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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:

Subsidiary Legislation/Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L.N. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Institutions (Resolution) (Protected Arrangements) Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Institutions (Resolution) Ordinance (Commencement) Notice 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees Retraining Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 2) (No. 2) Notice 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Papers

No. 96 — Research Endowment Fund
Financial statements and Report of the Director of Audit for the year ended 31 August 2016

No. 97 — Securities and Futures Commission
Approved budget of income and expenditure for the financial year 2017/2018

Report of the Bills Committee on Inland Revenue (Amendment) Bill 2017
WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Basic Competency Assessment Research Study

1. MR CHEUNG KWOK-KWAN (in Chinese): President, in recent years, there have been voices in society calling for the abolition of the Primary Three Territory-wide System Assessment ("TSA") because some schools over-drilled their students in the hope that the students would get good scores in the assessment. Last year, after making improvements to TSA (including adjusting the design of assessment papers and questions) in accordance with the recommendations of a committee, the Education Bureau ("EDB") invited 50 schools to participate in a tryout for the Basic Competency Assessment Research Study ("BCA"). In view of the positive feedback on the tryout, EDB extended BCA to all primary schools in the territory this month. However, some parents request EDB to shelve BCA as they are still worried that schools will drill students. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the current total number of schools which have expressly indicated that they are not participating in BCA; the percentage of that number in the total number of schools in the territory; the follow-up actions taken by EDB in respect of those schools which have expressly indicated their non-participation, and whether EDB has plans to, as far as possible, persuade them to participate;

(2) given that EDB has appealed for a number of times to schools not to drill students in preparation for BCA, of the specific measures, other than making those appeals, put in place by EDB to ensure that schools will not drill their students; how EDB handles complaints about schools drilling students; and

(3) whether EDB will, upon the completion of BCA of this school year, carry out the relevant analysis and study to assess the effectiveness of BCA and determine its future direction; if EDB will, when it will commence and complete such work, and whether it will compose a detailed report on the analysis and study outcome; if EDB will, whether it will publish the report and table it in this Council?

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION (in Chinese): President, Territory-wide System Assessment ("TSA") is one of the components of Basic Competency Assessments. It is an assessment on students' Basic Competencies in the three
subjects of Chinese Language, English Language and Mathematics upon completion of the three key learning stages (i.e. Primary Three, Primary Six and Secondary Three levels). Basic Competencies form part of the curriculum and have been integrated in students' daily learning and internal assessments made by schools. Students are expected to acquire the Basic Competencies in the three subjects in order to proceed effectively to the next key learning stage.

TSA is a low-stake assessment that does not assess and report performance of individual students. Neither does it affect students' advancement in education nor allocation of school places for admission to Secondary One. The data is not used for ranking or classifying schools. It is not related to the closure of schools necessitated by under-enrolment.

To address public concerns about TSA, the Coordinating Committee on Basic Competency Assessment and Assessment Literacy ("the Committee") has been conducting a comprehensive review on the implementation arrangements of TSA since October 2015, and recommended implementing the 2016 Tryout Study (Primary Three) (2016 Tryout Study). The feedback and views collected as well as the experience of participating schools showed that the four new initiatives under the 2016 Tryout Study could effectively address the public concerns, including eliminating the incentives for over-drilling induced by TSA, alleviating stakeholders' concerns about the stake involved, reflecting the "low stake, no drilling" design of TSA and the original purpose of providing feedback on learning and teaching, deepening the mutual trust among schools, parents and various stakeholders, as well as enhancing assessment literacy.

In view of the effectiveness of the 2016 Tryout Study, the Committee recommended extending the four new initiatives under the 2016 Tryout Study to all primary schools in the territory in order to collect more comprehensive feedback so as to continue to review related arrangements. The Education Bureau accepted related recommendations and introduced the 2017 Primary Three Basic Competency Assessment Research Study (2017 Research Study), extending the new initiatives for enhancement under the Tryout Study to all primary schools in the territory in 2017.

Regarding the question raised by Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, my reply is as follows:

(1) At this stage, the 2017 Research Study is in good progress. All publicly funded primary schools (i.e. more than 470 schools) have arranged to participate in the Research Study; and more than 20
private primary schools have also opted to join. Should schools encounter any special circumstances or difficulties in participating in the Research Study, the Regional Education Offices of the Education Bureau would look into the matter and provide assistance.

(2) The Education Bureau's position on opposing over-drilling is very clear and firm. In 2015, the Education Bureau issued a circular on "Guidelines on Homework and Tests in Schools—No Drilling, Effective Learning" to schools, reiterating that the quality of homework is more important than the quantity. Schools should attach importance to students' whole-person development, and allow students to have spare time to participate in other meaningful social or extra-curricular activities conducive to whole-person development, and have time to gain sufficient rest and sleep. The circular also sets out that school sponsoring bodies and school management committees should collaborate with schools to make arrangements for an appropriate homework and assessment policy. Schools should timely explain to parents the school homework and assessment policy (e.g. setting out the types of effective homework, frequency of tests and examinations, arrangements of supplementary lessons and whether there is a need to purchase supplementary exercises, etc.), as well as seek their views and encourage them to give feedback on their children's performance in homework. In addition, schools should inform all parents of the school homework and assessment policy and upload it at the beginning of every school year. Besides, early this year, a number of school sponsoring bodies, representatives of primary school heads associations and District Federations of Parent-Teacher Associations launched a three-party initiative on "Opposing excessive drilling and making good use of assessment to provide feedback to learning and teaching", supporting the effective use of assessment data to understand students' learning and opposing meaningless drilling.

In addition, the Education Bureau has introduced various concrete measures to eliminate the incentives for over-drilling induced by TSA. To begin with, the assessment papers have been improved with the question design aligned with the requirements of Basic Competencies of Primary Three students, and tied in with the spirit of the curriculum to address students' learning needs. As such, students are able to acquire Basic Competencies in their daily learning without the need for extra preparation or over-drilling.
specifically for TSA. Under the 2016 Tryout Study, the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority ("HKEAA") provided four types of school reports with different coverage, including a school report which only provided data of an individual school without the overall data for reference purposes. Schools may, in the light of school-based needs, choose the school reports that best facilitate analysis of students' performance. This effectively alleviated schools' concerns about the possible stakes of TSA data. In addition, the Education Bureau has removed TSA from the Key Performance Measures for primary schools to reflect the low-stake nature of TSA. The Education Bureau accepted the Committee's recommendation on strengthening internal guidelines to provide clear guidelines on the use of TSA data and information by various sections within the Education Bureau. The Education Bureau has also made it clear that government primary schools would not purchase supplementary exercises for the preparation of TSA, and would step up public education and enhance training for teaching staff at different stages (including training for prospective teachers, pre-service training for appointed teachers, and in-service training for serving teachers), and enhance their understanding of "assessment for learning" to ensure the proper and effective use of TSA data to facilitate learning and teaching.

The Education Bureau encourages schools and parents to maintain good liaison. The Regional Education Offices of the Education Bureau have been maintaining close communication with schools and will take the initiative to understand schools' homework and exercise arrangements. Should there be complaint cases or situations related to over-drilling, the Regional Education Offices will handle and continuously follow up according to established procedures.

(3) The 2017 Research Study will adopt quantitative and qualitative approaches to collect views and recommendations as a basis for feedback and review of related arrangements for the assessment. Details of the arrangements and methods regarding the review of the Research Study are set out in LC Paper No. CB(4)799/16-17(03).

Under the 2017 Research Study, the oral assessments for Chinese Language and English Language as well as audio-visual assessments on Chinese Language were conducted on 4 and 5 May, and the
written assessments for Chinese Language, English Language and Mathematics will take place in mid-June 2017. After completing the written assessments in mid-June, the Education Bureau and HKEAA will conduct a series of focus groups and seminars to collect views of the school sponsoring bodies, school heads, teachers and parents. In line with the prevailing practice, HKEAA will issue territory-wide and school reports in November. Professional support measures for schools will also be rolled out in the new school year.

The Committee and the Education Bureau will continue to observe and listen to the views and recommendations of the sector and various stakeholders with a view to submitting recommendations to the new Government on the arrangements of TSA. Following the prevailing practice, the Education Bureau will also upload the review report submitted by the Committee to the Education Bureau website for public viewing.

**Measures to meet public demand for housing**

2. **MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG** (in Chinese): President, quite a number of members of the public have complained to me that subsidized housing has been persistently in short supply, leaving them no choice but to live in rented private residential units and pay high rents while waiting for allocation of such housing. Despite the implementation of a series of demand-side management measures by the Government targeting the residential property market in recent years, residential property prices have repeatedly hit record high and, like a rising tide that lifts all boats, the rents have also risen incessantly. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

1. of the respective expected numbers of public rental housing estates and Home Ownership Scheme courts which will be ready for intake in the coming nine months, and set out in a table the names of the housing estates and courts, the districts in which they are located, the numbers of flats to be provided and intake dates;

2. whether it will introduce new demand-side management measures in the coming six months to bring down residential property prices and rents; if so, of the details; if not, how the authorities address the public demand for housing; and
(3) given the current short supply of subsidized housing, whether the authorities will consider afresh implementing a rent control scheme; if so, of the implementation timetable; if not, what more effective measures the authorities have in place to alleviate the rent burden on the public?

