the Census and Statistics Department (C&SD), will the Government inform this Council:

   (1) as there are views that the yearly surveys conducted by the Rating and Valuation Department on the vacancy situation of private domestic units fail to reflect the actual situation, whether C&SD will, when it conducts the population by-census next year, concomitantly carry out a survey on the vacancy situation of private domestic units; if C&SD will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

   (2) as the information on the Long Term Housing Strategy published by the Transport and Housing Bureau in December last year showed that the total number of subdivided units (SDUs) was estimated at 86,400, whether C&SD will, when it conducts the population by-census next year, conduct a survey for the purpose of providing a more accurate number of SDUs;

   (3) whether C&SD lists the domestic household income data in 10 decile groups when it conducts the General Household Survey; if C&SD does, whether it will publish the relevant data; if not, whether it will consider adopting such a statistical tool; and

   (4) as the domestic household income data, such as the median household income, currently published by C&SD are expressed in nominal prices, whether C&SD will consider publishing the relevant data in constant prices as well?

**SECRETARY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND THE TREASURY** (in Chinese): President, our reply to Mr WU Chi-wai's question on the provision of statistical information on private domestic premises and household income by the Census and Statistics Department (C&SD) is as follows:
(1) and (2)

The C&SD will collect information on "sub-divided units" through the 2016 Population By-census but has no plan to compile statistics on vacancy situation of private domestic flats. The reason is that during the population by-census, enumerators may not be able to contact the household in certain premises. However, they are not able to ascertain whether the premises in such cases are vacant.

(3) and (4)

According to prevailing practice, the C&SD publishes the most commonly used statistical tables in the Report on General Household Survey. As for other statistics which are not published in the report (for example, monthly domestic household income analysed by decile and domestic household income at constant price), individual users may request the C&SD to compile relevant statistical tables according to their needs (for example, the base period for the constant price statistics) through the C&SD's Data Enquiry Service on a chargeable basis.

Construction Works of Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge

3. **MR TANG KA-PIU** (in Chinese): President, the construction works of the Main Bridge of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge project (HZMB Project) commenced in 2009 and is targeted for commissioning in 2016, and the various other local infrastructural projects involving the Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities and link roads connecting the existing transport network, including the Hong Kong Link Road, Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link and Tuen Mun Western Bypass (local projects) are expected to be completed one after another between 2016 and 2018. It is learnt that as affected by the judicial review case on Environmental Impact Assessment reports and the construction difficulties encountered, the works projects under the HZMB Project have experienced delay of varied durations, and the tight works schedule has resulted in excessive overtime work and a much higher risk of industrial accidents. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:
(1) of the latest progress of each works project under the HZMB Project (set out the differences between the expected and the current percentages of completion), and the latest anticipated completion dates;

(2) of the total number of works contracts involved in the local works projects under the HZMB Project; the key information of the contracts concerned, including the dates on which the contracts were signed and the completion dates;

(3) whether it knows if all the works projects under the HZMB Project involved workers undertaking overtime work in the past three years; the average monthly hours of overtime work per worker in each works project;

(4) in respect of each works project under the HZMB Project, of (i) the respective numbers of fatal and non-fatal industrial accidents occurred, and (ii) the number of days of work stoppage due to industrial accidents, in each of the past three years; and

(5) of the number of meetings on the HZMB Project held in the past three years between Secretaries of Departments and Directors of Bureaux of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government and mainland officials?

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Chinese): President, the entire Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (HZMB) project consists of two parts: (i) the HZMB Main Bridge; and (ii) the link roads and boundary crossing facilities of the three sides. The works of the HZMB Main Bridge are situated in Mainland waters and the HZMB Authority is responsible for their implementation, whilst the three Governments are responsible for their own boundary crossing facilities and link roads.

My reply to the five parts of Mr TANG Ka-piu's question is as follows:

(1) The HZMB was targeted for completion by end 2016 when it was planned. The HZMB Authority and the three Governments have been implementing the projects against this target. However, as the HZMB project is huge and complicated, there are many challenges
during both the design and construction stages. Regardless of whether it is the HZMB Main Bridge or the related projects of the three sides, technical difficulties in construction and pressure in meeting the programme schedule are encountered.

As I indicated at the meeting of the Legislative Council Panel on Transport on 16 January this year, the Joint Works Committee of the Three Governments (JWC) had advised that it would be very difficult for the entire HZMB project to be completed by end 2016. The JWC and the HZMB Authority will further conduct an in-depth and objective analysis on the programme with a view to coming up with a programme target. Besides, the Director of the Guangdong Development and Reform Commission advised at the press conference of the third session of the 12th Guangdong Provincial People's Congress held on 10 February this year that, as the HZMB project encountered many unforeseen difficulties and technical problems, it would be difficult to commission the entire HZMB by end 2016.

As for the Hong Kong-related projects of the HZMB, according to the current progress, the Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities (HKBCF) and Hong Kong Link Road (HKLR) projects may not be completed in time by end 2016. The Highways Department (HyD) is reviewing the anticipated completion dates. Together with its consulting engineers as well as resident site staff, the HyD will closely monitor the works progress and supervise the contractors in endeavouring to implement the projects with the premise of ensuring safety and quality to dovetail with the commissioning of the Main Bridge.

As for the Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link (TM-CLKL), the completion time of its Southern Connection will dovetail with that of the HZMB Main Bridge whilst its Northern Connection is anticipated to be completed by 2018.

As for the Tuen Mun Western Bypass (TMWB), the HyD proceeded with the preliminary design and related assessments after obtaining local support for its original alignment in 2010. However, some members of the local community have since expressed concern that
the northern viaduct section of the TMWB and the portal of its southern tunnel section at Tsing Tin Interchange might affect nearby residents, and raised strong objection against the project. In the light of their views, the HyD has been endeavouring to examine if there would be room for changes to its proposed alignment, with a view to formulating a road scheme that would strike a balance in terms of technical feasibility, environmental concerns of residents, traffic performance and economic benefits. The HyD completed a preliminary review of the TMWB project early this year and presented a proposed revised alignment of the TMWB connecting Tuen Mun Area 40 with Tsing Tin Road to the Tuen Mun District Council in March 2015. We will further review the TMWB project, including the works programme and estimated cost, having regard to the latest views of the Tuen Mun District Council.

(2) The HKBCF, HKLR and TM-CLKL projects are being implemented mainly through 16 works contracts, the details of which are at Annex.

(3) According to the records provided by the contractors to the HyD, workers (including imported workers) of each of the Hong Kong-related projects were required to work overtime for about 22 hours per month on average in the past three years (that is, the 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 financial years). The contractors will ensure adequate rest time at appropriate places for their workers during their work time in accordance with the relevant requirements.

As regards rest break arrangements for workers, employers shall, in accordance with the Occupational Safety and Health Ordinance, ensure so far as reasonably practicable the safety and health of their employees at work. The Labour Department has issued the "Guide on Rest Breaks" to put across the importance of providing employees with suitable rest breaks.

(4) The data on the industrial accidents of the Hong Kong-related projects in the past three years (that is, the 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 financial years) are tabulated as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Number of Industrial Accidents</th>
<th>Number of Fatal Accidents</th>
<th>Number of Non-fatal Accidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HKBCF</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKLR</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM-CLKL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the past three years (that is, the 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 financial years), the relevant works processes for the HKBCF and HKLR projects were suspended for a total of 85 and 55 days respectively on account of suspension notices issued by the Labour Department in connection with the occurrence of industrial accidents.

(5) The Governments of the three sides hold regular meetings to monitor the works progress of the HZMB Main Bridge. In the past three years (that is, the 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 financial years), the three Governments held a total of 26 regular meetings. In addition, the Transport and Housing Bureau and other relevant bureaux as well as departments conduct site inspections from time to time. The Transport and Housing Bureau and the HyD also hold meetings with relevant Mainland authorities on issues of the HZMB works as necessary.

Annex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Description of Works</th>
<th>Contract Commencement Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HKLR</td>
<td>(Some works are entrusted to the HKBCF and carried out under Contract HY/2013/05.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract No.: HY/2011/03 HZMB HKLR — Section between Scenic Hill and HKBCF</td>
<td>Design and construction of the section of the HKLR between Scenic Hill and the HKBCF, and road links between the HKBCF and the Hong Kong International Airport.</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract No.</td>
<td>Description of Works</td>
<td>Contract Commencement Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY/2011/09</td>
<td>Design and construction of the section of the HKLR between the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Boundary and Scenic Hill.</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(TM-CLKL)
(Some works are entrusted to the HKBCF and carried out under Contracts HY/2010/02 and HY/2013/05.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract No.</th>
<th>Description of Works</th>
<th>Contract Commencement Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY/2012/07</td>
<td>Design and construction of a dual two-lane viaduct between the HZMB HKBCF and the North Lantau Highway with associated slip roads, modification and realignment of sections of the North Lantau Highway and Cheung Tung Road at North Lantau, and associated works.</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY/2012/08</td>
<td>Design and construction of a dual two-lane sub-sea tunnel of about 5 km long between Tuen Mun Area 40 and the HZMB HKBCF, and reclamation of about 16.5 hectares at Tuen Mun Area 40.</td>
<td>August 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY/2013/12</td>
<td>Construction of a toll plaza of approximately 5.4 hectares and associated structures, carriageways and a footbridge, modification and realignment of sections of Lung Mun Road and Lung Fu Road at Tuen Mun, and associated works.</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract No.</td>
<td>Description of Works</td>
<td>Contract Commencement Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY/2014/17</td>
<td>Construction of an administration building, a toll control building and ancillary buildings and facilities for the Northern Connection, electrical and mechanical works, and re-provision of facilities for the Customs and Excise Department and the Fire Services Department.</td>
<td>Tender to be invited in the latter half of 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY/2014/10</td>
<td>Design, supply, delivery, installation and commissioning of a traffic control and surveillance system for the TM-CLKL, including its toll plaza, sub-sea tunnel and southern viaduct.</td>
<td>Tender to be invited in the latter half of 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY/2010/02</td>
<td>Construction of an artificial island of about 150 hectares, of which about 130 hectares is for the HKBCF and about 20 hectares is for the southern landfall of the TM-CLKL.</td>
<td>November 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY/2013/01</td>
<td>Construction of a passenger clearance building, a drop-off deck and area, footbridges and a district cooling system, and so on, for the HKBCF.</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY/2013/02</td>
<td>Construction of vehicular bridges and at-grade roads at the western portion of the HKBCF.</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract No.:</td>
<td>Description of Works</td>
<td>Contract Commencement Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY/2013/03</td>
<td>Construction of vehicle clearance plazas, ancillary buildings and facilities, vehicular bridges, at-grade roads, a drainage system, a sewerage system, a water supply system, landscaping, utilities and electrical and mechanical works, and so on, for the HKBCF.</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY/2013/04</td>
<td>Construction of vehicular bridges and at-grade roads at the southern portion of the HKBCF.</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY/2013/05</td>
<td>Design, supply, delivery, installation, testing and commissioning of a traffic control and surveillance system which covers mainly the HKBCF, the HKLR and the TM-CLKL Southern Connection.</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY/2013/06</td>
<td>Design, supply, delivery, installation, testing and commissioning of an Automatic Vehicle Clearance Support System for the HKBCF.</td>
<td>Under tender assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY/2014/04</td>
<td>Design, supply, delivery, installation, testing, commissioning and maintenance of a gantry type X-ray vehicle inspection system for the HKBCF.</td>
<td>Tender being invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY/2014/05</td>
<td>Construction of the remaining ancillary buildings and facilities for the HKBCF.</td>
<td>Tender being invited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated by the Secretary for Transport and Housing at the Legislative Council Panel on Transport on 16 January this year, according to the current progress, the HKBCF and HKLR projects may not be completed in time by end 2016. The HyD is reviewing the anticipated completion dates. As for the TM-CLKL, the completion time of its Southern Connection with dovetail with that of the HZMB Main Bridge whilst its Northern Connection is anticipated to be completed by 2018.

Law Enforcement by Government Departments

4. **MR PAUL TSE** (in Chinese): President, at the House Committee meeting of this Council on the 24th of last month, a Member questioned why the authorities did not institute any prosecution against persons who had failed to provide a registration officer with their changed particulars (including residential addresses and correspondence addresses) in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Registration of Persons Regulations (Cap. 177 sub. leg. A), and the authorities were thus criticized for not enforcing the law. Besides, it is pointed out in Report No. 64 of the Director of Audit that the Buildings Department has been slow in handling "actionable" unauthorized building works, and the Department is alleged of being too lax in law enforcement. On the other hand, the Independent Commission Against Corruption has often been queried of faultfinding in its examinations of the election expenses incurred by Legislative Council or District Council election candidates, and is alleged of being too stringent in law enforcement. Regarding law enforcement by government departments, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it has assessed why there are significant discrepancies in the degree of stringency in law enforcement among various government departments;

(2) of the criteria based on which various government departments determine the degree of stringency in their law enforcement; and

(3) whether it has assessed how the significant discrepancies in the degree of stringency in law enforcement among various government departments affect the public perception of the Government and whether they will confuse members of the public?
SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Chinese): President, Article 64 of the Basic Law provides that the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region shall implement laws passed by the Legislative Council and already in force. Law-enforcement agencies always perform their respective functions with dedication, enforcing various statutory provisions in a fair and impartial manner. In determining whether prosecution should be brought against person(s) involved in cases of suspected violation of law, law-enforcement agencies will consider the circumstances of the cases and the evidence collected, and seek legal advice from the Department of Justice (DoJ) when necessary. According to the Prosecution Code of the DoJ, the decision of prosecution should only be taken upon full evaluation of the evidence and circumstances. Apart from assessing whether the evidence is sufficient, one must at all times act in the public interest and be guided or directed by public interest considerations in the measured and just application of the rule of law. The considerations to be addressed include the nature and circumstances of the offence, the seriousness of the offence and the effect of a prosecution on Hong Kong law-enforcement priorities, and so on. All law-enforcement agencies will continue to perform their statutory functions in accordance with the relevant policies and legal provisions.

Living Space of PRH Flats

5. MR FREDERICK FUNG (in Chinese): President, the Chief Executive raised in the 2013 Policy Address: "[d]o we have the courage to make it our vision to improve the living space for the future generation?" Recently, some public rental housing (PRH) tenants affected by the redevelopment programmes of Shek Kip Mei Estate and Pak Tin Estate have relayed to me that they have found that a new design has been adopted for the redeveloped PRH flats allocated to them, rendering their living space smaller than that in the past. They feel very disappointed that their living space will be reduced rather than increased. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it has drawn up short, medium and long term plans for achieving the aforesaid vision; if it has not, of the reasons for that; if it has, the details of the plans; of the specific work it has carried out so far, and whether such work includes increasing the space standards of PRH flats; if so, of the specific work to be carried out;
(2) of the changes in the space of PRH flats completed in the past decade, broken down by the designed number of occupants per flat; the reasons for reducing the space standards of the new type of PRH flats, and whether such reasons include an attempt to increase the production of PRH flats; if so, of the details, including the relevant percentage increase; whether it has assessed the impact of the new type of PRH flats on the living space of the tenants; and

(3) whether it has assessed if the construction of the new type of PRH flats with a smaller size is contrary to the aforesaid vision; whether it will consider reviewing afresh and revising the design of PRH flats; whether it will amend the layout plans for the redevelopment programmes of Shek Kip Mei Estate and Pak Tin Estate to increase the living space of the redeveloped flats, so that the living environment of the local residents can be improved through the redevelopment and aforesaid vision can be achieved; if it will not, of the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Chinese): President, my replies to the various parts of the question by Mr Frederick FUNG are as follows.

The Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA)'s objective is to provide public rental housing (PRH) to low-income families who cannot afford private rental accommodation, and to maintain the target of providing first flat offer to general applicants (that is, family and elderly one-person applicants) at around three years on average.

In order to better utilize the land resources and provide PRH to the applicants, the HA will consider all suitable sites, regardless the size, and will develop PRH in the most cost-effective and sustainable manner in order to meet public demand, based on the principle of maximizing site development potential. In the past decades, the HA had adopted a standard-block design approach in public housing developments. Starting from 2000, due to limited availability of land resources, the topography, size and configuration of the public housing sites have become more complicated. As a result, the HA has switched to a site-specific design approach.
At present, the design principle of "Functional and Cost Effective" has been adopted for every PRH project, with the incorporation of "Standard Modular Flat Design". The purpose is to maximize site development potential, while achieving cost-effectiveness through PRH building design. There are currently four types of modular flats, including one-or-two-person flat with an internal floor area of 14.1 sq m to 14.5 sq m, two-or-three-person flat with an internal floor area of 21.4 sq m to 22 sq m, three-to-four-person flat with an internal floor area of 30.2 sq m to 31 sq m and four-to-five-person flat with an internal floor area of 35 sq m to 36.1 sq m.

Taking into account feedbacks from tenants and concern groups on flat size and layout, the current modular flat design has struck a balance for all design aspects. Compared with previous designs, it provides internal living space of better utility; the ratio between kitchen and bathroom against living and sleeping areas is more rational and can cater for various family combinations. Besides, it is more flexible for partitioning and placing of furniture. Other design enhancements include cross-ventilating windows to enhance natural ventilation, enhanced universal design for tenants of all ages and different physical conditions, and improved design of plumbing, drainage and electricity supply systems. These improvements create a healthy living environment for tenants. Such design enhances the flexibility and quality of living space and has been generally supported by PRH tenants. In view of the above, it would not be appropriate to solely focus on flat size in the comparison between previous and present PRH developments and their comprehensive planning and design.

With the view to continuously improving the design of modular flats, the HA will continue to take on board the views of industry stakeholders and tenants' concern groups about flat size and layout. Whilst meeting the production target, the HA will also put emphasis on harmonizing the public housing developments and the environment, with due regards to social, economic and environmental needs as well as planning and related legal requirements.

Regarding the redevelopment works of Pak Tin Estate and Shek Kip Mei Estate, it is not possible to amend the redevelopment plan at this stage as the construction works have already commenced. When the HA is making rehousing arrangements for affected tenants, it would refer to the number of members in the tenant family and follow the established allocation standard to allocate appropriate flats to them. The prevailing PRH allocation standard is about 7 sq m internal floor area per person. The same standard also applies to PRH tenants affected by redevelopment.
The HA will keep the affected tenants updated of the progress of the redevelopment and will provide them with relevant information to ensure that they are apprised of the relevant matters.

Use and Collection of Energy-efficient Lighting Products

6. **MR KENNETH LEUNG** (in Chinese): President, in order to save energy, the Government has for many years encouraged the public to switch to use energy-saving lighting products such as light emitting diode (LED) lamps, fluorescent tubes and compact fluorescent lamps (CFLs), which are more energy-efficient than incandescent light bulbs (ILBs). It is noted that the blue rays emitted by LED lamps may impair vision, and some CFLs and fluorescent tubes when broken will release phenol and vaporized mercury, a toxic heavy metal, and prolonged contact with such chemical substances is harmful to the human body. On the other hand, the Fluorescent Lamp Recycling Programme currently launched by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) provides households with free collection and treatment for all used fluorescent lamps containing mercury, including fluorescent tubes, CFLs and high intensity discharge lamps. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it assessed in the past three years the effectiveness of the various measures aiming to promote the use of energy-efficient lighting products; if it did, of the details;

(2) whether EPD at present handles separately the various types of waste energy-efficient lighting products collected; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(3) of the quantity of waste energy-efficient lighting products collected by EPD in each of the past five years, with a breakdown by type of products;

(4) of the quantity of waste energy-efficient lighting products containing mercury handled by EPD in each of the past five years;

(5) of the quantity of waste energy-efficient lighting products sent to the landfills for disposal in each of the past five years, with a breakdown by type of products and landfill; if such figures are not available, of the reasons for that;
of the quantity of energy-efficient lighting products imported for local use in each of the past five years;

whether it regulates the disposal of energy-efficient lighting products by households as well as industrial and commercial users; if it does, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

whether it has assessed the impacts of energy-efficient lighting products on the health of humans and animals in the course of their use, collection and disposal; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

whether it regulates the chemical substances contained in LED lamps, and assesses the quality of such kind of products; if it does, of the details and the channels through which the authorities disseminate such information; if not, the reasons for that;

given that the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) currently incorporates LED lamps into the "recognition type" of the Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme (EELS), whether EMSD will consider the incorporation of such kind of products into the "grading type" of EELS, so as to allow consumers access to more information; if EMSD will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

whether it has compiled statistics on the existing number of LED lamps installed at outdoor venues, and assessed the amount of glare and brightness of such lighting equipment; if it has, of the details, and set out the relevant information by District Council district; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (in Chinese): President, our reply to various parts of the question is set out below:

In the past decade, lighting on average accounted for about 15% of total electricity consumption in Hong Kong. Incandescent light bulbs are not energy-efficient as 90% of the electricity consumed is lost as heat whereas only 10% is used for lighting. The Government has since 2012 adopted a two-pronged approach to expedite the phasing out of incandescent light bulbs by launching a
Charter Scheme under which retailers and suppliers pledged to reduce the supply of incandescent light bulbs (1), and stepping up public education on the benefit of using more energy-efficient lamps. Regarding alternatives, overseas countries and Hong Kong commonly adopt energy-efficient compact fluorescent lamps and Light Emitting Diode (LED) lamps to replace incandescent light bulbs.

As at April 2015, a total of 36 suppliers and 28 retailers have signed up to the Charter. The suppliers and retailers have pledged to stop replenishing stock of targeted incandescent light bulbs and stop selling the targeted incandescent light bulbs by the end of 2013. In December 2013, the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) wrote to all participating suppliers and retailers to remind them to stop the sale of incandescent light bulbs. Regular inspections have been regularly conducted since then to ensure suppliers' and retailers' compliance with the pledge.

We will continue to educate the public and major lamp users on the benefit of using more energy-efficient lamps through broadcasting of TV and radio announcements in the public interests, distribution of posters and publicity materials, as well as dissemination of information on the Internet.

(2), (3), (4) and (7)

As for the parts of the question concerning the handling and recycling of used energy-efficient lighting products, our reply is as follows:

Amongst various lighting products, compact fluorescent lamps and fluorescent tubes normally contain mercury vapour. Disposal of these lighting products in large quantity (mostly from commercial and industrial premises) must comply with the Waste Disposal (Chemical Waste) (General) Regulation. These products should be properly packed, labelled, and collected by licensed chemical waste collectors for delivery to the Chemical Waste Treatment Centre (CWTC) in Tsing Yi for treatment. On the other hand, the relevant

(1) The Charter Scheme currently covers 25 watt or above non-reflector type incandescent light bulbs, including general lighting service lamps, candle shape, fancy round and other decorative lamps, but excluding tungsten halogen lamps.
trade has launched the Fluorescent Lamp Recycling Programme (FLRP) with support from the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) to collect compact fluorescent lamps and fluorescent tubes from domestic households free of charge and deliver them collectively to Tsing Yi's CWTC for proper treatment.

Over the past five years, the number of compact fluorescent lamps and fluorescent tubes (including those collected through the FLRP and from industrial and commercial sectors) items handled by the CWTC in Tsing Yi is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of compact fluorescent lamps and fluorescent tubes items handled at CWTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1 584 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1 664 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1 997 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1 982 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1 823 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for LED lights, since they are not categorized as chemical waste, there is no recycling programme for LED.

(5) In the annual waste composition survey conducted at landfills, we have not conducted separate survey on "waste energy-efficient lighting products" that have been mixed with other waste, hence there is no relevant statistical data.

(6) The Census and Statistics Department compiles the import and re-export statistics of hot cathode fluorescent lights (including compact fluorescent lamps and fluorescent tubes) and LED based on the information provided by importers and exporters to the Customs and Excise Department (C&ED). The figures for 2010-2014 are as follows:

(i) Hot Cathode fluorescent lights (including compact fluorescent lamps and fluorescent tubes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imports (Million)</th>
<th>Re-exports (Million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ii) LED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imports (Million)</th>
<th>Re-exports (Million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>28 356</td>
<td>19 068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>32 231</td>
<td>21 794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>32 387</td>
<td>23 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>37 986</td>
<td>28 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>49 432</td>
<td>32 352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

Apart from general lighting purposes, LED can also be used as decorative lighting, indicators, display boards, and so on.

The above figures are compiled based on the information provided by various importers and exporters to the C&ED, but the difference between the imports and re-exports in a particular year is not equivalent to the local sales figure for that year.

(8) Regarding the potential health effect of light emitted from domestic energy-efficient lighting products (such as LED lights and compact fluorescent lamps), overseas authorities, including the Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks of the European Commission, Health Canada and the former Health Protection Agency of United Kingdom, have conducted relevant studies. According to the results of these studies, ultraviolet and blue light levels from domestic energy-efficient lighting products under normal use are unlikely to pose significant health risk to the general public. For people who suffer from light sensitive conditions, they have to be cautious in using LED lights and compact fluorescent lamps, and be aware of their body conditions and consult medical professionals if necessary. Besides, people who suffer from light sensitive conditions should also be aware of their body conditions when exposed to sunlight.

Compact fluorescent lamps contain materials including metal, glass and a tiny amount of mercury. FLs do not affect the human body and the environment when they are intact. When such lamps break,
a small amount of mercury vapour will be released and they should be handled with care. With good ventilation, mercury vapour will be diluted very quickly. Therefore, under normal circumstances, the transport and disposal of compact fluorescent lamps will not affect the health of the public or the persons handling such wastes. The EPD has issued guidelines on disposal of compact fluorescent lamps to remind the public to place used FLs in the packaging of new lamps before depositing them into collection boxes for recycling, and to take safety measures when handling broken lamps.

(9) Battery operated LED supplied in the market for private use should comply with the "General Safety Requirement" under the Consumer Goods Safety Ordinance. The requirement imposes a duty on manufacturers, importers and suppliers to ensure that their goods are reasonably safe, having regard to all the circumstances including:

(i) the manner in which and the purpose for which the goods are sold;

(ii) the use of marks, instructions or warnings on the goods in connection with its keeping, use or consumption;

(iii) compliance with reasonable safety standards published by a standards institute; and

(iv) the existence of reasonable means to make the goods safer.

As for electrical products designed (including LED lighting) for "household use" operated from mains supply (220v) and supplied in Hong Kong, they must comply with the electrical safety requirement stipulated in the Electrical Products (Safety) Regulation and be issued with valid certificates of safety compliance.

(10) Since June 2011, the Voluntary Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme under the EMSD has been extended to cover LED lamps. The participating manufacturers, importers and local agents could affix the "recognition type" label to the products which meet the energy efficiency and performance requirements of the scheme. The label assists consumers in choosing more energy efficient products by informing consumers that it meets a certain standard of energy efficiency.
Since LED lighting technology is under development, it is more appropriate to adopt the "recognition type" of energy efficiency labelling for LED lamps for the time being. The EMSD will closely monitor the development of LED lighting technology, and consider the need to adopt the "grading type" of energy efficiency labelling for LED lamps in due course.

(11) We do not have statistics on the number of all external lighting installations in Hong Kong.

Publicity of Government Policies and Measures

7. **MR YIU SI-WING** (in Chinese): President, at present, various policy bureaux publicize and promote their policies and measures through a number of channels. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the respective expenditures incurred by various policy bureaux last year on publicizing policies and measures, with a breakdown by publicity means (including (i) television announcement in the public interest, (ii) radio announcement, (iii) newspaper supplement, (iv) outdoor publicity activity, (v) Internet and (vi) social media) according to the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>(ii)</th>
<th>(iii)</th>
<th>(iv)</th>
<th>(v)</th>
<th>(vi)</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Affairs Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Health Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce and Economic Development Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Chinese): President, we have consulted relevant Policy Bureaux on Mr YIU’s question and our consolidated reply is as follows:

(1) Expenditures of various Policy Bureaux in 2014-2015 on publicity of policy measures are tabulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Television and radio announcements in the public interest ($)</th>
<th>Newspaper supplement ($)</th>
<th>Outdoor publicity activity ($)</th>
<th>Internet and Social media ($)</th>
<th>Others(^{\text{note}}) ($)</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service Bureau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>132,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Affairs Bureau</td>
<td>2,551,000</td>
<td>3,028,000</td>
<td>475,000</td>
<td>1,864,000</td>
<td>1,249,000</td>
<td>9,167,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Bureau</td>
<td>1,330,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,370,000</td>
<td>1,742,000</td>
<td>1,590,000</td>
<td>15,032,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 18,080,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) whether it regularly assesses the effectiveness of the publicity work of various policy bureaux; if it does, of the assessment criteria and outcome of the last assessment; if not, the reasons for that; and

(3) how the authorities tackle the situation where the publicity work is not cost-effective?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Television and radio announcements in the public interest ($)</th>
<th>Newspaper supplement ($)</th>
<th>Outdoor publicity activity ($)</th>
<th>Internet and Social media ($)</th>
<th>Others Note ($)</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food and Health Bureau</td>
<td>1,857,000</td>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>1,761,000</td>
<td>1,072,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,876,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>216,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>216,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce and Economic Development Bureau</td>
<td>1,484,000</td>
<td>5,167,000</td>
<td>2,297,000</td>
<td>3,702,000</td>
<td>3,801,000</td>
<td>16,451,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Bureau</td>
<td>1,554,000</td>
<td>222,000</td>
<td>303,000</td>
<td>1,571,000</td>
<td>6,463,000</td>
<td>10,113,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour and Welfare Bureau</td>
<td>499,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>1,277,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>2,326,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Bureau</td>
<td>3,943,000</td>
<td>1,569,000</td>
<td>1,370,000</td>
<td>808,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,690,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Housing Bureau</td>
<td>1,085,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,644,000</td>
<td>2,148,000</td>
<td>4,877,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 1,016,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
Including leaflets, posters, publications and roving exhibitions, and so on.

(2) and (3)

When carrying out publicity initiatives, Policy Bureaux will, having regard to the objectives and actual circumstances of such initiatives, collect responses via different means to assess the effectiveness of the publicity initiatives for reference for mapping out publicity and promotional strategies in future. Generally speaking, Policy Bureaux may, in their assessing the effectiveness of the publicity initiatives, consider such factors as the number of programme
participants or service users, opinions from target groups or relevant stakeholders, relevant press commentaries and reports, number of hotline enquiries, hit rates of webpages and content of submissions received.

Policy Bureaux are tasked with prudent and effective use of allocated funding to take forward various areas of work, including publicity initiatives, under their respective policy portfolios. Their key areas of work and performance will also be reported in the Controlling Officer's Reports for the relevant year. In addition, in their annual budgeting exercises, Policy Bureaux will examine the priorities of various tasks and prepare budgets for the following year, including the budgets for publicity initiatives. Taking into account cost-effectiveness and other relevant factors, they will consider making necessary revision to the budgets.

Shortage of Cross-boundary Container Truck Drivers

8. **MR FRANKIE YICK** (in Chinese): President, some members of the cross-boundary container freight industry have pointed out that the industry has all along been facing the problems of driver shortage and succession gap in recent years. According to the information at the end of 2012, over 40 000 people held a licence for driving container trucks in Hong Kong, but there were merely about 4 700 registered cross-boundary container truck drivers. They have also said that since the mainland authorities have set an age limit for container truck drivers and in-service drivers are generally of older age, it is increasingly difficult for them to hire cross-boundary container truck drivers. They are worried that there will be an even greater demand for cross-boundary truck drivers upon the commissioning of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, and that if the shortage of drivers cannot be alleviated, the development of Hong Kong's logistics industry will be stifled. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it knows the respective number of drivers in the cross-boundary container freight industry in each of the past five years, and set out a breakdown by age group in the table below;
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) of the measures currently taken by the authorities to alleviate the shortage of drivers in the cross-boundary container freight industry; whether they have assessed the effectiveness of such measures; whether the authorities will enhance such measures to dovetail with the development of the logistics industry; if they will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(3) whether it knows if the relevant mainland authorities have currently suspended the handling of applications from Hong Kong drivers for mainland heavy vehicle driving licences (mainland driving licences); if so, whether it has assessed the impacts brought about by the continuation of such a situation on the cross-boundary container freight industry of Hong Kong; whether the authorities will take the initiative to look into this matter and assist Hong Kong drivers in applying for mainland driving licences; whether it will, in the long run, explore with the mainland authorities the direct issuance of mainland driving licences without test to container truck drivers in Hong Kong; if it will, of the details; if not, of the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Chinese): President, my reply to Mr Frankie YICK Chi-ming's question is as follows:

(1) Any person who wishes to drive a container truck must hold a valid driving licence for articulated vehicles issued by the Transport Department (TD). Moreover, according to the requirement of the Governments of Guangdong and Hong Kong, only designated drivers may drive cross-boundary trucks (including container trucks) between Guangdong and Hong Kong. Based on the TD's
information, the numbers of persons fulfilling the above requirements for driving cross-boundary container trucks over the past five years (as at the end of each year) are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>1166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>2371</td>
<td>2520</td>
<td>2391</td>
<td>2720</td>
<td>2490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or above</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5135</td>
<td>4804</td>
<td>4630</td>
<td>5215</td>
<td>4547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) As for the demand for cross-boundary container truck drivers, the TD’s records show that there were over 44 000 people in Hong Kong holding valid driving licences for articulated vehicles as at the end of 2014, yet only about 4 500 of them were designated drivers for cross-boundary container trucks during the same period. It is believed that the gap is due to the personal choice of drivers and the better working and employment conditions offered by other industries. To encourage more people to join the cross-boundary container freight industry, the Government had liaised with the Mainland authorities and a dedicated counter was set up at the Shenzhen Vehicle Administration Office (SVAO) in September 2011 to handle applications for driving licences by Hong Kong drivers. Guidelines, points-to-note and procedures on the application for driving licence by Hong Kong drivers have also been formulated for the reference of interested persons. In addition, with the support of the Hong Kong Logistics Development Council, the Government sponsored the Hong Kong Container Tractor Owner Association to launch the Training Programme for the Cross-boundary Container Truckers in 2011-2012. By providing training to meet the written examination requirements and assistance in filing licence applications to the Mainland authorities, the Programme assisted individuals holding a valid Hong Kong driving licence for articulated vehicles to obtain the corresponding Mainland driving licence. However, the Programme was terminated in March 2012 due to insufficient enrolment.
The Government will maintain dialogue with the cross-boundary container freight sector on the operation and development of the industry, and will consider any views or recommendations that the sector may put forward regarding the shortage of cross-boundary container truck drivers.

(3) In response to the enquiry from the cross-boundary truck trade, the TD has liaised with the relevant Mainland authorities and has been advised that the SVAO continues to handle applications for Mainland container truck driving licences by Hong Kong drivers. The TD has informed the local truck trade of the application details.

The proposal on requesting the Mainland authorities to directly issue Mainland driving licences without test to Hong Kong container truck drivers must be considered with care. This is because such arrangement is generally carried out on a reciprocal basis. In other words, the Mainland authorities may request for equivalent treatment for Mainland drivers in Hong Kong when considering our proposal. Taking into account the road safety concern that driving commercial vehicles requires a higher level of skills and commercial vehicles are driven on roads for longer period of time, as well as the need to secure job opportunities for local drivers, we will have great difficulty in offering any reciprocal arrangements.

Review on Territory-wide System Assessment

9. **MR IP KIN-YUEN** (in Chinese): President, regarding the Territory-wide System Assessment (TSA), will the Government inform this Council:

   (1) as some primary school teachers have relayed to me that while the authorities launched the enhancement measures of TSA in April 2014 and ceased to disclose to individual primary schools the number and percentage of their students achieving basic competencies (attainment rates) in Chinese Language, English Language and Mathematics, schools can still derive the attainment rates of their students based on their scores in various sub-papers of the subjects, reflecting the limited effect of the enhancement measures on relieving the pressure on and workload of teachers and
students, whether the authorities have collected the preliminary views of teachers and schools on the effectiveness of the enhancement measures; if they have not, how the authorities will review the effectiveness of the enhancement measures; whether they have plans at present to improve the enhancement measures; and

(2) as an official of the Education Bureau said at the meeting of the Panel on Education of this Council on 13 April this year that the authorities had set up a steering committee on TSA to review the implementation of TSA, of the following information on the committee:

(i) the membership list, and whether any of the members are representatives from the education sector and representatives of frontline teachers and parents; if there are no such representatives, of the reasons for that;

(ii) the terms of reference;

(iii) the work targets and tasks involved (including whether it will make recommendations on further enhancement of TSA), and the time when it is required to complete its work;

(iv) the approach for work, including whether and how it will collect the views of the education sector, frontline teachers and parents; if it will not collect views, of the reasons for that; and

(v) whether it will consult the education sector on the draft report; if it will not, of the reasons for that; whether it will publish the review report; if it will, of the arrangements?

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION (in Chinese): President, my reply to the questions raised by Mr IP Kin-yuen is as follows:

(1) The Basic Competency attainment rate and the facility index are two distinct concepts. The facility index of a sub-paper refers to the average percentage of correct responses given by the students of the
school, whereas the attainment rate refers to the school percentage of students obtaining scores at or above the "cut score". For each subject, the "cut score" is determined by the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority by means of psychometric methods and is not computed directly from the facility indices. Therefore, the average facility index of each sub-paper and the overall student attainment rate are not necessarily related. It is not possible to derive the school's overall student attainment rate directly from the students' facility indices of sub-papers.

With a view to facilitating the implementation of the Territory-wide System Assessment enhancement measures, the Education Bureau has conducted a number of seminars to explain to schools the measures concerned and to hear the views of front-line fellows. On various occasions, we have been appealing to schools (especially primary schools) not to engage themselves in blind pursuit of facility indices but to focus their attention on the item analysis reports and to understand students' strengths and weaknesses in order to feedback learning and teaching. As the enhancement measures have only been implemented for a short time, the Education Bureau will continue to communicate with the school sector and to collect views from different stakeholders through various means, for example, seminars, focus groups and questionnaire surveys, with a view to evaluating the effectiveness of the enhancement measures.

(2) The Education Bureau set up "The Coordinating Committee on Basic Competency Assessment (BCA) and Assessment Literacy" (the Committee) in October 2014. Members of the Committee include academics from tertiary institutions, school principals and teachers (see membership list at Annex). The terms of reference of the Committee are to advise on the direction relating to the development of the BCA project (including the Territory-wide System Assessment and Student Assessment) as well as the enhancement of assessment literacy in schools. The Committee will make reference to the views collected by the Education Bureau from time to time through various means, and report the progress of the work concerned and seek further advice from the education sector when appropriate.
Coordinating Committee on Basic Competency Assessment and Assessment Literacy
Membership List

Chairperson

Dr CHAN Ka-ki, Catherine  Deputy Secretary for Education (5),
Education Bureau

Non-official Members

Professor Carol CHAN
Ms CHAN Cheuk-lin, Irene
Dr CHAN So-yee, Zoe
Mr CHENG Pat-leung, Victor (Representative of the Hong Kong Education City)
Dr CHONG Siu-man, Ambrose
Professor HAU Kit-tai
Mrs Martina KAN
Dr Winnie LAI
Ms LAM Sau-lan, Anna
Mr LEUNG Wai-cheong
Professor MOK Mo-ching, Magdalena
Ms SIN Yuk-chan, Rosita

Other representatives of the Education Bureau will also attend the meeting.

Offsetting of Severance Payments and Long Service Payments with Accrued Benefits of MPF Schemes

10. **MR JAMES TIEN** (in Chinese): President, at present, under the Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Ordinance (MPFSO)(Cap. 485), an employer may use the accrued benefits derived from his contributions to a Mandatory Provident Fund (MPF) scheme for an employee to offset the severance payments or long service payments payable to that employee under the Employment Ordinance (Cap. 57) (the offsetting arrangement). Regarding the suggestion put forward by labour organizations that the offsetting arrangement be abolished, some members of the industrial and commercial sectors have pointed out that this suggestion not only deviates from the legislative intent of
MPFSO but also is, in effect, an additional provision of "double benefit" to employees, which increases the burden on and is unfair to the employers. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) given that at the meeting of the former Legislative Council on 27 July 1995 during the scrutiny of the Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Bill, the then Secretary for Education and Manpower advised that "[a]t present, the employers' contributions to a retirement scheme may be set off against any amount paid out for severance payments or long service payments. It is not appropriate to expect employers to pay twice", whether the authorities' current stance is consistent with that view; if it is not, of the reasons for that;

(2) given that before MPFSO was enacted, it had been stipulated in the law that employers' contributions to retirement schemes could be used to offset severance payments or long service payments, of the authorities' detailed justifications, including the factors considered and their respective weightings, for following this established practice when they subsequently enacted MPFSO;

(3) whether it has assessed (i) the percentage increase in staff costs for employers (especially those of small and medium enterprises), and (ii) the impacts on the business environment and economy of Hong Kong that the abolition of the offsetting arrangement will bring about; and

(4) whether it has reviewed how to make optimal use of the Government's ample fiscal reserves to provide better support and protection to the grassroots' retirement life, instead of shifting the responsibility to employers; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND THE TREASURY (in Chinese): President, regarding the question raised by Mr James TIEN Pei-chun that employers may use the accrued benefits derived from their contributions made to Mandatory Provident Fund (MPF) schemes in respect of their employees to offset the severance payment or long service payment payable to their employees under the Employment Ordinance, the Government's reply is as follows:
Severance payment and long service payment were introduced into the Employment Ordinance in 1974 and 1986 respectively, at the time when there was no mandatory retirement protection scheme. To encourage more employers to voluntarily provide their employees with termination or retirement benefits, the Employment Ordinance stipulates that an employer may offset the contributions made to a retirement scheme in respect of an employee or gratuity based on length of service paid to an employee against severance payment or long service payment payable to the employee. Subsequently, the Government, balancing the interests of both employers and employees, adopted the long-established offsetting arrangement under the Employment Ordinance in the Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Ordinance enacted in 1995, allowing employers to offset severance payment or long service payment payable to employees against the accrued benefits derived from their contributions to MPF schemes.

The offsetting arrangement is a complicated issue. Before a consensus is reached among employers, employees and stakeholders on whether the offsetting mechanism should be revised, the Government will not change the existing arrangement of which employers may offset severance payment and long service payment against the accrued benefits derived from employers' contributions to MPF schemes.

The Government has not conducted any assessment of the impact of abolition of offsetting arrangement on employers, the business environment and the economy.

Retirement protection is a very important social issue. After the release of the report on the "Future Development of Retirement Protection in Hong Kong" submitted by a research team led by Professor Nelson CHOW last August, there have been divergent views on the issue in the community. In this connection, the Commission on Poverty will conduct a public consultation on retirement protection, and is devising a framework and setting out the details. The public consultation is expected to be launched in
the fourth quarter of this year. The Government looks forward to rational and pragmatic discussions with a view to arriving at a community consensus. The Government agrees that protection for needy citizens after retirement should be improved. To demonstrate its determination and commitment, the Government has earmarked $50 billion to provide for future needs.

Selection of Books for Children and Youths by Public Libraries

11. **MR CHRISTOPHER CHUNG** (in Chinese): President, in March this year, the Hong Kong Public Libraries (HKPL) under the Leisure and Cultural Services Department and an educational body jointly organized the 26th Secondary Students' Best Ten Books Election (the Election), in which secondary students elected, among 60 shortlisted books, 10 favourite books of secondary students. Recently, some parents have complained to me that one of the shortlisted books advocates extreme and radical political ideas, and they are worried that the book will instill wrong concepts in secondary students, thereby causing undesirable impact on them. Regarding how HKPL selects and handles books for children and youths, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the role of HKPL in organizing the Election;

(2) of the amount of public money spent on the Election this year;

(3) whether HKPL knew the titles and contents of the shortlisted books before the list of shortlisted books was announced; whether HKPL objected to the inclusion of any individual books in the list of shortlisted books in the Election in the past;

(4) whether HKPL has drawn up any criteria or guidelines for shortlisting books in the Election, so as to ensure that the books shortlisted are suitable for children and youths;

(5) of HKPL's current procedures for purchasing books, the ranks of the staff mainly by whom the book order lists are drawn up, and whether any mechanism is in place for reviewing the list before the books are purchased;
(6) whether, in the past five years, HKPL removed any books with undesirable notions from the library shelves on its own initiatives or in response to public complaints; if so, of the details;

(7) whether HKPL has put in place any mechanism for removing books from library shelves; if so, of the details; and

(8) what procedures HKPL has in place for ensuring that it will not purchase books which are unsuitable for children and youths (e.g. books that exaggerate violence, pornography, vulgarism and undesirable notions, or propagate ethnic/religious hatred, etc.)?

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Chinese): President, my reply to various parts of the question is as follows:

(1) to (4)

Launched in 1989, the Secondary Students' Best Ten Books Election has been held for 26 years. In the past, the event was jointly organized by the Former Urban Council and the Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union with a view to encouraging reading among secondary school students and promoting a reading culture. Since the establishment of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) in 2000, the Hong Kong Public Libraries (HKPL) under the LCSD has continued to co-organize the event with the organization. The organization has all along been taking charge of all the co-ordination work, including open invitation for book recommendation, establishing a panel for the selection of the shortlisted books, arranging the voting for 10 good books by secondary school students, and organizing the prize presentation ceremony, and so on. The LCSD respects the co-ordination work undertaken by the co-organizer and has not been involved in any work concerning book recommendation and election. The role of the LCSD in the event is primarily to provide a venue for the prize presentation ceremony and bear part of the expenses, as well as organizing a roving exhibition of the elected recommended books in some of the public libraries. The cost borne by the LCSD for the Secondary Students' Best Ten Books Election this year is $35,000.
(5) The collection development of the HKPL aims at developing a balanced and diversified library collection to meet the community's needs for information and research, to support lifelong learning, continuous education and profitable use of leisure time, and to promote local literary arts. It is guided by the beliefs proclaimed in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Public Library Manifesto. The selection and acquisition of library materials is performed by professional library staff according to the principles of collection development. The HKPL will take into account the overall status and development direction of its collection, the demands and interests of different users, the quality of the materials, latest publication information, book reviews and bibliographies, and so on, in selecting suitable titles to compile purchase lists for the approval of the Collection Development Board. The Board, established within the internal structure of the HKPL, is served by the professional library staff. Its primary responsibility is to supervise and co-ordinate the various tasks related to the development of the library collection, including the acquisition of library materials.

The HKPL awards supplier contracts through open tender in accordance with the Government's established procedures and follows the lists approved by the Collection Development Board for the acquisition of library materials.

(6) to (8)

The HKPL will acquire library materials according to the principles of the UNESCO Public Library Manifesto. It is committed to safeguarding the principle of free access to information and will not promote any beliefs or points of views through its collection. To ensure the vitality and usefulness of the library collection, and to make room for new and updated materials, regular and systematic weeding is conducted to identify items that are worn out/damaged beyond use, items with outdated information, and reference materials with their reference or research value lost for withdrawal from the library collection. Moreover, the HKPL will review library books as appropriate to ensure they conform to the collection principles. In the past five years, the HKPL handled a total of 12 cases which
involved the withdrawal of books not conforming to the collection principles, including books referred by the Department of Health on problematic Chinese medicine; books which have used pictures or photos without the consent of copyright owners; books containing violent and pornographic elements, and publications which have been ruled as infringing copyrights by a court in Hong Kong.

Police Officers Involved in a Case of Alleged Assault

12. **MR DENNIS KWOK** (in Chinese): President, on 15 October last year during the occupation movement, seven police officers allegedly assaulted a protester and were interdicted from duty on the following day. On 17 March this year, the Commissioner of Police said that the Police had completed investigation of the case, and had referred it to the Department of Justice (DoJ) for consideration and was awaiting advice from DoJ. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

   (1) whether the seven police officers are still interdicted from duty at present; of the remuneration arrangement during their interdiction, and the regulations under which such arrangement has been made; and

   (2) of the anticipated time when DoJ will provide advice to the Police on whether to institute prosecution against those police officers?

**SECRETARY FOR SECURITY** (in Chinese): President, regarding the case mentioned in the question in which a man was allegedly assaulted by seven police officers on Lung Wo Road in Central on 15 October 2014, the Police are very concerned about the incident and have been handling the case seriously. The Police reiterate that no illegal acts by any police officers shall be tolerated. If any individual police officer is suspected of committing illegal acts, the Police will definitely conduct investigations in a fair and impartial manner.

The Complaints Against Police Office (CAPO) of the Hong Kong Police Force received a complaint from the man on the day the incident took place (that is, 15 October 2014). A dedicated special investigation team was immediately assigned by the CAPO to conduct a thorough investigation into the incident.
The police officers who conducted the arrest of the complainant at the time in question have been removed from front-line operational duties by the Police on the afternoon of the day of the incident. Following investigation, the Police confirmed that there were seven police officers involved in the handling of the complainant at the time in question. On the following day (that is, 16 October 2014), the Police interdicted those seven police officers in the public interest. Upon further investigation and seeking legal advice, the Police arrested the seven interdicted police officers on 26 November 2014 for alleged "assault occasioning actual bodily harm".

At present, the Police have already submitted the investigation report to the Department of Justice (DoJ) and are now awaiting legal advice. The Police will continue to follow up the case and report to the Independent Police Complaints Council in relation to the complaint involving this case.

The Government's reply to the question raised by Mr Dennis KWOK is as follows:

(1) The aforementioned seven police officers involved in the case (including two inspectorate officers and five junior police officers) have been interdicted from 16 October 2014 up to now.

The Hong Kong Police Force has been handling the interdiction of those seven police officers as well as their salary arrangements during interdiction in accordance with the Police Force Ordinance (Cap. 232). Section 17 of the Police Force Ordinance sets out the arrangements in these two aspects for police officers in the rank of Chief Inspector of Police or below. Relevant legal provisions are excerpted as follows:

"(1) If the Commissioner [of Police] considers that the public interest requires that a police officer other than a gazetted police officer should cease to exercise the powers and functions of his office forthwith, he may interdict the police officer from the exercise of such powers and functions where —

(a) disciplinary or criminal proceedings are being instituted or are about to be instituted against such officer; or
(b) such officer is the subject of an inquiry into his conduct in connection with his duties as a police officer or the subject of an investigation into any report, allegation or suspicion that he has committed an offence.

(2) A police officer who has been interdicted under —

(a) subsection (1)(a), shall be allowed to receive such proportion of his pay, not being less than one-half, as the Commissioner shall in every case direct, until such time as he may be convicted of an offence whereupon the matter shall be determined under section 37(4);

(b) subsection (1)(b), shall not on that account receive less than his full pay."

In accordance with section 37(4) of the Police Force Ordinance, no pay or allowance shall be payable to any police officer with effect from the date of the finding by a court in criminal proceedings that a charge against such officer in respect of a criminal offence has been proved against him unless the approval of the Commissioner of such payment be given.

(2) The independent prosecutorial power is guaranteed by Article 63 of the Basic Law which says that the DoJ shall control criminal prosecutions free from any interference. According to the Prosecution Code, the DoJ should bring a prosecution only if there is a reasonable prospect of conviction. Prosecutors in the DoJ have been strictly adhering to the prosecution policy and jealously guarding the principle of prosecutorial independence as guaranteed by the Basic Law.

The DoJ will make all prosecution decisions independently, fairly and in strict accordance with the law and the Prosecution Code. The DoJ will handle any suspects in a fair and just manner, regardless of their background, position or status. And where actually feasible, the DoJ will also seek to provide detailed and comprehensively considered legal advice to law-enforcement
agencies (including the Police) as quickly as possible. However, the actual time that it takes to provide legal advice on each case would depend on a whole host of factors, including mainly the nature and complexity of the case. And amongst the cases submitted to the DoJ for legal advice, in the event that directions were necessary for the relevant law-enforcement agency to make further enquiries, they would be given before the legal advice could be finalized and prosecutions (if considered appropriate) be taken forward. Although prosecutors have the duty to decide as soon as possible after an incident whether to take prosecution action, they also have the responsibility to conduct comprehensive, detailed and in-depth research and analysis into the details of the case, so as to ensure that prosecution will be pursued only where there is sufficient evidence.

In respect of the case mentioned in the question, the DoJ and the Police have all along maintained communication. The DoJ is examining the information provided by the Police and related legal issues and is concurrently seeking legal advice from an independent senior counsel, with a view to providing legal advice to the Police as soon as possible, including whether further enquiries would be required, whether the complainant or other relevant individuals should be requested to provide further assistance, or whether any person should be prosecuted. It is not appropriate for the HKSAR Government to make further comments on the case at this stage.

Hong Kong Childhood Immunization Programme

13. MISS ALICE MAK (in Chinese): President, the Hong Kong Childhood Immunization Programme (the Programme), implemented by the Centre for Health Protection under the Department of Health, provides vaccination for eligible children in Hong Kong for the prevention of 11 types of infectious diseases such as measles and varicella. On the other hand, it has been reported that the numbers of measles cases in Hong Kong and many places in the world have shown a rising trend in recent years. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:
(1) of the respective vaccination rates of the various vaccines under the Programme in each of the past five years;

(2) whether parents have the right under the existing mechanism to refuse to make arrangements for their children to be vaccinated; if they do, of the types of vaccines involved, the number of such cases in the past five years, and the reasons for their refusal of vaccination; whether the authorities have put in place measures to follow up such cases; if they have, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(3) of the criteria based on which the authorities determine whether to include a certain type of vaccine in the Programme; whether there is plan in the short term to include more types of vaccines in the Programme; if there is, of the details;

(4) whether the authorities regularly update the list of vaccines under the Programme; if they do, of the intervals between the updates; if not, the reasons for that; and

(5) whether the authorities assessed the effectiveness of the Programme in the past three years; if they did, of the outcome?

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Chinese): President,

(1) The Scientific Committee on Vaccine-preventable Diseases (SCVPD) under the Centre for Health Protection (CHP) of the Department of Health (DH) makes recommendations regarding the Hong Kong Childhood Immunization Programme (the Programme) from the public health perspective. Children from birth to Primary Six will receive different types of vaccines and boosters under the Programme in order to be protected from 11 infectious diseases, namely, tuberculosis, poliomyelitis, hepatitis B, diphtheria, whooping cough (pertussis), tetanus, pneumococcal infection, chickenpox, measles, mumps and rubella.
Under the Programme, these vaccines are given at birth in hospitals, during pre-school period by the DH's Maternal and Child Health Centres (MCHCs), or in primary schools by the DH's outreaching School Immunization Teams. The Student Health Service Centres under the DH also provides mop-up vaccination to secondary school students. Also, parents may have their children vaccinated in private medical sector at their own expenses.

The DH had conducted territory-wide immunization surveys in 2001, 2003, 2006, 2009 and 2012 respectively among children aged two to five attending pre-primary institutions to monitor the coverage rate. Results of these surveys showed that the immunization coverage rates were consistently high at or above 94% for the respective birth cohorts (see Annex 1). Immunization coverage rates for primary school students are summarized in Annex 2.

(2) The DH provides vaccine information through various media, including webpages, information hotlines, information pamphlets. The DH also provides individual health advice on a case-by-case basis to parents in MCHCs, in order to encourage vaccination. All vaccinations are voluntary. If parents refuse to have their children vaccinated, the healthcare personnel of MCHCs will try to understand and explain if there are any misconceptions about vaccinations. They will also explain the risks of not receiving vaccination so that parents can make informed choices. The DH does not keep statistics of cases of refusing to receive vaccinations.

(3) and (4)

The DH formulates the Programme according to the recommendations of the SCVPD, including incorporation of vaccines into the Programme and their vaccination arrangements. SCVPD has been closely monitoring the changes in the global and local epidemiology of vaccine preventable diseases and reviewing scientific developments, including the application of new vaccines, vaccine formulations and cost-effectiveness, as well as the experiences of other health authorities, in order to provide science-based advice. SCVPD regularly holds meetings among
experts and comes up with recommendations for the Programme. The CHP will make reference to these recommendations when reviewing and updating the Programme. For example, the pneumococcal vaccine and varicella vaccine were incorporated into the Programme in September 2009 and July 2014 respectively.

(5) The CHP has been closely monitoring the local prevalence of vaccine-preventable diseases, and conducting epidemiological investigation and analysis of clinical data in order to assess the effectiveness of immunization programme. Routine health promotion activities on immunization are also in place to raise and sustain high immunization coverage for effective disease control. In the past decades, there was a marked decline in incidence and mortality of relevant diseases due to vaccination, such as a significantly reduced number of measles cases reported since the introduction of the measles-containing vaccine in 1967, as well as the confirmed eradication of poliomyelitis in 2000. This has proven that vaccination is effective in controlling relevant diseases.

Annex 1

Coverage rates (%) of children by type of vaccine and year of birth (1995 to 2009) according to immunization surveys conducted by the DH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Vaccine</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCG Vaccine</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Polio Vaccine</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Diphtheria, Tetanus and Pertussis Vaccine</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 2

**Immunization coverage rates for primary school students**

(according to statistics from the School Immunization Teams of the DH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of vaccine</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Hepatitis B Vaccine</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Measles, Mumps and Rubella Vaccine</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary One</td>
<td>DTaP-IPV</td>
<td>99.17%</td>
<td>99.26%</td>
<td>99.15%</td>
<td>99.16%</td>
<td>98.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MMR I</td>
<td>99.55%</td>
<td>99.38%</td>
<td>99.56%</td>
<td>99.58%</td>
<td>99.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MMR II</td>
<td>98.52%</td>
<td>98.21%</td>
<td>98.66%</td>
<td>98.86%</td>
<td>98.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Six</td>
<td>dTaP-IPV</td>
<td>99.19%</td>
<td>99.17%</td>
<td>99.12%</td>
<td>98.97%</td>
<td>98.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MMR I</td>
<td>99.63%</td>
<td>99.49%</td>
<td>99.59%</td>
<td>99.71%</td>
<td>99.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MMR II</td>
<td>99.15%</td>
<td>98.88%</td>
<td>99.18%</td>
<td>99.47%</td>
<td>99.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hep B I</td>
<td>99.73%</td>
<td>99.72%</td>
<td>99.70%</td>
<td>99.75%</td>
<td>99.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hep B II</td>
<td>99.55%</td>
<td>99.57%</td>
<td>99.54%</td>
<td>99.59%</td>
<td>99.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hep B III</td>
<td>99.07%</td>
<td>99.08%</td>
<td>99.24%</td>
<td>99.19%</td>
<td>98.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hep B: Hepatitis B Vaccine

DTaP-IPV: Diphtheria, Tetanus, acellular Pertussis and Inactivated Poliovirus Vaccine

dTap-IPV: Diphtheria, Tetanus, acellular Pertussis (reduced dose) and Inactivated Poliovirus Vaccine

MMR: Measles-Mumps-Rubella Vaccine
Regulation of Indoor Children's Playgrounds

14. MR LEUNG CHE-CHEUNG (in Chinese): President, it is learnt that recently quite a number of parents bring their children to the newly-popular indoor integrated children's playgrounds (playgrounds) for recreational activities. These playgrounds, which are quite large in scale, provide users with a variety of services and facilities, including food, rock climbing exercises, trampolines, several-story-high slides, gun-shooting computer games, gigantic ball ponds, motor racing circuits and various kinds of toys. I have received complaints alleging that some children were injured at a playground and the complainants learnt afterwards that the playground had obtained merely a business registration certificate and no licence. The complainants are worried that with the lack of monitoring, there is no assurance of the safety, quality and hygiene conditions of the playgrounds. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) how the Food and Health Bureau (FHB) ensures that the ball ponds and other recreational facilities in the playgrounds will not become hotbeds for spreading bacteria and viruses; when an epidemic is suspected to have spread via the playgrounds, whether the authorities may, in accordance with the legislation, demand the playgrounds concerned to suspend business; whether FHB will consider putting the playgrounds under its communicable disease surveillance; if it will not, of the reasons for that;

(2) given that the playgrounds often receive many children at the same time, whether the Education Bureau and the Labour and Welfare Bureau will consider bringing them under the ambit of the Education Ordinance (Cap. 279) and the Child Care Services Ordinance (Cap. 243); if they will not, of the reasons for that;

(3) given that the gun-shooting computer games provided by some playgrounds show bloody and violent scenes, and rock climbing and trampolining are relatively high-risk activities which are prone to accidents causing serious injuries, whether the Home Affairs Bureau will consider bringing the playgrounds under the ambit of the relevant legislation; if it will not, of the reasons for that; and
(4) of the institutions, other than the Consumer Council, from which members of the public may seek assistance when they are dissatisfied with the facilities or services of the playgrounds?

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Chinese): President, regarding the enquiry raised by Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, the co-ordinated reply prepared having consulted relevant bureaux and departments is as follows:

(1) In order to prevent the spread of infectious diseases, the Centre for Health Protection (CHP) has issued guidelines on environmental disinfection, which are applicable for use by general public, institutions, as well as governmental and industry stakeholders, including public health advice pertaining to playgrounds. According to the guidelines, hand-washing facilities or alcohol-based hand rubs should be readily available for use by the general public for hand hygiene. Environmental disinfection of the premises and facilities should be performed regularly, particularly when soiling occurs. During periods with heightened activities or spread of infectious diseases in the community (such as Enterovirus 71), institutions are regularly reminded of the need for enhanced vigilance and disinfection of the environment, with particular attention to share-use items such as toys in indoor game rooms.

Moreover, the CHP has been closely monitoring any outbreak of infectious disease in the community. If there exists or existed in any premises a case or source of a specified infectious disease, the health officer of the Department of Health may close the premises to carry out necessary disease control measures pursuant to section 37 of Prevention and Control of Disease Regulation (Cap. 599A).

(2) In accordance with the Education Ordinance (Cap. 279), "school" means an institution, organization or establishment which provides for 20 or more persons during any one day or eight or more persons together at any one time, any nursery, kindergarten, primary, secondary or post secondary education or any other educational course by any means. As the activity nature of a "playground" does
not involve the provision of educational courses to the participants, it does not fall under the definition of "school" mentioned above, and should not be regulated under the Education Ordinance.

According to the Child Care Services Ordinance (Cap. 243), any premises which habitually receive at any one time more than five children under the age of three years for the purposes of care and supervision requires registration as a registered child care centre. An indoor playground which provides a venue for parents to participate in leisure activities with their children does not involve providing care and supervision for children, and, therefore, is also not under the ambit of the Child Care Services Ordinance.

(3) Section 23 of the Control of Obscene and Indecent Articles Ordinance (Cap. 390) (COIAO) prohibits public display of indecent matters. The Office for Film, Newspaper and Article Administration is responsible for the enforcement of the COIAO and would take appropriate follow up actions if a breach of the COIAO is observed.

Sports climbing facilities and trampolines are sports facilities. International federations of the respective sports have set out the facility standards and user guidelines for relevant competitions and listed out information on authorized equipment suppliers. If the facilities are used for recreational purposes, respective playground operators and manager or owners of the venues concerned should make reference to the installation and user guidelines issued by the manufacturers of these facilities. Qualified persons should be hired to instruct users of the proper operation and use of the facilities if necessary.

(4) All venues must comply with prevailing relevant legislation and statutory requirements. If a member of the public suspects that a venue has breached relevant laws or regulations and wishes to file a complaint, he/she may do so through the government hotline 1823. The complaint would be, having regard to its nature, referred to the relevant department(s) for any necessary follow up actions.
Young People of Hong Kong Working Overseas Under Working Holiday Scheme

15. **DR CHIANG LAI-WAN** (in Chinese): President, at present, there are bilateral Working Holiday Scheme agreements entered between the Hong Kong Government and the governments of 10 countries, including Australia. It has been reported that the Australian Broadcasting Corporation recently broadcast a programme about the situation of foreign young people working in Australia on working holiday visas and uncovered that some young people had been grossly exploited by employers, e.g. by deduction of wages or provision of accommodation with appalling conditions, and some young women had even been sexually harassed. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it knows the respective numbers of working holiday visa applications made by young people of Hong Kong to the aforesaid countries in the past three years, with a breakdown by the job type of the short-term employment they intended to take up and country;

(2) whether the authorities received in the past three years requests for assistance from young people of Hong Kong working overseas on working holiday visas; if they did, provide a breakdown by the nature of such cases; whether the authorities followed up such cases; if they did, of the details;

(3) given the instances revealed in the aforesaid programme, whether the authorities will take the initiative to inquire into the situation of young people of Hong Kong working overseas on working holiday visas to find out whether they have been subjected to wage deductions, sexual harassment, etc.; whether the authorities will formulate measures to protect the safety of such young people; if they will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(4) whether the authorities will formulate guidelines to help young people intending to apply for working holiday visas understand and identify the backgrounds of overseas employers so as to avoid being exploited; if they will, of the details?
SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Chinese): President, my reply to the question of Dr CHIANG Lai-wan is as follows:

(1) Based on the information provided by the governments of Working Holiday Scheme (WHS) partner economies, a breakdown of the number of Hong Kong youths that were granted working holiday visas in the past three years is set out at Annex. The governments of partner economies did not provide the types of employment engaged by these working holidaymakers.

(2) The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) Government does not keep the requested breakdowns.

(3) and (4)

The HKSAR Government has been promoting WHS in different government organizations, public places and tertiary institutions through various channels, including organizing talks, setting up webpages and distributing publicity materials (for example, posters, pamphlets, postcards, and so on).

When promoting WHS, the HKSAR Government has reminded participants to raise their safety awareness abroad, for instance, by taking out medical insurance and abiding by local laws, and so on. Participants have also been reminded that for good preparation they should, before their departure, acquire a better understanding of their destinations (including employment situation and living condition) by visiting webpages of destination governments and their consulates in Hong Kong and dedicated WHS webpages set up by the HKSAR Government, as well as by consulting friends who have participated in WHS previously.

If WHS participants encounter, amongst others, employment or personal/property safety issues overseas, they should contact the local government authorities for assistance as soon as practicable. In case of accidents or serious incidents, WHS participants can, in addition to approaching the local government authorities for assistance, approach the relevant Chinese Embassies/Consulates for
assistance, or call the 24-hour hotline of the Assistance to Hong Kong Residents Unit (AHU) of the Immigration Department at (852) 1868. The Chinese Embassies/Consulates concerned and the AHU will provide suitable assistance according to the circumstances of the case (such as reissuing travel documents, contacting families, referring the case to local lawyers, doctors or interpreters and liaising with the local authorities, and so on). The AHU will endeavour to co-ordinate and follow up the case, including contacting the relevant governments and their consulates in Hong Kong where necessary.

Annex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner economies</th>
<th>Number of visas granted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>404(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>9,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>150(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(1) Statistics from April of the year to March of the following year
(2) Statistics from July of the year to June of the following year
(3) Statistics from July to December of the year
(4) Statistics from April to December of the year
(5) Statistics from July to December of the year
- Scheme not yet in operation that year
Aircraft Noise

16. MR ALBERT CHAN (in Chinese): President, in reply to my question at the meeting of this Council on 11 June 2014, the Government indicated that to minimize the impact of aircraft noise on the districts near the flight paths, the Civil Aviation Department had implemented a series of aircraft noise mitigating measures in accordance with the balanced approach to aircraft noise management promulgated by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), and the measures included requiring aircraft to avoid overflying populated areas, to adopt the noise abatement departure procedures prescribed by ICAO during take-off and the Continuous Descent Approach for landing, etc., in the small hours as far as possible. Yet, I have learnt that aircraft noise during the hours between 11 pm to 7 am the next day still often causes nuisance to the residents of quite a number of housing estates at present, making it difficult for them to fall asleep. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the monthly data recorded between May 2014 and April 2015 by various aircraft noise monitoring terminals on aircraft noise levels which reached 70 to 74, 75 to 79, and 80 decibels (dB) or above during the aforesaid hours;

(2) of the types of aircraft with noise levels reaching 80 dB or above last year, and the names of the airline companies to which such aircraft belonged; and

(3) whether it will further enhance the existing aircraft noise mitigating measures to reduce the nuisance caused to residents in the districts concerned; if it will, of the details?

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Chinese): President, our reply to the various parts of Mr Albert CHAN's question is as follows:

(1) The Civil Aviation Department (CAD) has 16 noise monitoring terminals. The aircraft noise events recorded by these terminals from May 2014 to March 2015 by month are set out in Annex 1. The data for April 2015 are pending verification and thus not available at the moment.
(2) The types of aircraft with noise events of 80 decibels or above recorded in 2014 and the operating airlines concerned are set out in Annex 2.

(3) The CAD has implemented a series of aircraft noise mitigating measures in accordance with the balanced approach to aircraft noise management promulgated by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). These measures include requiring aircraft to avoid overflying populated areas, to adopt the noise abatement departure procedures prescribed by the ICAO during take-off and the Continuous Descent Approach for landing, and so on, in the small hours as far as possible. The CAD has also implemented a new set of flight procedures that aim to allow aircraft which could use satellite-based navigation technology in their flights to adhere closely to the nominal centre line of the flight track when departing to the northeast of the Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA) and making south turn to the West Lamma Channel, thereby keeping the aircraft at a distance away from the areas in the vicinity of the flight paths, and reducing the impact of aircraft noise on these areas.

Apart from implementing the aircraft noise abatement operational procedures mentioned above, the CAD has prohibited aircraft not meeting the relevant aircraft noise levels from landing and taking off in Hong Kong. Since 2002, aircraft not complying with the noise levels in Chapter 3 of Volume I, Part II of Annex 16 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation(1) (Chapter 3 noise levels) are not allowed to operate in Hong Kong. This requirement is in line with other major international airports. To strengthen this aircraft noise mitigating measure, starting from 2014, the CAD has imposed further restrictions on aircraft which are marginally compliant with the Chapter 3 noise levels to land and take off in Hong Kong. At present, the restrictions on noisy aircraft imposed by the CAD are more stringent than those imposed by other major international airports. The CAD will keep reviewing this

(1) Volume I, Part II of Annex 16 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation sets out the aircraft noise levels formulated by the ICAO at different times. The aircraft noise levels of Chapter 3, which were formulated at a later stage than those of Chapter 2, were more stringent. Generally speaking, the noise levels of Chapter 3 — compliant aircraft were lower than those of Chapter 2 — compliant aircraft.
arrangement from time to time and closely monitor the latest development of the ICAO, the international aviation industry and the operation of the HKIA with a view to considering the need to step up the relevant requirement.

With the advancement of aviation technology, aircraft engines are quieter than before, and the improved design of airframe has also helped reduce noise significantly. The CAD has been requesting airlines to introduce newer models of aircraft to replace the older ones, and to deploy quieter aircraft for night time operations. Airlines have been taking responsive actions, and the ratios of newer-model aircraft in their fleets are on the rise. The CAD will continue to monitor the progress made by the airlines in their aircraft fleet replacement and their deployment of quieter aircraft for night time operations, as well as the effectiveness of such measures.

Meanwhile, with a view to encouraging the airlines to deploy quieter aircraft, the Airport Authority Hong Kong is exploring the feasibility of introducing environmental charges/incentive schemes on the basis of the 24-hour operation of the HKIA, and by adopting the guidelines relating to aircraft noise charges issued by the ICAO. The aviation industry and the stakeholders will be consulted accordingly.