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Chinese): President, my reply to various parts of the question raised by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung is as follows:

(1) According to the Public Housing Construction Programme of the Hong Kong Housing Authority as at end March 2017, there will be a total of about 7 000 public rental housing ("PRH") units and 1 819 units under the Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS")/Green Form Subsidized Home Ownership Pilot Scheme ("GSH") available for intake in the coming nine months (i.e. from June 2017 to February 2018). Details are set out at Annex.

(2) The Government has repeatedly emphasized that the crux of resolving the housing problem lies with increase in supply. To address the demand-supply imbalance at source in the long run, the Government has strived to increase the housing land supply through short-, medium- and long-term means under the supply-led strategy. Through sustained efforts of the Government, private housing supply has increased steadily. As at end March 2017, the projected supply from the first-hand private residential property market for the coming three to four years is approximately 96 000 units, a record high since the first release of the quarterly statistics on the supply of first-hand private flats in September 2004. On completion, based on the preliminary assessment of private residential developments known to have started or to be started on disposed sites, the private sector will, on average, develop about 20 300 private residential units each year in the next five years, 70% higher than the yearly average of the past five years.

Nevertheless, as it takes time for the increase in supply to realize, the short-term demand-supply balance remains tight. Owing to the ultra-low interest rates and abundant liquidity in the global monetary
environment in view of the easing monetary policies adopted by many major economies, the local residential property market has been exuberant with property prices out of line with economic fundamentals and heightened risk of a bubble. Against such background, it is necessary for the Government to continue with various demand-side management measures in combating speculative activities, curbing external demand and reducing investment demand, thereby minimizing the risk of a housing bubble.

The Government announced the introduction of the New Residential Stamp Duty ("NRSD") measure on 4 November 2016 to increase the ad valorem stamp duty chargeable on residential property transactions to a new flat rate of 15%. The new measure increases the transaction costs, thereby reducing investment demand for residential properties, which in turn helps guard against further increase in the risks of a housing bubble. According to statistics of the Inland Revenue Department, since the announcement of the new measure, the number of residential property transactions involving Hong Kong permanent resident ("HKPR")-buyers who have owned one or more local residential property (which can be regarded as an indicator of investment activities) has decreased from about 1 800 cases in November 2016 (reflecting the situation before introduction of NRSD) to the monthly average of 340 cases during the period from January to April 2017, representing a significant drop of 80%. In addition, amongst residential property transactions involving HKPR-buyers, the percentage of buyers who do not own any other residential property in Hong Kong at the time of acquisition reached 94% on average during the period from January to April 2017, much higher than the relevant percentage of 70% in November 2016.

After the introduction of NRSD measure, there has been public concern over the increase in transactions involving acquisition of multiple residential properties under a single instrument in recent months. Against such background, the Government announced on 11 April 2017 to tighten the exemption arrangement for HKPRs under the NRSD regime with effect from 12 April 2017, so as to prevent local buyers from making use of the above exemption arrangement to avoid the payment of NRSD. Under the tightened
exemption arrangement, if a HKPR-buyer acquires more than one residential property under a single instrument, the transaction concerned will no longer be exempted, and will be subject to the NRSD rate of 15%.

The Government will continue to stay vigilant and closely monitor the property market movements and the ever-changing external conditions by making reference to a series of indicators, including property prices, home purchase affordability ratio, transaction volume, flat supply, changes in local and global economies, etc., and will adjust the demand-side management measures as and when appropriate.

(3) Rent control is highly controversial and consensus has not yet been reached in the community over this issue. To this end, the Government conducted a detailed study on the issue of tenancy control in 2014 by looking into Hong Kong's past experience and overseas experience in implementing tenancy control measures, and briefed the Panel on Housing of the Legislative Council in detail in July 2014(1). After extensive public consultation, the Government also elaborated on this subject in the Long Term Housing Strategy (paragraphs 6.15-6.18) announced in end 2014.

Empirical findings, both local and overseas, suggest that tenancy control measures often lead to an array of unintended consequences, including those detrimental to the tenants whom the measures seek to assist. These unintended consequences include reducing supply of rented accommodation; encouraging landlords to be more selective about their tenants, thereby limiting access to adequate housing by those with unstable financial means (e.g. daily-waged workers), ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, and other socially disadvantaged groups; encouraging certain behaviour from landlords to offset the impact of the tenancy control measures (including increasing initial rent and requiring the tenants to pay excessive miscellaneous charges, etc.); and discouraging proper maintenance of rented accommodation by landlords.

(1) The relevant paper is "Tenancy Control" (LC Paper No. CB(1)1709/13-14(01)).
On balance, the Government considers that introducing tenancy control measures under the current tight housing supply situation will be counter-productive and will not be in the interest of the inadequately housed households and the general public. To address the problem of rent increase attributed to imbalance in demand and supply, the fundamental solution remains to be a continued increase in housing supply. The Government will endeavour to expedite the building of more public housing units (including subsidized sale flats) according to the rolling 10-year housing supply target set under the Long Term Housing Strategy, and to ensure adequate and stable supply of land for private housing. This will help stabilize the private rental level, and genuinely relieve the rent burden on the public.

Annex

PRH estates/HOS court/GSH court available for intake in the coming nine months (i.e. from June 2017 to February 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of PRH estates/ HOS court/ GSH court</th>
<th>District (by District Council)</th>
<th>Flat number</th>
<th>Anticipated intake date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRH estates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Tai Estate</td>
<td>Kwun Tong</td>
<td>1 400</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yan Tin Estate (Phase 1)</td>
<td>Tuen Mun</td>
<td>2 600</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yan Tin Estate (Phase 2)</td>
<td>Tuen Mun</td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwai Tsui Estate</td>
<td>Kwai Tsing</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOS court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheung Chui Court</td>
<td>Tsuen Wan</td>
<td>962*</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSH court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Tai Court</td>
<td>Wong Tai Sin</td>
<td>857*</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

* The flats in the Courts concerned were sold by presale. Figures provided are actual number of flats.
Utilization of the Maritime and Aviation Training Fund

3. MR LUK CHUNG-HUNG (in Chinese): President, in 2014, the Government established the Maritime and Aviation Training Fund ("the Fund") with an allocation of $100 million to subsidize young students and working persons to receive relevant technical training and undertake professional degree programmes and join the maritime and aviation industries. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it has assessed the manpower supply and demand situations of the maritime and aviation industries in each of the past five years and coming five years; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(2) of the respective numbers of students and working persons subsidized by the Fund each year since the establishment of the Fund, and among them, the respective numbers of those who were employed by the maritime and aviation industries upon completion of the relevant programmes or the relevant training, with a breakdown by post;

(3) of the measures currently implemented by the authorities for the purpose of nurturing talents for the maritime and aviation industries through the Fund; and

(4) whether it will adopt measures to encourage employers of the maritime and aviation industries to employ those persons who have been subsidized by the Fund, for example, making it mandatory that a certain number of crew members employed to work on a ship registered in Hong Kong must be locally trained, in order to safeguard the employment opportunities of local talents; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Chinese): President, to nurture talents to support the long-term development of the maritime and aviation industries, the Government established the Maritime and Aviation Training Fund ("MATF") with a commitment of $100 million in April 2014.
The Fund seeks to assist and encourage young students and practitioners of the maritime and aviation sectors to receive maritime or aviation education and training, thereby enhancing the overall competitiveness and professional competency of the industries. A number of training and incentive schemes covering various aviation and maritime sectors have been launched under MATF.

Our reply to the four-part question raised by Mr LUK Chung-hung is as follows:

(1) According to the results of the "General Household Survey" and "Quarterly Survey of Employment and Vacancies" conducted by the Census and Statistics Department, the overall employment situation in the maritime (including port) and aviation industries in the past five years\(^{(1)}\) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Overall Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maritime/Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>97 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>92 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>92 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>93 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>88 400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As regards projected manpower requirements, the "Report on Manpower Projection to 2022" compiled by the Labour and Welfare Bureau in 2015 roughly estimated that the projected manpower requirements of the freight transportation industry\(^{(2)}\) (covering the maritime, aviation and land transport trades) would increase by 0.1%.

(1) Figures for 2016 are not yet available.

(2) Freight transportation industry includes freight transport by road, transport by tractors and loading and unloading of luggage or freight during land transport; and ship agents and managers, local representative offices of overseas shipping companies, ship owners and operators of sea-going freight vessels, and freight vessels moving between Hong Kong and the ports in Pearl River Delta, inland freight water transport, and service activities incidental to freight water transportation. It also includes air transport (freight) and service activities incidental to air transportation, as well as other transportation support activities.
on average per annum between 2012 and 2022, amounting to approximately 164 800 people to around 165 600. We do not have breakdown for the maritime and aviation sectors.