Annex 1

Noise Events Recorded by the Noise Monitoring Terminals from May 2014 to March 2015 (between 2300 hours and 0700 hours the following day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Monitoring Terminal</th>
<th>Noise Level (dB)</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mei Lam Estate, Tai Wai</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Monitoring Terminal</td>
<td>Noise Level (dB)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. On Yam Estate, Kwai Chung</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yiu Tung Estate, Shau Kei Wan</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Beverley Heights, Cloud View Road, North Point</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fairmont Gardens, Conduit Road, Mid-Level</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hong Kong Garden, Tsing Lung Tau</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sha Lo Wan, Lantau</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Caribbean Coast, Tung Chung</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ma Wan Marine Traffic Control Centre, Ting Kau</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Park Island, Ma Wan</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tai Lam Chung Tsuen</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Noise Monitoring Terminal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Monitoring Terminal</th>
<th>Noise Level (dB)</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Greenview Court, Yau Kom Tau, Tsuen Wan</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cheung Hang Estate, Tsing Yi</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. MTR Siu Ho Wan Depot, Sunny Bay</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mount Butler Road, Jardine's Lookout</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mount Haven, Liu To Road, Tsing Yi(1)</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

1. Due to equipment failure, no data was recorded from the noise monitoring terminal at Mount Haven from 1 May 2014 to 12 June 2014.

---

### Annex 2

Aircraft Types with Noise Events of 80 dB or above Recorded and their Operating Airlines

(Annex 2)

(from 1 January to 31 December 2014)

(between 2300 hours and 0700 hours the following day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Airlines</th>
<th>Aircraft Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHK Air Hong Kong</td>
<td>Airbus A300-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AirBridge Cargo</td>
<td>Boeing B747-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Nippon Airways</td>
<td>Boeing B767-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airlines</td>
<td>Aircraft Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargolux Airlines International</td>
<td>Boeing B747-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boeing B747-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargolux Italia</td>
<td>Boeing B747-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathay Pacific Airways</td>
<td>Airbus A330-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Airbus A340-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boeing B747-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boeing B777-300ER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebu Pacific Air</td>
<td>Airbus A319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Airlines</td>
<td>Airbus A330-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boeing B747-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emirates Airline</td>
<td>Boeing B747-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian Airlines</td>
<td>McDonnell Douglas MD-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garuda Indonesia</td>
<td>Airbus A330-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Airbus A330-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Airlines</td>
<td>Airbus A330-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Airbus A330-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-Mile Air</td>
<td>Boeing B737-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalitta Air</td>
<td>Boeing B747-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lufthansa German Airlines</td>
<td>Airbus A340-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinair Holland</td>
<td>Boeing B747-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Air Cargo Group</td>
<td>Boeing B747-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient Thai Airlines</td>
<td>Boeing B747-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polar Air Cargo</td>
<td>Boeing B747-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qantas Airways</td>
<td>Boeing B767-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabian Airlines</td>
<td>Boeing B747-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boeing B747-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Airlines Cargo</td>
<td>Boeing B747-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Air</td>
<td>Boeing B747-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT Airways</td>
<td>Boeing B777-200LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmile Air Services</td>
<td>Boeing B727-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS Parcel Delivery Services</td>
<td>Boeing B747-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McDonnell Douglas MD-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangtze River Express</td>
<td>Boeing B737-300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BILLS

First Reading of Bills


SPECIAL HOLIDAY (3 SEPTEMBER 2015) BILL

CLERK (in Cantonese): Special Holiday (3 September 2015) Bill.

Bill read the First time and ordered to be set down for Second Reading pursuant to Rule 53(3) of the Rules of Procedure.

Second Reading of Bills


SPECIAL HOLIDAY (3 SEPTEMBER 2015) BILL

SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Cantonese): President, I move the Second Reading of the Special Holiday (3 September 2015) Bill (the Bill). The sole purpose of the Bill is to propose designating 3 September 2015 on a one-off basis as a special General Holiday and a Statutory Holiday under the General Holidays Ordinance (GHO) (Cap. 149) and the Employment Ordinance (EO) (Cap. 57) respectively.

Hong Kong was part and parcel of the Chinese people's eight-year war of resistance and the Pacific War. I believe many elderly citizens in Hong Kong will still remember the plight during the Japanese Occupation period which lasted for three years and eight months. In 2014, the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress approved that 3 September be designated as the Victory Day of the Chinese people's war of resistance against Japanese aggression. The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) also decided in August 2014 that an official commemorative ceremony would be held in Hong Kong on 3 September every year.
This year marks the 70th anniversary of the victory of the Chinese people's war of resistance against Japanese aggression and it is particularly meaningful. The Central People's Government announced that 3 September 2015 would be a National Holiday in order to facilitate extensive public participation in the commemorative activities to be held by the Central Authorities and various local authorities. Various commemorative activities will also be held for the public by the HKSAR Government in remembrance of history on 3 September 2015 in Hong Kong. We propose designating 3 September 2015 on a one-off basis as a special General Holiday and a Statutory Holiday so as to facilitate public participation in these activities.

The Bill which I have move to be read a Second time proposes to designate 3 September 2015 as a General Holiday under the GHO, a day which shall be made a holiday by all banks, educational establishments, public offices and government departments unless otherwise provided for by law. The Bill also designates 3 September 2015 as a Statutory Holiday under the EO so that all employees in Hong Kong, including imported workers and foreign domestic helpers, to whom the EO is applicable will be entitled to this holiday on 3 September 2015 irrespective of their lengths of service while employees who meet the requirements of the EO will be further entitled to holiday pay. The designation of 3 September 2015 as both a General Holiday and a Statutory Holiday allows the majority of employees to have a holiday on that day.

The Labour Advisory Board and the Panel on Manpower of the Legislative Council discussed the special one-off holiday at a meeting this month and supported the Government's proposal. We have also noticed that ever since the Government announced the proposal of providing the special one-off holiday, there was generally a positive response in society. Some members of the business sector, organizations and members of the public have even expressed the hope that the special holiday can be confirmed as soon as possible so that they can make early arrangements.

I hope that the Bill, subject to support by Members, can be passed as soon as possible so that members of the public can enjoy a General Holiday and a Statutory Holiday on 3 September 2015 as well as participating in the relevant commemorative activities while various sectors of the community can also make preparations for this extra holiday as soon as possible.

Thank you, President.
PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the Special Holiday (3 September 2015) Bill be read the Second time.

In accordance with the Rules of Procedure, the debate is now adjourned and the Bill is referred to the House Committee.

Council went into Committee.

Committee Stage

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Council is now in Committee to continue to vote on the remaining amendments to the Appropriation Bill 2015 one by one, and deal with the rest of the proceedings. Committee has voted on Amendment No 599 before the meeting was adjourned on 22 May.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2015

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 600 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Dr Fernando CHEUNG, you may now move your amendment.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 600, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Dr Fernando CHEUNG moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 170 be reduced by $70,700,000 in respect of subhead 700."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr Fernando CHEUNG be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Dr Fernando CHEUNG rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr Fernando CHEUNG has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr NG Leung-sing, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr James TO, Prof Joseph LEE and Mr Charles Peter MOK did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN, Mr WONG Yuk-man and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr James TIEN, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Alan LEONG, Mr WU Chi-wai, Dr Kenneth CHAN, Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present and 20 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 22 were present, five were in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 601 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move your amendment.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 601, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 174 be reduced by $14,595,500 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr NG Leung-sing, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr James TO and Mr Charles Peter MOK did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN, Mr WONG Yuk-man and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr Paul TSE, Mr James TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr WU Chi-wai, Dr Kenneth CHAN and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present and 20 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 21 were present, five were in favour of the amendment and 11 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 602 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move your amendment.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 602, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 180 be reduced by $45,392,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr James TO and Mr Charles Peter MOK did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN, Mr WONG Yuk-man and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr Paul TSE, Mr James TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr WU Chi-wai and Dr Kenneth CHAN did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, five were in favour of the amendment and 11 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 603 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr Albert CHAN, you may now move your amendment.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 603, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr Albert CHAN moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 181 be reduced by $246,979,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr Albert CHAN be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr Albert CHAN rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr James TO and Mr Charles Peter MOK did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert CHAN, Mr WONG Yuk-man and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr Paul TSE, Mr James TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr WU Chi-wai and Dr Kenneth CHAN did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 17 were present, three were in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 604 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr Albert CHAN, you may now move your amendment.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 604, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr Albert CHAN moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 186 be reduced by $768,965,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr Albert CHAN be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr Albert CHAN rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Charles Peter MOK did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert CHAN, Mr WONG Yuk-man and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr Paul TSE, Mr James TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr WU Chi-wai and Dr Kenneth CHAN did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 17 were present, three were in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 605 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move your amendment.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 605, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 186 be reduced by $215,356,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Charles Peter MOK did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr James TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU and Mr WU Chi-wai did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 16 were present, two were in favour of the amendment and 11 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 606 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move your amendment.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 606, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 186 be reduced by $189,300,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Charles Peter MOK did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr James TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU and Mr WU Chi-wai did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 16 were present, two were in favour of the amendment and 11 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 607 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move your amendment.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 607, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 186 be reduced by $184,753,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-keung, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Charles Peter MOK and Mr Kenneth LEUNG did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr James TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Alan LEONG and Mr WU Chi-wai did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, two were in favour of the amendment and 12 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 608 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move your amendment.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 608, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 186 be reduced by $4,209,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-keung, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Charles Peter MOK and Mr Kenneth LEUNG did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr James TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Alan LEONG and Mr WU Chi-wai did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, two were in favour of the amendment and 13 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 609 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 609, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr WONG Yuk-man moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 190 be reduced by $54,161,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr WONG Yuk-man rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-keung, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Charles Peter MOK and Mr Kenneth LEUNG did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr James TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Alan LEONG and Mr WU Chi-wai did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 13 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 610 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 610, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr WONG Yuk-man moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 190 be reduced by $54,100,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr WONG Yuk-man rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Charles Peter MOK and Mr Kenneth LEUNG did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr James TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Alan LEONG and Mr WU Chi-wai did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 13 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 611 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 611, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr WONG Yuk-man moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 190 be reduced by $40,700,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr WONG Yuk-man rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-keung, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Charles Peter MOK and Mr Kenneth LEUNG did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr James TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Alan LEONG and Mr WU Chi-wai did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 14 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 612 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 612, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr WONG Yuk-man moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 190 be reduced by $33,298,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr WONG Yuk-man rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-keung, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Charles Peter MOK and Mr Kenneth LEUNG did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert CHAN and Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr James TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Alan LEONG and Mr WU Chi-wai did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, two were in favour of the amendment and 14 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 613 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 613, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr WONG Yuk-man moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 190 be reduced by $12,175,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr WONG Yuk-man rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Charles Peter MOK and Mr Kenneth LEUNG did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert CHAN and Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr James TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Alan LEONG and Mr WU Chi-wai did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, two were in favour of the amendment and 14 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 614 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 614, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr WONG Yuk-man moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 190 be reduced by $5,400,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr WONG Yuk-man rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-keung, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Charles Peter MOK and Mr Kenneth LEUNG did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert CHAN and Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr James TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU and Mr Alan LEONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, two were in favour of the amendment and 14 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 615 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 615, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr WONG Yuk-man moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 190 be reduced by $1,525,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr WONG Yuk-man rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-keung, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Charles Peter MOK and Mr Kenneth LEUNG did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert CHAN and Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU and Mr Alan LEONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, two were in favour of the amendment and 13 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 616 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 616, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr WONG Yuk-man moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 190 be reduced by $1,431,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr WONG Yuk-man rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Charles Peter MOK and Mr Kenneth LEUNG did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert CHAN and Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU and Mr Alan LEONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 17 were present, two were in favour of the amendment and 12 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 617 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 617, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr WONG Yuk-man moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 190 be reduced by $117,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr WONG Yuk-man rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Charles Peter MOK and Mr Kenneth LEUNG did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert CHAN, Mr WONG Yuk-man and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU and Mr Alan LEONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, three were in favour of the amendment and 13 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No 618 as set out in Appendix II to the Script.

Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No 618, as set out in Appendix II to the Script, be passed.

Mr WONG Yuk-man moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that head 190 be reduced by $1,000 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr WONG Yuk-man rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Charles Peter MOK and Mr Kenneth LEUNG did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Albert CHAN, Mr WONG Yuk-man and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU and Mr Alan LEONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, three were in favour of the amendment and 13 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee has voted on all the amendments.

I now propose the question to you and that is: That the sums for heads 21 to 26, 28, 30, 31, 33, 39, 42, 44 to 47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 59, 60, 62, 63, 70, 72, 74, 76, 79, 82, 90, 91, 92, 95, 96, 100, 118, 121, 122, 137 to 144, 147, 148, 151, 152, 155, 156, 158, 159, 162, 170, 174, 180, 181, 186 and 190 stand part of the Schedule.

The Committee now proceeds to the seventh debate. Does any Member wish to speak?

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, after several weeks of discussion, this debate on the Budget has come to the seventh session and I think this is extremely important because the items covered by this one are numerous. I am not going to enumerate them, and the Chairman has also read them out just now. From head 21 to head 186, several dozen heads are involved.
Over the past two to three weeks, we proposed many amendments and I personally also proposed 200 amendments to effect a number of deductions. The legislature is a venue for debate and no matter if one agrees or not, all Members can express their views through the debate. However, this legislature, in particular, the silence of the pro-government camp, can be described as a mockery of and an insult to democracy because if you think that certain motions are worthy of your support or should be opposed, you should express your views and the claim of some Members is not true, that is, to cast nay votes on the amendments is like pressing "idiotic buttons" because this means that those Members opposing the amendments are "idiotic Members". Not only is this an insult to one's status, it is also a further insult to the relevant discussions in the legislature, thus denigrating one's own status.

For this reason, Chairman, this is very interesting: It fully reflects the self-denigration of the pro-government camp and its ignorance of or contempt for the fundamental and sanctimonious task of the legislature, namely, monitoring the executive. You have to defend a government policy for this is the fundamental duty of the pro-government camp. If you think that the Government can never be wrong, if you think that LEUNG Chun-ying "689" is worthy of support; if you think the physical assaults committed by police officers should be encouraged; if you think public funds can be dumped into the sea without any limit, if you think that senior officials — for example, those of the Civil Aviation Department — can continue to abuse power for personal gains and commit all kinds of outrageous acts, if you think that people like the Secretary can hoard land with a view to making huge profits … if one wants to enumerate them, one can go on and on endlessly.

In the debate on each motion, we expressed a lot of views and also cited many incidents to make it clear that we found this kind of fund allocations and expenditures utterly unacceptable. As Members all know, for many years, the quality of operation of these departments has been on the decline as well as a disappointment and they have let us down time and again. Many Members have expressed regrets or doubts over and voiced strong criticisms of individual projects or individual acts of the Government in the committees concerned but when it finally came to pressing the button, they think of themselves as "idiots". In sum, they support whatever the Government proposes and oppose whatever the opposition proposes, so they are out-and-out "idiotic Members". For this reason, the pro-government camp has a new sobriquet, that is, "idiotic Members".
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN, please comment on the sums in the 62 heads read out just now.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, this area involves a huge sum. Of the various amendments proposed by me, the expenditure of the Chief Executive's Office (head 21) alone exceeds $100 million and as regards other heads, such as head 22, the amendment also seeks to deduct the amount by as much as $80 million. Another example is the expenditure under "Head 23 — Auxiliary Medical Service". If we go on enumerating in this way, there are also expenditures related to such departments as the Architectural Services Department and the Census and Statistics Department. Some amendments, such as that to head 26, involve expenditures amounting to more than $670 million. Therefore, the expenditures of all departments are public funds and the hard-earned money of the people. The Government transfers billions of dollars to the rich and powerful through the transfer of benefits and by such means as rates and tax deductions, yet the "five have-nots" remain getting nothing.

It is unfortunate that the Legislative Council can only propose deductions but not increases to the sums of money. Otherwise, I will surely propose a number of amendments to give the "five have-nots" more of the rights and welfare to which they are entitled. Therefore, you can see that in respect of these items, many amendments proposing deductions have been negatived across the board and none of the 618 amendments was spared as they were all negatived. In the case of some amendments, including those proposed by me, they met such a woeful fate that only one vote supported them. This is not because my team did not support them, rather, we did not want some Members to stay here to help the pro-government camp make up numbers, since often, the number of votes stood at just 35, which was the minimum required for a quorum and that was why the amendments were negatived. If two or three Members on our side left the Chamber, at least, this would compel two or three Members of the pro-government camp to defend the Government by coming in here to fulfil their inherent duties.

Chairman, I have said many times that the pro-government camp, in defending the Government, has to pay a price. It is not true that one can just enjoy the glory, splendour, wealth and rank without having to shoulder any responsibility. At least, they have to sit here nicely to cast their votes. Even if they think of themselves as idiots, they still have to fulfil the duties of idiots duly. Therefore, you can see that in respect of those heads, for example, head 55, which
involves the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau, many members of the public really have strong views about the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau. As regards the Home Affairs Bureau, I have criticized the Home Affairs Bureau for acting as though it were autistic and detached from society. Of course, he has to perform the political tasks of the Central Authorities, since the Home Affairs Bureau is an intelligence agency, a unit and a department for united front work, is it not?

Chairman, the actual operation and original duties of many departments have changed gradually since 1997 or the reunification. The changes since 2003 have been particularly pronounced. Some changes and tasks are no longer talked about openly and they are totally different from what is publicly claimed. Therefore, Chairman, for various reasons — you can look at the various heads and I am not going to comment on them one by one in detail anymore because I have talked about them in the discussions on individual items — I believe this motion on their standing part of the Schedule must be negatived. Of course, with those "idiotic Members" coming to the defence of the Government in the legislature and continuing to press the "idiotic buttons" …

(Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok stood up)

IR DR LO WAI-KWOK (in Cantonese): Chairman, point of order.

Chairman, I do not mean I fit the description but I think that in talking about "idiots" and "idiotic Members", no matter which Member he refers to, it is offensive. I ask the Chairman to make a ruling.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN, the comments made by you concerning other Members are offensive, please withdraw them.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I withdraw all the criticisms directed at Members. I am only referring to Members who consider themselves as pressing "idiotic buttons", Chairman. That is to say, if they consider those buttons to be "idiotic buttons", it follows that the people pressing them are surely "idiots", are they not, Chairman?
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN, please focus your speech on the heads under discussion now.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, this is important because later on, if those people vote in favour but regard that button as an "idiotic button" … this is a very important motion and also an important subject because this is a matter about the intention and attitude of a Member when he votes, is it not? Therefore, on whether or not these are "idiotic buttons", Chairman, if Members want to accept such a description and consider themselves idiots, I do not wish to comment on this.

However, since the Chairman has ruled that the remark describing people pressing the "idiotic buttons" as "idiotic Members" is offensive to Members, I respect the Chairman's ruling and will just withdraw it. There is also no point in distorting the nature of the discussion as a result of the issue of whether one is an "idiot" or not because as Members can all see full well, the more than 600 amendments were totally annihilated and there was a lack of meaningful discussions on these 600 or so amendments. On these 600 or so amendments, some Members of the pro-government camp regard those Members who cast votes against the motions as "idiots ", so this kind of attitude clearly reveals the dysfunction of the legislature in monitoring the administration by the Government and the fact that it has failed to fulfil its inherent responsibilities or its inherent responsibilities under the law or the constitution.

Chairman, why do I consider negativing the sums standing part of the Schedule important? Chairman, because historically, the legislature has never tried to negative the motions proposed by the Government in relation to the sums standing part of the Schedule. Not to mention their incorporation, in Legislative Council meetings, there has never been any success in amending any fiscal expenditure proposed by the Government, that is, any minor or minuscule part of the expenditure estimates. For many years, the Government has acted in a wanton and hegemonic manner. As some Members said, in sum, when it comes to pressing the buttons, the "idiots" would just follow suit in pressing the buttons. For this reason, I have never seen such an extent of degeneration before, that is, throughout the years in which I have been in the legislature, and this includes the way in which the pro-government camp monitors the Government's administration and expenditures … in the past, the pro-government camp would
also offer some insightful opinions and level criticisms at the blunders that may have been made in relation to some of the Government's expenditures.

Chairman, if you look at the proportion, the cost overruns experienced by the Government are unprecedentedly high. In the past two decades, since I joined the legislature in 1991, that is, since the era of the former Legislative Council, I have never seen the Government acting so wilfully in respect of its expenditures. I have never seen the Government acting so wantonly and I have never seen such a lack of checks and balances and oversight on policymaking by senior officials. This situation has developed to the very serious situation of a partial collapse of administration.

Therefore, if we want to enumerate the wrongdoings, we really can do so for a long time: The wrongdoings of the Chief Executive's Office under LEUNG Chun-ying; the many mistakes made by the Hong Kong Police Force, for example, the recent incident of arresting a mentally handicapped person, not to mention physical assaults, which fully reflected the fact that the Force's total disregard for issues of humanity in dealing with basic interpersonal matters; the complete inability of the Development Bureau in coping with works expenses since cost began to rise in 2011 and its lack of any counter measures. In particular, after LEUNG Chun-ying had been elected and Paul CHAN had become the Secretary, costs rose drastically and instances of cost overrun came to a head one after another. Again, no effective measures or more reasonable measures were introduced to ameliorate or reduce instances of cost overrun, so obviously, this amounts to dereliction of duty.

In addition, I have also talked about the Secretary for Transport and Housing a number of times. Basically, this commander-in-chief of sea, land and air transport totally lacks the ability to manage and develop sea, land and air transport. I have also pointed out a number of times that this Secretary completely lacks any knowledge of transport and even though the Under Secretary is a nice guy, each time, in the face of these problems, he does not have the administrative or political abilities to deal with the relevant issues. Members can see that in respect of the airport, the obvious examples include the mistakes made by the Civil Aviation Department and the wilful behaviour of the Airport Authority Hong Kong (AA) in developing the third runway and saying suddenly that Terminal 2 had to be demolished. These are the obvious examples. On many matters, without offering the public any explanations, it was said that the works had to commence and many decisions detrimental to public coffers,
expenditures and interest came to light only after the decisions to launch works had been made. Often, it is only afterwards that disclosures were made little by little in the fashion of "squeezing a tube of toothpaste". Now, the Government faces many judicial reviews, including the environmental assessment related to the third runway, as well as issues related to the Public Finance Ordinance. These problems may all make the third runway die in the embryonic stage.

However, despite the many voices of opposition, the Government disregards public opinions completely. For example, at the meeting of the Establishment Subcommittee of the Legislative Council today, a motion of adjournment was moved on the staff funding related to the third runway. At the same time, the Government indicated that the AA would give a detailed account of the financial information related to the third runway only after it had been criticized severely. Such an approach is unacceptable. Often, in respect of large-scale infrastructure projects, the Government must first resolve the financial issues, then win public approval and support before making funding applications or staffing arrangements. For this reason, the Government's procedures often put the cart before the horse.

If we rashly incorporate the relevant sums into the Schedule today, then pass the appropriation, the Government will think that it can continue to act in a wilful manner and make arbitrary decisions with impunity and that it can continue to squander public funds wantonly. Having seen the failures of the Government in governance in the past year, we feel very woeful. Seeing the continual misery of the public in their living and the decline in their quality of life makes one feel very discontented. Given such an affluent society with such high incomes, it turns out that the public still have to endure various miseries.

Chairman, not many Members are present and there are fewer and fewer Members in the Chamber, so I hope you will exercise your power to do a headcount. Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will the Clerk please ring the bell to summon Members back to the Chamber.

(After the summoning bell had been rung, a number of Members returned to the Chamber)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Kin-por, please speak.

MR CHAN KIN-POR (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN has once again stirred up conflicts and prompted me to waste the time of the legislature to respond to his comments. I am very angry about this.

As pointed out by Mr Albert CHAN himself, his meaningless amendments have met a total defeat, and he also described this as a total defeat. It is obvious to all that in each round of voting, only three or four Members voted for these amendments, and the overwhelming majority opposed the amendments. These directly-elected Members are elected by Hong Kong people, but their actions only mean to reflect their position through their actions.

In the past month or so, a number of Members have been committed to making an all-out effort to stay in the Chamber. Although they had to sit in the Chamber for a long time, they still exerted their best to remain in the Chamber so as to maintain the operation of the legislature. I must salute to them.

On the contrary, those people who have messed up Hong Kong society have shown no repentance, nor have they reflected on their behaviour. To those people who made it a point to stir up conflicts in the legislature and wasted time, I must condemn them severely. As such, I must condemn Mr Albert CHAN severely. I implore him to drop his butcher's knife and become a man of virtue immediately. He should stop making meaningless comments and wasting our time. Thank you, Chairman.

MR PAUL TSE (in Cantonese): Chairman, I have not spoken on the Budget and the relevant amendments so far. Initially, I did not intend to waste Members' time, but I understand that many members of the public may have only watched one side of debate, including the speech made by Mr Albert CHAN just now, and this is extremely unfair to this Council, Hong Kong society and all Members present.

Chairman, in the speech made by Mr Albert CHAN earlier, he has criticized this Council repeatedly for lacking meaningful debates, the imbalance and Members' failure to fulfil their responsibility properly, and he considers such deterioration rare. These comments are quoted from his speech. Let me recap some of his comments again. He has pointed out that if he is to criticize the Government, the Budget, and the behaviour and practices of government officials
or departments, as well as the private life of individual government officials, in the past year or over the years, there are innumerable cases he can cite. In fact, Mr Albert CHAN and other Members who have spoken have made numerous criticisms which are totally irrelevant to the motion and the amendments. This practice is improper procedure-wise, or I would say that it is completely out of proportion.

I recall that in the previous term and the term before the last, I had used the analogy of "washing rice" at the Council meeting of this same stage to explain the case. Chairman, allow me to explain briefly my "rice-washing argument" to those who have not heard it before and the public who are watching the broadcast on television. People should know what it means. All housewives and those who have cooked rice before should have performed this action of washing rice. Given the quantity, we cannot wash each grain of rice but can only do the washing as appropriate and in proportion. We will put the rice in a large bowl, wash it briefly and then pour out the water. The procedure will be repeated two to three times. I learnt how to wash rice when I was a boy scout in primary schooling. Some people may be less fortunate. They may have to help out with household chores when they were young, so they also understand this rationale. Chairman, Members of this Council have exploited the leeway of the Rules of Procedure and the silent tolerance of Members to level endless criticisms at all government officials, government departments, policies and previous practices. They simply got hold of a public document of the Public Accounts Committee and read out the items therein one by one. What kind of a debate is this? What yardstick is used for the debate? We must monitor the accounts and expenditure of the Government, but this should be done at an appropriate timing according to a proper procedure and yardstick. But now, they merely use such purpose as an excuse to start their rice-washing actions, so that they can wash each grain of rice. I think if we are to wash the rice in this manner, we will not be able to finish washing it even if the washing is done from the morning till night. They insist they are washing rice in principle and in theory. But their actions are indeed meaningless. Regrettably, we are subject to the restrictions of the Rules of Procedure of the legislature. Although the Chairman has suitably tailored the amendments proposed by the relevant colleagues this time in a more rational manner, I am afraid if the Rules of Procedure is not amended, it will still allow certain people to disrupt the procedure of the Council deliberately or make use of the space and time of the legislature to give vent to their personal emotions, to insult government officials and colleagues blatantly and to achieve their political purposes. The discussion in the legislative is thus entirely hijacked by them.
Chairman, although many colleagues have stated that they are not in the pro-establishment camp, they should not forget that each and every Member in the Chamber and Members who have sworn to uphold the Basic Law are part of the establishment. We are obliged to maintain the healthy growth of the establishment. All Members are responsible for its advancement and maintenance. We highly respect the system of the rule of law adopted during the British-Hong Kong era, which has been carried forward and upheld after 1997, for the existing judicial system is relatively complete and Judges are relatively authoritative. If any person brazenly disrupt the order of the Court, he or she will be charged with contempt of court and be refuted immediately. If any counsel or senior counsel wastes the time of the Court, he will be rebuked and subject to sanctions. Yet under the proportional representation system and given that the legislature is comprised of elected Members, I am afraid many Members need only gain the support of a small number of electors to continue to disrupt the order of the legislature. Chairman, do not focus merely on the need to maintain and improve the Rules of Procedure. More important are the many unwritten practices, rules and mutual respect adopted in a democratic society or regime. If these rules or so-called "soft-culture" vanish, the establishment will become more and more corrupt.

I am moved to make this comment this morning, for I noted from a report yesterday that Mr Martin LIAO had indicated he would not stand in the election of the next term of the Legislative Council as he considered it a waste of time and meaningless. I have not had the opportunity to talk to him directly to confirm if it is really his will. If it is true, I think it is most regrettable and unfortunate. An increasing number of quality and capable Members whose academic qualification and social service experience are outstanding and comparable to various colleagues consider it meaningless to continue to be Members. I note that Mr CHAN Kin-por has been relatively emotional in his recent speeches. He insists on going into the hill even though he knows there is a danger of coming face to face with tigers, and he chooses to fight the beast, to be mocked and treated harshly. I think this is the time we let out our howls of outrage and reacted. Otherwise, the legislature will come to a final end after this turning point till there is improvement in the election system, or as other people say, till we have used our votes to replace certain trouble makers. However, if there is no improvement in the election system, I am afraid many trouble makers will still be elected. In this connection, and giving the matter its fair deal, I must say that the current-term Government has taken the lead to destruct the "soft culture" and
"soft rules", causing certain Members to make the daring comment "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth". But who took the lead to cause the damage of an eye? Who took the revenge to cause the damage of a tooth? I am afraid we can hardly tell. Yet I recall a famous quote of GANDHI, "An eye for an eye makes the whole world blind". What we are doing now is "an eye for an eye" and "a tooth for a tooth". Is it because the Government has first stirred up troubles and Members have to fight back? Or is it because certain Members have first stirred up troubles and the Government has been forced to make constant amendment and destruction passively to certain systems and unwritten rules which are originally sound? This vicious cycle will only lead the legislature onto a path of no return.

I must thank the Chairman for listening to my speech attentively and not intervening so far, for basically and fundamentally speaking, I am not discussing the question of the heads standing part of the Schedule. However, since some colleagues have spent 15 minutes to insult each and every Member who have done their level best to uphold the establishment, I think it will only be fair for someone to voice out for them. I learnt an example during my childhood. In a family, quarrels between the couple are inevitable, be it about family trivia or the education of children. I remember I once mentioned the relevant experience, or say memory or analogy. Whenever a quarrel breaks out in a family, the father who seldom speaks will make harsh comments once he speaks. I recall two articles written by the Chairman. Those two articles earned high commendation from many people, including me, and they described your relationship with your father. Actually, in Chinese society, men, including the Chairman, seldom speak their heart, yet we perceive, understand and remember those emotions.

I recall that whenever quarrels broke out in my home, my father would went into a temper after holding it back for a long time. More often than not, he would remain silent. Sometimes, he might leave home for a walk or go for a drive, and he might go out to have a chat with his friends and let it be. As for the three meals at home, all the household chores and the care of the children, my mother would have to stay home to handle them. I hope my following remark will not be offensive to men. I have a feeling that women are more patient, they have higher EQ and are more responsible, and they are more committed to the family. A man can just run away, but most women will give regard to the big picture, for someone must take care of the interest of the whole family …
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr TSE, just now, I have allowed you to respond to the speech of Mr Albert CHAN, but for the remarks you are making now, how are they related to the question under debate?

MR PAUL TSE (in Cantonese): Chairman, I am trying to use an analogy as a response. Perhaps I can explain this analogy briefly. Some people need to give regard to the big picture, while some people may act irresponsibly. He himself has admitted that he deliberately kept the number of Members at the lowest, even at the cost of giving up the right to vote, and he did so merely to bring suffering to his opponents. This practice of causing the opponent to suffer by all means to gratify one's own desire is utterly unacceptable. For a person to shamelessly express this motive and find pleasure in doing so, it is even more unacceptable.

I have to thank the Chairman again for allowing me to go on with my speech. I just want to point out directly that the public should not take the practices adopted by Members who have spoken repeatedly in the debates in the past few weeks as an act of fulfilling their responsibilities. For there are many proper mechanisms and channels, including consultation in written form and participation in meetings for discussion, for Members to monitor, ask questions and exercise checks and balances. After the relevant motion is submitted to the legislature, we should only give relatively general comments from a macroscopic point of view rather than commenting it like washing each grain of rice and consider ourselves being dedicatedly responsible. They are deceiving the public, and bullying and wasting the time of this Council, which is extremely unfair to other responsible Members.

With the expression of this view, I hope Members in the Chamber who agree with this will state their position known. In fact, the majority of us have remained silent for we do not want to waste any more time, and we do not want to see our discussion which is originally constructive to be confused with those meaningless discussion lest our discussion become meaningless too. Although I know my effort will be futile, I hope to let the public know that the time of the legislature is precious and there are established procedures in the legislature. The culture of the legislature can be maintained only with the efforts of all Members. Otherwise, the legislature will be reduced to a place worse than a market, where Members speak swear words like gangsters and behave in a
barefaced manner like hooligans. I have even heard children in the community query why they cannot behave that way if Members can. I really do not know how to answer this question.

I hope the Chairman, as the speaker of the legislature, will strike a balance. On the one hand, he should remain neutral in an impartial and appropriate manner, and on the other, in the event of brazen disruption of the Rules of Procedure or the originally sound tradition and culture of the legislature, he will enforce the rules decisively. Thank you, Chairman.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, before I speak on the seventh debate, I would like to first respond to some of the remarks made by Mr Paul TSE earlier.

As Mr Paul TSE said just now, most of the Members who have proposed amendments or have spoken in the past six debates — I believe I have not distorted what he meant — are more of nit-picking than being constructive. This means that it is not constructive to criticize the Government, but they being pro-Government are constructive. He earlier asked pro-Government Members if they agreed to his point. I think that those pro-democracy Members who have proposed amendments should make a clear statement at this stage to Mr Paul TSE or those with similar views that we have made serious efforts to propose amendments in the course of examining the current Budget. We criticize the Government not for nit-picking purposes. We do so because of the long list of crimes the Government has committed with regard to its administration and financial management, and we are just conducting sampling tests.

Two years ago, Mr Paul TSE invented the analogy of "rice washing" which he favours very much, and he has mentioned it time and again ever since. If he regards our examination of the Budget, which involves the Government's largest financial provision of the year, as an instance of "rice washing", he may have overly belittled our responsibility. Borrowing this analogy of rice, let us suppose that the Government administers the barn which supplies rice to all Hong Kong people. What could we do at most? We could merely sample eight or ten bowls of rice to examine if there is any problem, and yet we found bugs in this and rice weevils in that, so we had to take a larger sample. Only a few Members were involved in the sampling initially, followed by other Members who joined in later on out of distrust.
Mr Paul TSE takes a different view, which is precisely the logic of the pro-Government camp. In their view, there is a need to casually sample only a bowl of rice near the door of the barn — Dr Helena WONG is familiar with the process of food safety checks, during which only a bunch of vegetable nearest to the truck door is sampled to examine if there is any pesticide residue — and proceed to say that sampling is just a gesture, the examination is over, and the whole barn is problem-free. The analogy of rice test suggested by Mr Paul TSE actually points to the fact that an inspection is carried out as a formality and ritual over the years, and this has become what the Government describes as a proven practice. We are here to break the convention. What we do not like to see is that we need only sample just a bowl of rice when the truck passes through, whereas sampling two more bowls will be blamed for blocking the passage of the truck which supplies rice to the whole village. I am here to point out the various problems with the truck, like the bugs, poison, pesticides and rice weevils found in the rice. Problems have been identified in every bowl of rice sampled.