(2) and (3)

Since its inception in April 2014, MATF has launched a total of 11 maritime and aviation-related funding and scholarship schemes to encourage workers, in particular the younger generation, to pursue careers in maritime or aviation sectors. Details of the funding schemes are at Annex. The number of beneficiaries are set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>In-service Practitioner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>1 183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Government does not have statistics on the number of the above beneficiaries who joined the maritime or aviation industries after completing the training programmes. That said, some MATF schemes are applicable for in-service practitioners of the maritime and aviation industries only. Besides, students who are awarded scholarships to pursue maritime or aviation-related bachelor or master degree programmes are required to work in the maritime or aviation industries for one year after graduation. According to surveys conducted by the tertiary institutions concerned, in 2016, about 55% of the beneficiaries continued to serve in the maritime or aviation industries in Hong Kong after completing the one-year mandatory service period.

(4) For the continuous development of the maritime industry in Hong Kong, the Hong Kong Shipping Register ("HKSR") welcomes vessels from overseas countries to register in Hong Kong. At present, HKSR ranks fourth in the world in terms of gross tonnage. Similar to other top ranking flag States (such as Panama, Liberia, Marshall Islands, Singapore, etc.) which do not impose nationality requirements on crew members, HKSR does not require its
registered ships to employ locally trained personnel, in order to continually attract overseas and Mainland shipowners to register their ships with Hong Kong.

To enhance the employment opportunities of local talents, on maritime front, the Government has been encouraging local shipowners and shipping companies to employ graduates trained in Hong Kong through various channels, including regular meetings between the Marine Department and the maritime industry. On aviation front, the Government has been also encouraging local aircraft maintenance companies/organizations through educational institutions to employ students who have completed specialized aircraft maintenance programmes, thereby attracting more new blood and promote the sustainable development of the aircraft maintenance industry. In fact, the employment prospect of the local maritime and aviation professionals has been good, and there are keen demands for local talents in both sectors. On the other hand, the current priority is to attract more local talents to join the maritime and aviation industries through MATF and other initiatives.

Annex

Training and Incentive Schemes under the MATF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schemes under MATF</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Professional Training and Examination Refund Scheme</td>
<td>The Scheme aims to enhance the professionalism and competency of practitioners in the maritime and aviation sectors and encourage them to acquire relevant professional qualification(s). The approved courses include maritime- or aviation-related courses and professional examinations provided by various education institutions, professional organizations and trade bodies. Eligible applicants are refunded with 80% of the fees after completing approved courses or passing examinations, subject to a cap of $18,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schemes under MATF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2) Maritime and Aviation Internship Scheme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Scheme offers internship places in maritime and aviation-related companies for students of tertiary institutions through tripartite cooperation among the Government, the industry and academia.</td>
<td>MATF will cover up to 75% of the intern's monthly honorarium, or $6,000 (whichever is lower), for an internship period of up to three months.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3) Local Vessel Trade Training Incentive Scheme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Scheme provides a monthly allowance of up to $30,000 for eligible deck or engine room ratings newly employed by the local vessel trade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(4) Sea-going Training Incentive Scheme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Scheme offers a monthly subsidy of $6,000 to deck or engine room cadets on ocean-going vessels for a maximum period of 18 months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(5) Ship Repair Training Incentive Scheme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Scheme offers a monthly subsidy of $1,500 to eligible graduates of the Vocational Training Council (&quot;VTC&quot;) who have enrolled for apprenticeship in the ship repair industry for a maximum period of 36 months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(6) Hong Kong Maritime and Logistics Scholarship Scheme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship for selected students of the Master of Science in International Shipping and Transport Logistics of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (&quot;HKPU&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7) The University of Hong Kong (&quot;HKU&quot;)—Dalian Maritime University (&quot;DMU&quot;) Academic Collaboration Scheme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Scheme consists of two parts:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) provides scholarship to selected students of DMU to undertake the Master of Common Law course at HKU; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) supports HKU students and in-service practitioners to undertake summer courses and professional seminars.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(8) Hong Kong Maritime Law Scholarship Scheme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship for selected students of the Master of Laws (Maritime and Transportation Law) programme of the City University of Hong Kong (&quot;CityU HK&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schemes under MATF</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9) Overseas Exchange Sponsorship Scheme</td>
<td>The Scheme provides financial support ($30,000-$50,000) to undergraduates or postgraduates of selected maritime-related disciplines in HKPU, CityU HK, Chinese University of Hong Kong and Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (&quot;HKUST&quot;) to attend maritime-related overseas exchange courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Partial Tuition Refund Scheme for the Specialized Aircraft Maintenance Programme</td>
<td>Eligible applicants undertaking the Higher Diploma in Aircraft Maintenance Engineering or Diploma in Vocational Education (Aircraft Maintenance) offered by VTC and joining the aircraft maintenance industry after graduation are refunded with 50% of the total tuition fee, subject to a cap of $30,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Hong Kong Aviation Scholarship Scheme</td>
<td>Scholarship for selected students of aviation-related bachelor or master degree programmes of HKPU or HKUST.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development of the cities in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Big Bay Area

4. **MR CHRISTOPHER CHEUNG** (in Chinese): President, in March this year, the Premier of the State Council stated in the Report on the Work of the Government that "[w]e will promote closer cooperation between the mainland and Hong Kong and Macao. We will draw up a plan for the development of a city cluster in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area, give full play to the distinctive strengths of Hong Kong and Macao, and elevate their positions and roles in China's economic development and opening up". The Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Big Bay Area ("Big Bay Area") covers 11 cities, including Hong Kong and Macao. In April this year, the Chief Executive led a delegation comprising a number of senior government officials, non-official members of the Executive Council and members of the Commission on Strategic Development and the Economic Development Commission to visit a number of Mainland cities in the Big Bay Area. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) as the authorities have indicated that they will promote cooperation in the Big Bay Area under the principles of "complementarity and mutual benefits", and will conduct research on Hong Kong’s role in
the Big Bay Area, of the specific direction and objectives of the research; how the authorities will facilitate the industries where Hong Kong enjoys clear advantages, in particular the finance industry and the financial services industry, to play a leading role in the economic development of the Big Bay Area, and how they will, through the Mainland and Hong Kong Closer Economic Partnership Arrangement, enable the various relevant industries in Hong Kong to play an important role and make contributions in the Big Bay Area;

(2) whether it will, based on the findings of the relevant research and visits, formulate specific policies, measures and timetables, including measures for implementing enhanced immigration and customs clearance arrangements, to foster tourism and commercial development with a view to laying a solid foundation for developing the Big Bay Area into a world-class tourist area in the long run; and

(3) whether the current-term Government will, before the end of its term, arrange for Members of this Council to visit the Mainland cities in the Big Bay Area; as the Government has indicated that it will submit its views on the planning of the Big Bay Area to the National Development and Reform Commission before the end of June this year, whether the Government will consult the organizations or chambers of commerce of various relevant industries in Hong Kong before submitting the views; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AND MAINLAND AFFAIRS (in Chinese): President, upon consulting the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau and the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau, our consolidated reply is as follows:

(1) In accordance with the principle of "one country, two systems", the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR") Government is participating in the drawing up of a development plan for a city cluster in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Bay Area ("the Bay Area development plan") with the National Development and Reform Commission ("NDRC") as well as the Guangdong Provincial...
Government and the Macao Special Administrative Region Government. The successful development of a world-class city cluster in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Bay Area hinges not only on the ability of Guangdong, Hong Kong and Macao to fully leverage and organically integrate their different yet complementary advantages, but also on a clearly defined role for each city in the coordinated development to avoid any adverse competition, so as to further enhance the global competitiveness of the Bay Area as a whole.

The Bay Area development plan can be regarded as an important regional development plan under the "Outline of the 13th Five-Year Plan for the National Economic and Social Development of the People's Republic of China" ("the 13-5 Plan") and the nation's Belt and Road Initiative. As for HKSAR, the Bay Area development plan must reflect and consolidate Hong Kong's unique positioning that has been clearly defined in the Dedicated Chapter on Hong Kong and Macao ("the Dedicated Chapter") in the 13-5 Plan, which includes, in particular, the support for Hong Kong in consolidating and enhancing our status as international financial, transportation and trade centres, strengthening our status as a global offshore Renminbi business hub and an international asset management centre, promoting financing services, business and commerce, logistics and professional services, etc. towards high-end and high value-added developments. The Dedicated Chapter also supports Hong Kong in developing the innovation and technology industry, nurturing emerging industries, as well as establishing itself as a centre for international legal and dispute resolution services in the Asia-Pacific region. Moreover, the Dedicated Chapter supports Hong Kong in participating in the country's two-way opening up, as well as the Belt and Road Initiative, encouraging enterprises from the Mainland, Hong Kong and Macao to leverage their respective advantages and adopt various collaborative approaches to "go global" together.

Being the country's most international city in the Bay Area, not only can Hong Kong benefit from the advantage of "one country" and the convenience of "two systems", it can also serve as a "super-connector" in the Bay Area. In the development of the Bay
Area, Hong Kong should fully leverage its unique positioning, which is recognized in the Dedicated Chapter, and achieve coordinated development with other cities in the Bay Area. It should complement the nation's Belt and Road strategy by also serving as a platform for two-way opening up to expand into the international arena with the other Bay Area cities.