In fact, apart from pro-democracy Members or those who have proposed amendments, he also criticized the Chairman earlier, saying that many of our debates were meaningless. I believe that Chairman already made rulings in the past six debates. Remarks deemed irrelevant, meaningless or frivolous, including many of those made by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, were all disallowed by the Chairman, despite my view that he may have allowed more room for the debates.

Chairman, yet I agree to some of the remarks made by Mr Paul TSE. He said that this Council may take a doomed course of no return, and this I agree. I even think that we are already in such a state, or that of an Avīci hell. Why do we remain here? We cannot say that we have failed to do anything. We have not achieved much by checking the rice at this moment. We are merely pointing out to the public the problems found in the barn, such as the rice sacks which are empty or faulty, hoping that many of the problems can be brought to light in this course. However, they may query if we can return the whole truck of rice or dismiss those in charge. Sorry, I have to admit to the public that under this so-called proven parliamentary system where the pro-Government camp and the functional constituencies constitute the majority, we cannot do so. Therefore, the Government as the major rice trader has nothing to fear. Even if access to the rice truck and the barn are denied for two more weeks, they may go on smearing us for blocking people's access to the rice, and yet the Budget will still be passed before June.
Chairman, subsequent to your ruling, there are 618 amendments in total this year, the lowest number in years. I have proposed 191 amendment in total, and, according to my tally, I have spoken 20 times or so; the 191 amendments involve dozens of heads, and speaking for just 20 times or so is surely not enough for me to elaborate and explain all of the amendments. These 618 amendments have all been negatived now. Fortunately, the Chairman pointed out that we may still speak in this session on contents not yet covered. Of course, we will not speak on the amendments one by one, but we will speak on the heads. If I propose amendments again next year, I wish Chairman would not say that I had not spoken on many of the amendments proposed in the past, so they are merely proposed to make up numbers; it is not the case that I do not wish to speak, only that I do not have enough time to do so.

Chairman, in this session, I would like to speak on several particularly significant heads which I did not have the time to explain in the past debates, including "Head 21 — Chief Executive's Office" — I did not even have the time to settle scores with LEUNG Chun-ying and the Executive Council — and another significant one "Head 142 — Government Secretariat: Offices of the Chief Secretary for Administration and the Financial Secretary". I would focus on the Office of the Financial Secretary in this session to point out why we think it should not be included in the head.

Over the past few years or at least the three years since I joined this Council, the Financial Secretary has yet to show any improvement in his approach of budgeting, which can be regarded as getting even worse year after year. I am not sure if Members have watched the Financial Secretary's witty speech at the Hong Kong Journalists Association's evening party which drew rounds of applause. After that, he in all seriousness blamed Members on his blog for their filibustering in this Council to prevent the passage of the Appropriation Bill 2015 in mid-May, thus affecting the subvention to be made to organizations like the Hospital Authority (HA) in June.

In fact, Members may understand that given the tailoring done by the Chairman, the Budget will still be passed in June if not in mid-May. Therefore, before that happens, the Office of the Financial Secretary should make some preparations in respect of financial arrangement in advance. He is now blaming us for blocking the financial provision to the HA, the Legislative Council Secretariat and the University Grants Committee, which need to draw on their own reserves for contingency. This is actually an expected outcome, so he
should have included them while seeking funds on account. What he now suggests is that those who have their own reserves should pay their salaries in June on their own, and the Government will not reimburse them until after the passage of the Budget. This works like a cycle, as he may cite the same reason next year.

Given the anticipation that the Budget will be passed in June, why do they not make an adjustment to the funds on account? It is his intention not to do anything and then use it as another reason to blame … Chairman, filibustering is not a yardstick to differentiate Members. Although Mr WONG Kwok-hing has kept displaying the slogans and scissors, I do not make the fuss to argue with him and ask for your ruling because the finishing line is in sight, and no one will speak indefinitely to kill the time of this Council and impede its operation.

At this point, I need to add a word on a point I forgot to mention just now. This "battle of amendments" on the Budget — I avoid the term "filibustering" — one of the goals of this confrontation in the legislature is surely to stop pro-Government Members from acting just like a machine for voting and from thinking that the seat won is just meant for showing off, pressing the button and speaking once or twice only. Instead, they need to take part in meetings. Yes, we want them to spend a day like a year, to feel nauseous every time the summoning bell rings, and finish a meal in three portions. We are intent on increasing the cost of the Government as well as that of pro-Government Members with regard to the office they hold, and this is one of the goals of this confrontation in the legislature. We can admit it frankly, and there is no question of shame. Mr Paul TSE said earlier that Mr Albert CHAN had made it explicit in saying that he would leave the Chamber intentionally, such that one more pro-Government Member would be needed to form a quorum of 35. This is exactly one of the goals of this confrontation. I may request a headcount right away, but I wish to finish my speech first.

In fact, the Chairman and the Government have already … I am not saying that you have sided with the Government, but the action you took from an objective point of view has assisted in the Office of the Financial Secretary's work on the current year's Budget, including reducing the number of amendments from 3,904 to 618, making proper time arrangements for each of the debates on the amendments, and setting out the schedule. Under the most conservative estimate, the examination will conclude by early June, or the Third Reading debate may come to an end as early as this evening or next. Nonetheless, what
does John TSANG as the person-in-charge of the Office of the Financial Secretary say? Is he using his remark to deprive Members of their rights to speak and examine and Budget as bestowed by the Chairman and resort to the executive authorities' influence for building up the pressure of public opinion? This reason alone shows that there is dereliction of duty on his part or he is just incompetent, so they should not be given any funding at all. Hence, at least for the Budget, this is not a "battle of filibustering", as its pressure on the Government is rather limited, but we insist on doing so.

On the contrary, the Finance Committee remains as a source of resistance to the Government at present. It can prevent the Government from seeking financial provision any time in relation to cost overruns. However, the Government is superb in the sense that it has requested this Council to work according to its agenda as well as its tempo. Why do they not provide this Council with a script, force Chairman to time the debate and disallow Members to speak indefinitely for all motions? They also favour revising the Rules of Procedure the most because they treat examination of the Budget as a ritual. In theory, relevant examination has already taken place in previous panel meetings and the Finance Committee's special meetings. However, may Members, including the pro-Government ones, think from the bottom of their heart if this is really enough? I heard Mr Paul TSE mention "enough" in his earlier remarks. How is it enough? Members having joined the Finance Committee's special meetings should know that everyone is entitled to just four minutes of time for question and answer, and an additional three minutes should there be a second round. The time is not enough for one to even figure out what is going on.

Many Members may treat "having done something" as "having finished the job" and further as "having achieved something", but that is not the case. Members should not just raise a couple of questions, treat the verbal delivery as the replies, and then sit down in contentment. In my opinion, during the examination of this year's Budget, Members who have proposed amendments are all very serious. It is utterly unfair for the Office of the Financial Secretary or pro-Government Members to criticize them in this way.

This year, I cannot even finish the serious business, how do I find the time to talk nonsense? Chairman, I have yet to say even a word on "Head 45 — Fire Services Department", "Head 122 — Hong Kong Police Force" and "Head 141 — Government Secretariat: Labour and Welfare Bureau; as for "Head 42 — Electrical and Mechanical Services Department", "Head 39 — Drainage Services
Department" and "Head 49 — Food and Environmental Hygiene Department", may I know if the Chairman would allow me to speak on the heads one by one without mentioning individual subheads in this session?

My speech is now ending. Yet, as Secretary Matthew CHEUNG is present, may I add a word, that is, the double Comprehensive Social Security Assistance payment should not be used as an excuse to blame Members for standing in the way of the Budget's passage.

MR LEE CHEUK-YAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, even though I have said this many times in this Council before, since Mr Paul TSE remarked that we have hijacked the debate of this Council, I think I cannot but say that this Council should actually be a Council that belongs to the people. For how many years has this Council that belongs to the people been hijacked by the functional constituencies (FCs)?

Mr Paul TSE had visited Germany together with us and when we came back, we always say that it is necessary to make compromises. I said that I very much wish to make a compromise in this Council. If this Council is fair, and if we are truly equal and directly elected by the people … And as we all know, a general rule under party politics is that a reshuffle takes place once every few years. It means that when you rule this year, it could be other people ruling in the next term. When you seek help from other people, other people may also seek help from you one day, and then everyone is working for the benefit of the state or for the benefit of their place. But what about Hong Kong? This Council is in a deep abyss of despair and doomed, not because of our debate but because we have yet seen fairness reign in this Council to date.

Mr Martin LIAO said that he found this meaningless and would not run for re-election in the next term. Could it be that we found this very meaningful? Who in this Council would found this meaningful? There is separate voting here; we cannot propose private bills; and we often cannot do what we wish to, while the Government keeps dragging its feet and remains very much the same no matter how we chided it. Could we be happy about this? So, Mr Paul TSE accused us of hijacking the debate, but we are actually here to counteract a hijack. We are here to oppose the hijacking of this Council by the FCs over the years. Even after hijacking this Council for so many years, they have not ceased doing so and they want to continue with the hijacking, causing the constitutional reform to remain stagnant, and we have yet settled accounts over this.
Of course, Chairman, you may say that this is not a topic of our debate today, for we are debating the Budget now. But first, I have to respond to this remark about hijacking the debate of this Council, so to speak; and second, I wish to respond to the so-called "theory of rice washing". Mr Paul TSE talked about washing rice, saying that we are washing rice grain by grain but he fell short of mentioning another point and that is, John TSANG is "rice-infesting John" and he keeps a nest of "rice weevils". He does not spend on what he should spend but spends on what he should not spend. As such, should we not help him wash the rice? But of course, I do not mean washing it grain by grain, and you would wish that it is best not to wash it at all and simply give the whole truck of weevils-infested rice for people to eat without washing it at all.

What I wish to say is that, as you also mentioned earlier, there were some traditions during the British-Hong Kong era, and the Government, when waging struggles, may destroy these traditions. For instance, as I have said many times in this debate, while the Government should table the proposals to the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council, it deliberately did not do so but bypassed the Finance Committee. Looking back on the British-Hong Kong era, we can see that there was such a case only before 1985 and never had this happened after 1985. But now, the Government has outrageously resumed the practice adopted before 1985, bypassing the monitoring of the Legislative Council without allowing us to "wash the rice" in the Finance Committee and arbitrarily mixing the proposals into the Budget. It has mixed the bug-infested rice with other rice and forced us to pass all of the proposals. Should we not do some washing? We in the Labour Party have only sieved 26 grains of rice to wash, and even if they are added up altogether, Chairman, only 600 grains of rice have been granted permission by you.

Therefore, Chairman, the whole thing is most unfair to us, and so is it to Members who have proposed amendments. I think the worst point about "rice-infesting John" is that he said in his blog that as a result of what we have done, the Hospital Authority (HA) would not be able to pay for the staff wages and that it would have to draw on its reserves. Who said that the HA has to draw on its reserves? Actually we all know that when he wrote these things in his blog, Chairman, I believe everyone here knew that the debate would come to an end soon and that the whole issue would end in early June. In fact, insofar as the entire "rich washing" process is concerned, Chairman, you have indeed made it structurally clear that it is your wish to end this debate this week, and despite
knowing this clearly, why did John TSANG or "rice-infesting John" still lie to Hong Kong people, claiming that the universities would not make it and the HA would not make it? If they are really so concerned about the HA, and turning back to the Budget, we would think that if they really think that the HA is not going to make it, they should not have increased its provision by a mere 0.4% to force the HA to draw on its reserves.

So, "rice-infesting John" has gone so far as to vilify this Council, smearing our reputation by describing us in a way like we have been a drag on the entire Council. As Members all know, it is simply impossible that universities would be unable to pay for the staff wages and would hence need to draw on their reserves; nor is it possible that the HA would need to draw on its reserves. Besides, if this is really what he thinks, why is it that the provisional appropriation can meet the expenditures for such a short span of time? Actually it does not matter even if it can meet the expenditures only for a short period because we all know that the debate will end this week on the next at the most. Although I have no idea about what will happen in the future, everyone knows that it is impossible for the allocation of funding to be further withheld in June. Therefore, I think John TSANG should not tell this lie to Hong Kong people.

Regarding this debate on the relevant heads standing part of the Schedule, I particularly wish to say that we definitely strongly oppose the inclusion of the acquisition of water cannon vehicles by the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF). Of course, we will not be as crazy as KIM Jong-un in killing our political enemies with an anti-aircraft gun. Water cannon vehicles are not anti-aircraft guns, but insofar as water cannon vehicles are concerned, we have debated this issue many times in this Council. But Chairman, I think this is very much regrettable, and I must say this once again for the record. That is, the officials have never given any response in any of our debates. For many of the items that had never been discussed thoroughly in the Finance Committee, including the acquisition of water cannon vehicles, the officials have never given any response. We asked a lot of questions but the Government had never given any response in respect of the water cannon vehicles to explain why it is necessary to procure three water cannon vehicles; why each vehicle costs $9 million; what equipment on the vehicles will be harmful to human health; whether there is any chemical; and whether an assessment has been made to ascertain the circumstances under which these vehicles will be deployed. Chairman, as you can imagine, if these issues are raised for discussion in the Finance Committee, Members will certainly ask a
lot of questions, but the Government has completely bypassed us. Therefore, we clearly express our opposition to include head 122 in the Schedule, that is, the item concerning the acquisition of water cannon vehicles by the HKPF.

We also oppose the inclusion of another item in the Schedule and we have, of course, mentioned it here before and likewise, the Government has not given any response in respect of it. It is about why a spending of some $400 million is necessary for the Museum of History. Why do we say that "rice-infesting John" does not spend money appropriately? In respect of many infrastructure projects, he has actually spent money that should not be spent. Then there is the development of the third runway at a cost of $140 billion, and the Express Rail Link has incurred a cost overrun of over $20 billion, and worse still, money has already been spent even before the "arrangements for co-location of boundary control facilities" are properly dealt with, and then the Liantang boundary control point has also run into a cost overrun. Many projects are under their control, and we are only playing a "gate-keeping" role. They are the ones who spend the money, and they are spending it rashly and throwing the money down the drain rashly. But with regard to our questions, including the question why $400 million should be spent on the Museum of History, I have never heard any reply from the officials.

Chairman, the debate could have been very meaningful but the officials have been evading the entire debate, unwilling to answer questions. Of course, why can the officials do this? Chairman, as you also understand, the officials know clearly that there are the pro-establishment Members here — Mr CHAN Kin-por got so worked up just now, but he will never play a "gate-keeping" role for the public, for he will only help his own sector, and FC Members are always like this — They clearly know that the Appropriation Bill 2015 will be passed and so, they simply do not bother to pay attention to us. They turn a deaf ear to whatever we say, for they clearly know that they have enough votes to pass the Bill.

This Council has degenerated to such a sorry state because the Finance Committee Members have completely failed to guard the bottom line and perform a gate-keeping role for the people, knowing only to act as a rubber stamp. I think they most wish to become Deputies to the National People's Congress (NPC) or members of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (CPPCC) — perhaps with the exception of Mr James TIEN — for those deputies or members do not have to attend meetings all the time and they are so
prestigious, right? Every one of them wishes to hold these offices and they are most suitable for holding these offices. So, they may as well go back to the Mainland and become Deputies to the NPC or CPPCC members, so that people who truly wish to play a gate-keeping role and monitor the Government for Hong Kong people can take up office as Members of this Council and all the FC seats should be abolished.

Chairman, on the entire issue, we mainly wish to express one point. That is, when we state opposition to the inclusion of certain heads in the Schedule in this debate, our reason is that the Government has bypassed the Finance Committee, and as we consider that government spending is unnecessary in some areas but the Government has not explained why such spending is necessary, it is impossible for us to pass these proposals casually or blindly. Therefore, it is necessary for us to wash the rice, rather than doing nothing and not washing even one grain of the rice as suggested by Mr Paul TSE.

Chairman, this attitude adopted by the officials all along is, I think, very much regrettable. We hope that this Council should once again give play to the functions expected of it and monitor the Government on behalf of the people. Therefore, let us state very clearly here that when considering the inclusion of the relevant heads in the Schedule, we will examine the items one by one. For items that basically should not stand part of the Schedule, we will certainly oppose them. Particularly, concerning the applications in relation to the Museum of History and the acquisition of water cannon vehicles, we will definitely oppose their inclusion in the Schedule.

Furthermore, Chairman, in respect of some items, even though we have proposed amendments to them, we will not oppose their inclusion in the Schedule. We support these expenditures, just that we hope to propose debates on these items again because the Government had bypassed the Finance Committee. So, the position of the Labour Party is very clear. We will definitely guard for the people what should be guarded, and for items on which spending is justified, we will not oppose them. For example, although we have proposed a number of amendments to such items as the food bank or the Child Development Fund, we fully support these items and in proposing amendments to these items, our purpose is to raise these items for discussion, but we will ultimately support them and we support their inclusion in the Budget. However, we will definitely oppose some of the items.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr James TIEN, please speak.

(Mr CHAN Chi-chuen stood up)

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I request a headcount.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will the Clerk please ring the bell to summon Members back to the Chamber.

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

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr James TIEN, please speak.

MR JAMES TIEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, first of all, I thank Mr CHAN Chi-chuen for requesting the headcount to make more people present, but I note that it is lunchtime now, so Members just came in for a while — perhaps it is better going out for lunch. I would just like to respond briefly to the so-called "theory of fools" mentioned by Mr Albert CHAN earlier.

In fact, I find his "theory of fools" quite interesting: after all, has a "stupid" Member proposed a "stupid" amendment now? Or is it that many other "stupid" Members who do not bother to vote have left, leaving behind the Member who has proposed the "stupid" amendment to cast his vote? Or are those who press the button to vote against his amendment "fools"? Chairman, Mr Tony TSE, Mr LEE Cheuk-yun and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen have criticized various views earlier. I think one of the major reasons is that the relationship between the executive and the legislature has made the Budget debate nowadays different from those in the past. In the past, we would conduct a debate and vote on the Budget as a whole rather than discussing whether the remunerations for each department or each official should be increased or reduced.

(THE CHAIRMAN'S DEPUTY, MR ANDREW LEUNG, took the Chair)
There is not a government department whose income and expenditure can satisfy all the political parties and groupings or all the Members. When certain estimates aim at levying taxes on the business sector, we will raise objection. When Members from the labour sector consider that certain expenditure items do not dish out enough money, they will raise objection. Over these years, if 80% to 90% of us Members were satisfied with the overall funding proposals in the Budget, we would have to accept it because it is impossible for the Budget to cater for all political parties and groupings, Members and projects. Of course, regarding the hundreds of amendments proposed by Members, I sometimes find them reasonable. Why is a certain Bureau Director often absent from work and meetings here? Why should we still allocate so much money to a certain department when it has done such a poor job? However, should these be referred to the panels or the Establishment Subcommittee for discussion? Should we express our views there, instead of raising them here and prattling on when we are to vote on the Budget as a whole every year?

In my opinion, now the so-called "theory of fools" is directly related to the "theory of filibustering" which the Liberal Party is strongly against. Why do we refrain from speaking? Because we object to filibustering. We consider that some of the amendments proposed by Members are reasonable, but among the 618 amendments, many are unreasonable. To reduce a small amount of money, an amendment was proposed. To delete a few posts, an amendment was proposed. We did not respond to these "stupid" amendments because we do not wish to be dragged into the filibustering, not because we have become "stupid" Members who will simply press the "Against" button here. Looking at it the other way round, I found Mr Albert CHAN's point awesome. Only the Member who proposed the amendment voted for it here, while all the other 60-odd Members, including many Members in the pan-democratic camp, did not support him. He said the reason for doing this was to make all Members in the pro-establishment camp to come to the meeting. As such, did he treat all members of the public as "fools"? Hong Kong people could hear him say so. In fact, did a "stupid" Member propose the amendment? Did we press the "stupid button"? Or did he treat members of the public as "fools"?

Deputy Chairman, I notice that recently, debates in this Chamber are seldom broadcast on the television. Perhaps even the television station considers that we are talking about some "stupid" motions and debating "stupid" subjects, so it does not bother to pay attention to us. Similarly, the officials did
not make any responses. Members in the pan-democratic camp are right. The officials just sit here without making any response at all. Of course, their point of view may be the same as ours. They object to filibustering. It is not that there is nothing to which they can respond. They just do not bother to make any responses on this occasion. However, if they do not respond, members of the public will wonder whether the Government is in the wrong.

Hence, I think in the future, these comments — I thank the Deputy Chairman for reminding me earlier — we should talk about them in the eighth debate, not now. Nevertheless, I think the key point is, the relationship between the executive and the legislature has worsened to such a state that without any proper discussion in the panels, the application was moved to the Establishment Subcommittee or the Public Works Subcommittee. If it was rejected, they would submit it to the Finance Committee direct and handle the item after obtaining the funds. Then they would insert it into the whole Budget as a bundle. In that case, no wonder many Members — not necessarily the pan-democrats. There are individual Members as well — would propose all kinds of amendments. On the other hand, as we have noted, how come it happens that the whole debate — including the decision made after discussion by the Chairman, who has just left, and the pan-democrats — can be completed neatly at the end of May and put to vote today or tomorrow? This time the arrangement is certainly better than that of last year. I hope we will have this kind of arrangement again next year so that Members in the pan-democratic camp will be able to propose more "stupid" amendments, and we will be able to press the button and vote before the Government exhausts the funds at the end of May. Thank you, Deputy Chairman.

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, I believe you surely understand why we have such a big controversy over the Budget. As a matter of fact, in any legislature, there should be healthy interaction between a reasonable Government and Members. That is to say, if the Government has any proposal, whether it be on its administration or on the Budget, there will be opportunities of sincere discussions with Members. Then they will gradually resolve their disputes and find the best way to do the work properly. That should be the case. Mr Paul TSE might have observed this phenomenon during the visit in Germany too. However, is that the case in the Legislative Council today? As we can see, the Government has placed some very groundless items in the Budget, such
as the highly controversial Innovation and Technology Bureau. If it cannot obtain enough support for endorsement in the Finance Committee, never mind, the Government can insert it into the Budget by bundling it up with the reasonable livelihood items. Then it says anyone who hinders the Government from doing so is impeding people's livelihood and obstructing the Government's administration. Can any Government be so violent and unreasonable? Let me cite another example, Deputy Chairman. The proposal on the acquisition of water cannon vehicles which did not gain public approval was submitted to this Council anyway. The Government took the lead to play tricks. Since any funding application for $10 million must be vetted and approved by the Finance Committee, it can simply change the amount to $9.9 million and bundle this $9.9 million up with other items as general expenses. Members of the public have noted that the Government has acted in defiance of rules in a disorderly manner, disregarding consequences. It seeks to get its application passed no matter what, and it is only afterwards that it will reviewed what has happened in the Council. As such, how will the Council have the opportunity to relay most of the public opinions?

In the current Council, apart from the Finance Committee which has got more time to discuss the implementation of certain policies, actually on most other occasions, the Government does not bother to pay attention to us. After a brief introduction here, most of the policies will be implemented by the Government even if we have raised objection. If the Government conducts a consultation, no matter what we say, it will only regard it as window dressing, and in the end its proposal will certainly be passed by force. Some people say we cannot act in this way, since the filibuster on the Budget will waste tens of million dollars or plenty of canned food. However, let us examine what is happening in Hong Kong. This morning we were still discussing whether additional posts should be created to monitor the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link (XRL) project. This kind of "white elephant" project met with a big controversy at the beginning. The technical issues encountered in the project had not been solved, and there was still no solution to the problem of co-location of boundary control facilities, but the Government insisted and got it passed after securing enough votes. Is it the Members or the Government who was violent? Well, having stirred up a mess, it cannot beat a retreat now. It is not enough to obtain $60-odd billion or $70-odd billion. It will probably cost $90 billion. Actually $90 billion may not be enough either. In fact, this is a project that can never be completed. For this reason, we need to ask what
problem has arisen in the Legislative Council which leads to such an outrageous situation. This controversial project could be passed even though there was absolutely insufficient time for scrutiny. What has happened to the legislature? As far as the Government is concerned, the ideal legislature should be like a rubber stamp. It simply needs to stamp its approval on all the submissions received. The Government will regard any slight interruption as filibuster, considering that it stands in its way. What about the Financial Secretary? He did not speak on this occasion. Deputy Chairman, you probably know that when dozens of Members were present, he merely gave a brief explanation on the whole Budget. During that time, he just drank some water and said some senseless words, then a couple of hours ticked away. Later, well, the Hong Kong Journalists Association provided a platform for him to make some irresponsible comments, or he could hide at his blog to be a "dork", since he could hit and run after keying in his words. A whole platform was available for him to talk nonsense and perform that kind of "stand-up" comedy. There was official business to attend to, but he did not do it. As such, how will he be qualified to criticize us for hindering the allocation of funds in the Budget to the Hospital Authority (HA) and the universities? How does he treat our patients? The whole Budget has increased the healthcare expenditure for 2015-2016 by only 0.8%, which is less than 1%. Some patients have waited for one year, two years, three years, year after year. They have been waiting for surgeries, waiting for medical consultation and waiting for medicines. Patients are waiting for anti-cancer drugs on their deathbed, but the Government stalls them with all kinds of excuses, such as the Drug Formulary, and so on.

Our Government — the Secretary is present now — yesterday a news report exposed that the staff of a private residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) stripped the elderly residents naked on the balcony while they waited for showers. How would the Secretary not know about such things? The authorities allocate funds to private RCHEs, and the latter will spend the remaining money on the elderly only after making the maximum profit. The Secretary should find the time to listen to those news reports in which the family members of the elderly residents concerned recounted how the elderly were subject to inhumane treatment. For example, their faeces could be left unattended for more than 10 hours. No one knew what they had eaten, and no one knew how long they had not taken a bath either. Yet the Government turned a blind eye and a deaf ear to all this. Then, regarding all the government projects, regardless of the amount of money involved, if we interrupted it slightly,
we would be regarded as blocking the way and stirring up trouble. As a result, now the Government resorts to tricks. To prevent anyone from standing in the way in respect of the project funding of $141.5 billion, it took a devious route. K C CHAN, John TSANG and a whole bunch of fraudsters bypassed the Legislative Council, saying that the Airport Authority (AA) could stop paying dividends. How great it sounded, but those are not dividends because every penny of the whole AA is taxpayers' money. After the construction of the runway and the airport, the resulting profit should be returned as public expenditure, but the Government calls it dividend payment which it may stop collecting, and then it will raise loans and issue bonds. The issue of bonds is certainly not related to them. Frankly speaking, now the senior management of the AA receive salaries of several million dollars to $10 million. If the airport runs into any problem in the future, they will have left office and retired already, and the present Financial Secretary or Bureau Director may not be in office either. When the project cannot be completed, the situation will be similar to what they said during our current discussion on the XRL: "That promise was made to you by Eva CHENG. It has nothing to do with me." Where is Eva CHENG? Eva CHENG has already retired.

No one pays attention to these things which have been going on. We certainly hope that the Council can work properly and the Government is determined to do a good job, yet had that been the case, we would not have proposed the amendments here, and we would not have been unwilling to pay the Secretaries of Departments and Directors of Bureaux their salaries. If they have done a good job, we should raise their salaries, but did you see how they work? They make use of their wits to loaf. I do not know how long John TSANG has sat here. When we discussed the Budget, not even his shadow could be seen. I wonder if he heard what Members said. He did not show up until the last moment, and then he claimed that we were obstructing this and that. What a shameless official!

He is always good at accusing us of when we have impeded such and such an initiative in Hong Kong, say, universal retirement protection. However, when did we ever impede it? It has never been launched at all. After years of talking, the initial fund is only $50 billion. He said, no, it is unworkable and financially infeasible. However, is the cost for the XRL calculable? Is the cost for the third runway calculable? They are incalculable, but the Government is bent on going ahead with them. It has no idea how much money it will take to
settle the bill, but it can have the proposals presented. How the heck does this Government work? When we need it to do something, it can never work out the relevant accounts. When we are worried about something, it says our worries are unnecessary and there is no need to worry. Just believe it, since all the officials must be right.

Deputy Chairman, today we have discussed that team of Chief Engineers. Seven years have passed since 2008. What have they done? The reason for the cost overrun and delay is that the land is too hard. If the land is too hard, why did they not mention it back then instead of mentioning it now? How come? Is the Government sick? Doctors are most afraid of patients suffering from illnesses deny they are sick and refuse to take medicines. Similarly, the Government is sick but it does not admit it. On the contrary, it claims that we are sick — there are many such people in Castle Peak Hospital. Is the Government like that? How can it treat the elderly, the patients and the grassroots in such a cold-blooded manner?

Regarding those "white elephant" projects, however, it will implement them without blinking an eye. The discussion on the Liantang issue has not completed yet, and it is still seeking funding approval. On top of $10-odd billion, $8.7 billion is added — it is $8.7 billion, not $8.7, $87 or $87 million. It is $8.7 billion. For how many old people can this large sum of money provide so that they will not be stripped naked like those elderly residents in Cambridge Nursing Home yesterday? The officials do not care about these things. They need not bear any responsibility. When they attended the Legislative Council meeting, they merely said that it was because both the material costs and wages had risen, and the increase was 50% within 18 months. I wish the Government's allocation of funds to the HA, the Social Welfare Department and the universities could be increased by 50% within 18 months too. Yet the annual increase in the allocation to hospitals has increased by less than 1%. How could this be? How dare he then accused us of obstructing the work of the HA.

Our university and tertiary education — that is "short-piling education". What is meant by "short-piling education"? Deputy Chairman, that means some students have to take associate degree courses for the time being. After they have completed the courses, whether they can articulate with degree programmes will depend on their own efforts to look for undergraduate places. If they cannot find any, they will have to take the self-financed courses. That is to say, after bearing a loan of $100,000-odd for two years, it is still not enough, and they have
to borrow $100,000-odd again. In what way has the Government treated local secondary school graduates? How will it be qualified to comment that now we have nearly made the universities run out of money, forcing them to draw on their reserve funds? How will it be qualified to say so? It certainly is not qualified. When did it ever give young people a fair opportunity to receive tertiary education?

We proposed to implement more small class teaching, but the Government said, no way, it will continue with the "short-piling education". We proposed to provide more residential care places, but the Government responded that such places can be bought and a number of approaches are currently in place, such as the care service voucher. Is it supposed to work in this way? How can the Government not have any long-term plans? How can it be so calculating, telling members of the public to wait for luck? The Government said that some land is currently available for non-governmental organizations (NGOs). After the land is developed, it will continue to help them. Why did the Government simply let the NGOs do as much as they propose instead of working proactively itself? How can the Government work in this way?

Speaking of the licensing of RCHEs, the Director said they will try their best. Members of the public asked her if more inspections will be conducted. She replied that they had conducted inspections and issued a warning. However, after a warning has been issued, if it remains the same, it cannot be helped because the Government does not dare to intervene, fearing that it will be embarrassed after finding out the truth. We have talked ourselves blue in the face in the Finance Committee, hoping that the Government will give a little more concern to what is happening in society now, unlike the senior officials who hide themselves away all day, while someone attends grand balls, performs stand-up comedies and writes blogs in isolation at his official residence. I hope he will go out to the street to take a look at the people. See how miserable the underprivileged are. Observe how the elderly live in RCHEs. Go to the hospitals to see how members of the public queue up for services. Take a closer look at the social situations. Do not just hide in a corner and make irresponsible comments. This Government is really beyond cure.

With these remarks, I object to the sums for the aforesaid heads standing part of the Schedule. Thank you.
MS EMILY LAU (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, as mentioned by some Members earlier, the Budget is very important and can be highly controversial. For this reason, in some civilized parliaments, the executive and members of the legislature will hold discussions, communications and negotiations. As Mr James TIEN has said earlier, it does not necessarily need to satisfy all the people. As long as it is submitted to the Legislative Council for endorsement after 70% or 80% of us have reached a consensus, there will not be too many difficulties.

However, the executive — Deputy Chairman, you must know about it because you have a meeting with them every Monday — does not respect the Council at all. Deputy Chairman, you and your colleagues have allowed yourselves to answer their dictates, enabling them to act arbitrarily. If there is something which the Deputy Chairman says you will not support … I have heard some time ago a Member say that he would vote against it. I believe if that is the case, it will freak the Government out. However, the present problem is, we need to think how the Council should operate. Just now some Members mentioned Germany — right, Deputy Chairman, we will submit a report to the House Committee on Friday — in the German parliament, there are a number of political parties and groupings. They will spend a lot of time on co-ordination and communication and then reach a consensus. For this reason, in the end no one will win to the full, and no one will lose completely either. Why are the Special Administrative Region Government and Beijing unable to learn these things?

Deputy Chairman, a number of Members have raised their views, and though many of them are shared by us, most of them are not accepted. For this reason, Members have proposed amendments. Even though some Members are accused of filibustering, this is allowed by the Rules of Procedure, and that is why they do so. I concur with some Members' remark that our present debate does not receive much coverage in the news. Some people have even asked what we are discussing. Something which is novel at the beginning will lose its novelty when it reaches a certain stage. Nevertheless, what Members have done is allowed by the Rules of Procedure. The question is, how can Hong Kong focus on addressing these pressing problems now? Deputy Chairman, we are certainly unable to focus, since we have been busy handling this and dealing with that. No wonder Hong Kong has lost to Shenzhen now. Moreover, if things go on like that, we will continue to lose to other places.
Just now at the meeting of the Establishment Subcommittee under the Finance Committee, a Member said that Hong Kong is no longer a first-tier city now. We do not know to which tier it belongs. To which tier it belongs is not important, but Hong Kong people are. We hope the authorities will listen to the views in society. Whether it be the Budget, the policy address, other policies or funding applications, if the authorities have had prior discussions with Members and put forward its proposals only after obtaining the support and recognition of most of the Members, there would not have been so many disputes. That was the case this morning. So was it at the meeting of the Finance Committee on Friday concerning the matters of Liantang/Heung Yuen Wai Boundary Control Point. That is always the case. Do the authorities think that Members have too much free time that they insist on arguing with them? The problem is, there is something which we consider unacceptable. Moreover, it is not the view of the Legislative Council only. Many members of the public outside also have a lot of views, but the authorities are unwilling to discuss with Members. They are unwilling to seek a compromise and reach a consensus together. They just want to push it through by force.

Deputy Chairman, I have just read the agenda of the meeting of the Finance Committee on Friday, on which there is only one item for discussion, which is the Liantang/Heung Yuen Wai Boundary Control Point. However, it is said that there are many other issues which need to be addressed. Hence, just now I asked the Chairman of the Finance Committee to give me the relevant paper so that I could see if there are still 30 to 40 outstanding items. Yet none of them has been placed on the agenda now, but the Government has told people here and there that there are many issues to address. Have the authorities actually discussed with Members how to deal with these issues?

Deputy Chairman, if the relationship between the executive authorities and the legislature continues to go towards the freezing point — some people say that the situation is not the worst yet, as it will only keep worsening. After all, who will suffer? LEUNG Chun-ying told us to discuss with the Beijing officials what the situation will become if the constitutional reform package is vetoed. Why not look at the present situation? After it is vetoed, I believe, our relationship will only worsen. The executive authorities have never done anything to illustrate their intention to talk with the Legislative Council, discuss options on the important public policies in Hong Kong together and seek the support of the Council for the authorities' proposals. That is the case with the Budget. That is also the case with the other items in the Finance Committee,
leading to widespread discontent time and again. If it goes on like that, these scenarios will only keep recurring. No wonder a Member said he will not stand for election again, because not only members of the public cannot bear to see this, even Members find it infuriating and meaningless.