On financial services, the HKSAR Government, in accordance with the positioning laid down in the Dedicated Chapter as mentioned above, complements and supports the Bay Area development plan in the following aspects.

First, Hong Kong's strengths and experience in the financial services industry will complement the development of different industries in the Bay Area and open up new business opportunities. As the global hub for offshore Renminbi business, Hong Kong is capable of meeting relevant demands for offshore Renminbi settlement, financing and capital management. Hong Kong also makes an ideal platform for Renminbi capital and risk management as a much wider choice of Renminbi investment products is available in the market upon implementation of the Shenzhen-Hong Kong Stock Connect, the Shanghai-Hong Kong Stock Connect and the Mainland-Hong Kong Mutual Recognition of Funds Arrangement.

Second, enterprises in the Bay Area intending to "go global" can leverage the rich experience of Hong Kong in interacting closely with global markets and capitalize on our sophisticated financial infrastructure. We encourage them to set up corporate treasury centres in Hong Kong to carry out intra-group capital and risk management activities, and to establish captive insurance companies in Hong Kong to enhance efficiency in risk management.

Third, Hong Kong's capital market is stable and mature. It also demonstrates a strong fund-raising capability through initial public offerings and can offer a full range of investment and financing options to enterprises in the Bay Area and attract global investors. The Hong Kong Exchanges and Clearing Limited is assessing the feasibility of introducing a new board to provide a financing platform for a more diverse range of issuers.
To foster financial cooperation in the Bay Area, the HKSAR Government will strengthen the connectivity of financial services within the area, develop additional financing channels and cross-boundary financial services to tie in with the growth of enterprises therein. Meanwhile, the HKSAR Government will seek to relax the entry thresholds of Hong Kong financial institutions entering the Bay Area, and explore ways to achieve a more efficient allocation of resources in the Bay Area by, for example, reducing transaction costs of both tangible and electronic commerce between Hong Kong and the other cities in the Bay Area, and optimizing the business environment in the region.

In addition, the Dedicated Chapter has expressed clear support for stepping up efforts to further open up the Mainland market to Hong Kong and Macao, and upgrading the Mainland's closer economic partnership arrangements with Hong Kong and Macao. Through further liberalization measures under the Mainland and Hong Kong Closer Economic Partnership Arrangement ("CEPA"), the industries of Hong Kong will be able to further explore the Mainland market including that of the Bay Area, and to deepen the development and economic cooperation in different industry sectors between the two places. In this connection, the Trade and Industry Department and the Mainland Ministry of Commerce have established a mechanism to discuss and follow up on the further development of CEPA and the implementation of existing liberalization measures. The HKSAR Government is discussing with the Mainland the expansion and enhancement of CEPA in the areas of investment and economic and technical cooperation. It is expected that some concrete results will be achieved within this year. The HKSAR Government will continue to discuss with the Mainland authorities measures to enrich the content of CEPA.

(2) In summing up the Bay Area visit of April, the Chief Executive said that the HKSAR Government would study the ways in which our participation in the Bay Area development plan could facilitate the flow of people, goods, and capital, as well as that of information, between Hong Kong and the other cities in the Bay Area. The HKSAR Government would also study how Hong Kong industries
could make use of the unique advantages to join forces with the Bay Area cities to "go global" together in complementing the Belt and Road strategy.

Regarding tourism, the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Bay Area is located at the south of China and possesses abundant tourism resources, with strong potential to be developed into a world-class tourist destination cluster. Hong Kong, as a diversified tourist destination, will continue to strengthen cooperation with the Mainland, especially Bay Area cities, to further promote "multi-destination" travel. In recent years, many visitors travelled to Hong Kong on a "multi-destination" basis. About 60% of the visitors from short-haul markets travelled on a "multi-destination" basis while the corresponding figure for long-haul markets is over 80%. Hong Kong has well-established international connections. Various major infrastructure projects, including the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge and the Hong Kong Section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link, will soon be completed, which will serve to further enhance the land transport connections between Hong Kong and the Bay Area and greatly reduce the required transport time. Leveraging on the above advantages, the HKSAR Government is confident of attracting visitors from around the world to travel to Hong Kong and other Bay Area cities, thereby enabling the potentials of tourism resources of the Bay Area to be fully developed.

The HKSAR Government will continue to support the Hong Kong Tourism Board to establish cooperation platforms with Bay Area cities and to jointly develop more "multi-destination" tourism products, as well as encourage the Hong Kong travel trade to seize the opportunities and develop more travel products featuring the Bay Area for Hong Kong citizens and "multi-destination" visitors.

(3) The HKSAR Government wishes to continue arranging visits to the Bay Area for different sectors of Hong Kong society in the future, so that they can learn about the latest development of Bay Area cities. The Chief Executive mentioned at a media session earlier that the HKSAR Government would submit its views on the Bay Area
development plan to NDRC for consideration. It is expected that NDRC would consult the Guangdong Provincial Government and the HKSAR and Macao Special Administrative Region Governments on the draft development plan before finalizing it within this year. The HKSAR Government will, in the process, incorporate the views of the relevant industry sectors and advisory committees.

Regulation of online crowdfunding and lending platforms

5. *MS ALICE MAK* (in Chinese): President, platforms for raising funds from and lending small loans to members of the public through the Internet ("crowdfunding and lending platforms") have become popular in recent years. However, some financial advisers have pointed out that investors participating in crowdfunding activities are exposed to considerable risks. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it knows the number of companies currently operating local crowdfunding and lending platforms, and the number of complaints received by the authorities in the past three years concerning crowdfunding activities, with a breakdown by type of complaints;

(2) how the current legislation regulates the fundraising and lending activities conducted through crowdfunding and lending platforms;

(3) as some financial advisers have pointed out that investors provide funds through such platforms, which in turn lend the funds to borrowers, whether the authorities will, to avoid such investors breaching the law inadvertently, clarify if such investors are regarded as money lenders under the Money Lenders Ordinance (Cap. 163) and therefore are required to obtain money lender licences; and

(4) whether the authorities will conduct public education activities on the risks faced by investors participating in crowdfunding activities; if so, of the details?
SECRETARY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND THE TREASURY (in Chinese): President,

(1) We do not have information about the number of companies currently operating local crowdfunding and lending platforms.

The Companies Registry has not received any complaints against crowdfunding and lending business in the past three years.

The numbers of complaints received by the Securities and Futures Commission ("SFC") in the past three years regarding crowdfunding and lending platforms are tabulated as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of complaints about crowdfunding</th>
<th>Number of complaints about lending platforms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (as at end March)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) and (3)

Depending on the specific structure and features of the relevant arrangement, some types of crowdfunding activities, in particular equity crowdfunding and peer-to-peer lending, may be subject to the provisions of the Securities and Futures Ordinance (Cap. 571), and/or the Companies (Winding Up and Miscellaneous Provisions) Ordinance (Cap. 32). For further details, please refer to the SFC's "Notice on Potential Regulations Applicable to, and Risks of, Crowd-funding Activities" issued on 7 May 2014.

According to the Money Lenders Ordinance ("MLO") (Cap. 163), a person carrying on business as a money lender must obtain a money lender's licence. Licensed money lenders must operate their money lending business pursuant to the requirements in MLO. The Police is the enforcement authority of MLO. If we receive any complaints about carrying on unlicensed money lending business, we will refer the complaints to the Police.
As the business operation of each crowdfunding and lending platform is different, we will not comment on individual cases.

(4) We will ensure that investors and consumers of crowdfunding and lending platforms will receive proper protection under Hong Kong’s regulatory rules and standards. In view of the rapid development of financial technologies ("Fintech"), the Investor Education Centre ("IEC") is working on a series of articles to introduce various Fintech services/products, associated risks and regulatory framework to the public. Topics will include equity crowdfunding, peer-to-peer lending, robo-advice, etc. These articles will be published in the coming months on various Chin Family platforms of IEC, including its Website, Facebook page, newspaper columns and blog. The Chin Family website already carries an article explaining to the general public the risks of participating in crowdfunding activities.