Deputy Chairman, for this reason, I hope your good self and your party, granting the opportunity to discuss with the authorities and Beijing, really need to find a way to deal with the present split in the Hong Kong legislature, since Hong Kong and Hong Kong people will be the big loser in the end, and LEUNG Chun-ying must take the blame for this.

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

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, there are very few Members present right now. Please do a headcount.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will the Clerk please ring the bell to summon Members back to the Chamber.

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

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

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): I thought I had to order Mr Jasper TSANG, the President, not to return to the Chamber today. Why did I say so? It is because it would be a waste of time should the meeting be aborted due to a lack of quorum. Mr WONG Kwok-hing is known for being a "big mouth". He said that the "gridlock" had caused 12 motion debates and 36 oral questions to fail to proceed. Deputy Chairman, I believe you are aware that all this is only perfunctory. It is like when Empress Dowager Cixi was enjoying her meal, the dishes placed two feet from her were for decoration purposes only. Is Mr WONG Kwok-hing sick …
DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, we are debating the sums for 62 heads to stand part of the Schedule. Would you please speak on the relevant question.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): I will explain now why it makes sense for the sums to stand part of the Schedule. Let me give a simple reason. Deputy Chairman, since you are so fond of holding meetings, you had better come back during the summer holiday to hold meetings on those oral questions and motion debates. Would you dare do so? I was prepared a long time ago not to take a break during the summer holiday. What else do Members have to say? Please take a look at the terrified expression of Dr LAM Tai-fai. This Council is hypocritical — no further action will be taken when things are over. The rest of Members are also hypocrites, except Dr LAM Tai-fai, who is an honest man. Does Dr LAM understand what I meant? Is he sick too?

Although other Members said they were fond of attending meetings, they would not do so after July …

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, I will order you to stop should you continue to stray away from the subject.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, thanks to the advice of President Jasper TSANG, I now speak in objection to subhead 007 under head 60 to stand part of the Schedule. If not for the advice of the Chairman, all of us would have been kept in the dark. Why must I object to the sums to stand part of the Schedule? The Financial Secretary has made provisions in secret in case the Airport Authority (AA) will not be able to pay dividends this year. Do Members understand what I mean? In other words, without the $5 million or so, we will have to make up for the shortfall.

Deputy Chairman, I am absolutely against doing so. First, all Members, including Mr WONG Kwok-hing, are still asleep. As they knew nothing about what had happened, they had unwittingly passed the motion. Though we are responsible for keeping an eye on the Government's piggy bank, we cannot move a motion to increase or reduce the government revenue. However, the Government is allowed to dump $5 billion or so into the sea. Deputy Chairman,
although all of us are Legislative Council Members, the so-called important matter mentioned by Mr WONG Kwok-hing is actually unimportant. As a result, the financial arrangement involving $151.4 billion was passed while Members were dozing off. In other words, the $5 billion-odd funding application has already been passed. Deputy Chairman, why did we forgo that sum of money? The Government has not only failed to give the rationale, data and justifications, but it has also refused to discuss with us. Am I right? Neither did John TSANG account for it when he performed a stand-up comedy, right? As a Legislative Council Member, I certainly have to raise objection to the Government's refusal to take that sum of money. Worst of all, this move will lead to serious sequelae, with the Government suffering a loss of more than $50 billion in 10 years' time. What is more, this Council is expected to approve the application by the AA to increase fees and charges because it must seek our approval, that is, the Government's approval.

Like a dead person, this Council has made no response at all. Just now, Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that some elderly people were stripped naked in a balcony and then driven to the bathroom as if they were livestock. If more than $5 billion can be used to improve the bought place system, it will definitely do much good to the whole society. Am I right? Why did this Council not have more debate on this matter? From the angle of opportunity costs, should an additional airport runway be built in Hong Kong at this moment without knowing whether or not it is really useful and a significant increase in the overall expenditure or a gridlock in the construction of infrastructure will be caused, thereby resulting in inflation or a shortage of manpower? When it comes to economic and financial issues, they will definitely have something to do with cost-effectiveness. This is one of the key points. At the annual Gala Dinner hosted by the Hong Kong Journalists Association, the Financial Secretary disguised as a singsong girl and performed a stand-up comedy. Could it be the case that he could not see these problems? Now, Hong Kong is so poor that it has nothing but money. On the one hand, we have refused to accept money but, on the other, we are reluctant to improve the livelihood of the people. This is why I oppose subhead 007 under head 60 because that would mean spending money not yet earned.

Many people say that the filibuster staged by "Long Hair" has led to a gridlock in this Council. It is yet another big lie. John TSANG really deserves to die 10 thousand deaths because his lies will have serious consequences. Deputy Chairman, you have discussed with the Chairman how the meeting should
proceed, and he has already planned to "cut off" or "tailor" any filibusters to enable the Budget to be passed easily in early June. John TSANG still wanted to blatantly lie that the Government might become penniless at any time in view of the gravity of the situation. Moreover, the Hospital Authority and tertiary institutions have been notified to make use of the provisions set aside. First of all, the reserves are supposed to be used for meeting contingency needs. Deputy Chairman, am I right? Let us assume that you have a $1 million bank deposit. If you were threatened by a thief at gunpoint to give him $900,000 or else he would kill you, I believe you would give him the money, right? The setting aside of fiscal reserves is supposed to be normal, why should the Financial Secretary be afraid to do so? Second, the Financial Secretary should know it very well that after the passage of the appropriation Bill in June, the sum of money will be transferred from the left hand to the right for later retrieval. Why should he keep lying and advise us not to filibuster? Did he really have to tell lies one after another? I do not consider it a big deal if he merely makes wrong comments occasionally. However, he has kept using a lie to cover another and performed poorly. What is more, he has taken the initiative to lie. He is indeed a man of lowly character. I have never met a Secretary of Department who could have distorted things to such an extent. One of the reasons for my objection to the head standing part of the Schedule is that I do not wish to pay him salary.

Deputy Chairman, regarding the criticism made by Mr WONG Kwok-hing that many people will go without money because of us, I would like to ask whether or not he is an idiot. We have once staged a filibuster to call on the Government to allocate $50 billion to the setting up of a fund. Despite the approval of this sum of money, it has never been put to use. So, should the Government be queried as the $50 billion sought during the filibuster staged by "Long Hair" is supposed to be used for the establishment of a healthcare fund and should have been released now? Honestly, given that the gate is already open, a responsible parliamentary assembly should take the money out and use it. However, this Council has simply turned a blind eye to this sum of money. This is the first point.

Secondly, I have only one goal for the time being, and that is, to set up a universal retirement protection scheme. However, such protection can still not benefit others, especially those elderly people in Tai Po who were treated like animals. Should they receive $3,200 a month under a universal retirement protection scheme, they will be able to spend at least $3,200 on a better
residential care place. In that case, they will not be treated like animals. Is Mr WONG Kwok-hing taking faeces for meals? He has denied that his colleagues are performing this task though he knows it very well that they are. Given that he takes faeces for meals, no wonder he has bad breath. Deputy Chairman, he has turned out to wrong others in this manner.

Deputy Chairman, is filibustering really futile? Let me share with Members my experience in voting for or against certain heads standing part of the Schedule. In 2008, Donald TSANG announced in the old Legislative Council Building the increase of the amount of "fruit grant" by half, from $750 to $1,050. Nevertheless, he said that a means tests had to be conducted if the amount of "fruit grant" was to be raised because the Government was very poor. Although Mr WONG Yuk-man was condemned by Mr TAM Yiu-chung (he is now sitting here) that day for committing an unforgivable act by hurling bananas — I had bought some eggs, bananas and tomatoes — the Government decided immediately to abolish the means tests. Hence, we must master the art of voting for or against certain heads standing part of the Schedule. I oppose the head standing part of the Schedule today because I have to press the Government to do something.

The second example I would like to cite is very simple. Deputy Chairman, you were involved, too. In 2011, John TSANG, who was a "lazybone", employed an old trick he used in 2007 by handing out "candies" to the Mandatory Provident Fund accounts of people earning less than $10,000 a month. In other words, he had continued to hand out "candies" though he drew criticisms in 2007. I was also warned by Mrs FAN that day not to return to the Chamber because I was holding a large cheque in protest. But four years down the line, he had continued to "hand out cash" four years ago. As a result, we were compelled to hurl "hell banknotes" at him. Even you, Deputy Chairman, considered it unforgivable — though Mr CHAN Kam-lam considered it acceptable — this practice was criticized by Mr TAM Yiu-chung for being unforgivable, too. However, when John TSANG realized that we were prepared to "turn hostile", he proposed that every person should be given $6,000 instead.

As such, Deputy Chairman, the employment of skills in this Chamber is required in voting for or against certain heads standing part of the Schedule. Are those people who criticize Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung for being "destructive without making any constructive points" mentally ill? Who raised objection at the beginning? Who took photographs with John TSANG to claim victory?
Deputy Chairman, you should have seen for yourself that the $50 billion Fund was not established initially. My head was spinning because I had repeatedly voted for or against certain heads to stand part of the Schedule on every occasion. Eventually, a $50 billion Fund was set up by the Government. When it comes to the Old Age Living Allowance, strenuous efforts had been made by Members to argue for it. It was eventually passed after a new round of dispute — I was unable to witness it — and Prof Nelson CHOW was immediately invited to conduct a research into universal retirement protection. Although this incident took place in 2013, it still remains vivid before my eyes. May I ask those Members who said that Hong Kong people can be benefited from their proposal of 36 oral questions and 12 motion debates whether or not they have taken the wrong medicine?

Deputy Chairman, I know that you are not supposed to speak, but may I ask you if these questions and debates can really bear fruit? Could you please illustrate them with examples? Will the Government say that it has decided to carry out reform when the motion debates are over? The situation with the oral question session is even more ridiculous. Under Secretary LAU Kong-wah should know it all too well, for his replies were simply irrelevant to the questions. One of the catchphrases of the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman is "the public officer has already replied. If other Members are not satisfied with the reply, please continue with the debate on other occasions". I think these replies were considered by the Chairman to be simply meaningless. I had once complained to Mrs FAN about Michael SUEN staging a filibuster and making frivolous, trivial or repetitive remarks, but I was eventually expelled from the Chamber. Which eye did Mr WONG Kwok-hing use to look at things? The one at the top or bottom?

Will Honourable Members please stop laughing. Deputy Chairman, I think that it is a right decision to vote against subhead 007 under head 60 standing part of the Schedule.

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

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, I think a quorum is lacking in the Chamber.
DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will the Clerk please ring the bell to summon Members back to the Chamber.

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

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

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, I am sorry as I did not quite catch what you said just now. Deputy Chairman, of course, I am sure that most Members will resolutely defend and support the sums of the relevant heads standing part of the Schedule. But I would like to further explain the importance of successfully voting down the incorporation of the sums of the relevant heads into the Schedule.

In their earlier speeches some Members criticized me — Deputy Chairman, they named me when they made their criticisms, or else I would not have wished to continue in this entangle over this issue — They accused us of proposing the amendments purely to stir up troubles. Deputy Chairman, if you can still recall, when China was under the rule of the Kuomintang (KMT), the Communist Party of China (CPC) had organized many strikes, revolts and political campaigns in the light of the livelihood problems resulting from the governance of the KMT, and every time they put up a fight or struggle, they pointed out the mistakes made by the Government in its policy which had caused sufferings to the people. Deputy Chairman, in proposing the amendments, our intention is actually similar to that of the CPC in putting up struggles. We are waging a war of words instead of one of violence, and we are non-violent. We seek to point out through the amendments the mistakes made by certain Policy Bureaux or certain departments or in certain incidents, and when I spoke on the various amendments, I pointed out a series of these mistakes. Let me say this once again in brief. On the question that the sums of the relevant heads stand part of the Schedule, if we can successfully vote down the incorporation of head 122 concerning the funding for the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) into the Schedule, although that would cause a huge uproar, I believe many members of the public would feel happy at the bottom of their hearts.
In brief, the incident of the unreasonable arrest of a mentally handicapped man by the HKPF, which has been reported in many newspapers, has fully shown that the police officers, in their enforcement of law, have completely neglected basic human rights and have completely neglected the fact that each person may have different abilities and may be at different levels. The Police, being law enforcers, should have basic respect for the people in exercising their public powers to handle issues. This incident has shown that the behaviour of some front-line police officers is entirely indicative of authoritarianism and hegemonism, and as I have said many times when I made criticisms, the Police in Hong Kong nowadays are even worse than the public security officers in the Mainland and they can only be compared to the urban management officers in the Mainland.

The handling of persons with mental disabilities by the Police as well as the attitude and approach that they adopted in this incident have fully shown that the front-line police officers are like urban management officers in their work. Are you, being Members of the Legislative Council and Hong Kong people, willing to approve the allocation of funding, so that through the funding arrangements under head 122, the HKPF will be allowed to continuously carry out work of the standard of urban management officers with our hard-earned money? We are certainly unwilling to do so. This is why we, being Members of this Council, proposed the amendments with the aim of reflecting the nature of certain problems. Of course, some people in high positions and with great powers are accustomed to flatteries and praises lavished on them by other people, and when they face criticisms or when they face negative comments, they would find these unpleasant to the ears.

I remember that many years ago in early 2000 when Donald Tsang was the Chief Secretary for Administration, I conveyed to him the miserable situation of the residents in Tin Shui Wai, and he said to me, "Hulk', do not always make these exaggerated and scaremongering remarks." Three months later, a mother and her two children jumped to their deaths. More often than not, the problem is that these bigwigs of you are always drinking Lafite, a bottle of each costing at least over $10,000 or $20,000, or even as much as $50,000 or $60,000 for the more expensive ones. You people like to ride on private jets or luxurious yachts for entertainment, and you have become completely detached from the grass-roots people. So are the officials in the Security Bureau, for the reports that they have received in their circle are all positive ones; and so are the officials of the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the Hong Kong
Special Administrative Region (LOCPG) who always dine with the rich and powerful, savouring delicacies and drinking Maotai and fine wine and enjoying all sorts of luxurious pleasures. They are detached from the general public and they read only *Wen Wei Po* and *Ta Kung Pao*. Now that almost all media corporations and newspapers are in the pro-government camp, knowing only to flatter and fawn on people, right?

The report carried in *Ming Pao Daily News* yesterday was an investigative report rarely seen recently. It has revealed the deep-rooted conflicts in society, which is a problem repeatedly pointed out by Premier WEN Jiabao. But honestly speaking, has the LOCPG addressed this problem? From the era of TUNG Chee-hwa to Donald TSANG and then LEUNG Chun-ying, have they addressed this problem of deep-rooted conflicts at all? Have these people of you in the pro-government camp and these bigwigs of you addressed this problem? You people are most adept at making false reports, concocting false reports to cover up everything and then smearing the reputation of other people and shirking your responsibility by describing the Occupy Central action as being covertly funded by the United States.

When I met with Congressmen of the United States on a previous occasion, I asked them to tell LEUNG Chun-ying — In this connection, Deputy Chairman, Members must definitely vote against this Head 21 — Chief Executive's Office — After meeting with the United States Congressmen back then, I said to them, "When you meet with LEUNG Chun-ying this afternoon, you must ask him to produce evidence of how the United States Government had provided funding for the Occupy Central action and if he cannot provide any evidence, you should tell him to shut up." A Congressman said that he would not say this to him and then another Member of Congressman, who was more awesome, said that he would not say this in his personal capacity but he would tell the Chief Executive that this was what "Hulk" had said. Then we all laughed a bit as it was very humourous. So, Deputy Chairman, later I learnt from some reports that those Congressmen did put this question to LEUNG Chun-ying, whereas LEUNG Chun-ying only smiled like an idiot, just as he knew only to smile like an idiot when he saw the President of the Philippines, Benigno AQUINO III. When he saw rich and powerful people and when he saw people in power, his reaction would only bring disgrace to Hong Kong. Therefore, the expenditure in relation to the Chief Executive's Office under head 21 must be negatived.
So, there are reasons to vote against these heads standing part of the Schedule. It is all up to your own judgment as to whether you agree to the reasons stated by us and whether you think they are sufficient. But if you draw a general conclusion to say that the amendments proposed by us are all meant to stir up troubles, you would be tantamount to the KMT when facing the challenges from the CPC back in those years and completely ignoring the problems revealed by the CPC through their criticisms of the KMT, just as you have completely ignored the problem of deep-rooted conflicts pointed out by Premier WEN Jiabao.

Deputy Chairman, in proposing many amendments and opposing the incorporation of the heads into the Schedule, our purpose is, in some measure, to reflect the need to address this problem of deep-rooted conflicts squarely. Given that the Budget involves a lot of issues relating to public spending and the decisions on public spending reflect the Government's values and preferences, whether public expenditures are well spent and whether they can alleviate and address the conflicts in society are most significant. Therefore, regarding all the motions proposed by the Government, if you will unreservedly take the attitude of a fool pressing the button indiscriminately, which means that you will say "Yes" like a fool to whatever the Government supports, you would be completely ignoring the objective developments and situation. A quorum is again lacking in the Chamber. Deputy Chairman, please do a headcount.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will the Clerk please ring the bell to summon Members back to the Chamber.

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

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN, please continue with your speech.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, everyone is very punctual. A quorum is formed every time when it comes to the thirteenth minute. Every time it is like that.
Deputy Chairman, I have already presented my reasons for opposing the 62 heads standing part of the Schedule. If I keep on being entangled in presenting my opposition, it might probably be like preaching to deaf ears only. In my view, more time should be allowed for all to study as well as hear from the public. Deputy Chairman, invoking Rule 40(1) of the Rules of Procedure, I move that the debate on the proposed resolution under section 54A of the Interpretation and General Clauses Ordinance be adjourned.

**DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): Since Mr Albert CHAN has moved a motion of adjournment, I have to deal with it first.

I now propose the question to you and that is: That further proceedings of the Committee of the Whole Council be now adjourned. In accordance with Rule 40(5) of the Rules of Procedure, this shall be an adjournment motion without amendment. Does any public officer wish to speak?

(No public officer indicated a wish to speak)

**DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): Does any Member wish to speak?

**MR ALBERT CHAN** (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, I have proposed an adjournment motion, and there will certainly be someone to say we are "filibustering", right? However, "filibustering" does not mean much because we can speak once and again on the motion that the heads stand part of the Schedule. So long as we speak with no repetition but justifications, we can speak for many times.

Deputy Chairman, I have proposed this adjournment motion under circumstances comparable to that in the Establishment Subcommittee this morning. When the Government said that it had to create several posts for the third runway project, I then proposed an adjournment motion for the reason that the Government had said this morning that in relation to the third runway the Airport Authority would provide more relevant financial viability studies later to facilitate our understanding of the actual financial condition of the third runway. In fact, the annual Budget would be approved safely without much ado as a routine under the pro-Government Members' escort year after year, which caused the Government to have lost its awareness of risks. I think the problems arising
from the absence of any sense of awareness of risks among government officials (particularly those at the senior levels) have been exposed in many incidents and tragedies over the past years; no matter it was the Lamma marine disaster or railway incidents … Deputy Chairman, we do not have a quorum here. Please do a headcount.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will the Clerk please ring the bell to summon Members back to the Chamber.

(While the summoning bell was ringing)

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN, as we are now in Committee, you should have invoked Rule 40(4) of the Rules of Procedure to propose your motion on adjournment of further proceedings of the Committee.

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

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN, please speak.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, you are so brilliant. Just now I made a wrong decision because I initially did not intend to propose an adjournment motion at this stage. The Deputy Chairman was right. Thank you, Deputy Chairman. I now move that further proceedings of the committee of the Whole Council be now adjourned under Rule 40(4) of the Rules of Procedure.

Deputy Chairman, just now, it was mentioned that it was an art of compromise in politics to move an adjournment motion such that Members can be given more time and room to deal with differences over the Budget. Although all civilized parliamentary assemblies can learn step by step through the art of politics, they must attain a certain degree of civilization in order to do so. To the CPC, politics as an art is no different from "model operas". Members who have seen such "model operas" as "The Tale of the Red Lantern" and "Taking Tiger Mountain by Strategy" should have found that all the performers were wearing a stern face. Moreover, their facial expressions were very stiff.
Like "model operas", the CPC deals with politics without any sense of art. Its sense of art, if there is any to speak of, can only be described as the art of "model operas".

Insofar as the art of truly civilized parliamentary politics is concerned, the procedure and compromise are an art, and so is the delivery of speeches. Some people are eloquent but appear to be insincere. However, people who master the art very well can turn something fake into genuine. LEUNG Chun-ying is not very good at it, probably because he is not well versed in the Thick Black Theory. As a result, people can instantly tell that he is insincere.

In fact, it is usual for parliamentary assemblies to adjourn the transaction of an agenda item to give more time for discussion. Over the past years, we have time and again pointed out that certain issues are highly controversial and asked if we can pause and think and examine other non-controversial issues first. I believe Members should still remember that many similar proposals were put forward by us during the examination of the North East New Territories (NENT) development project. However, the Government got tough and obstinately insisted that no change could be made. Eventually, the project was forcibly passed in the meeting chaired violently by NG Leung-sing, thus resulting in the arrest of a number of people.

The subsequent Umbrella Revolution was actually linked to the NENT development project because members of the public believed that there was no alternative after witnessing the violent attitude of the pro-Government camp in examining the development project through the television, media coverage and the Internet, as well as the Government's indifference to public opinion and grievances. Moreover, there is still this problem with Choi Yuen Tsuen where power supply is actually still lacking. Its villagers agreed to leave after being coaxed by the Government into "pocketing it first" — the Government told Choi Yuen Tsuen villagers at that time that it would provide them with land, suitable sites and adequate funds to undertake construction works and assistance would be provided by all means — it was because the villagers chose to "pocket it first" that the completed buildings are still not supplied with electricity. What a miserable situation.

(THE CHAIRMAN resumed the Chair)
We can see that the Government adopts a most ossified attitude in handling many issues related to policies and financial arrangements, which eventually leads to intensifying conflicts. Although the Government is the winner on every occasion, the price paid becomes increasingly high and grievous. Should the Government fail to improve its art of politics again, similar problems will definitely arise again.

Chairman, you should remember very well that we requested the Government to pause and think during the scrutiny of a number of motions, but our request was turned down by the Government. Moreover, each adjournment motion proposed by us, whether in the Finance Committee or in other committees, ended in failure. The only exception is the adjournment motion on the establishment issues related to the third runway, which was fortunately passed this morning.

The Government has once taken the initiative to abandon some items which have already been passed but made changes when submitting funding applications. Despite the inclusion of funding for fishermen on the agenda, the item can be removed in a violent manner, too. However, when we requested the Government to give Members more time to discuss certain agenda items in the light of growing public grievances and outrage, it flatly refused to accede to our request. This is precisely the political attitude of a "model opera".

Insofar as the CPC or Hong Kong communists ruling Hong Kong is concerned, politics emphasizes prestige and authority. The words of "Grandpa" cannot be challenged because he is the symbol of a royal family, feudal society, feudal family, and feudal dynasty. Since the CPC is the sole dominating party, the 31 August Decision made by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress can absolutely not be changed. Hong Kong people must accept it. Nonetheless, even China internally no longer accepts this attitude in dealing with things. I have explained that different mechanisms are required to tackle problems. Before making a decision, the CPC will deal with internal conflicts through the relevant mechanism before submitting the matter to the Politburo Standing Committee for discussion before a decision can be made. Enjoying "a high degree of autonomy", Hong Kong as a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China has no internal mechanism for dealing with internal conflicts. Although the Budget appears to follow an established procedure
whereby the Financial Secretary will first listen to the views of political parties and collect opinions through a consultative mechanism, "Grandpa" will still set the definitive tone in the end, thereby making yet another wrong decision.

When we staged filibusters for the first time years ago, we told the Financial Secretary that the People Power would not accept proposals for tax or rates rebate because they were financial arrangements tilted to the rich and powerful, as well as tycoons, thereby making the rich even richer. We would rather the Government adopt the method of even distribution, regardless of whether the sum at stake is $10 billion, $20 billion or $30 billion, to distribute an equal sum of money to each and every member of the public. In other words, should the Government have $70 billion or $35 billion, each member of the public will receive $10,000 or $5,000 respectively. Even if the amount of money is smaller, each person can still receive $2,000. This is the only reasonable arrangement which can prevent the continued existence of unfair distribution of resources, whereby certain major real estate developers may collect $200 million in three years but households with "five noughts" have not got even a cent for three years in a row. We have warned the Financial Secretary again and again that should he continue to adopt the method of tax or rates rebate, the People Power will definitely fight until the end. We did tell him about our determination.

Nevertheless, given his high position and the offer of adequate protection by the pro-Government camp in this Chamber, the Financial Secretary will not take small political parties like us seriously. The small nuisance caused by us is utterly unimportant to him. As a result, he can do whatever he wants and continue to transfer money to major consortia, real estate developers and the rich and powerful through tax or rates rebate arrangements. With the rich and powerful getting more, more people will be able to enjoy red wine with him. Just as when Donald TSANG was the Chief Executive of Hong Kong, as many rich and powerful people were very satisfied with his performance, he was embroiled in the incident involving "sea-land-air corruption". When feeling satisfied, the rich and powerful will invite retired high-ranking officials to be non-executive directors, right? Eva CHENG is now a non-executive director of a bank. While in office, these officials would exhaust all means to transfer benefits to people and consortia with clout, power and resources so that upon retirement — perhaps their relatives and confidants could receive special treatment due to their intricate relations and then they would be invited to serve
the consortia as pugs. I have often seen some Commissioners of Police, who were addressed as "Number One Man" while in office, serve consortia as guard dogs upon retirement. I feel very sorry for them. I have also seen some former Secretaries of Departments and Bureau Directors work for consortia upon retirement. Members should be aware that some employers who are consortia will bawl at their employees. These former government officials can only serve as dogs in the residences of these tycoons. What is more, they have to toil for a couple of years before they can resign. How miserable they are!

Hence, everything is now being controlled by the rich and powerful in Hong Kong. This Budget has also reflected the Government's transfer of benefits to the rich and powerful, thereby resulting in intensifying deep-rooted conflicts in society and the emergence of a number of hardly predictable possibilities in social ecology. Not only have struggles continued to escalate recently, conflicts between the Mainland and Hong Kong have also continued to intensify. Besides the occurrence of quite many policy blunders, we have also seen an imbalance in the Budget as a whole. When the Budget fails to address the conflicts between community groups and the problems arising from difficulties faced by the grassroots by way of financial distribution, social struggles and movements will erupt, right? From the perspectives of history, sociology and political science, the intensification of quite a number of social conflicts or struggles is linked to unemployment, redevelopment or demolition of housing. The repeated eruptions of radical actions, rooftop houses and demolition problems, and industrial actions are all linked to people's livelihood problems, right? When a series of livelihood problems erupt, all the problems will worsen.

Today, I pointed out in a now TV programme that the actions taken by participants of this struggle campaign might range from the hoisting of yellow umbrellas to strikes or class boycotts. In that case, the CPC will say that the objective of Hong Kong people in initiating these actions is to challenge the governing authority of the Central Authorities. However, the Central Government, the British Hong Kong Administration and the Budget have time and again turned a blind eye to the existing problems in society. May I ask the Financial Secretary how he will account for the Government's failure to make overall improvements to the conflicts, dissatisfaction among social groups, and the livelihood of some of the people in Hong Kong? Does he not owe us an explanation? He has merely kept repeating such initiatives as "double payment" of CSSA and rent waivers for public rental housing flats, and that the needy may
address and ameliorate their problem through the Community Care Fund. Nevertheless, we can see that the proposals put forward by the Financial Secretary this time around have failed completely to resolve many existing problems, including the difficulties encountered by "sub-divided unit" tenants and the grassroots and the problems faced by many students and parents. As regards the problem of elderly homes, which we raised years ago, despite the earnest efforts made by Matthew CHEUNG, 5 000 to 6 000 elderly persons passed away every year while waiting for residential care places. But still, the Government has not made any response.

Therefore, I hope Members can support this adjournment motion to give us more political room to address these deep-rooted conflicts.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN has moved that further proceedings of the Committee be now adjourned according to Rule 40(4) of the Rules of Procedure.

I now propose the question to you and that is: That further proceedings of the Committee be now adjourned. According to Rule 40(5) of the Rules of Procedure, Members are not allowed to move an amendment to this motion. Does any public officer wish to speak on this motion?

(No public officer indicated a wish to speak)

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

MR GARY FAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I speak in support of the motion for adjournment proposed by Mr Albert CHAN.

The Neo Democrats has proposed 11 amendments to the Budget of this year, and I have already spoken on each of them earlier to explain clearly the rationales. However, John TSANG, the Financial Secretary, dared to draw a concealed analogy in his official blog of the Financial Secretary recently by using the theme song entitled "難為正邪定分界" (It is difficult to demarcate right and wrong) of a television drama series to suggest the advocacy of the Appropriation Bill 2015 (the Bill) by government officials in the Legislative Council as "努
Chairman, the SAR Government imposes its executive hegemony to force the Legislative Council into a position where it cannot consider certain funding proposals. Not only has it placed into the Budget the funding proposal for the Hong Kong Police Force to procure water cannon vehicles, it also suddenly withdrew four items from the Finance Committee early this year and subsequently placed them into the Budget to compel the Finance Committee to consider and grant approval for the establishment of the Innovation and Technology Bureau (ITB). With a practice as such, the Government was the real perpetrator of the evil of "being as destructive as one likes" to the relationship between the executive and the legislature.

Actually, during the scrutiny by the Finance Committee of the funding proposal for the North East New Territories Development in the last Session and the funding proposals for the "three landfills and one incinerator" and the ITB this year, the pan-democratic camp has written to the Government repeatedly for reshuffling of the agenda items to give way to those funding items with no controversy. But did the Government heed such views? No. The Government disregarded the views from Members of the Legislative Council and has been forcing its way through to repeatedly coerce the Finance Committee into prioritizing the scrutiny of controversial items. It is the backstage manipulator indeed who placed the legislature in a state of "all to suffer". Pulling all stops, the Government even reshuffled the agenda items selectively to have four funding items withdrawn and subsequently incorporated into the Budget. The Government is the real original evil-doer to be "as destructive as it likes (in singing)" to the relationship between the executive and the legislature.

Chairman, regarding the scrutiny procedure for the Budget, you have already refused by virtue of your supreme power the proposal of a total of some 3 200 amendments from Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung for reasons of frivolity. To look at it the other way round, all the current 618 amendments as approved by the Chairman are not frivolous. Quoting the words of yours, Chairman, these 618 amendments may "facilitate a meaningful debate". Had the Financial Secretary
listened attentively during the Committee stage in the meetings of the Legislative Council over the past few weeks to the speeches made by those Members who have proposed amendments, he could definitely have made in his blog some responses which were more specific and meaningful. However, the Secretary talked in the way of calling a stag a horse, which is not only disappointing, but also proof that the executive hegemony of the SAR Government has become strong enough to have any Bill passed in the Legislative Council without listening to the dissenting views.

Chairman, while it is a function of the Legislative Council discharged in accordance with the provisions in the Basic Law to scrutinize the Appropriation Bill, there is no such stipulation in the Basic Law that the Legislative Council must pass the Budget within a specific time frame. If the SAR Government is really "governing according to law" as the officials claimed, then it should be instead obliged to let the Legislative Council determine the scrutiny procedure by itself, but not waging a public opinion war against those Members who proposed amendments in each of the past few years to interfere in the operation of the legislature. Chairman, from a further detached perspective, you not only exercised your supreme power at the Committee stage of the current Budget to tie many different amendments together for joint debates, but also limited the time for each session of joint debate. It can be said that all debates have proceeded according to your script. The SAR Government should be mentally prepared that the scrutiny of the Budget will last until the end of May. The Financial Secretary claimed it "be as destructive as one likes (in singing)"; but it is simply because the SAR Government has not proposed a Vote on Account Resolution and other corresponding measures in response to the fact that the Legislative Council needs time to scrutinize the Budget. He should not put all the blame on the Members who proposed amendments.

Chairman, there were altogether 618 amendments proposed to the Budget of this year, including the 11 amendments proposed by me; yet they were all negatived by the pro-establishment and pro-Government Members when it came to the voting procedure. But this does not mean that the amendments were frivolous and unnecessary. Conversely, this is a naked manifestation of the fact that the Legislative Council has become a rubber stamp and voting machine under the manipulation of Members from the pro-establishment, pro-Government and functional constituency Members. Over the decade, the total public expenditure on infrastructure made by the SAR Government in budgets has seen an average
annual growth of as much as 7.4%. The crude scrutiny by the Legislative Council has caused tens of billion dollars in cost overruns in infrastructural projects. The money was earned by Hongkongers with blood and sweat.

It was exactly the indiscriminate support by the pro-establishment camp and the pro-Government Members which made the Legislative Council fail to function as the gatekeeper, the funding proposal for the construction of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link (Hong Kong section) that the Government introduced to the Council for scrutiny in 2010 has eventually become a huge scandal. Without regulation, the expenditure of the project faces the ill fate of a cost overrun at almost or more than $30 billion. In the Budget this year, there is also the expenditure concerning the third runway at the Hong Kong International Airport (the third runway), that is, the forgoing of cash dividends of more than $4.6 billion collectible from the Airport Authority. However, the construction project of the third runway is still greatly controversial in society. The Government not only used reduction in revenue in lieu of increment in expenditure as a trick to bypass scrutiny by the legislature, but also placed this item into the Budget to make Members of the Legislative Council approve it inclusively, which is in effect giving endorsement for the commencement of the project. The Neo Democrats do not agree to such a practice of the Government.

Chairman, we know so well that, with the pro-establishment camp and the pro-Government Members supporting the Government, the adjournment motion will not be passed. But why do I still agree to the motion by Mr Albert HO? Because by doing so, I want to condemn the SAR Government for its executive hegemony and belittling of the power of the Legislative Council exposed in dealing with the current Budget as well as the funding applications in the past. Chairman, I dedicate herewith another part of the lyrics to the SAR Government from the song entitled "難為正邪定分界" (It is difficult to differentiate between the good and the evil) as quoted by the Financial Secretary, which goes "對抗命運，但我永不怕捱 … 努力未願平賣，人性我沒法賤賣" (In fighting against fate, I never dread to endure hardship … My efforts, I do not wish to vend them cheaply; my humanity, I cannot vend it at a leek's price).

Chairman, I so submit.

(Mr CHAN Chi-chuen stood up)
MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I request a headcount.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will the Clerk please ring the bell to summon Members back to the Chamber.

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

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, please speak.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I thank Mr Albert CHAN for proposing at this juncture a Motion for the Adjournment of the Council at the Committee stage according to Rule 40(4) of the Rules of Procedure. In rising to speak, of course, I want to voice support for it.

This motion would not create any actual resistance to the passage of the Budget, unless many Members speak and each of them speak for 15 minutes. If 20 Members speak, it will take five hours. Adding to this the time spent on headcounts, it may take 10 hours. However, this will have limited effect on the passage of the Budget, that is, this has limited effect on preventing the passage of the Budget or what you people call "delaying the passage of the Budget". In that case, what purpose does this motion serve? I thank Mr Albert CHAN for moving this motion for adjournment of proceedings of the Committee, so that I can have 15 minutes to spell out in an orderly and clear manner the reasons for my dissatisfaction with and refusal to support the Budget, as well as what my discontents with the approach adopted by the Government in formulating and bringing about the passage of the Budget are. In the debate on the motion for adjournment of proceedings of the Committee, I can also give a clear account of the areas in which I disagree with the President in relation to the arrangements for the Budget debate.

I have pointed out a number of times in the past the abuse of power by the President in dealing with the debates on the Budget. I could not challenge your rulings vigorously because if I did so, you would rule that I could not speak or had to leave the Chamber, so even on the most highly charged occasions, I could only refute you a little bit. On this occasion, you probably would not interfere
with me, so allow me to refute you in greater detail. That means if someone has
doubts about the enforcement of rules by the referee or thinks that he has a
serious problem, in fact, a match should not continue. It is a shame that I have
no alternative and cannot leave in protest because leaving in protest will mean
that this match will end even sooner and the winning side, that is, the Government
or the pro-Government camp, will be even happier, so we have to do our level
best and even exert our last bit of strength to play this match with you to the last
minute. Therefore, I hope Members who oppose the Budget will support this
motion for adjournment of proceedings of the Committee moved by Mr Albert
CHAN.

Nowadays, Members of the opposition or members of the public who
support the opposition all fully understand that if we only cast "Against" votes at
the final moment, this is tantamount to lending our support because we
understand that the "Against" votes do not have any impact, nor would they exert
any pressure on the Government. Not to mention this time around, in the future,
they would not make the least bit of improvement in the formulation,
arrangement, promotion and discussion of the Budget. Even if a couple of
amendments are proposed or speeches are given a couple of times, this is only to
feign opposition. In spite of this, I still have to thank Honourable colleagues
who have played a part in proposing the amendments. In terms of the number of
people, the number is the largest in the past several years and in terms of the
number of times of speech delivered by various Members, it is also the largest in
the past several years. I also hope that they will exert their utmost and express
their dissatisfaction with the Budget whenever the opportunity arises and we are
also striving towards this goal now.

Chairman, you taught Members not to exercise their power to the fullest
and I remember this remark of yours very well. However, I think that you,
Chairman, have not only exercised all your power but also exercised it
excessively and there are even contradictions in your rulings. This year,
originally, we have 3 000 …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN, I have to remind you that when
speaking in the Chamber, you should not comment on the President's rulings.
This is not allowed. Please focus on the motion in question.
MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I am not debating your ruling with you, rather, I wish to raise one point in passing, that is, I am not satisfied with your debate arrangements, so I support …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN, you should not comment on the rulings made by me when you speak.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): That means one cannot even talk about it, so you see how great your power is. I only wish to organize and give an account of the reasons for my supporting this Motion for the Adjournment of the Council, hoping to explain them somewhat but even this is not allowed. Therefore, Chairman, last year, you said you suspected that you had the Stockholm syndrome, saying that sometimes, you also had some admiration for us but this year, you have not said anything like that. I also have the Stockholm syndrome, that is, when I address you, sometimes, I feel that you are not entirely wicked and that among people in the pro-Government camp, you still have some human qualities. However, sometimes, I feel that you are the devil who made devil's rulings that prevented us from speaking. Well, since criticizing the President is not allowed, I will criticize the Government.

Scrutinizing the Budget is Members' duty as we have to monitor the Government. Article 73(2) of the Basic Law stipulates, "To examine and approve budgets introduced by the government;". What does "examine" mean? Members, in moving amendments to the Budget at the Committee stage and explaining the reasons for moving the amendments, are exercising the power of examining the Budget conferred on us by the Basic Law. To examine does not mean voting on it at the final stage, then sign in favour of or against it, rather, there is a process. After the Government has put forward a proposal, we would express our views. Then, the Government will recommend and explain the Budget and we will also ask questions and oral questions. Having come to today or this session, we are constructing the procedure of examining the Budget. Is our Budget just like the 31 August framework, that is, it cannot be shaken in any way? This definitely is not so. Many past examples showed that so long as there is a sufficiently large number of Members or they are sufficiently determined, the Government's administration or fiscal arrangements could more or less be swayed.
Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said a number of times that he had used the struggles waged over the Budget in the legislature to force the Government to respond to the issue of universal retirement protection. Although the Government did not agree in any way, he believes that LEUNG Chun-ying, in saying publicly that he is prepared to allocate $50 billion as a gesture of sincerity, intended to respond to the demands of the community for universal retirement protection, as well as the struggles waged by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung in the legislature for universal retirement protection. Although the campaign could not be considered successful, it forced the Government to take some measures.

As regards instances in which the Budget was truly shaken, of course, we have to cite some classic examples. On one occasion, some 40 pro-Government camp Members went together to the Financial Secretary to criticize him for injecting money into Mandatory Provident Fund accounts, so he was subjected to criticisms from all quarters. In the end, each resident was given $6,000. This proves that the Budget can be shaken but this has nothing to do with whether or not the views put forward by Members pack any punch or are capable of shaking the Budget. We have a lot of views and have even voiced our views on the waiver of rates at the meetings of bills committees. I oppose the rates waiver and even assuming that we agree to this measure, the way in which it is returned is quite a hassle as a cap is imposed and it has to be deducted over two quarters, so people in the lower-middle class who own properties cannot benefit from this waiver fully. He would not heed such views. Why? The reason lies not in whether or not the views put forward are convincing but in our inability to exert any pressure on him.

Is the process of examining the Budget real examination or fake examination? I believe members of the public who have paid attention to our process of debate should have noticed that the kind of comments made by Mr Paul TSE this morning was fake examination. He talked about what is called appropriate discussion, that is, regardless of the quality, so long as one draws a bowl of rice to examine it, this can already be considered examination.

In fact, insofar as monitoring the Government and the use of public funds are concerned, the direct outcome achieved by examining the Budget is that we can influence him and make him change. The indirect outcome is that this will make him extra cautious next time. The Financial Secretary has to consider public opinions and the views of the legislature rather than perform a ritual, in the belief that everything would proceed according to his timetable and script, and
that he can have it passed in whatever way he likes. In fact, the Government has become callous and only keeps stating its own positions. We are very angry because John TSANG stopped the funding for June for the Hospital Authority, the Legislative Council Commission — since this has a bearing on us, I am not going to talk about it — and the tertiary institutions funded by the University Grants Committee and they were required to use their own reserves to cope with the expenditures in June. This tactic has become his ritual. He employed this tactic last year and on the first occasion, some people heeded it because at that time, you, President, did not trim the time for debating various parts, so people could not see where the bottom line was. Although all parties conjectured that the bottom line was early June, at least, the outcome could not be seen or was not revealed. However, this time around, the so-called filibustering war was conducted in the reverse chronological order or the so-called "narration interspersed with flashbacks". We were told the final outcome on the first day and even the times and dates were made public. In that case, why did the Financial Secretary still continue to use this tactic?

Just now, Mr Gary FAN mentioned "striving for construction" and "bent on destruction". Although the Financial Secretary dares not say outright that we are the devils that cause destruction and only said that it was difficult to differentiate between the good and the evil, of course, he has made this kind of insinuations. In fact, this is not the first year that the Government resorted to scaremongering by talking about the fiscal cliff and intimidating the public, such that pressure can be exerted on the Legislative Council. Has the Government ever thought about how the relationship between the executive and the legislature, which we often talk about, is like? Now, this situation will only continue to deteriorate.

Over the past few weeks, I have spoken about 20 to 30 times and advanced innumerable arguments to prove that this SAR Government is high-handed and unreasonable. In the end, this Budget will be passed in the legislature dominated by the pro-Government camp and all 618 amendments will be negatived. Moreover, there was not any real discussion in the process, nor did any government officials give any response, since they only regard this as a ritual. Now, the officials tasked with attending the meeting are only Directors of Bureaux and there are no Secretaries of Departments. Sometimes, the Financial Secretary would rather drink coffee outside than come in and only the Secretaries and Under Secretaries took turns to be present here. They only regard this as a ritual and perform it accordingly.
Some Members really proposed amendments with specific targets, demanding the deduction of funds for the purchase of water cannon vehicles, the Airport Expansion Project Coordination Office or the Mainland Experience Pilot Scheme of the Education Bureau but the Government did not give any response in respect of all these issues. Members opposing these amendments also said nothing but at least, they should say why they opposed them. But, it seems even the speeches on why they oppose them were a lot fewer this year.

In fact, as Members can all see, in the budgets of the past three years, the approaches adopted by the Financial Secretary have worsened year on year. We cannot say that because relief measures can be found in the budgets, we must not get in the way. Even some members of the pan-democratic camp have such a mentality. If this is the case, everything would be much easier to deal with and in the budgets in the future, it is only necessary to add a few relief measures, such as proposing increases in CSSA or waiving the rents for public rental housing, and no one would dare prevent the passage of the budgets because even causing delays for one week will be regarded as a heinous crime, much like "obstructing the earth from spinning", hindering people from getting rich or depriving people of their means of living. In this way, this matter could be dealt with much more easily. Therefore, if this motion is negatived later on, when I speak again, I will continue to criticize their handling of the Budget when commenting on "Head 142 — Government Secretariat: Offices of the Chief Secretary for Administration and the Financial Secretary".

Now, the Government controls not only our agenda, but also those of the Finance Committee or Legislative Council meetings, it can also add or withdraw items at any time. Moreover, it wants to control our pace and exert pressure on the legislature and the President, so that the President follows the pace of the Government either consciously or unconsciously. How can we succumb to this? How can we deal with this Budget according to the Government's script and idea without making even a sound?

Finally, there are still several seconds to go. I reiterate that when these relief measures are submitted to the Finance Committee for examination, the Government must by no means put them behind the item related to the Innovation and Technology Bureau, then accuse Members of causing delays. (The buzzer sounded)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak?

MR CHAN KAM-LAM (in Cantonese): Chairman, first, on behalf of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong, I will oppose the motion that the Council do now adjourn proposed by Mr Albert CHAN. First of all, the Appropriation Bill 2015 (the Bill) concerns the most critical and crucial Budget presented by the Financial Secretary every year. We are now dealing with a very important motion which serves to affirm the financial planning proposed by the Budget in the form of legislation. It concerns the overall operation of the Government, economic development of our society, various livelihood issues, law and order, the environment and conservation. Many other things are also included in the Bill. It is not only important in nature, but also time-critical. I believe a number of expenditure items will be unable to get funding for implementation accordingly in the coming year if we fail to pass it in this meeting.

As we have learnt some time ago, if the Hospital Authority is not allocated any funding, it may have to secure a bank loan or look for ways to identify resources to maintain its operation. In addition, I can quote an example. At present, such organizations receiving government subventions as primary schools, secondary schools and tertiary institutions or non-governmental organizations require funding in the Budget to support their operation in the coming year. If the Bill cannot be passed in time, it will certainly cause them a great deal of trouble.

Another reason why we cannot agree to the motion that the proceedings do now adjourn is that in our debate which has lasted a few weeks, the pan-democratic Members have proposed 618 senseless, trivial, frivolous and meaningless amendments, attempting to obstruct the passage of the entire Bill by means of filibustering. We have spent hundreds of hours on voting or debating …

(Mr CHAN Chi-chuen stood up)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, what is your point?
MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, point of order. Earlier on, you said we were not allowed to criticize the President. But Mr CHAN Kam-lam has just indicated that the 618 amendments approved by you are trivial and frivolous. I would like the Chairman to make a ruling.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, I have heard the speech of Mr CHAN Kam-lam. The Rules of Procedure provide that Members may not move an amendment which is in the opinion of the Chairman frivolous or meaningless. Mr CHAN Kam-lam did not question the views of the Chairman earlier on. He just pointed out that in his opinion, those amendments were frivolous. Obviously, the Chairman and Mr CHAN Kam-lam are divided on this issue. But the speech of Mr CHAN Kam-lam does not constitute any violation of the Rules of Procedure.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, please continue.

MR CHAN KAM-LAM (in Cantonese): Chairman, as to question of whether the amendments proposed by Members are trivial and frivolous, now I may as well point it out to Hong Kong people. I believe even if I just randomly turn to a page and read it out, it will make Hong Kong people feel very much agitated. Chairman, let me quote an example …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN, we are now debating the motion for adjournment of proceedings of the Committee moved by Mr Albert CHAN. Please do not stray from the question.

MR CHAN KAM-LAM (in Cantonese): Chairman, I see your point. But since we are talking about triviality and frivolity, I have to quote one or two amendments to Hong Kong people, and prove that the triviality and frivolity as mentioned by me is a fact. I will quote an example by randomly turning to a page. It is proposed by Mr WONG Yuk-man that $8,000, approximately equivalent to the annual estimated expenditure for individual job-related allowances for the staff of the Chief Executive's Office, be deducted. Is it not meaningless? Moreover, it also requests a reduction approximately equivalent
to the annual estimated expenditure for the Mandatory Provident Fund contributions for the staff of the Chief Executive's Office. These are the mandatory contributions that we are required to make for the staff. But to our surprise, the pan-democratic Members have proposed to reduce them. Is this not meaningless? They have even proposed to reduce the operational expenses of the Audit Commission to $1,000. The Audit Commission will conduct value for money audits of the expenditure of various government departments every year. This is an important task. How can we reduce its expenses to $1,000? If there is only $1,000 left, how can they operate? Furthermore, the annual estimated expenditure for the general departmental expenses of the Correctional Services Department has to be reduced. Chairman, I have just randomly quoted a few examples. Hong Kong people will be able to see it just by taking a casual look. If Members propose some amendments for reductions because they think that the expenditure of the Government is totally unreasonable, they have to be justified. Now I have just randomly picked some examples, but all of them can be regarded as rather senseless and meaningless. What is the main purpose of these amendments? They serve to waste time, attempting to obstruct and delay the passage of the entire Bill by making use of the Council proceedings.

We have spent hundreds of hours on the scrutiny and voting on each of the items. We have completed the voting process for 618 amendments after all the trouble, and now, we have also completed the seventh debate. We are supposed to come to the Third Reading of the Bill, but to our surprise, they have proposed to debate the motion for adjournment of the proceedings of the Committee at this moment. Earlier on, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen also mentioned that this motion for the adjournment of the Committee proceedings proposed by them can actually achieve no purpose. As the pro-establishment Members will definitely oppose it, it will surely serve no purpose. So, why do they still insist on doing so and spend a few more hours on discussing these issues? Do Members want to exhaust every means possible to abuse our proceedings in an attempt to delay business which is supposed to be normally conducted in the Council or our society, causing everything to be held up here?

Hence, the role played by the pro-establishment Members in the Council is rather important. We are here to ensure the normal operation of society in various aspects. Facing the deliberate obstruction by certain Members, we still hope that things will proceed smoothly. Certainly, we are also aware that the pace of development of society in various aspects has slowed down in the past
few years. Why? It is because every issue submitted to the Council will always meet with hurdles posed by the pan-democratic Members and their obstruction. Hence, we see that recently, neighbouring cities have gradually caught up with Hong Kong in terms of competitiveness, and our overall productivity has also been overtaken by Shenzhen. We can say that the overall strengths of Hong Kong are on the decline due to its internal attrition and all of these should be attributed to the pan-democratic camp acting wilfully for the sake of disrupting Hong Kong’s social stability and economic development. Seeing their fierce obstruction of the passage of the Bill today, the general public have fully realized that such acts solely attempting to cause destruction and disruption with no practical purpose are downright undesirable. If we wish to see an end to this disagreeable phenomenon, there is only one solution. In the 2016 Legislative Council Election, we must make a sensible choice with our votes to bar these trouble-making and wayward Members from being returned to the Council again.

Thank you, Chairman.

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Does any public officer wish to speak?

(No public officer indicated a wish to speak)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN, you may now speak in reply.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, how much time do I have for this reply?

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): You have 15 minutes.
MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, regarding the long speech given by Mr CHAN Kam-lam just now, I appreciate his final remark most, that things should be decided by votes. I welcome an instant dissolution of the Legislative Council by LEUNG Chun-ying today and the conduct of an election, so that voters may decide which Members should be removed from the Council by their votes to do justice to members of the public.

Chairman, smearing, distortion and suppression are precisely the means employed by the pro-Government camp and Hong Kong communists, while failing completely to specifically address the crux of the issue. What is the quality of governance of this society of ours? How is the economic development? Why is there gradual deterioration and shrinkage, leading to an increasingly difficult life for people? This is the basic responsibility of the Government. Members like CHAN Kam-lam and those from his party swell their own pockets, reaping huge profits from speculation on properties. However, when it comes to people's hardship in living, how inconceivable that they could have attributed the recent economic downturn in Hong Kong to Members from the opposition camp? Are they saying that we have the power to formulate a tax regime, allocate land and formulate an economic policy? The one who is in charge of economic issues is "Secretary Name-card", former Vice-Chairman of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB). You people from the DAB are enjoying a high status and great power with so many committees and resources on hand. More than 100 staff members are working in the head office of the DAB alone, while the total headcount of staff working in hundreds of other ward offices has not been taken into account. Enjoying a high status and great power though, you people have no impact on the administration of the Government. But individual Members who have been swelling their pockets and enjoying huge benefits have nonetheless attributed people's hardship in living, the overall economic downturn and low status of Hong Kong to the opposition camp. Hence, such a practice of calling a stag a horse and distorting facts is precisely the reason for the degradation and gloomy development of Hong Kong. With poor governance and administration, when those in power have no intention to reflect the social situation and rectify these problems for their people, these corrupt and rotten systems and ruling echelons will definitely give rise to a society full of conflicts and a declining economy.

Chairman, in fact, as early as a decade ago, I already suggested the Government re-activate and develop high value-added industries instead of encouraging Hong Kong people to start their career in the Mainland just as what
TUNG Chee-hwa did. No government in the world will encourage young people to leave their homeland and work elsewhere. A government should create an ideal home for its people on its own land instead of relying on the alms given by the great Motherland at the back, and adopting a colonial policy to destroy the ideal home built by Hong Kong people. Hence, the DAB assigned by the CPC will certainly listen to the instructions of the CPC and move according to the dictates of its baton, like a puppet.

In view of the above, Chairman, I proposed this motion for adjournment of the Committee proceedings for the purpose of creating some space, just as I said from the outset. It is because when it comes to politics, a consensus can be sought only with space provided. According to many, the existing China-Hong Kong conflicts, conflicts between Hong Kong people and the Government, the serious division of society after the Umbrella Revolution and conflicts among different social groups have not been alleviated. In fact, disagreement and division among different social groups are common in history or even in many places around the world nowadays. Speaking of division, the presence of only a few Members here in this Chamber is a shame. Chairman, please do a headcount.

**CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): Will the Clerk please ring the bell to summon Members back to the Chamber.

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

**CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN, please continue.

**MR ALBERT CHAN** (in Cantonese): Chairman, I have just mentioned that proposing a motion for adjournment of proceedings of the Committee can make room for discussion. In addition to making room for discussion, it is also necessary to have a mechanism that can help us reach a consensus on the Budget, formulation of policies, the Government's governance as well as solutions to the problems and conflicts between different social groups. Such a mechanism is really important but such an effective and strong mechanism is precisely lacking in Hong Kong now. Although political issues are managed by the Central
Government Offices relocated from Central to Admiralty, everything is actually controlled by the Western District — there is actually just one power organ instead of two — and the governance by this power organ is detached from the public. Such a political system is detached from the public and does not belong to Hong Kong. It is remotely controlled by Beijing through a cobweb of relationships developed with the rich and powerful. They are perhaps not well versed in the situation of Hong Kong, and we cannot rule out the possibility that their relationships with certain people involve some interests … Chairman, are we having a meeting now? Or is the DAB holding its own meeting here? Even if you are a Member of the Executive Council, you should not abuse your power like that in total disrespect for the President, who is a former Chairman of the DAB. Chairman, you can therefore see how disrespectful the rich and the powerful are now. They disregarded their own statuses after securing the privileged positions.

Chairman, the Budget is, in fact, very important. In the past, the budget and the policy address would be handled separately so that the Financial Secretary could make some important decisions within the political space provided in the budget. However, ever since the Hong Kong communists took office, LEUNG Chun-ying, who is also known as "689", wantonly combined the policy address and the budget. As a result, not only did the room of the budget gradually shrink, it may even completely disappear. Under the rule of the Hong Kong communists, the budget has become a political tool serving the Chief Executive. Such a change is indeed very dangerous, and it will also bring about a qualitative change in the governance of Hong Kong overall. If such a qualitative change can improve people's livelihood, it is certainly commendable. However, it is obvious from the reality that ever since the budget became a tool of governance of the Chief Executive, its ability to resolve social conflicts and improve people's livelihood has been drastically reduced in relative terms.

Moreover, we find that this year's Budget is short of novelty. In the past, the Financial Secretary did try to think up some solutions, funding arrangements or techniques within the room available in the budget so as to benefit certain groups in the community through making some adjustments in the budget. However, there is none of such changes in the Budget this year or measures that can benefit any group in society. Therefore, my proposing the motion for adjournment of proceedings of the Committee can at least, if possible, stimulate the thinking … Actually, we can hardly do so. It cannot inspire the mindset of the pro-Government Members, especially Members from the DAB, as they have
become an iron plate. Under the rule of the Hong Kong communists, the mindset of the CPC is as rigid as a model play which does not have any expression, vitality or creativity. They criticized us — Mr WONG Kwok-hing is most adept at it, for he has been criticizing us in the same manner for three years — without knowing anything about the roots of the problems or considering whether we have any new ideas and features this year. They have completely failed to grasp the problems and the fact that it is necessary to adjust the governance in the light of the radical change in social conflicts. Ruling governments all over the world have to examine the prevailing situations of their societies and make adjustments and decisions in regard to policy formulation and funding provision, taking into account the social situation, conflicts, development and vision. However, our Government has not done this.

It has already been 17 years since TUNG Chee-hwa first took office. However, what we saw is the bureaucratic structure becoming increasingly rigid and the pro-Government Members growing more and more ossified. There are some Members who were rather dynamic when they were first elected to the Council. I remember Dr LAM Tai-fai was rather dynamic and energetic when he was first elected to the Council. Yet, such a system has gradually mummified him in this pot of soya bean paste and he can hardly move now, not to mention LAU Kong-wah whom I have known for 30 years. When we went to Taiwan to observe its elections back then, he was still full of creativity and ideals. Nonetheless, ever since he broke with the United Democrats of Hong Kong and even became a government official … he was rather dynamic and energetic during the debates when he was still a member of the DAB …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN, your speech has strayed away from the question. Please focus your speech on the relevant motion.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): I said that because I saw him, Chairman. I certainly have to make a few comments when he is present as it seems unfair to criticize LAU Kong-wah for behaving like a rubbish bin. He did not say anything …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN, please focus your speech on the motion moved by you.
MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): … in the previous terms of the Legislative Council, apart from you, Chairman, LAU Kong-wah was actually the most eloquent speaker out of all pro-Government Members. It will be such a waste to let an eloquent Member become a rubbish bin, Chairman.

Chairman, let me come back to the importance of proposing the motion for adjournment of proceedings of the Committee. If my memory serves me well, this is the first time for a Member to propose a motion for adjournment of proceedings of the Committee in regard to examination of the budget. It is rather, though not entirely, creative. In terms of a debate, the regulation of a debate on the question of the sums for certain heads standing part of the Schedule is stricter while the discussion scope of a motion for adjournment of proceedings of the Committee is larger, for the latter gives us more room for discussion. Pro-Government Members can also apply their skills of speaking in regard to the motion for adjournment of proceedings of the Committee. In fact, Under Secretary LAU Kong-wah should say something because if he keeps sitting there like a rubbish bin without saying anything or moving, it seems to run against his nature. He can also take this opportunity to apply his skills of speaking.

Chairman, if the motion for adjournment of proceedings of the Committee in regard to the Budget is not passed and we approve the Budget in a mechanical, conventional and rigid manner, the Government will simply remain unchanged and high-handed, turning a blind eye to the plight of the public. Moreover, the deep-rooted social conflicts will persist while the problems will be intensified. The Government disregarded the problems as if those problems do not exist at all. This is exactly how TUNG Chee-hwa governed Hong Kong. A problem did not exist if he did not mention it anymore or a policy would not be further implemented if there was no mention of it. Therefore, we can foresee that Hong Kong will be facing one tragedy after another. Such a prediction is similar to those I made in the past about the consequences of some social or political problems, and many of them have turned out to be true. Therefore, if this Budget is passed without any amendments; if all amendments proposed by us are negatived yet again; if the motion for adjournment of proceedings of the Committee, which provides room for discussion between the Government and various parties, is not properly handled; if the Financial Secretary makes a wrong estimate again while his team keeps governing Hong Kong in a wanton and irrational manner; and if the pro-Government Members continue to sing praises of the Government as if they are staging a model play and act according to the
script, I predict that all of the aforementioned problems will only bring about disasters to Hong Kong. Yet, Members simply could not care less and continue to not attend the meeting … Chairman, I request a headcount.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will the Clerk please ring the bell to summon Members back to the Chamber.

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

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN, please continue.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, basically, my proposing this motion for adjournment of proceedings of the Committee regarding the examination of the Budget is meant to induce some changes. However, the Financial Secretary is not present and only the Under Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs is here. I think we can hardly change the mindset of the Government.

Chairman, I am not going to further give any comments on the question of the sums for certain heads standing part of the Schedule. I will further criticize this problem later and explain why I object to it. Yet, I think that raising an objection is actually an attitude. If we can adjourn the relevant proceedings upon the passage of the motion for adjournment of the Committee proceedings and give us an opportunity to discuss, I think it will allow more flexibility, creativity, opportunities and room in terms of the overall development and outcome of our discussion, thereby allowing various parties to seek a consensus so that the Budget can better satisfy the needs of the public and pacify the public angers over the Budget.

Some Members considered that the Budget is well supported by the middle-class people, but I do not think so. It is because I have talked to many middle-class people who also think that the Budget is simply tilted in favour of the tycoons who are richer and have a higher social status rather than taking care of the grassroots. Many middle-class people also consider the Budget unjust.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Mr Albert CHAN under Rule 40(4) of the Rules of Procedure be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr Albert CHAN rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for five minutes.

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

CHAIRMAN (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:

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr NG Leung-sing, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok and Mr Tony TSE voted against the motion.

Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che abstained.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN, Mr WONG Yuk-man and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted for the motion.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Ms Emily LAU, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Christopher CHUNG voted against the motion.

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

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 24 were present, 23 were against the motion and one abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, four were in favour of the motion and 15 against it. 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.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee continues to examine the Schedule to the Appropriation Bill 2015. We now continue with the seventh debate.

Does any Member wish to speak?

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I oppose heads 21 to 26, 28 and 30 standing part of the Schedule. Head 21 concerns the expenditure of the Chief Executive's Office (CEO). Why do I oppose the sum for this head standing part of the Schedule? In fact, I have proposed an amendment to it, that is, in Amendment No 2 I proposed that its expenditure be reduced to $1,000. Regrettably, Mr Albert CHAN had proposed the same amendment and his amendment was already negatived. Today, I once again appeal to colleagues here to solemnly consider this issue.
First, the CEO is an organ tasked to assist the Chief Executive in his work, and its expenditure includes the honoraria and allowances for the Executive Council. So, it goes without saying that I oppose this provision because all the organs under the CEO do not deserve to be given money by taxpayers in Hong Kong to carry out their work. I do not wish to go into the details. I only wish to make one point and that is, the head or the most senior officer in the CEO, who is Mr LEUNG Chun-ying, has suddenly suffered from "loss of control in speech" recently. He said that the 4 June activities are organized every year but at such a crucial juncture, it is vitally important to go to Shenzhen to discuss the constitutional reform proposal and so, Members should know how to make a choice.

As you know, Chairman, he lied. I also wish to ask you this: What is the purpose of this visit to Shenzhen? This morning, I put this question to you in your office but you said that you had no idea. Tell me, Chairman, is there a Chief Executive as muddle-headed as such? For one thing, if the Chief Executive does not know what the entire visit is about, for what purpose did he tell you, being the Speaker of this Council, to lead us to Shenzhen? If the Chief Executive knows the purpose but did not tell you what it is, it means he deceived you into leading this visit but nobody knows what its purpose is. On this point, I think he really does not deserve to be given any funding.

Let me read out his expenses: Salaries and allowances for the Chief Executive, and expenses and allowances for the CEO. Honestly, I was dumbfounded, not knowing what to say when being asked questions about this visit. First of all, Chairman, I do not have a home visit permit and you know about it, though this is not under the control of the Chief Executive. Now that the entire Hong Kong has become like crazy suddenly, and let me cite some examples to explain to what extent disgrace has been brought to Hong Kong. It is because the subordinates of the Chief Executive are too undesirable, especially Edward YAU. He spoke in a humourous and delightful manner over the tea with me outside this Chamber and I asked him, "Director YAU, what is this visit to Shenzhen all about?" He said that he had no idea, and he only smiled though not viciously. How does the story goes? I have been dragged into troubles because of this visit too, as I am supposed to give a talk on the 4 June incident in Malaysia, and I do not know what I should do. It turned out that last Saturday, when you, Chairman, might have already finished work, it was learnt that a Member had received a call from somebody who said that the Member would be summoned to Shenzhen. Then he told the media about it but the media did not make any attempt to verify ...
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, how are these remarks that you are making now related to the relevant head?

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): This is why he should not be given money. Buddy, he is the one responsible for finding out about the details from his superior and then explaining why we have to pay a visit to Shenzhen. He is such an important person, but there is no conclusive view in society now. I was dumbfounded, not knowing what to say in response to enquiries made by the reporters about this visit and over the past few days, it has taken me four hours answering questions from reporters alone. The reporters asked me whether I would be going or not; or whether I would be going or not if I would not be able to further express views; or whether I would be putting on clothes with wording relating to the 4 June incident; or whether I would be bringing books with me as I did last time, and so on. So far, I have no idea for what purpose we are going to Shenzhen. I asked, "Can I express views?", and the reply was "no idea". Honestly, Chairman, it is most important for a person to state everything unequivocally clear. Assuming I cannot make any comments and I can only listen to other people during this visit to Shenzhen, then I can choose not to go …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, what you are saying now is not related to head 21.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): How dare you say this? The entire CEO, from LEUNG Chun-ying at the highest level and then in the middle there is his CEO's …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, you were talking about the meeting to be held in Shenzhen …

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): But is that not the hottest issue in town? Before it happened, I could not talk about it …
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, please listen to me first. If you have paid attention to the reports and the papers issued to you, you should know that it was the Chief Secretary for Administration who invited all Members of this Council to attend the meeting to be held in Shenzhen, and it is not directly related to the work of the CEO that you referred to just now. Please speak on head 21 and do not stray away from the question.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): What are you trying to say? It means that the Chief Executive is not involved, and if the Chief Executive does not have a part to play, then his salary has to be deducted.

Chairman, sorry, I must say that the CEO includes the Executive Council and in the Executive Council there is this person named Carrie LAM. To be honest, it is useless for you to stop me from speaking, for all Hong Kong people understand that if the Chief Executive knows the details, it would be his fault in not telling Hong Kong people what he knows, whereas Chief Secretary Carrie LAM did not know the purpose of the meeting when she invited us to attend it. It is unacceptable that the Chief Executive knew nothing about it and did not give Carrie LAM any reminder. Or if he did not tell Chief Secretary Carrie LAM or openly tell everyone what he knew, including you, Chairman, that would also be his fault. Do you see my point? What has happened is a gross defiance of the rules because it was a Member who intimated a reporter and the latter subsequently covered the story. Chairman, with due respect, what if I told the reporter that this Member had got it wrong because the person who rang him up was asking him to go to Shenzhen for a seafood feast?

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, the things you are talking about now are not related to the question. Please stop speaking on them immediately, or else I will order you to stop speaking. The question under discussion now is whether the sum for head 21 should stand part of the Schedule. Please speak on the question.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): You still think that they are not related? Fine, let me sing some praises then … I was precisely speaking on whether the sum should be included, and not even one cent should be given to it.
I first thought about giving it $1,000 but it was negatived in the vote presided by you. I originally thought about giving it $1,000 …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, the Committee should not discuss a question that has already been put to the vote. We are now discussing whether the sums for the 62 heads should stand part of the Schedule. Please speak on the question.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, you are right. But I am trying to prove that I am more concerned about this than everyone else. I originally planned to express my views by proposing an amendment which has nevertheless been negatived, and we have now come to the question of these sums standing part of the Schedule. I was talking about $1,000, right? I initially planned to give it $1,000 but now, I think not even $1,000 should be given to it. The Chief Executive has performed so poorly, and so have his subordinates because when his subordinates attended meetings of the Executive Council … Chairman, as you know, there is this organ called the "constitutional reform trio", which is comprised of Raymond TAM, Rimsky YUEN — I will not read them out in a reversed order this time — and Carrie LAM. If it was the Chief Secretary of the trio who urged the President of the Legislative Council to lead us to Shenzhen, what reasons are there that you were not notified of the details beforehand? Chairman, there is division of work among the trio. Raymond TAM is responsible for liaising with officials in the next lower rank and I think his post should be roughly equivalent to that of LI Fei, and then Carrie LAM should be responsible for entertaining WANG Guangya or others. Members of the trio have their respective area of responsibilities — you may make enquiries with Under Secretary LAU if you do not believe it — Discussion is held in three separate areas. As for the situation from the legal perspective, the responsible official should be Rimsky YUEN. When it comes to securing support from 70% of the people, that would fall under the ambit of LI Fei, right? It means Raymond TAM …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, I have reminded you time and again that the arrangements for this meeting to be held in Shenzhen are not related to head 21. Please do not stray away from the question.
MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Since this has caused bad feelings, I will not talk about it anymore. But Chairman, you are really wrong in …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, I am duty-bound to point out any violation of the Rules of Procedure by a Member in his speech.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Give me 20 minutes to explain it to you. This Council works like a steady, continuous creek. Had they not committed this sinful act last Saturday, I would not have this topic to speak on today. What reasons are there for banning me from discussing the latest issues in the wake of the emergence of some latest developments. You should be reasonable in chiding people …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, this is not a general debate. We are examining the Schedule to the Appropriation Bill 2015, and we are debating the question that the sums for the 62 heads stand part of the Schedule.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Let us do it this way. I will talk about the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau now. Is that alright? I will talk about the Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs. Is that alright? This is head 144. Head 144 is about Raymond TAM, and I was talking about his counterparts just now. This should be made clear. He is responsible for public opinions, not the legal issues. Therefore, he should clearly explain to the President the most decisive … Chairman, this is not made up by me. People all over the territory are talking about this, and this is of the utmost concern to the entire Hong Kong. If Secretary Raymond TAM’s counterpart is LI Fei, then, how can he secure support from 70% of the people? If he cannot achieve it, he should discuss with Members in Hong Kong, including both the pro-establishment Members and pan-democrat Members, how support from 70% of the people can be secured, because it is now said that this constitutional reform proposal can be passed or make a glamorous turnaround only if it can secure support from 70% of the people. Regarding this duty of Raymond TAM, and as Under Secretary LAU is in the Chamber today, is there
not a long way to go before he can achieve it? It is said that they need to obtain support from 70% of the people but they only have the support of around 50% of the people now. Honestly, how can he be considered to have delivered? How can I give him money?