Economic development of Lantau Island and opportunities to be brought about by the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Big Bay Area

6. MR JIMMY NG (in Chinese): President, according to "Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030" published by the Government in December last year, Lantau Island will become the focal point of Hong Kong’s future development. Moreover, the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge ("HZMB"), upon its commissioning, will link up Lantau Island and other cities in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Big Bay Area ("Big Bay Area") which is under planning. As such, the industrial and commercial sectors have great concern for the economic development of Lantau Island as well as the opportunities to be brought about by the Big Bay Area. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) given that some Hong Kong people are worried that Hong Kong will lose its autonomy if it participates in the economic planning of the adjacent regions, but will be marginalized if it does not, whether the Government has consulted and lobbied the authorities of neighbouring cities on the planning of the Big Bay Area with a view to securing for Hong Kong a positioning which is conducive to its
long-term development, and avoiding vicious competition between Hong Kong and its neighbouring cities; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(2) given that the Government has pointed out that Lantau Island will become the confluence of the Greater Pearl River Delta and the "double gateway" of Hong Kong, and some members of the commercial sector consider that the Big Bay Area is a brand and Lantau Island is the brand of brands possessing immense economic value, whether the Government will, having regard to the planning of the Big Bay Area and leveraging on the increasingly comprehensive and well connected transport network of Lantau Island, further revise the industry planning and market positioning of Lantau Island, such as developing high value-added logistics and storage industries and establishing a Hong Kong brand industrial park integrating manufacturing, retail and tourism industries; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(3) given that HZMB is scheduled for completion at the end of this year, and the Humen Second Bridge and the Shenzhen-Zhongshan estuary passage are expected to be commissioned in 2019 and 2023 respectively, and these three transport infrastructures, upon their commissioning, can boost the economy of Pearl River East, and such effect generated therefrom will radiate to Pearl River West, whether the Government has, in respect of these three infrastructures, conducted any integrated assessment on their daily throughputs, the economic benefits to be generated and the regional collaboration opportunities arising; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR DEVELOPMENT (in Chinese): President, having consulted the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau, Transport and Housing Bureau and the Planning Department ("PlanD"), my reply to the various parts of the question is as follows:

(1) The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR") Government will participate in the drawing up of the development plan for a city cluster in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Bay
Area (the Bay Area development plan) in accordance with the principle of "one country, two systems". In this connection, the HKSAR Government believes that Guangdong, Hong Kong and Macao should coordinate efforts and complement each other's advantages. Through consensus-building, various cities within the Bay Area could distinguish their respective development positioning, with a view to developing the entire Bay Area into a more globally competitive world-class city cluster.

(2) Hong Kong is an international city. Our development has all along had strong relationship with the neighbouring region (including cities in the Guangdong Pearl River Delta ("PRD") Region) in terms of culture, people movement, logistics and capital flow, etc. Indeed, it has become a global megatrend that mega-city regions are the nexus of economic growth and as a model of city development. Examples are the San Francisco Bay Area and New York Bay Area in the United States, as well as Tokyo Bay in Japan. The Development Bureau and PlanD are responsible for the work relating to land planning, including the strategic planning and conceptual spatial framework under the "Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030" ("Hong Kong 2030+"), as well as the blueprint for development and conservation of Lantau anticipated to be published later this year, the formulation and consultation of which have commenced since 2015. Both have taken into consideration Hong Kong's positioning in the regional development.

Leveraging the existing strategic infrastructures and those under planning and construction including the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao-Bridge ("HZMB"), the Hong Kong International Airport and the Three-Runway System, the strategic location of Lantau in the Greater PRD will be further elevated. Lantau will become the "Double Gateway" of Hong Kong to the world and Greater PRD. In formulating the conceptual spatial framework under "Hong Kong 2030+" as well as the blueprint for development and conservation of Lantau which will be published later this year, we have taken into consideration the geographical advantages and development opportunities of Lantau, and the proposed market positioning of the major economic land uses in North Lantau.
According to "Hong Kong 2030+", a number of major commercial developments in North Lantau including the North Commercial District, Topside Development at Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities Island of HZMB, Tung Chung New Town Extension, the Siu Ho Wan and Sunny Bay Developments, together with Tuen Mun West and Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area ("NDA"), will form the Western Economic Corridor to create greater synergy. This corridor will also serve as a new platform for economic growth. The proposed East Lantau Metropolis will further reinforce the development of this corridor. The developments on Lantau can provide land for various uses such as housing, business, retail, hotel, recreation and tourism, high value-added modern logistics, warehouse, etc. In the next stage of detailed planning for strengthening the economic land uses along the northern shore of Lantau, we will further study the proposed "Hong Kong Branding Industries Park" having regard to considerations such as compatibility with the surrounding land uses, environmental and traffic impacts, as well as market responses, economic benefits and financial arrangements, etc.

Apart from North Lantau, the developments of Northwest New Territories ("NWNT") and northern parts of the New Territories ("NT") are also complementing the Bay Area development plan. The Hung Shui Kiu NDA under planning is located between three new towns, namely Tuen Mun, Tin Shui Wai and Yuen Long. It is also located at the landing point of the Shenzhen Bay Bridge and connected with the existing New Territories Circular Road and West Rail, as well as the Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link in the south. NDA will be developed as the Regional Economic and Civic Hub of NWNT in future. Apart from being a major source of housing land supply providing 61 000 flats, it will provide many sites for economic development, which is estimated to provide about 6.4 million sq m of commercial and industrial gross floor area. "Hong Kong 2030+" also proposed the New Territories North as a strategic growth area, utilizing the potential developable areas in the northern part of NT for the future spatial development of Hong Kong. Both of the above planning would fully leverage the advantageous geographical location of NWNT and northern part of NT so as to seize the future development opportunities.
(3) The HKSAR Government has not conducted any comprehensive assessment on the daily traffic flow, economic benefits and opportunities for economic cooperation arising from the Shenzhen-Zhongshan Cross-River Expressway and Humen Second Bridge as they involve various technical and policy details of different parties. We will continue to monitor the development of regional transport infrastructure and examine their potential impact on Hong Kong.

As regards HZMB, according to the Feasibility Study of the HZMB project completed in 2008, upon the initial stage of the commissioning of HZMB, the traffic flow is expected to be 9,200 to 14,000 vehicles per day. There are abundant human and land resources in the West PRD. Upon the commissioning of HZMB, the travelling time between Hong Kong and the West PRD can be greatly reduced. This could provide a great deal of opportunities for trades in Hong Kong to expand their business in the Mainland, which is beneficial to various sectors including tourism, finance, commerce and logistics, etc. of the two sides.

Prioritizing the development of undeveloped and underdeveloped land

7. **MR ABRAHAM SHEK:** President, the Chief Executive announced in the 2017 Policy Address that he had asked the authorities to explore the feasibility of allocating a small proportion of land on the periphery of country parks with relatively low ecological and public enjoyment value for other uses. Yet there are strong public views that given the existing substantial quantity of undeveloped and underdeveloped land, including brownfield sites in Hong Kong, the Government should accord priority to their development rather than jeopardizing our country parks, which are valuable natural resources. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the authorities' projections to date of the respective demands for commercial, residential and industrial floor areas for the next decade;
of the following details in respect of the sites covered by various statutory outline zoning plans ("OZPs") in the table below: (i) the number of undeveloped and/or underdeveloped sites, (ii) their total area, and (iii) the total gross floor area which may be developed, calculated on the basis of the development parameters set out in the respective OZPs and/or the Building (Planning) Regulations (Cap. 123 sub. leg. F); and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undeveloped and/or underdeveloped sites</th>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>(ii)</th>
<th>(iii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites currently zoned for &quot;Commercial&quot;, &quot;Residential&quot; and/or &quot;Industrial&quot; uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites convertible to &quot;Commercial&quot;, &quot;Residential&quot; and/or &quot;Industrial&quot; uses by approving planning applications made to the Town Planning Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

whether the authorities have any plan to prioritize and expedite the development of undeveloped and underdeveloped sites to meet the land demand through various means, including change of land use and/or lease modification; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR DEVELOPMENT: President, in the 2017 Policy Address, the Chief Executive has proposed to increase the total area of ecological conservation sites and country parks, enhance their recreational and educational value, and at the same time consider allocating a small proportion of land on the periphery of country parks with relatively low ecological and public enjoyment value for purposes other than real estate development, such as public housing and non-profit-making elderly homes. Matters concerning this proposal are being followed up and studied by the relevant bureaux and departments as a further option under the Government's multi-pronged strategy for land supply, which already includes land use reviews, implementation of New Development Areas ("NDAs") and new town extension, development of brownfield sites, reclamation, etc.

The above advocacy is in line with the Government's established priority in land use, i.e. priority will be given to land at the fringe of the built-up areas in existing urban areas and new towns, adjacent to existing roads and other
infrastructures and having relatively low conservation value and buffering effect, as well as those government sites with development potential which are currently unleased or unallocated, under short term tenancy or different short-term or government uses in existing urban areas and new towns. For land with development potential, we will examine and assess the feasibility of the development proposal in accordance with the established mechanism. Land with high ecological, landscape and/or historical value will be preserved.

Having consulted the Transport and Housing Bureau and Planning Department ("PlanD"), my reply to the various parts of the question is as follows:

(1) Regarding housing demand, under the Long Term Housing Strategy promulgated in December 2014, the Government updates the long term housing demand projection annually and presents a rolling 10-year housing supply target in order to capture changes in social, economic and market circumstances over time and to make timely adjustment where necessary. Housing demand projection covers four main demand components, namely net increase in the number of households, households displaced by redevelopment, inadequately housed households, and housing needs arising from miscellaneous factors. Based on objective data of various demand components, the Government projects the supply target which can satisfy the housing demand. The target will serve as a planning guide for the Government to identify land for housing development.

Based on the latest housing demand projection announced in late 2016, the Government has adopted 460 000 units as the total housing supply target for the 10-year period from 2017-2018 to 2026-2027, while maintaining the 60:40 public/private split for new housing supply. Accordingly, the public housing supply target is 280 000 units, including 200 000 public rental housing units and 80 000 subsidized sale units; while the private housing supply target is 180 000 units. In identifying land for housing development, the Government will use the above mentioned supply targets as a planning guide.
As regards the demand of land for economic uses, PlanD has completed a consultancy study titled "Review of Land Requirement for Grade A Offices, Business and Industrial Uses" ("the Review") early this year. The Review has provided forecast data on the demand and supply of five types of market-driven economic land uses, including Central Business District ("CBD") Grade A Offices\(^{(1)}\), Non-CBD Grade A Offices, General Business\(^{(2)}\), Industries\(^{(3)}\) and Special Industries\(^{(4)}\), as inputs to the "Hong Kong 2030+: Towards A Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030" ("Hong Kong 2030+") Study, for which the public engagement has just ended. The Review has adopted quantitative models to assess the demand and supply of land for the five types of uses in the periods from 2013-2014 to 2023 (short term), 2033 (medium term) and 2041 (long term), taking into consideration the various factors which may affect the demand for such land and the various land supply projects that are committed, planned or under planning. The major findings of the assessment are tabulated below:

\(^{(1)}\) This type includes Grade A offices in CBDs. In the short term (i.e. 2023), CBD is defined as Sheung Wan, Central, Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Tsim Sha Tsui (including West Kowloon Reclamation to the south of Jordon Road). In the medium to long term, the East Kowloon CBD2 developments (i.e. Kai Tak Development and Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong Business Areas) are added to the supply of CBD Grade A Offices.

\(^{(2)}\) This refers to non-Grade A offices, and business activities involving no industrial production that have flexible floor space requirements. General types of research and development ("R&D") as well as testing and certification are under this category.

\(^{(3)}\) This type includes manufacturing, warehousing and other industrial activities, but excludes "Special Industries". General logistics/warehousing, covering general storage and warehousing uses, is subsumed under this category. Facilities for modern logistics are not included and should be subsumed under "Special Industries". The demand estimate is mainly due to the general logistics/warehousing.

\(^{(4)}\) This type includes industries that have unique locational and/or operational requirements having regard to specific environmental or other considerations. They usually require purpose-built premises of more rigid building specifications (e.g. higher loading, higher ceiling, larger floor plate, highly reliable electricity supply with back-up supply, and dust free environment). Data centres, modern logistics, and special types of R&D as well as testing and certification are subsumed under this category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2023 (Short Term)</th>
<th>2033 (Medium Term)</th>
<th>2041 (Long Term)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand Estimate</td>
<td>Supply Projection*</td>
<td>Deficit/Surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD Grade A</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-CBD Grade A</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Business</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industries</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>16.74</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Industries</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>-3.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gross Floor Area (million sq m)

Notes:

* Including major committed/planned/under advance planning projects, but excluding the two strategic growth areas proposed in the public engagement of "Hong Kong 2030+", namely the East Lantau Metropolis and New Territories North.

The figures in the table may not be added up to total due to rounding.

(2) and (3)

Land is a valuable resource in Hong Kong. The Government endeavours to make optimal use of land resources through continuous land use planning, allocation and management in order to meet the various development needs of society. In the reply to a Legislative Council question raised on 16 November last year (Legislative Council question 22), the Development Bureau already explained in detail the Government's general mechanisms for planning, allocation and management of land. In the LC Paper No. CB(1)461/16-17(01) submitted to the Legislative Council Panel on Development in January 2017, the Development Bureau also provided an overview of land demand and supply, and elaborated on the Government's multi-pronged strategy on land supply and the latest progress of the various initiatives for land supply in the short, medium and long term.
The Government does not have a definition of or compile statistics on the so-called "undeveloped or underdeveloped land". According to the established mechanism, it is necessary to undergo different stages and procedures before the "potential sites" could turn into "disposable sites" (i.e. developable land), such as land use reviews or other planning and engineering studies, and the necessary procedures and works for the sites. It takes time to complete these procedures and works, which include tackling various technical issues, seeking funding, land resumption and clearance, site formation, and providing infrastructure and other supporting facilities. Generally speaking, given the current tight supply of developable land, when a site becomes "disposable" and ready for development, the Government will lease or allocate the site as soon as possible. Besides, as the unleased or unallocated land merely reflects its status at a given point of time during the implementation of long-term planning uses, and the land use status may change from time to time subject to the planning of land use, such land should not be simply regarded as "undeveloped or underdeveloped land". We also do not compile statistics on the unleased or unallocated land on statutory plans.

On land supply, the Government is vigorously taking forward the multi-pronged strategy for land supply. Generally speaking, land supply suggestions that are considered feasible, such as development of land currently without any development plan, for which the original purpose is no longer pursued or not in optimal use, have already been incorporated into the land supply strategy. For instance, the various land use reviews conducted by PlanD on an ongoing basis have already covered the Government land currently unleased or unallocated, under short term tenancy, in different short-term or government uses, and other Government land without any development plan at the moment. With some 210 short-to medium-term housing sites identified by the current-term Government through the ongoing land use reviews, coupled with the increase of development intensity as appropriate, implementation of Kai Tak Development Area and Diamond Hill Comprehensive Development Area, reuse of three quarry sites, railway property developments, and urban renewal projects, etc., it is expected that a
total of over 380,000 residential units and over 2 million square metres ("sq m") of gross floor area ("GFA") for economic uses can be provided in the short to medium term.

In the medium to long term, the Government has been taking forward major land planning and development projects, including Kwu Tung North ("KTN")/Fanling North ("FLN") NDAs, Tung Chung New Town Extension, Hung Shui Kiu ("HSK") NDA and Yuen Long South ("YLS") Development. Meanwhile, other land supply options are being studied and examined, including Tseung Kwan O Area 137, topside development at Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities Island of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, other potential railway property development projects, etc. It is expected that a total of over 220,000 residential units and over 8.6 million sq m of GFA for economic uses can be provided in the medium to long term. The optimal use of brownfield sites is also a major direction of the land supply strategy. By taking forward the above three projects in HSK, YLS and KTN/FLN, some 340 hectares of brownfield sites will be released. Together with the development of adjoining areas through comprehensive planning, a total of over 940 hectares of developable land is expected to be provided.

For the long-term sustainable development of Hong Kong, there is a need for the Government to adopt a visionary, pragmatic and action-oriented approach to tackle the planning issues critical to Hong Kong's future, and to formulate a robust territorial development strategy in the light of the latest planning circumstances and challenges ahead. PlanD commissioned the "Hong Kong 2030+" Study in 2015 to update the territorial development strategy. Three building blocks, namely "Planning for a Liveable High-density City", "Embracing New Economic Challenges and Opportunities" and "Creating Capacity for Sustainable Growth", and two long-term strategic growth areas, namely the East Lantau Metropolis and New Territories North, are proposed. It is expected that about 1,700 hectares of land can be provided to meet future needs in housing, economic and social developments; to provide space for improving liveability; to provide land required for economic activities; and to meet additional housing needs arising from the large-scale urban redevelopment.
With limited resources and given that comprehensive planning is relatively more cost-effective, the Government has considered the circumstances of different land and areas, and prioritized land utilization and development accordingly. Resources have been devoted to expediting the implementation of a series of measures for increasing land supply as mentioned above. At the same time, the Government is working to streamline the development processes and continues to implement the Pilot Scheme for Arbitration on Land Premium to facilitate private development/redevelopment, with a view to increasing the land and floor space supply in Hong Kong effectively and continuously. Nevertheless, there is no single measure that can both address the existing land shortage and provide sufficient land in a sustainable manner for meeting all the short-, medium- and long-term development needs. Therefore, it is important for us to continue to adopt a multi-pronged, robust and flexible approach, in order to increase land supply and create development capacity wisely. In reality, in order to meet the needs for Hong Kong's future development, all the current measures for land supply are indispensable. We must also keep on exploring any feasible land supply options.