Another example is Rimsky YUEN. The problem with Rimsky YUEN is this: Views are diverse in society and you, Chairman, have also expressed your views — In fact, you are not allowed to express views in your capacity as the President of the Legislative Council, but frankly speaking, I have breached the rules myself and I will not accuse you of breaching the rules — A lot of people have expressed their views on the constitutional reform proposal, such as how the "blank vote veto" proposal should be taken forward, or whether the situation would become bizarre according to Hong Kong 2020's proposal of Anson CHAN. The people are talking about all of these. However, Rimsky YUEN has suddenly become muted. People all over the territory are discussing how it should be handled from the legal viewpoint. I am not talking about the visit to Shenzhen now. When views are diverse and as you, Chairman, have also expressed views on this matter, Rimsky YUEN should indeed state clearly whether the views of President Jasper TSANG can work, or whether the views of Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung can work or whether those expressed by Mr Ronny TONG can work. If he remains silent, what does it mean? Let me ask you this: First, Chairman, we agree to the leadership of the Government, and what does leadership mean? It does not mean that he has the ability to lead us but it is only because of his official position that we are led by him. He has enormous manpower, resources and financial powers; and he has the powers of the Government and also the responsibilities of the Government in carrying out such work and yet, he has failed to deliver.

Chairman, in all fairness, do you think that Mr YUEN has remained silent and become muted recently? It is now a most critical moment as the discussions have already become most intense. Is it possible to enact legislation locally to replace corporate votes by director votes or individual votes? These are two different matters and involve the stakes of both sides. If there were director votes, that would be a rip-off, right? Which company's board is not … Could it be that the board of LI Ka-shing's company is not appointed by him? It would be tantamount to telling the people of LI Ka-shing to vote for LI Ka-shing. But it would be different if individual votes were adopted, for this would change the
entire inclination of public opinions and there would be a chance to secure support from 70% of the people. So, what kind of a team is this trio? When the political issues that need to be resolved are spelt out, can they be resolved in legislation? The man responsible for the legal issues has remained silent.

Next comes this man named Raymond TAM. Speaking of public opinions, Chairman, I clearly remember that it was 1 September that day, and I remember that after LI Fei had given a speech at the Asia World Expo, he said that as the 31 August Decision had been endorsed, the most important task would be to fully reflect the support of the compatriots in Hong Kong for the 31 August Decision. Chairman, those words really roared in my ears like thunder that day, and I thought: "It is going to be awesome this time around. They are definitely going to launch massive publicity campaigns in the style of the Cultural Revolution." Unexpectedly though, they have not done so. On that day, LI Fei told everyone in his official capacity as the Deputy Secretary-General of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress … Of course, the officials in Hong Kong had listened to his speech all the more attentively for he holds the actual power of appointment, right? What do people like us have to do with him? So, if Raymond TAM has failed to explain this clearly despite that so much has been said, and if he has failed to accomplish his task even though he had implored Robert CHOW to come forth to help and engaged the "blue ribbons" and resorted to all possible means, is he not derelict of his duties?

All in all, the grand master, Carrie LAM, is indeed helping these two men. Now that an order is given and it says, "I, Carrie LAM, want you to go up North now." Buddy, if you do not explain it, you should tell your subordinates to explain it. Chairman, tell me, are they right or not in doing that? The sum for head 144 all concerns the allocation of funds for these people. It is downright a waste of money to pay them salaries. They have caused us big troubles. Chairman, tell me, should you not feel angry? You must have made plans for 31 May already and now, you have to lead a delegation to Shenzhen and you cannot refuse it. How impolite these people are! She said that the itinerary of the Beijing officials had to be taken into account. Buddy, are these Beijing officials "the boss"? There are 70 of us but only three of them. I have finished what I wish to say. I think it is necessary to deduct their salaries. We must not give them money. We must not give them money (The buzzer sounded) …
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, your speaking time is up.

I hope that members of the public have listened to Members' speeches seriously, especially the speech made by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung just now. If anyone should seek a judicial review of my arrangements for this debate, alleging that it is unreasonable of me to impose limits on Members' speaking time, the remarks made by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung just now would be my most powerful defence. Anyone who has listened to those remarks can make his own judgment on whether Members have prepared abundant information and marvellous ideas on the subject matters of the debate but cannot present them due to the limits I have imposed on their speaking time or they have beat around the bush purely to use up the time of this Council. The public will make their own judgment on this point.

Does any other Member wish to speak?

(Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung stood up)

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Since I was involved in what you have just said …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Your speaking time is up.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): I request to speak again because you attacked me.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Please hold on. Let me ask if other Members would wish to speak first.

(Mr CHAN Chi-chuen stood up)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, please speak.
MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, you said that the public would make their own judgment. In that case, Members should also be here to make their judgment. Chairman, please summon Members back to the Chamber in order to make a judgment on who is more reasonable in the ensuing debate.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will the Clerk please ring the bell to summon Members back to the Chamber.

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

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

(Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung stood up)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you are speaking consecutively.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, rarely would I heard a chairman criticize a Member for two minutes. I think you are obviously exploiting your public office for private ends, since you are going to go to court with me. You said if I initiate proceedings against you, this will be a good example. Frankly speaking, actually this is not right, is it? This is inappropriate. Nevertheless, I am a man with breadth of mind. I will forgive you, Chairman, as I have forgiven you for commenting on politics on different occasions because I have commented on you too. Hence, the clichés in the Legislative Council should be erased. You are the first person who took the lead to break the rule. Never mind. I can put up with this.

Well, now I am going to talk about the Home Affairs Bureau. I have not talked about the Home Affairs Bureau because many of my amendments were disallowed by the Chairman. The several items which I now oppose standing part of the Schedule concern incompetence in the overall poor performance of the Home Affairs Bureau. What am I talking about? It is mainly about young
people. I only wish to spend a few minutes to talk about it now. What will I speak on? It includes the Funding Scheme for Youth Exchange in the Mainland, the annual subvention for national education, the funding support for internship on the Mainland, the Youth Forum, the provision of funds for relevant uniformed groups and other youth organizations, so and so forth. All of them are related to young people, right? In a nutshell — lest the Chairman would accuse me of going into the details again — in a nutshell, it has worked perfunctorily without any accomplishment.

Chairman, after the Umbrella Movement, if we take a look, we will notice that most of the participants are young people. Standing among them, we are distinctly old. In the light of this, we ought to talk about the annual estimated expenditures for uniformed groups and other youth organizations, the Youth Forum, internship on the Mainland, national education, the Funding Scheme for Youth Exchange in the Mainland, and activities relating to youth development, together with the promotion of civic education outside the school campus. These funds have been allocated, and such provisions must be used properly in the future … However, if we look at the past records, we will find that all these of items are just rehashes of old ideas or old wine in new bottles. That means the Government continues with what it has been doing. It merely gives the items supplementary provisions. For some of the items, it will increase the provision by a certain percentage. It may be due to inflation, or perhaps they consider that there is room for improvement. In a nutshell, firstly, we have noted a phenomenon, which is stirring up unnecessary trouble. This is what I often say …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, I have to remind you that the Committee is now conducting a debate on the question that the sums for the heads stand part of the Schedule under Rule 68(3) of the Rules of Procedure. This particular rule provides that the debate shall be confined to the policy of the service for which the money is to be provided. You have criticized the performance of various government departments and thus requested to reduce the relevant estimates. You have already spoken and raised these views many times in the debate on the amendments. Let me remind Members again that according to Rule 68(3) of the Rules of Procedure, the debate shall be confined to the policy of the service for which the money is to be provided. Mr LEUNG, please go on.
MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Oh, in that case, what I have said is right … I have hit the nail on the head, have I not? I am speaking on the youth policy. Buddy, everything I have read out falls under the youth policy. It is about money. There is the annual estimated expenditure for this and annual estimated expenditure for that. I do not agree that they should stand part of the Schedule. I talked about them as a whole, but you said I could not do so. Now, it is about students as well as non-students. After all, it is about all the young people. That is to say, it concerns the allocation of funds under the Home Affairs Bureau for young people. Even if all the other funds are granted, this one should not be approved. Just now when I mentioned stirring up unnecessary trouble, you interrupted me. What is the unnecessary trouble that was stirred up? The authorities have created a platform for young people to oppose the Government. Buddy, how awkward! It has backfired. Chairman, suppose you instruct the Clerk to persuade "Long Hair" not to make trouble, but after she has come to me for a brief talk, I become even more eager to stir up trouble. Will you still hire her? Will you pay her money? She suggests spending $100 to buy me a pen so that I may behave better, but after I am offered a pen, I am even more rowdy. Chairman, your reminder was really timely. If we separate the young people, no matter whether we make use of the uniformed groups — but LEUNG Chun-ying has privately organized something like an army cadets association and used the barracks of the People's Liberation Army (PLA), causing a big scandal. Even the PLA said it has no idea and stated that usually it will not let any particular group use its place — this has led to a scandal and disgraced the PLA. Among all these things, the worst part is that he does not know what young people need. Yet he blindly tried to borrow a page from another's book by setting up a website to call for young people to express their views. First of all, no one will visit this website. Even if they do, all of them oppose the Government. What should be done?

Hence, on this point, I will not go into the specifics, but the same kind of work is carried out under various names and is repetitive, right? Let me give an example. The Funding Scheme for Youth Exchange in the Mainland is parcelled out from the annual expenditure for other activities relating to youth development, right? The relevant uniformed groups may also overlap with other youth organizations. The Youth Forum is a new initiative with Chai Wan serving as the main venue where youth forums are held at irregular intervals. I attend them every day — no, I have attended every one of them. On each occasion, I saw a large group of youngsters raise opposite views against the guest speakers. It is awkward, is it not?
Chairman, on this score, we cannot provide it with any more funds. Instead, we must form a general mindset. Chairman, now let me tell you what mindset it is. I really have justifications. Let me hold a forum for them to scold me. In this way, we can test if the Government's youth policy is successful, right? We cannot be biased and let all the events be hosted by such groups as the "blue ribbon" and the "Democratic Alliance" or something like that. This is meaningless. Suppose they have such magnanimity to say to me, "LEUNG Kwok-hung, the Chairman of the League of Social Democrats (LSD), I think you are appealing to the young. Let me sponsor you to hold a seminar on 'the Uniqueness of LEUNG Chun-ying's Lying Skills'", and I will be the speaker. In that case, perhaps many young people will come to listen to the talk, and upon arrival, they will jeer at me. Look, this kind of reverse thinking is actually essential in conducting youth work.

Chairman, our education teaches young people to ask "why". However, we need to ask "why not", that means why it must be so, right? This is close-mindedness. Those who will only ask "why" can already be regarded as more capable. I feel sick when I see those people from the DAB, such as CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, and there is that guy called Holden CHOW …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, now you are speaking for the third time. Please do not stray from the question.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I have justifications. I often tell them to go there … why did I not tell members of the LSD to go there? Buddy, you only tell them, you are exploiting your public office for private ends. Everything is pre-set, right? It has been prepared beforehand. Hey, if your youth policy is biased and uses public funds to support fellow organizations to hold youth training camps for grooming them, it will be doomed for sure, right? If we change our mentality and encourage young people to ask "why it must be so", the situation will be different. Honestly, now this is indeed universal. The present publicity on the constitutional reform proposal is similar. It talks about "why" instead of "why not". For this reason, it says "2017 Make it happen". It only asks "why", and so it fails in the end.
Chairman, hence, on this point, I am speaking from the bottom of my heart. Just now a youngster sent me a text which said, "Mr LEUNG, you need to speak for the young people." I would like to tell this youngster that if young people really wish to speak out for themselves, they should not only stage protests but also go to the website of the Home Affairs Bureau to extensively and frequently voice their opinions rather than expressing them in a defiant manner. This is a very important concept.

I remember Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has mentioned some information technology Apps. As a matter of fact, information technology has brought forth many Apps and platforms for young people. They have achieved very good results with more than a million viewers, right? Indeed, there are more than a million viewers. Chairman, orders are placed through information technology, and so much funding is obtained through the youth policy. Actually we are unable to tell clearly who are involved. An order is placed to hire someone to create an App. The one who creates the App is not to blame. Maybe he himself is incapable, or maybe the one who places the order is incapable. Hence, on this point, I am really well-prepared. You said earlier that I am not well-prepared. Chairman, let me ask you, do you remember how many times we have worked on the Youth Forum? You certainly do not remember, do you? Let me tell you, the answer is nine times. Of course you will nod, but actually it is not true, because I do not know the answer either. Right? Hence, in the Council, what is meant by "detailed and accurate information"? Are you kidding me? I am not citing classics or authoritative works.

As a result, speaking of young people here, I have brought up this point. There is another issue which concerns the Arts Development Council. Besides, on expenditures, another item which follows is related to the Sports Federation and Olympic Committee of Hong Kong, China (SFOC). This is also quite interesting, as it has not conducted any reform over the years. The election process of the SFOC is rather lousy. Every year there will be a couple of scandals. However, in allocating the funds, the Home Affairs Bureau has wrongly used this satellite organization to distribute the resources, and the worst point is that the SFOC holds the franchise to select athletes for the Olympic Games. I once handled a case in which a judo athlete who was matchless in Hong Kong could not represent Hong Kong to participate in the competition because he had offended the SFOC. Chairman, this is public money. For this
reason, if you say that LEUNG Kwok-hung has not made any preparations, Chairman, you should go back and do it yourself, right? I know you have to go back and make preparations. You may check it up when you go back.

(THE CHAIRMAN'S DEPUTY, MR ANDREW LEUNG, took the Chair)

Deputy Chairman, on this point, actually it is right for me not to approve these small items, such as the one for the SFOC. In a nutshell, we have noted that these expenditures do not meet the value-for-money principle. Expenses are made without achieving any effects. There are even counter-effects. May I ask Mr Charles Peter MOK, if he runs a company and its business condition is like that, will he continue to invest in it? He will certainly choose to fold it up. If someone advises him not to fold it up, of course he should dismiss this person because he is doing harm to him. For this reason, Chairman … The Deputy Chairman is back? In that case, I will do you a favour and stop talking.

Actually I wish to tell you, now the Home Affairs Department has stirred up unnecessary trouble. It seems to operate by non-interference, but in fact, it operates by incompetence. This is rather serious. Many people do not understand this. They say Secretary TSANG Tak-sing is a very kind man who manages to obtain large sums of funds in silence and commands affinity among people. Deputy Chairman, I am sure he works by incompetence rather than non-interference. Hence, in a nutshell, not only will I refuse to grant him money for the small items — I have just presented the justifications — for the large items, since Secretary TSANG Tak-sing and his Under Secretary Florence HUI … frankly speaking, she is really like a stranger in a sea of faces. Do you know her? Buddy, she is paid $200,000-odd a month all the same. I once saw her hurry past me in North Point. I asked if she was going to buy food for dinner. She said yes, because she had worked too late. Deputy Chairman, how miserable she was! After working late into the evening, she still … at that time she was really going to buy food for dinner. If you do not believe me, just ask Florence HUI. She pointed at a middle-class housing estate. I said she had indeed worked very hard. Honestly, she really looked pitiable. She worked so hard, and it was not until eight in the evening that she hurried home, carrying a basket of food. Even so, no one knows what she has done. Frankly speaking, is it because I am ignorant, or she is too inefficient?
So, on this point, the Under Secretary's performance is not satisfactory. Now let me test Members' general knowledge. Does Dr CHIANG Lai-wan know who the Political Assistant in the Home Affairs Bureau is? Can she tell me his name? This person is a member of their political party, but no one can tell …

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you have strayed from the question.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Yes, sorry. So, I have proved that no one knows these people at all. No one knows them, and even the Legislative Council Members do not know them either. Although the main duty of Political Assistants is to liaise with us, I have never received his business card. I just happened to pick up one on one occasion. As such, what the heck can we do? For this reason, actually not granting them the funds … Please do not laugh. He is your party comrade, but you are unable to tell his name either. Even I am unable to name him now.

Deputy Chairman, I will stop here for the moment because if I go on, sometimes I really cannot help laughing. Thank you, Deputy Chairman.

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

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, I will speak for the second time in the seventh debate session. However, I would like to first respond to the example cited just now by Chairman Jasper TSANG in connection with the previous speech delivered by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung. He said, "If any Member should think that I have hindered the delivery of speeches by Members and would like to apply for judicial review against me, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung should most preferably be cited as an example."

He did indeed treat Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung in the previous debate session with a most light-handed approach because, citing Legislative Council Members' visit to Shenzhen in the North on 31 May to meet with Chinese officials and the "constitutional reform trio" as an example, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung had
repeatedly mentioned "Head 21 — Chief Executive's Office". Although he is not prohibited from expressing his views, he must pinpoint the relevant head. Should he wish to criticize the arrangements for the Shenzhen visit or policies for being improper, he should speak on either Head 142 — Government Secretariat: Offices of the Chief Secretary for Administration and the Financial Secretary or Head 144 — Government Secretariat: Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau.

Even if Chairman Jasper TSANG gave Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung allowance in one of the debate sessions, it does not imply he will give all Members adequate room for discussing politics all the time. Certainly, even if I apply for judicial review, I will not speak in such a detailed manner, pointing out what I was not allowed to say in this session.

Let me now get down to business. This is the second time I speak. Head 142 — Government Secretariat: Offices of the Chief Secretary for Administration and the Financial Secretary is related to the Financial Secretary's Office. Although Secretary Matthew CHEUNG was seen sitting here in the previous session, he is not present at the moment. Now I would like to say a few words about Head 141 — Government Secretariat: Labour and Welfare Bureau. I would also like to tell Secretary Matthew CHEUNG that according to the current arrangements for dealing with the Budget, the Budget is expected to be read the Third time and passed tomorrow or not later than the day after tomorrow according to a conservative estimate. By then, some relief measures that seek to "hand out candies" will be referred to the Finance Committee.

Nevertheless, over the past two weeks, Secretary Matthew CHEUNG has been following the line of the Financial Secretary, alleging that Members staging filibusters have "engaged in wanton destruction" and appealing to Members not to hinder the Finance Committee from making "triple payment" of Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA). I would like to tell the Secretary that this remark of yours precisely demonstrates your negligence of duty. Hence, your remark can be cited as a rationale for not allowing Head 141 — Government Secretariat: Labour and Welfare Bureau to stand part of the Schedule. As Members are aware, the "triple payment" of CSSA is not controversial. Members will not play with it and stand in the way of the needy, though I think that this amount of money is not supposed to be used for saving lives. If it is, the Secretary is all the more in dereliction of his duty, for the current CSSA amount has been proved to be simply not enough for CSSA recipients to meet
their living expenses, and they have to wait for the double or triple payment of CSSA to buy enough food and repay their loans. I already said the same thing to Secretary Matthew CHEUNG at the previous meeting of the Panel on Welfare Services.

I would like to emphasize that should all the proceedings related to the Budget be finished within this week, I hope the Secretary can, upon finishing the agenda item related to Liantang crossing, immediately deal with these applications for one-off funding for relief measures and refrain from placing them after the Innovation and Technology Bureau. In other words, non-controversial motions should come before the controversial ones. I hope Members can take a closer look then.

I now wish to declare from the outset that I think he will not protect this funding. Hence, I have substantial grounds to oppose the annual estimate for the Labour and Welfare Bureau standing part of the Schedule. I have once told journalists that even if the Finance Committee really runs into serious congestion of its agenda, there are still many way to deal with these funding applications. For instance, additional meetings can be held by the Legislative Council or the relevant agenda items can be brought forward. I do not think any Member will raise objection. Even if we take many steps backward and the Finance Committee is really jam-packed, this Council can follow the practice of dealing with the Disaster Relief Fund, that is, circulation of papers. As remarked by Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Chairman of the Finance Committee, that a motion should be considered passed should there be no objection from Members. However, it cannot be considered passed even if only one Member raises objection. Not only can we deal with these one-off relief measures in this manner, we can also prevent them from being "hijacked".

With respect to Head 142 — Government Secretariat: Offices of the Chief Secretary for Administration and the Financial Secretary, why did I criticize the Financial Secretary's Office for dereliction of duty and hence propose that its expenditure should not stand part of the Schedule and be reduced? In fact, we have been repeating the same argument year on year, and no one has been able to refute our argument that not only did John TSANG come up with an erroneous budget every year after taking office, but his projections are incorrect one after another.
Last year, I challenged John TSANG at a special meeting of the Finance Committee, describing the budget as a "mistaken budget" and a "deceptive budget" should his projection be found to be wrong again. Actually, we have seen wrong projections year after year. I asked him whether or not he dared to return the erroneously estimated sums to the people because they were unexpected — a loss rather than a huge sum of income and surplus was originally thought to be incurred. Of course, he dared not answer my question.

No matter how wrong his estimate is or his mistake is getting more and more serious year on year, he needs not bear any actual or political consequences. During his tenure, a surplus of $60 billion on average has been recorded year after year, with a difference in the annual wrong estimate exceeding $400 billion.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you have strayed from the question. Our debate is on whether or not the sum for the relevant head should stand part of the Schedule, but you have repeatedly discussed issues related to the Financial Secretary.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Right. That is why I have not made any detailed elaboration. I only wish to point out that the sum for head 142 should not stand part of the Schedule for use by the Financial Secretary arbitrarily because of his poor performance. I do not wish to continue to express views on this point because he has got many other problems, including the initiative of "handing out candies", one-off relief measures, reductions of the salaries tax and profits tax, and waiver of rates for the first two quarters in 2015-2016, which are all opposed by us. These initiatives represent conflicts in policy, too.

The Financial Secretary has advised us to exercise prudence in financial management, which means that cash handouts may not necessarily be offered to the public even if the Government has money. So, are the aforesaid initiatives not "cash handout" initiatives? Obviously, the Financial Secretary is "handing out cash" and returning wealth to the rich, but members of the public are given cash handouts for the first two quarters only. We have been asked by many people on the streets why we have failed to fight for concessions for four quarters to enable everyone to benefit more.
Actually, we know the reason because we have been told by the Government in private that the Financial Secretary does not wish to give members of the public the feeling that there is no need to pay rates. Therefore, rates concession will not be offered every year. Instead, members of the public are required to make rates payment twice a year, so that they can keep the feeling and habit of making rates payment. In fact, these are "cash handout" initiatives, too.

(Mr Albert CHAN stood up)

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, the number of Members in this Chamber will decrease whenever a Member expresses more views. Will the bell be rung to summon Members back for the meeting.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will the Clerk please ring the bell to summon Members back to the Chamber.

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

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, please continue.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, I will continue to speak on the inclusion of head 142 on the Office of the Financial Secretary. In the previous part of my speech, I talked about this incorrect calculation of the fiscal surplus and his self-contradictory approach of making "cash handouts" de facto when he claimed he would not do so. This is the point I was making.

I will then point out that he is making a panic prescription of remedies in the Budget, for some of the targeted support measures proposed in the Budget are seriously flawed. Let me cite one or two examples to illustrate my point. These include waiving the licence fees for 1 800 travel agents for six months and the licence fees for 2 000 hotels and guesthouses for six months. When I checked the statistics provided by the Hong Kong Tourism Board (HKTB) on Visitor Arrivals to Hong Kong during the period between September and December last year, I found that the number of visitor arrivals for the year did not
record a decrease but an increase, and the number of visitors from the Mainland recorded an increase rather than a decrease. In each of the month between October and December last year, the number of visitors arriving at Hong Kong from the Mainland recorded significant increases of 18.3%, 24.1% and 13.2% respectively in comparison with the figures of the same period in the previous year.

The Financial Secretary pointed out in the Budget that these targeted support measures were introduced to provide subsidies to various trades and industries affected by Occupy Central. However, when we checked the relevant figures, we found out that it was not the fact. If so, why does he have to make "cash handouts" to travel agents, hotels and guesthouse by waiving their licence fees for six months? This policy is wrong, or at least the rationale underlining the policy is wrong.

According to the statistics of the HKTB, only limited increases in the short haul market and the long haul market were recorded last year, though the total number of visitor arrivals did not show any decrease. However, the overall visitor arrivals rose significantly by 12% to a total of 60.84 million passenger trips last year. Figures are most honest. The purpose of the policy formulated by the Financial Secretary is to introduce targeted measures to support the affected sectors, but hotels and guesthouses covered by the measures were not affected at all, for their turnover shows an increase. In the Budget, he insisted on shifting the blame of the slight decrease in short-haul and long-haul visitors to the Occupy action, which is extremely wrong.

Another measure he proposed is to waive the fees for vehicle examination, which is paid once a year, of taxis, light buses, goods vehicles and trailers. However, he has not introduced any measures for the tram service affected by the Occupy action. As such, we consider the mindset adopted by the Office of the Financial Secretary in formulating the policies in the Budget this year is entirely wrong. If Members ask anyone on the street which mode of transport had been greatly affected by the Occupy action, people will give trams as the answer, for tram services were paralyzed at the time when protesters occupied Queensway and Causeway Bay and blocked the tramway between the East and the West. In that case, why is tram service not covered by the targeted support measures? I think the only reason is that … If I must think of a reason to explain it, I think it is because the tram company did not join other sectors in rebuking the participants of the Occupy action. These policies are evident that the Office of the Financial Secretary has failed to draw up proper criteria and principles in formulating policies.
Another item which I guess the Deputy Chairman and all Members of the Legislative Council will oppose is the compulsory implementation of the "cost-recovery" and "user pays" principles, where various government departments are required to reduce their expenditure by ensuring that the fleece comes off the sheep's back. How can it be so? Even during the time of SARS, when Hong Kong was facing a fiscal crisis, the Government was not that penny-pinching and did not try to extort the public in general. I will not cite examples and figures on the relevant details, for many Members have explained these earlier. Now even cremation services will adopt the cost-recovery approach. In other words, "you are homeless when you are alive, and you will be charged every penny spent on you when you die".

From these policies, we understand what kind of mindset has the Office of the Financial Secretary adopted in formulating those policies. For proposals like broadening the tax base and introducing a sales tax, anyone who hears this will ask: "At this time when we see that the Government is making a great return as reflected in its fiscal surplus, and when the estimate of the surplus is incorrect every year, are you sure you want to talk about these measures now?" If I want to list those examples one by one, I may still cite a lot many other examples, but that is all I have got to say about the Office of the Financial Secretary.

I will now move to another item relating to fiscal budget and that is, "Head 147 — Government Secretariat: Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) Bureau". This is one of the important items which inclusion we oppose. A number of Members from the democratic camp have pointed out that, the authorities have bundled up the funding applications of 25 items which originally required the scrutiny of the Financial Committee with the Budget to circumvent the original mechanism, so that Members have to approve these items together with the Budget. Members from the Labour Party have proposed amendments to the various items in this respect, including the procurement of fire equipment, the provision for the Film Development Fund and Phase II project of the Disneyland. Actually, Members from the pro-establishment camp also think that those items should be handled and discussed separately. It does not mean that they will surely oppose those items, but they consider it necessary to have sufficient discussion about the items.

However, what we see is that the power of the Treasury Branch under the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau under Prof K C CHAN has been exercised to the fullest extent. This remark strikes me again, "You have the
power, but does it mean that you have to exercise it to the fullest extent?"

Last week, we all heard him say in public that the authorities were not undermining the power of the Legislative Council by bypassing the Public Works Subcommittee. He explained that the Public Works Subcommittee itself was a subcommittee of the Finance Committee facilitating the scrutiny work of the Finance Committee, and the Finance Committee definitely had the power to scrutinize items directly without seeking the assistance of the Public Works Subcommittee, so items which the Public Works Subcommittee had not yet processed could be submitted to the Finance Committee for discussion (The buzzer sounded) …

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, your speaking time is up. Please stop.

Does any other Member wish to speak?

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, I oppose the inclusion of head 144 involving the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs under this item. Regarding "Long Hair"'s criticisms of the arrangements on the coming Sunday, he spent much of his speaking time on head 21 and only turned to head 144 in the latter part. In my view, the arrangements for Sunday are improper overall, and the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau should be held responsible. I will not make detailed comments. Basically, I agree with "Long Hair"'s criticisms of the improper arrangement for this Sunday, and this is one of the major reasons for my opposing head 144 standing part of the Schedule.

The Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs should communicate and liaise with various political parties and groupings and Members concerning the arrangements. I think the overwhelming majority of Members, particularly me, feel discontented, for we all get the information on these events from reporters. Perhaps two or three Members were informed first and the media then obtained the information. Regarding the arrangements for this kind of events, in eight out of 10 times, we were asked about the events by reporters after they had obtained the relevant information. We seldom receive any official letter of invitation, and information on the arrangements on the day of the event is never provided. Members are the representatives of the public of the area or the SAR, and the meeting between the legislature and officials of the Central Authorities is
an official exchange. When Senators of the United States Congress visit Hong Kong, they will specify the scope for discussion. We usually receive background information concerning the Senators provided by the Consulate General of the United States in advance, as well as information concerning the items to be discussed and the purpose of the visit. We are also provided with the information of the co-ordinator. When we pay overseas duty visits, the delegation of the Legislative Council will provide information suffice to be used as reference for overseas organizations. But now, regarding this formal and official meeting which concerns the well-being of Hong Kong people and constitutional development of Hong Kong, the authorities have acted in such a slapdash and careless manner of not serving an official notice.

To date, no government official has contacted and communicated with me to discuss whether or not I will attend the meeting on Sunday as well as the relevant arrangements. No, Deputy Chairman, none of them has done so. The Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs is earning an annual salary of a few million dollars. As for the Under Secretary, he has been projected as a "rubbish bin". The Under Secretary who used to be an eloquent and articulated speaker for the ruling party has now turned into a silent "rubbish bin". How grievous it is? Regarding the provision made for the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau, any Member with some common sense will consider the arrangements unacceptable. Certainly, many Members from the pan-democratic camp have decided to join the visit to the North. However, we can tell from this simple protocol — Deputy Chairman, I do not know the Chinese translation for the word "protocol" — or the so-called etiquette arrangements, the respect accorded to the legislature and the status of Members … This is not about a master summoning his slaves or servants to worship him. The coming visit is an official meeting between the regional legislature representing 7 million people and the officials of the Central Authorities. How can they treat Members as servants, slaves or subordinates, who can be summoned and dismissed at their will? In the face of the defaming and deteriorating political relationship, it really makes me sad. Back then, when Donald TSANG arranged for Members to visit Guangdong Province and met with the Guangdong Provincial Government, the approach adopted was definitely dozens of times better than each of the arrangements made recently for all Members of the Legislative Council to meet with officials of the Central Authorities to discuss the constitutional reform. These days, the legislature is prone to demean itself. I feel sorry that they should lower themselves to this
extent. What a shame. Therefore, to those Members who insist on making the visit North, I think this is a humiliation for the democratic camp to see them submitting themselves and kneeling down to worship officials in the North.

I do not know if Members have received an official invitation, but I have not yet received one, as I have just asked my assistant whether or not I have received the official invitation. How can you ask me whether or not I will attend the meeting when I have not yet received any invitation? As such, Deputy Chairman, I can only say that the arrangement of the meeting is not made according to the general protocol standard or with due respect. I think the arrangement is comparable to a representative of a self-boasting and corrupted ruling regime which gives no regard to law calling on a group of people prepared to serve as slaves for admonishment or a good dressing down.

Deputy Chairman, I now return to the provision for the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau. Insofar as the provision under the relevant head and the changes over the years, particularly personnel changes involving increase in manpower is concerned, I become more and more convinced that the Policy Bureau is inflicting increasing harm on Hong Kong. Why am I saying this? Deputy Chairman, I did not talk about this when I proposed my amendments. I am purely expressing my personal view on the inclusion of this head, so there is no question of me making any repetition. I have never mentioned this point before.

Deputy Chairman, let us review the situation in 2007 and 2015. In 2007, there were only 80 staff members in the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau, yet it has surged to 117 in 2015, a double increase. In the year 2011, the provision was $84 million, and in 2015, the provision has been increased to 146,615,000, an increase of close to 70%. As for the manpower changes under various programmes, there has been no significant change in the programme of Director of Bureau's Office, and the expenditure remains the same for 2011 and 2014. As for the programme under Constitutional and Mainland Affairs, the establishment has increased from 76 persons to 85 persons. For the programme on the Mainland and Taiwan Offices, the establishment has increased from 40 persons to 72 persons. As for the programme on the Rights of Individual, there has not been much change over the years. However, Deputy Chairman, back to the programme on Mainland Affairs, what will be the impact of the increase in work and manpower on the Mainland? In the past, I called Stephen LAM, the "hatchet man" for Hong Kong communists, Eunuch LAM. Back then, I levelled
many criticisms and accusations at him. I rebuked him for choosing to protect the pandas rather than paying visits to Hong Kong people who were suffering. That was the first time I was ordered to leave the Chamber. I was ordered to leave the Chamber due to my criticism of him. At that time …

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN, you have strayed from the question.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): … Deputy Chairman, this is a relevant point, for this involves the reason for my opposition to the inclusion. I am citing this example to illustrate that my views about the Policy Bureau is traceable and that my criticism is not made only today. My criticism of this so-called Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau is that the Bureau should — Deputy Chairman, it should — protect and assist Hong Kong people when they encounter difficulties in the Mainland, but now it has deteriorated into a Policy Bureau indulging in drinking Maotai and establishing ties with the senior echelons in the Mainland, Mainland officials and officials of provincial and municipal authorities rather than trying to provide practical assistance to Hong Kong people.

I thus cited the case concerning the so-called Eunuch Stephen LAM as an example earlier. When Sichuan was struck by an earthquake, he was willing to visit the pandas there. Yet when he was asked whether he would gain any understanding of the plights of Hong Kong people trapped and arrested, he said at the time that it would be showing disrespect to Mainland organizations and Mainland departments if he requested to visit those Hong Kong people. Back then, I condemned him severely and was ordered by the President to leave the Chamber. Deputy Chairman, since the Bureau has added a lot of posts to its establishment out of the pocket of Hong Kong people by increasing its expenditure from over $80 million in 2011 to $146 million in 2015, what do Hong Kong people get in return for the significant increase in expenditure? In retrospect, we note that many problems are involved in Mainland affairs. Needless to say, the provision for disaster relief in Sichuan would eventually be pocketed by the corrupted officials. Of course, not only the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau should be held accountable, the Policy Bureau responsible for public works also has a part to play. If Members review the many items involving the Mainland, they will find that certain arrangements and agreements are basically made to enable Mainland influential officials and relevant Mainland departments to reinforce their control over and influence on
Hong Kong. It is definitely not about assisting Hong Kong people, providing timely and appropriate assistance when they run into troubles in the Mainland. Deputy Chairman, only a few Members are in the Chamber, and I am the only one from the democratic camp. Please do a headcount.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will the Clerk please ring the bell to summon Members back to the Chamber.

(While the summoning bell was ringing)

(THE CHAIRMAN resumed the Chair)

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

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN, please continue.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I once said that that is the quality of the pro-government camp. Yet they are great this time. The meeting would be aborted in a dozen to 20 minutes and they just managed to return to the Chamber.

Chairman, regarding the operation and performance of the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau, as I said earlier, not only has it failed to bring benefits to Hong Kong people but also damaged the development and existing social quality of Hong Kong, and even jeopardized the core values of Hong Kong. These situations will occur. Chairman, why am I saying this? You may refer to some of the job descriptions of the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau. For example, under Programme (2), it is to deepen regional co-operation with the Mainland and implement the Framework Agreement on Hong Kong/Guangdong Co-operation. And under Programme (5), two teams are specifically dedicated to carrying out the work in this respect. As for the content, little account or explanation was made in the past, and the media has seldom reported it. As such, I urge the media and the public to pay attention to the mode of operation of this special department. At first, we thought the
Constitutional Affairs Bureau did not have much work to do, for we notice that back then when Michael SUEN was the Secretary, he was always free and had nothing to do, and it was thus proposed that Mainland affairs be included in the purview of the Bureau. It has unexpectedly created an "alien". The Communist Party of China (CPC) tries to tear Hong Kong further apart through this organization and the implementation of the Framework Agreement on Hong Kong/Guangdong Co-operation — this Framework Agreement on Hong Kong/Guangdong Co-operation is indeed a plot by the CPC to enable Hong Kong to be further eroded and assimilated by Guangdong. Members can see that under the Agreement, more Mainlanders will gain easier access to Hong Kong. As a result, "red capital" will monopolize the economy of Hong Kong, which means Hong Kong may likely be turned into a paradise for money laundering secretly. The impact of the department is palpable. In fact, I seldom come across reports and accounts concerning the department, yet large sums have been approved and a lot of staff have been employed, and the expenditure incurred amounts to tens of million dollars. The expenditure for this year is $140-odd million, which is a significant increase in comparison with the $80-odd million a few years ago. It is thus evident that the series of tasks it carries out have caused a lot of problems and brought about changes to the structure of Hong Kong society. I think the impact is extremely negative. In respect of turning traditional industries in Hong Kong "red" and allowing these industries to be eroded and monopolized by "red capital", the department's performance has been extremely outstanding. Certainly, the promotion by the Central Authorities and the co-operation effort made by various parties of Guangdong Province must have a role to play. For these reasons, I think I must oppose the inclusion of head 144.