Encouraging producers of overseas movies and television programmes to conduct location filming in Hong Kong

8. MR YIU SI-WING (in Chinese): President, the Chief Executive indicated in the 2017 Policy Address that "the Government will, from this year, organize Belt and Road promotional tours to countries with market potential, such as Iran, Indonesia, Malaysia and India, with a view to attracting film producers to come to Hong Kong for post-production and location filming and production facilitation services". Some members of the tourism industry have pointed out that producers of overseas movies and television dramas and programmes ("movie/TV works") conducting location filming in Hong Kong will help promote Hong Kong's scenery to overseas audiences, thus alluring them to tour Hong Kong. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it knows the details of the overseas movie/TV works which involved location filming in Hong Kong in each of the past five years, including (i) the titles of the works, (ii) the places where the
works were produced, (iii) the countries/places where the works were distributed/broadcast and (iv) numbers of viewers (set out in a table);

(2) of the assistance provided by the authorities to the producers of the movie/TV works mentioned in (1), and the public expenditure involved;

(3) given that in recent years, the filming locations in Taiwan, South Korea and New Zealand of some popular movie/TV works have been developed into tourist attractions, whether the authorities have examined the factors contributing to the success of those examples, and taken the initiative to communicate with the authorities of the relevant countries/places to learn from their experience so as to step up Hong Kong's efforts in this respect; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(4) whether the authorities have drawn up any specific work plans for the coming three years to attract more producers of overseas movie/TV works to conduct location filming in Hong Kong, with a view to promoting Hong Kong's tourism industry; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR COMMERCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (in Chinese): President, the Government all along attaches importance to the work of tourism promotion and has been promoting through the Hong Kong Tourism Board ("HKTB") the diverse tourism appeals and travel experiences offered by Hong Kong through different channels, including television and digital marketing, social media and public relations initiatives. HKTB has been proactively inviting international and regional television networks and major TV channels in source markets to film in Hong Kong and has been providing support for movie shooting in Hong Kong to generate international exposure of the city through the extensive reach and influence of television and films. One recent example is the Hollywood film Ghost in the Shell showed in Hong Kong theatres in March 2017. Create Hong Kong ("CreateHK") of the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau also renders support services to non-local film and television programme production crews.
A consolidated reply to the questions raised by Mr YIU Si-wing is as follows:

(1) and (2)

HKTB provides different types of support according to the requirements of the production companies, such as providing advice on filming scenes and locations, liaising with venue providers, assisting in the application of permits for location shooting, and arranging accommodation and transportation for production crews if necessary. HKTB’s efforts in inviting media and production houses to film in Hong Kong and providing the necessary support is jointly undertaken by various departments at its head office and worldwide offices. HKTB does not have the breakdown of the related expenditure separately.

At the same time, CreateHK also renders support services to the non-local film and television programme production crews. Such services include providing production crews with information and recommendations on filming locations; arranging filming location scouting by production crews; applying for necessary approvals or permits for production crews; and liaising with the relevant government departments on matters relating to lane/road closure and parking of filming vehicles. Supporting location filming in Hong Kong is part of CreateHK’s regular duties. The expenditure involved, which mainly concerns emoluments of the staff concerned, has been included in the overall expenditure of the Communications and Creative Industries Branch of Commerce and Economic Development Bureau.

The lists of film/television works which conduct location filming in Hong Kong that received support services rendered by HKTB and CreateHK in the past five years are at Annex 1 and Annex 2 respectively. As the method on counting the number of viewers varies among different television channels, and the box office earnings have not been provided by the film companies, HKTB and CreateHK are unable to provide the exact amount of viewers of TV works and box office earnings of the respective films.
(3) and (4)

We understand that overseas destinations have been making use of TV programmes and films to promote tourism. In fact, HKTB has all along been working proactively on this front. In order to maximize the promotion effectiveness, in recent years HKTB has mainly invited regional television channels which cover various source markets to promote Hong Kong's diverse experiences. In response to media trends in source markets and local consumer preferences, HKTB strategically invites different types of high-rated TV shows to film in Hong Kong. For instance, HKTB has invited the Mainland and Korean reality shows to film in Hong Kong, as they enjoy great popularity in both markets. For the Taiwan market, travel and food programmes, as well as TV dramas have been invited. For Indian market, HKTB has also invited famous Indian TV drama series to use Hong Kong as a setting to showcase the city's diverse tourism appeal.

Apart from driving international exposure, HKTB also helps generate business opportunities for tourism industry by promoting the tourism products featuring filming locations in Hong Kong. For example, in 2015, HKTB collaborated with the movie company, local attractions and travel agents to introduce itineraries that cover scenes featured in the Mainland film *Lost in Hong Kong*. Besides, HKTB also joins hands with local travel trade under the New Tour Product Development Scheme to promote some brand new movie-themed tour products, such as tours guided by veteran film critics and local movie lovers to visit locations featured in classic Hong Kong films.