As for the Hong Kong Economic, Trade and Cultural Office in Taiwan, I will comment on it later when I have the time later on.

As for the Office of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the People's Republic of China in Beijing (Beijing Office), it is certainly another major reason for opposing the inclusion. This is because the Beijing Office has made blunders in handling cases of Hong Kongers seeking assistance, and its performance in handling cases involving Hong Kong people seeking assistance is undesirable. This is another problem.

Chairman, there are few people in the Chamber, please do a headcount.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will the Clerk please ring the bell to summon Members back to the Chamber.

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

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please return to their seats.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): This debate started at 11.45 am today. According to the original time arrangement, it should end at around 4 pm, yet an adjournment debate was added in between. However, excluding the debate time for the motion on adjournment, this debate has been going on for over five hours. Now, does any Member who has not spoken before wish to speak? Will Members who wish to speak please press the "Request to speak" button.

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): If no Member who has not yet spoken would like to speak, other than Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, does any other Member who has spoken wish to speak again?

(Mr CHAN Chi-chuen raised his hand in indication)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now call upon Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen to speak. This debate will come to a close after they have spoken.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, Emperor Puyi was reportedly to have cried when his hair was cut during the coronation, but the eunuchs around him said "it would be over soon"1. That is the way in which this Council is going, but I do wish that it will not end up this way.

---

1 Puyi was the last emperor of China.
It is Wednesday today. I am always blamed for wasting Members' time in this Council, and yet I have some contribution to make indeed. Horse races are held today. I think that even a horse will run faster when one is beaming with delight, whereas the leader is getting nervous when the old pals are at a loss. The Chairman is the leader, and both the new and old pals of yours do not show you any respect and have gone away. What a waste of time. Go to the racecourse right away.

As the Chairman said that this will be the last time I am speaking, let me read it out once and for all to save the Chairman troubles, who has a Clerk but I have none. The heads I am going to read out are 141, 142, 158, 90 and 156, covering the Labour and Welfare Bureau, Office of the Financial Secretary, Transport and Housing Bureau, Labour Department and the Education Bureau. The Labour and Welfare Bureau oversees welfare, and all societies alike would surely attach importance to the welfare of the elderly that I have mentioned here. To measure the level of empathy and sympathy of a community as well as whether money is well spent, a basis for consideration is the money spent on the elderly.

Chairman, not to mention something too far away — frankly speaking, I have not made much preparation — Come to think about this. Elderly persons at a residential care home are stripped and hustled like animals, and the Government still has to rely on such homes to meet the needs of the 5,000 or so elderly persons on the waiting list. Honestly, those 5,000 or so elderly persons had better die than receive such treatment. This has been mentioned for years, and you blame us for making repetitive or redundant remarks. Buddy, we surely need to do so because no one is here to rescue the elderly.

Chairman, why should Matthew CHEUNG be placed at the guillotine? If he had really heeded my advice to hand out $3,200 to each of the elderly, they would have been able to find a better residential care home instead of being turned into a bath machine. With this $3,200, some reform can be made to the so-called "bad son statement" and plus a handout of $1,000 or so from their children, the situation will get better and less government subvention will be needed, but that is not how it is going. This point alone is enough to demonstrate how "condemnable" he is.

When I took a taxi yesterday, I was greeted by a full load of expletives, which I thought were directed at me. When I was about to leave, I found that it was the Government that was being cursed, not me. Why? Because that taxi
driver spotted an old woman collecting cardboards out and beyond the cabin. Chairman, would you like to know what those expletives are? That is really offensive to the ear. He kept cursing at LEUNG Chun-ying then at John TSANG, and then he recalled Matthew CHEUNG after I reminded him of the name.

For the well-being of the public, I have proposed the introduction of universal retirement protection here, and let me repeat it. "WONG Kwok-hing the big-mouth dog" has kept biting me with that big mouth, stating that the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions (FTU) proposed a universal hand-out of at least $2,300 as early as 1994 …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, you have repeated this argument many times.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Buddy, I see tragedies repeat around the world day after day, do you not see them? I thought that those elderly persons were in a Nazi concentration camp, stripped like the Jews. Fortunately, they were waiting for a bath instead of a fate in the gas chamber.

Chairman, how can I not blame him? The Labour and Welfare Bureau is "condemnable". As in the case of standard working hours, well, the Chairman may say that I am repeating, but let me say it once again. Simply put, the three evils of not having standard working hours are, first, those who do not work overtime for pay will be regarded as neglect of duties and then dismissed; overtime work may not be rewarded at all; even if overtime work is rewarded, but in absence of statutory standard working hours, there is no basis for enacting a law that forbids fatigue, because a standard is needed before a rule can be made. Therefore, in the face of 3 million or so wage earners, including those who serve us here, whether willing or not, should the authorities not proceed to work it out? It has to be accomplished in five years, and this is already the third year. Hence, that is not acceptable.

The Financial Secretary is notorious, right? Let me not mention how he made wrong estimates for the time being. After $30 billion is granted out of this year's revenue of $100.3 billion, no one knows the use of the remaining $70 billion, which is said to have been saved up. Chairman, for heaven's sake, not to mention how that $70 billion can be used to build residential care homes, if
it can be used to buy places from private or subvented care homes and upgrade their services, will we see such a deplorable condition? Perhaps it can be used to implement universal retirement protection in the form of an immediate handout and leave it to the market. John TSANG has done nothing, and but proceeded instead to deduct $5 billion or so from the revenue about which you enlightened me. Is that $5 billion or so such a substantial sum? That is not the way to go.

This Financial Secretary went so far as to perform a stand-up comedy which, honestly, sounds like asking why people do not eat meat porridge. The said occasion of the Hong Kong Journalists Association charged $1,000 per head — Chairman, I have forgotten if it is $3,000 or $1,000 — I was not even eligible to join it. Even if I was asked if I would join or not, I would not give it a thought after learning of the admission fee of $3,000. He was there to act like a pimp and perform a stand-up comedy to make people laugh while being ignorant of the elderly who groaned under his harsh administration. The worst part is that he eats ordure while complaining about its stench, and he also accuses my current filibustering — it has indeed been tailored by you — of harming others. Also, there is this "WONG Kwok-hing the big-mouth dog" who barks at something rarely seen. He proceeded to say that both hospitals and patients are in dire needs — buddy, may he please stop scaring the elderly with such remarks, which sound too frightening to them — and that funding for university students is used up. What a bottom feeder he is.

The Transport and Housing Bureau is even more mind-boggling. Chairman, the bleeding and the various injuries sustained by Hong Kong are absolutely related to the inability of the Transport and Housing Bureau to advise them as required. I have never seen a city which carries out a large number of infrastructure projects concurrently without any logic. Chairman, there is a cost to build the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link (XRL), so is the boundary control point at Liantang, and the two compete with each other, and there is a need to build a new airport runway, too. With what party does the airport compete with? To the Mainland, the airport will have to compete with the XRL. Building them concurrently involves a colossal cost. Building the XRL and the new airport runway alone costs $80 million or so plus $151.4 billion. Should there be a cost overrun for the former, the cost will run up to $100 billion. Chairman, the two projects cost $250 billion to build, which is enough to support the rest of anyone's life. In the view of Prof Nelson CHOW, this is enough to finance the implementation of universal retirement protection until 2047.
Nothing is worse than this kind of "pickpocket administration", and they have no idea of what XI Jinping has said. Given Hong Kong's bid to connect with the Mainland's transport network, the Mainland says that works have to be carried out to complement the corresponding projects and make money. There is no way to make money from a disconnected boundary control point. Chairman, around the world, as in the highway network of Japan, resources dedicated to national railway development have been shifted to the highway network thanks to the manipulation by body corporates formed by retired senior officials, in detriment to Japan as a whole. This kind of policy switch from national railway to highway has brought the national railway to a halt. That is also the case with Malaysia, which I am going to visit. The authorities' current infrastructural development is utterly off balance. We need to pay, and the Transport and Housing Bureau also needs to handle the new airport runway, not to mention the issues concerning the Civil Aviation Department. The two costly projects of airport and XRL compete with each other. Chairman, how do they make it? Are they idiots?

Then, an Honourable colleague representing the engineering sector whose name I have forgotten says, "Are you trying to do harm to the workers by holding up the funding needed for building such essential facilities?" The Labour Department is largely to blame for creating either a huge oversupply or an acute shortage. When the authorities' infrastructural development is in full swing to an extent unmatched by workers nowadays, they call for labour importation. Chairman, listen, I must add a point regarding labour importation. A foreign worker was assigned to do just one job in the past, but not so anymore. Even Fordism does not work, so the production line is no longer divided into different sectors arbitrarily. Instead, workers are required to finish one job after another, and every foreign worker employed has to be versatile enough to do as many as five jobs, and yet the authorities are indifferent to this.

Hence, the money we spend … Based on the fallacy suggested by the FTU and the Member representing the engineering sector whose name I always forget … yes, that Member is Dr LO Wai-kwok, the silliest part is that instead of offering jobs to workers through "white elephant" projects, they should be granted money direct, because such "white elephants" will still have to be fed in the future, and Hong Kong people are not dumb. On the one hand, the authorities call for labour importation to tackle the shortage, are they idiots? Then, they said that everything has to go through the Labour Advisory Board (LAB). So, I asked about the LAB's position in the Basic Law, and I was told
that there is none. The LAB is used as a shield all the way. As for the tripartite parties of the Government, employer and business, the Chairman is also aware of the collusion between the Government and business. As two of the parties in the tripartite agreement collude with each other, is it how they cover the stink of ordure? Hence, all information cannot be disclosed.

I would now turn to the Education Bureau, which is really fraught with problems, and I would cite one example only. Since the incapable Eddie NG took office, he is supposed to implement an initiative in LEUNG Chun-ying's "rip-off" Manifesto, namely 15-year free education. Chairman, this is already his third year in office, and issues like teachers' qualification, form of subvention and school premises remain unsolved. What about 15-year free education? This is his number-one mission, which has yet to complete.

Second, one of the issues to be addressed in education reform is that many students have to study abroad because there are no school places. Another associated issue is that children of expatriates admitted to work in Hong Kong should be admitted to international schools, but places at such schools are taken up by local children thanks to the discrepancies between our secondary education examination and its international counterpart. Children of affluent parents would either study abroad or enrol in international schools in Hong Kong to prepare for the international examination. Chairman, the situation can be likened to a pair of shoes which I asked you to invent for me being too small to me and is thus given to another kid, and then I am told that I have already received the shoes and the job is done. As a result, I am left with nothing to wear, and my shoes have gone to that kid for no reason.

Tomorrow, LEUNG Chun-ying will attend the Question and Answer Session, and I will go to the Court, so I cannot hurl anything at him. He is really marvellous. I am not sure if this is prearranged. He once told all Hong Kong people the biggest lie, and no one could help laughing, that is, "To tackle the issue of talent admission, we have to address problems like pollution, and the most important one is the shortage of international school places, which can be ascribed to inadequate land." Nonsense. International schools take up a large chunk of our valuable land on which children of affluent parents not studying abroad may receive foreign education in Hong Kong, while children of expatriates working in Hong Kong are denied access to the educational support to which they are entitled. Even expatriates may find it costly. He lied to all
Hong Kong people, what kind of a man is he? If that is not the case, it must be attributed to the deceiving reports made by the Secretary for Education under him.

Chairman, even 10 years are not enough for me to recount all of this kind of double talk. Even if all the bamboos from Nanshan are exhausted, that is still not enough if one is to recount all of his evils. It is only because you disallowed me to speak, not that I have no solid material to speak.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, in this session, I am speaking for the third time in the seventh debate. I will continue to speak on "Head 147 — Government Secretariat: Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau (The Treasury Branch)" to elaborate further why I have to oppose its standing part of the Schedule. Earlier on, I mentioned that this Treasury Branch, in its original capacity as the financial controller of the SAR Government, is responsible for looking after the public coffers for Hong Kong people. Monitored, examined and approved by the Legislative Council, funding will be allocated to launching works or introducing policies. But in the past year, it was evident to all that the Government had exhausted every means in an attempt to bypass the Legislative Council's monitoring of government funding or reduce its monitoring ability, including requesting us to deal with in one go a number of funding items bundled up with the Budget mentioned in the last session. Even the pro-establishment Members have voiced their dissatisfaction, stating that these items could originally be discussed one by one, and that the discussion on each item could last at least one hour so that Members may ask questions. But now, we are unable to discuss these 25 items.

The latest incident is certainly the funding application submitted by the Government to the Finance Committee direct, bypassing the Public Works Subcommittee. Secretary Prof K C said in explanation that he had such power and that he was in full compliance with the Rules of Procedure in so doing. Surely I know it was in full compliance with the Rules of Procedure, or else it would not have happened. This morning, we gave him another challenge by proposing the motion for adjournment of proceedings in respect of the creation of posts for a third runway at the airport. Once a motion for adjournment of proceedings is proposed, it will become a ghost before transmigration, hovering between life and death. If the funding application can be made to the Finance Committee direct in that case, it will again become a precedent.
In addition, Chairman, I believe you are also aware that the Government has put pressure on us in the Legislative Council, asking you not to approve even one single amendment. Certainly, you have approved some of the amendments because the Chairman can hold views different from that of the Government. However, just like the Office of the Financial Secretary, the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau has certainly threatened Members and all Hong Kong people that whenever we speak once more or one day more, we will exhaust the coffers, plunge the Government into dire straits and obstruct its operation, sounding as if the Government is going to collapse and the CSSA recipients cannot be granted "double payment". These examples are not new to us. In fact, Chairman, you are an expert in tailoring filibusters. In terms of reducing the number of amendments, you are the best in Hong Kong. You have become an authority in deciding which amendments can be proposed and which ones cannot. But to our surprise, they are more authoritative than you, thinking that you should not approve even one single amendment and saying that all amendments are frivolous.

The "0-1-1" envelope savings programme and cost recovery briefly mentioned by me earlier on are policies intended to be launched by the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau (Treasury Branch), which have induced widespread wrath and extensive resentment with many internal complaints from various government departments. They think that the Government has abundant fiscal reserves. Why does it still act in such a miserly manner? Various departments struggle to make ends meet just for the purpose of cutting 1% or 2% of spending. Then, holding the Report of the Working Group on Long-Term Fiscal Planning in hand, the authorities have threatened us that although we now have abundant fiscal reserves, the situation will go downhill a few years later. Hence, instead of spending lavishly, we should implement cost recovery arrangements, uphold the principle of "users pay" and set up a "Future Fund", and so on. I will not go into the details here. It shows that the Government will pass the buck to Members and filibusters when problems arise in its projects. In respect of cost overruns and delays in completion of infrastructural development, they can shirk all the responsibilities. Similarly, they can even attribute the fact that Hong Kong will soon be overtaken by Guangzhou and Shenzhen to others. Do they not know that when these things happened in the past, we totally got nothing to do with the delays and cost overruns of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link Project? But this Government and the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau led by Secretary
Prof K C CHAN have nonetheless joined in the smear campaign against us in order to narrow the room for scrutiny of the Budget and government funding by Members.

Lastly, I have to speak specifically on head 49. In fact, I have proposed a number of amendments in different sessions of debate covering issues related to the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD). However, in this final session, I certainly cannot speak on the amendments one by one. I will only focus my discussion on two major topics and policies, that is, the policies on public markets and hawker control of the FEHD which have all along been a cause of criticism. The FEHD has significant problems with its policy on public markets, especially the management of public cooked food markets.

If Members have noticed the value-for-money report released by the Audit Commission, they will be aware that according to the report, the vacancy rates of public cooked food markets are extremely high, and land resource utilization fails to yield satisfactory results. Not only is public money wasted, but even worse, safety concerns about the facilities in cooked food markets have arisen, posing dangers to the public. I am not going to cite all the figures, but according to the report, the 11 Cooked Food Hawker Bazaars has a stall vacancy rate of 61% on average. And of the 114 vacant stalls in total, 80% has been vacant for over 10 years. I do not know what the Government's fiscal management approach is. It has requested departments to cut 1% of their spending every year. But in fact, the Government can earn such a sum of money as long as these vacant stalls are leased out or used for other purposes. Nine public cooked food markets have been located at temporary sites for some 30 to 42 years. For example, Cheung Sha Wan Cooked Food Market, the largest one, has a vacancy rate of 57%. The most shocking fact is that nearly 20% of them, that is, 28 stalls, have actually been vacant for over 25 years. Of these stalls, the longest period of vacancy is as long as 29 years. What is the FEHD doing? Such obvious problems have clearly demonstrated how poor its management is, with no policy for vacant stalls. Leaving aside whether the land is put to the best use, these situations are totally unreasonable. How can the Government allow these things to persist? The total area of the 11 Cooked Food Hawker Bazaars managed by the FEHD measures more than 8 000 sq m, but 60% of the stalls are vacant long term. Moreover, a number of Cooked Food Markets are located in urban areas. Now we often talk about the scarcity of land, so how can we allow this situation to persist?
In fact, the FEHD cannot absolve itself of the blame for its failure to regularly inspect the viability of Cooked Food Markets and Cooked Food Centres and take actions. The relevant issue does not only involve vacant stalls — if the stalls supposed to be leased out for rental income are left vacant, it will amount to a waste of money because in fact, the money also belongs to Hong Kong people — but also safety and fire hazard concerns.

Like any restaurants on commercial premises, public cooked food markets are subject to fire risk. According to the information about the number of fire incidents involving public cooked food markets, from 2011 to 2014, there were 11 fire incidents at public cooked food markets, with eight at Cooked Food Markets, two at Cooked Food Centres and the remaining one at Cooked Food Hawker Bazaars. As to other particulars, I will not go into the details. I think it is worth noting that the Audit Commission conducted site visits to 13 public cooked food markets in the period from November 2014 to January 2015 to examine the provision of fire service facilities therein, pointing out that those markets were subject to certain fire risk factors. For example, open kitchens without fire-resistant partitions were found in some stalls at Lai Yip Street Cooked Food Hawker Bazaar, and many liquefied petroleum gas cylinders were kept at Chai Wan Kok Cooked Food Market, clearly demonstrating the inadequacy of fire safety measures at these public cooked food markets.

The FEHD acts as if it has got nothing to do with the situation. It has not only turned a blind eye to the vacant stalls, but also done nothing to address the dangers. Now, facing criticisms, it has certainly indicated that it will expedite the implementation of measures. In fact, the FEHD itself is also aware of the problems, claiming that since 2002, the FEHD has implemented fire safety upgrading works at 22 Cooked Food Centres and Cooked Food Markets, and will carry out fire safety upgrading works at the remaining centres and markets which have yet to implement the relevant measures. In addition, it will also join hands with the Fire Services Department to review the fire risk at public cooked food markets and take enforcement actions against stalls in violation of regulations. Now it is like entering a zone under no management at all. I will not talk about wastage of electricity as it is too trivial, and I still have to discuss another policy of the FEHD which has been subject to criticism, that is, the street hawker control policy.
In fact, the Legislative Council has dedicated subcommittees to specifically deal with these two items. Given the seriousness of the problems, we hope to press the Government to join us in reflecting on the policies on markets and hawker control, currently known as the policy on bazaar economic activities. I believe Members will notice from daily press reports that the elderly people are singled out as the special targets of the FEHD staff because they do not know how to put up resistance. Certainly, you can say that they have broken the law in selling second-hand goods and old shoes as illegal hawkers on streets. But the FEHD staff will step on the goods of these elderly, disallowing them to pack their things. It is simply no use to ask for mercy as they have no sympathy at all. They will even shout at these elderly people, claiming that they should be psychologically prepared for being arrested and shouted at for peddling in the streets.

The FEHD is alleged to have repeatedly evicted and arrested these elderly hawkers. They have not only imposed fines, but also forfeited the articles of these elderly people operating in difficulty and even treated them in a violent manner. In fact, I think it is not necessary for the Government to demonize those who are self-reliant and earn a living through personal effort on streets, especially the elderly people. We all know that they can either scavenge cardboards and collect old newspapers, or sell second-hand items just like what these elderly hawkers do, barely earning several tens of dollars a day. We should appreciate these elderly people who still hope to support themselves through work at the age of sixty or seventy.

However, the FEHD sees them as "disgusting mice on the streets". Although the FEHD has both pressure and power in law enforcement, we think that justice should be tempered with mercy. When the elderly people get no assistance from social welfare policy, they have to provide for themselves, and what they have done are not evil deeds against the law. There are many heartrending cases. For example, an old man aged 72 has been selling egg waffles for 30 years at Tai Hang. He has never lived on CSSA, but suffered a crackdown by the Hawker Control Team of the FEHD, which arrested him thrice in 10 days. Apart from being fined $800 on each of the occasions, the wooden cart that he relied upon for subsistence was also forfeited.

There is a recent tragedy involving an officer of the FEHD, which is the last thing we would wish to see. A duty officer eventually died as a result of injuries sustained in a clash with a South Asian. As proposed by me at a panel
meeting, when the Government reviews this incident, apart from teaching them martial arts or asking them to watch videos on self-defence, it should also review the adequacy of the enforcement guidelines provided to them, and whether they have actually sown much hatred as a result of their unsatisfactory handling in the course of enforcement. Certainly, it is a difficult job to do because the FEHD amounts to urban management bureaus in the Mainland. However, compared with the urban management bureaus in the Mainland, the FEHD in Hong Kong can be considered lucky. Officers of the urban management bureaus in the Mainland may really become victims of gang assault.

I do not have much time left. This time around, the Government has been evading the issue of a review of its hawker policy. Fully committed to the task, Secretary Dr KO Wing-man has done quite a good job this year. However, the previous role of the FEHD is management in nature, striving to stay away from trouble, ensure the cleanliness and hygiene of food and avoid any accident. Hence, I am still much worried as it has been required to take the lead in launching a policy on hawker development. Nevertheless, after the discussion by the panel that has lasted one year, I hope there will be a successful precedent in the days ahead. If the panel does nothing after holding 10 meetings for discussion and then releases a report all the same, then it will be a downright waste of time.

I so submit.

MR ALBERT CHAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, this is my last speech on the question of the 62 heads standing part of the Schedule. At the different stages of scrutiny earlier, I have spoken on about half of the relevant heads. Regarding those heads on which I have not yet spoken, I hope to take this opportunity to add some of my justifications against their inclusion in the Schedule. For certain heads, however, there is still not enough time for me to state my reasons for proposing my amendments and supporting some of the Honourable colleagues' amendments, as well as why I oppose the inclusion of some of these 62 heads at this stage.

Chairman, earlier on, I have mentioned those items that will be included concerning the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau. I would like to add some points with regard to the performance and duties of the Office of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region in Beijing (Beijing Office). Just now I talked about the historical problems, but now, let us look at
the real-life situation. In 2014, the Beijing Office had 136 employees in total, whereas the Hong Kong Economic and Trade Office in Guangdong (Guangdong ETO) had 166. They had plenty of staff members. However, the number of cases they received was tiny. The number of requests for assistance received by the Beijing Office within a year was 24, whereas that received by the GDETO was 79. With 136 employees, the Beijing Office received only 24 complaints, while the Guangdong ETO, which had 166 employees, received only 79.

Let us look at these figures. Why were there so few cases? As far as my office is concerned, the number of requests for assistance received by me in my Hong Kong office concerning problems on the Mainland is definitely more than 24 each year. When the number of cases in a certain year was high, it might exceed 24 and adding to it 79, that means it might exceed 100. There are 12 months in a year. If there are 100 cases each year, that means on average, there are less than 10 cases a month. Sometimes there is indeed such a number of cases. We have received various complaints. For example, the complainants were subjected to surveillance on the Mainland, their properties on the Mainland had been occupied by someone else, or they had problems with property transactions on the Mainland. The number of cases in the past year is relatively small, but in the peak period, my office handled 600 cases a year. There could be 100 cases involving problems on the Mainland within a year. As far as I remember, there was absolutely such a situation.

A representative of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference once sought my assistance, saying that he was oppressed by Mainland officials. This happened about 10 years ago. I then wrote a letter to the Public Security Bureau in Beijing, pointing out the problem. Very efficiently, a couple of weeks later, a team of public security officers suddenly went from that province to the district concerned to carry out the relevant work. In handling these problems, there was a period of time when we had a volunteer lawyer in Shenzhen who helped us to deal with consultation on real estate in the Mainland. The provision of these services aims at giving Hong Kong people direct assistance. The Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions is the most awesome now, right? Perhaps it will even be able to offer people graveyards in the future.

However, let us look at the work of these so-called Mainland offices on the Mainland. Chairman, let me read it out to you: "Officers of the above offices" — including the Beijing Office and the Guangdong ETO — "do not have the rights and powers of visiting the detainees in the Mainland under the relevant Mainland laws and regulations. The practical assistance they may provide to the
assistance seekers includes providing information on relevant Mainland laws, regulations and procedures; advising on their right to appoint legal representatives; providing contact details of local law societies; and reflecting the assistance seekers or their family members' views and requests to the relevant Mainland authorities." They can neither visit them nor directly provide any professional assistance. They can only advise them on their right to appoint lawyers and give them information on relevant Mainland laws, regulations and procedures. This is even less than the support and assistance provided by our district office in helping members of the public to deal with their problems on the Mainland. Upon receiving a complaint, sometimes we would write to the relevant Mainland authorities for them, look up information for them and directly provide them with legal assistance. As I have just mentioned, we had a lawyer on the Mainland who could provide assistance, and they could directly contact each other in respect of the relevant problems. Moreover, such services which were provided on a voluntary basis were free of charge.

However, this Policy Bureau which incurs an expenditure of over $100 million and which has 100-odd staff members in service cannot even provide the basic information. Neither does it have the right to visit the detainees. As we all know, if an ordinary Hong Kong citizen wishes to visit such authorities as the Public Security Bureau, the Urban Management Bureau and the immigration department on the Mainland, very often he will have to rely on a lot of connections and so-called bribery, but he can still hardly visit the detainees. He can hardly know whether they are alive or dead and what their situation is. The offices concerned are departments that represent Hong Kong people. Our hard-earned money is used to pay them salaries. When Hong Kong people are subject to unfair treatment or detained on the Mainland, even if we simply wish to know if they are alive, to find out how they are and to get a glimpse of them, we cannot do so. As such, should the relevant funding not be withdrawn?

For this reason, I object to the heads relating to the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau standing part of the Schedule. Moreover, this is absolutely the wish of many Hong Kong people, especially those who have suffered, who have been subject to unfair treatment, who have been beaten up, or who have been imprisoned on the Mainland. Chairman, I have come across some cases. Those people were not released until their relatives or friends had brought them money because they were under administrative detention. If they could not pay, say, $1 million, they would not be allowed to leave. Even though
some of them had left the Mainland for some 10 years, after their return to Hong Kong, they were still demanded payment of the fees. Eventually, they had to flee to a faraway place and did not dare return to Hong Kong. The reason was that the relevant departments and authorities had threatened them for payment of the fees through triads in Hong Kong. Actually there are numerous such cases. Chairman, these situations have never stopped in the past two or three decades, but the support which the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau can provide is so weak and disappointing. For this reason, we should object to the inclusion of the relevant funding in the Schedule.

Chairman, besides, I would like to speak on "Head 91 — Lands Department" in relation to the Department of Justice (DoJ). Last time I talked about it already. This time I just wish to add some information. With regard to the prosecution figures, the drop in the number of successful prosecutions is alarming. Let us look at the prosecution figures, Chairman. For example, as you can see, in 2009, the conviction rate was 53%, and in 2014, 50%. The amount payable for unsuccessful criminal prosecutions soared from $17.99 million in 2001 to $43.72 million in 2014. That means after losing a case, the Government has to compensate the other party for the relevant costs. In view of the surge in this figure, we feel concerned about the service and professional standard of the DoJ.

Chairman, figures relating to the Occupy Movement are even more surprising. Recently, there have been continuous news reports pointing out that in many cases, the Judge ultimately criticized the lack of sufficient information or evidence, and the defendants had to be released then. These figures are quite astounding. Let me briefly spell out the information concerning the verdicts for cases in the Occupy Movement. Chairman, as at 3 April, there were 94 prosecutions. Among them, six defendants were acquitted, 40 had their charges dropped, and only 13 were convicted. Of course, some cases have not concluded yet. So, according to these figures, six were acquitted, 40 had their charges dropped and 13 were convicted. In respect of the percentage, the rate of conviction has dropped drastically when compared with the earlier figures. I wonder if the rate can reach 20%. It may be only some 10%.

Actually, insofar as this problem concerned, there are a lot of cases, but I am not going to talk about them in detail. Chairman, I have said a number of times that many of my comments on the Government were made with foresight. Chairman, last year I already commented on the performance of the DoJ. Members may look it up in the records. During the Committee stage of the
Appropriation Bill 2014, Chairman, how did I comment on the DoJ? My assistant is remarkable. He found my speaking note for that occasion. Back then, I criticized Keith YEUNG, the Director of Public Prosecutions. He assumed office in June 2013. At that time the problem was actually quite sensitive and controversial. Chairman, what did I say a year ago? "In the coming year" — that means from that time to the present moment — "Keith YEUNG will definitely continue to follow the rigid bureaucracy in serving as the Director of Public Prosecutions and callously deal with the peaceful participants in Occupy Central," — Chairman, at that time Occupy Central had not taken place yet — oppress the participants in Occupy Central and let corrupt officials go unpunished."

Why did I say that at that time? Chairman, at that time I criticized Keith YEUNG's appointment as the Director of Public Prosecutions. Back then, he did not have much experience in criminal cases. In fact, he did not wish to act as the Director of Public Prosecutions. Maybe the Government originally intended to ask him to handle the civil issues, but for some complicated or secret reasons, the Government chanced to invite him to take up this post, and he was willing to do it. Consequently, a lot of wrongful cases and mistaken prosecutions have occurred this year. Apart from the participants in Occupy Central, the recent case of KOON Wing-yee is similar, and LEW Mon-hung has also been acquitted. Hence, as we can see, there is a series of problems, no matter whether they are big or small issues. However, in a number of cases, prosecutions might have been instituted due to political factors, disregarding criminal evidence and professional requirements in criminal law. The present DoJ has turned out to serve political purposes. This is very obvious, as illustrated by the figures, the recent series of prosecutions and the final results. Chairman, I have to declare my interest. My appeal was dismissed a couple of days ago. I will consider lodging an appeal again. This involves my own business. I need to declare interests first. As shown by the previous examples and the various situations, it is justifiable that the sum for head 92 should not stand part of the Schedule.

Chairman, may I digress a little bit. That day, when the ruling on my appeal was delivered, the rainstorm signal suddenly changed from amber to red and then further to black within just 10-odd minutes. It was exactly the time when the Judge announced the dismissal of my appeal. According to a Chinese belief, when something is happening, a sudden tempest is an indication of injustice. This is similar to what happened when the People's Liberation Army (PLA) entered the city in 1997. I was in the High Court. The Court delivered
the ruling at about 10 o'clock. At that time the red rainstorm signal was hoisted, but when I came out after the ruling was delivered, it had already changed to black. When I came out to meet the reporters, the wind was howling and the rain was pouring. It was exactly like the weather when the PLA entered the city in 1997. Hence, I find this a blessing for me from heaven.

Chairman, the other items include "Head 33 — Civil Engineering and Development Department". I oppose the inclusion of this head. Besides, I oppose the inclusion of "Head 60 — Highways Department" because this involves delays in projects and blunders in supervision. Of course, in some cases, it may not be entirely attributable to the relevant officers. Some of them have long discovered the problem, but other senior officers ignored it owing to political reasons. Many projects are related to the Mainland, for example, the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link, the Liantang Boundary Control Point and the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge. Everything that is related to the Mainland will incur an insane cost overrun. Chairman, perhaps reference has really been drawn from the jerry-built projects and corrupt conduct on the Mainland. Hence, to show our attitude, we should oppose the inclusion of these items.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The seventh debate has come to a close. Committee will now proceed to vote on the questions that the sums for 62 heads stand part of the Schedule one by one in the order of those heads.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 21 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr Albert CHAN rose to claim a division.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

(After the division bell has been rung for one minute)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): A quorum is not present in the Chamber. Will the Clerk please ring the bell to summon Members back to the Chamber.

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

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

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr Albert CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Mr Kenneth LEUNG and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 36 Members present, 30 were in favour of the motion and two against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

**CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 22 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr Albert CHAN rose to claim a division.

**CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): Mr Albert CHAN has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG,
Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN, Mr WONG Yuk-man and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Dr Kenneth CHAN, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 44 Members present, 32 were in favour of the motion and four against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 23 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Dr Kenneth CHAN, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN, Mr WONG Yuk-man, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Mr KWOK Wai-keung voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 41 Members present, 30 were in favour of the motion and five against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 24 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Dr Kenneth CHAN, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 39 Members present, 31 were in favour of the motion and three against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 25 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung,
Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr Albert HO, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 39 Members present, 30 were in favour of the motion and three against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 26 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr Albert HO, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 39 Members present, 30 were in favour of the motion and four against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 28 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr Albert HO, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 40 Members present, 31 were in favour of the motion and three against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

**CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 30 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

**CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK
Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 40 Members present, 31 were in favour of the motion and three against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

**CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 31 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

**CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr Albert CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr Albert HO, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Mr Alan LEONG and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 40 Members present, 31 were in favour of the motion and two against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 33 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr Albert CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr Albert HO, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Mr Alan LEONG and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 41 Members present, 32 were in favour of the motion and two against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 39 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK
Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr Albert HO, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Mr Alan LEONG and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 41 Members present, 31 were in favour of the motion and three against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 42 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr Albert HO, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Mr Alan LEONG and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 41 Members present, 31 were in favour of the motion and three against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 44 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr Albert HO, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Mr Alan LEONG and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 41 Members present, 31 were in favour of the motion and three against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 45 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK
Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr Albert HO, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Mr Alan LEONG and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 41 Members present, 31 were in favour of the motion and three against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 46 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Mebers raised their hands)

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

(Mebers raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr Albert HO, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Mr Alan LEONG and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 40 Members present, 30 were in favour of the motion and three against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 47 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr Albert HO, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Mr Alan LEONG and Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 39 Members present, 29 were in favour of the motion and three against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the sum for head 49 stand part of the Schedule. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.
Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu- ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE voted for the motion.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Jasper TSANG, Mr Albert HO, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che and Mr Alan LEONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that there were 38 Members present, 29 were in favour of the motion and three against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

**SUSPENSION OF MEETING**

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now suspend the meeting. The Chief Executive's Question and Answer Session will be held from 9.15 am to 10.45 am tomorrow. The Council will resume at 2.30 pm tomorrow.

*Suspended accordingly at 7.59 pm.*