In 2017-2018, HKTB will continue to invite more TV programmes and production houses to film in Hong Kong. In fact, the US Public Broadcasting Service ("PBS") already came to Hong Kong for travelogue filming in February 2017 and the Discovery TLC will shoot another TV programme here later this year. HKTB will continue to encourage international and regional television channels to film in Hong Kong and will provide the necessary support, with a view to promoting Hong Kong's diverse tourism appeal to overseas audience through television and films.
Film/television works which conduct location filming in Hong Kong through support services rendered by Hong Kong Tourism Board (2012 to 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Country/Region of Production</th>
<th>Country/Region of Broadcasting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2012 Shanghai TV: Zhong Guo Nian Wei</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Shanghai TV: Traveler</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Ningbo TV: A La Lu You</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>TVS: Chao Liu Jia Qi</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>SET TV: iWalker</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>BS Fuji TV: World Tour Perfect Map</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>KBS: Sponge</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>KBS: Walk into the World</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>KBS: Dream Team</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>SBS: Art of Travel</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Channel 8: Good Man Good Food</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Astro: i-Travel</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>TV9: Mad Markets</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>GMA: Best Man</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>NDTV: Zaika India Ka</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>NTV: Ikh Nрав</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Nine Network: Weekend Today</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Qantas Welcome Aboard</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>TF1: Reportages</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>PBS: Travelscope</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Country/Region of Production</td>
<td>Country/Region of Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>GNT: Diario Do Olivier</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Onstyle TV: My Queen</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>ICE-TV Production: Asia's Next Top Model</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Modern Nine TV: Champ vs Champ</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>CCTV: Da Lian Yan Bo Shi</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>CCTV: Xiao Fei Zhu Yi</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>CCTV: Huan Qiu Cai Jing Lian Xian</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Anhui TV: Ye Xian 60 Fen</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Guangdong TV: Jin Ri Guan Zhu</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>8TV: 8Style</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>NTV 7: Breakfast Show</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>GMA: Pop Talk</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Rated K TV: Magazine Show</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>SCTV: News</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>STS: Galileo</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>NTV: Myth Hong Kong (Season 5)</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>The Travel Channel: Mei Wei Ren Sheng</td>
<td>Food Programme</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Zhejiang Satellite TV: Shuang Shi Hang Tian Xia</td>
<td>Food Programme</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>TWC Central: Mixeur</td>
<td>Food Programme</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Escales: Deux chefs à Hong-Kong</td>
<td>Food Programme</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Country/Region of Production</td>
<td>Country/Region of Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Nanning TV: News Ye Ban</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Fujian TV: Xian Chang</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>CCTV: Di Yi Shi Jian</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>CCTV: Zheng Dian Kan News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>CTI TV: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>TVBS: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>2013 Transformers: Age of Extinction</td>
<td>Movie</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Blackhat</td>
<td>Movie</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>ABS-CBN: Luv U</td>
<td>TV Drama</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>SET TV: iWalker</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>TV Tokyo: Hong Kong Travel Guide</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>BS Fuji TV: World Tour perfect map</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>NTV: Shittoko</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Sky Perfect TV: Better live in Hong Kong</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Yomiuri TV: Gutto Chikyubin</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Fuji TV: Walk Around</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>SBS: Wo Ri Ga Gan Da</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>RayMac TV: Sud Khet Tessakarn</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Pop Channel: Saturday Say Koi</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>TV Al Hijra: Tetamu Masjid China</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Astro Ria: Destinasi Cinta Bersama</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>NTV 7: Destinasi Bajet</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Country/Region of Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td></td>
<td>GMA: Biyahe ni Drew</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td></td>
<td>GMA: Ang Pinaka</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sab TV: Chintu</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aaj Tak TV: Gurmeet and Debina Celebrating their 2nd Honeymoon in Hong Kong</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NDTV Good Times: Highlight of HK with Sarah Van Dias</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td></td>
<td>My Planet: Planet of Tastes</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery Channel: The Flying Winemaker</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Australia, Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NDR: Metropole im Meer</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wealth TV: Let's Shop</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HGTV: House Hunters International</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Esquire Network/NBC: The Getaway with Aziz Ansari</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CNBC: Going Global</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Globo: Multishow</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bravo TV: The newly wed</td>
<td>Reality Show</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diva Universal: SuperModelMe</td>
<td>Reality Show</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fujian TV: Huan Le 789</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td></td>
<td>KTV: Let's visit Hong Kong</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Country/Region of Production</td>
<td>Country/Region of Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>DoCoMo Bee TV: Summers</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Kansai TV: Hapikuru</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>CJ Onstyle TV: Get it Beauty Show</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>KBS: Scout Show</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Channel 7: The Ace</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Aaron Aziz Productions: MTV</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>8TV: The Awesomest of MAMA in Hong Kong</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>CTI TV: Sisy's World News</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>NTV: Hirunan de su programme</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>NTV: Proshure Department</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>KBS: Live Live Infotainment</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>SBS: Documentary on Hong Kong Art and Culture</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>Channel U: Creative Heroes</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>France 2: Telematin</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>ITV: This Morning</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>CCTV: Yi Cheng Yi Wei Food Programme</td>
<td>Food Programme</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>CCTV: A Bite of China 2 Food Programme</td>
<td>Food Programme</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Country/Region of Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian Food Channel: 3 Chefs 1 City</td>
<td>Food Programme</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EBC: Taiwan Justice</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TTV: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SET TV: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EBC: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CTI TV: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CTS: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TVBS: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Formosa TV/GTV: You Light Up My Star</td>
<td>TV Drama</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SBS: Temptation</td>
<td>TV Drama</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sab TV: Taarak Mehta Ka Ooltah Chashmah</td>
<td>TV Drama</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colors TV: Sasural Simar Ka</td>
<td>TV Drama</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Xiamen TV: Gu Xiang De Yun</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SET TV: iWalker</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fuji TV: Sekai Ittemitara</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NHK: Somewhere Street</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td></td>
<td>BS12ch TV: Hanging out in Asia by Takada Junji</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBS: Tabi Zukin Chan</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td></td>
<td>MBS: Shittoko</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NHK: Sekai ItteQ!</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kansai TV: Nijiro Jean</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery Channel: My Taste of Hong Kong</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Channel 8: Round and Round We Go</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Channel 8: Where to stay?</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCA Channel: Play Time</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Country/Region of Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOW26: PAZA Bazaar</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Nine TV: Fiesta Diary</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Island Living Channel: Travel &amp; Cruise</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td></td>
<td>GMA: Touch Down</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trans TV: My Trip My Adventure</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td></td>
<td>MNCTV: Pelesir</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pyatnica: Pyatnica News</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NTV: Today</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pro Sieben: Kabel Eins</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arte: Cities by the Sea</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Germany, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td></td>
<td>BBC: The Travel Show</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wealth TV: Boys Toys</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wealth TV: Vicarious Escapes</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PBS: Epic Adventure</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TVA: VOL920</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EEN: Vlaanderen Vakantieland</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Belgium, The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jiangsu TV: The Brain</td>
<td>Reality Show</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CJ Olive Channel: Master Chef (Season 3)</td>
<td>Reality Show</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SBS: Running Man</td>
<td>Reality Show</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Country/Region of Production</td>
<td>Country/Region of Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td>CTV: The Amazing Race</td>
<td>Reality Show</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.</td>
<td>Fuji TV: Non-Stop</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.</td>
<td>Kansai TV: Yoidon</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.</td>
<td>JTBC: Witch Hunt</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.</td>
<td>Xiamen TV: Xia Shi Zhi Bo Shi</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.</td>
<td>NHK: Learn English</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.</td>
<td>NTV: Shiawase Bonbi Giral</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149.</td>
<td>TV Setouchi: HK Shokudo</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.</td>
<td>MBC: News</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151.</td>
<td>Channel News Asia: IT Figures</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152.</td>
<td>E24 TV: E Special</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.</td>
<td>Bloomberg TV: HK The World's Meeting Place</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154.</td>
<td>Qantas in flight TV</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.</td>
<td>STAR Chinese Channel: Shi Jie Wo Zuo Zhu</td>
<td>Food Programme</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.</td>
<td>Channel 10: Far Flung with Chef Gary Mehigan</td>
<td>Food Programme</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157.</td>
<td>SET TV: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158.</td>
<td>Unique Satellite TV: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159.</td>
<td>TVBS: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.</td>
<td>EBC: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161.</td>
<td>Formosa TV: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162.</td>
<td>Anya: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Country/Region of Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Lost in Hong Kong</td>
<td>Movie</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164.</td>
<td></td>
<td>India TV: Ishti Kutum</td>
<td>TV Drama</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165.</td>
<td></td>
<td>JSBC: Zong Yi Pai</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shanghai TV: Traveller</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NBS: Biao Dian Lu You</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fujian TV: Sheng Huo Ling Ju Li</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fujian TV: Sheng Huo Da Bu Tong</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fujian TV: Shui Zou Jiu Zou Zi You Zi Zai</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Xiamen TV: Xuan Cai Sheng Huo</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hangzhou TV: Zhou Mo Ai Sheng Huo</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.</td>
<td></td>
<td>STAR Chinese Channel: Shi Jie Wo Zuo Zhu</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fuji TV: Mezamashi Doyobi</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TV Asahi: Tabi-Salad</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TV Asahi: Banana TV</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177.</td>
<td></td>
<td>BS TBS: Luxury Cruise Travel</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yomiuri TV: Hong Kong treasure paradise</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179.</td>
<td></td>
<td>KBS: Food Odyssey</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180.</td>
<td></td>
<td>KBS: VJ Special Force</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Channel A: The Same Age</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Country/Region of Production</td>
<td>Country/Region of Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182.</td>
<td>Discovery Channel: A Taste of Hong Kong (Season 2)</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183.</td>
<td>Channel One: The First</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.</td>
<td>NOW26: Paza Bazaar</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185.</td>
<td>TV Burapha: Fiesta Diary</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186.</td>
<td>Voice TV: Do The Ride Thing</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187.</td>
<td>Astro: Primadona</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188.</td>
<td>8TV: Best in the World</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189.</td>
<td>GMA: Biyahe ni Drew</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190.</td>
<td>ABS-CBN: Cityscape</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191.</td>
<td>Zoom TV: Cruise like a star in Hong Kong</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192.</td>
<td>Fox Life: Life Mein Ek Baar in Hong Kong</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.</td>
<td>Friday: Food, I Love You</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194.</td>
<td>Flight Centre: Flavours of Asia</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195.</td>
<td>France 5: Echappees Belles</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196.</td>
<td>France 5: Des trains pas comme les autres</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.</td>
<td>PBS: Burt Wolf: Travels &amp; Traditions Hong Kong</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198.</td>
<td>Travel Channel: Rev Run Around the World</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199.</td>
<td>Extra: Mansions and Millionaires</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.</td>
<td>CNN International: In 24 Hours</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.</td>
<td>Travel Channel: Booze Traveler</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Country/Region of Production</td>
<td>Country/Region of Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.</td>
<td>TV4: Det är mat, äventyr och glimten i ögat</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.</td>
<td>BNN Vara: 3 Op Reis Backpack</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204.</td>
<td>Guangzhou Jia Jia Cartoon: Quan Jia Qu Na Er</td>
<td>Reality Show</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205.</td>
<td>VOX: Kitchen Impossible</td>
<td>Reality Show</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206.</td>
<td>NBC: Better Late Than Never</td>
<td>Reality Show</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.</td>
<td>CBS: The Amazing Race</td>
<td>Reality Show</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208.</td>
<td>PULS4: Austria's Next Top Model</td>
<td>Reality Show</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Germany, Austria, Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209.</td>
<td>Fuji TV: Viking</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210.</td>
<td>TV Shinshu Japan: Information Wide—Yuuka GET!</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211.</td>
<td>MBC Ulsan: A Story of Space</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212.</td>
<td>Channel News Asia: News This week</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213.</td>
<td>TV 5: Happy Wife, Happy Life</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214.</td>
<td>IBN 7: My Time for HK Family</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215.</td>
<td>ITV: This Morning</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216.</td>
<td>Dragon TV: Zhong Guo Nian Wei</td>
<td>Food Programme</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Country/Region of Production</td>
<td>Country/Region of Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217.</td>
<td>Food Network UK: Ching's Amazing Asia</td>
<td>Food Programme</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218.</td>
<td>SET TV: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219.</td>
<td>TVBS: Chinaing</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.</td>
<td>CTS: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221.</td>
<td>EBC: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222.</td>
<td>M6: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 Ghost in the Shell</td>
<td>Movie</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224.</td>
<td>True4U Channel: Wingless Angel</td>
<td>TV Drama</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225.</td>
<td>Astro: Strawberi Karipap, Hello Hong Kong!</td>
<td>TV Drama</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.</td>
<td>India Star Plus TV: Yeh Rishta Kya Kya Kehlata Hai</td>
<td>TV Drama</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227.</td>
<td>SXBC: Jian Shi Xiang Gang</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228.</td>
<td>Dalian TV: Zhu Bo He Ni Qu Lu Xing</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229.</td>
<td>NBS: Biao Dian Lu You</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230.</td>
<td>TVBS: Super Taste</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231.</td>
<td>SET TV: iWalker</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232.</td>
<td>EBC: YOYO Xi You Ji</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.</td>
<td>Kansai TV: Nijiiro Jean</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234.</td>
<td>TV Tokyo: Moya Moya Summer 2</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235.</td>
<td>BS TBS: Around the world by bus</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236.</td>
<td>BS TV: Nikkei plus One wo Miyo</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237.</td>
<td>NTV: Sekai No Hatemade ItteQ!</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238.</td>
<td>Nippon TV: Another Sky</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239.</td>
<td>TV Asahi: Tabi Salad</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Country/Region of Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240.</td>
<td></td>
<td>BS TBS: Genting Dream Cruise</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EBS: World Theme Travel Series</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TVN: Must HK</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243.</td>
<td></td>
<td>KBS: VJ Commando</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery Channel: A Taste of Hong Kong (Season 3)</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Channel 8: Bengpire</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246.</td>
<td></td>
<td>KIX: Ultimate BroCation</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suria: Cantik Detektif 3</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Siamsport Television: Thailand Sport Journey</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice TV: Do The Ride Thing</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NTV7: Travel with Parents</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ANC TV: Trending Now</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trans TV: Diary Laudya Cynthia Bella</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoom TV: Hong Kong Asia's World City</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NTV: Let's Go, Let's Eat</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Channel 10: Studio 10</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fox Sports Australia: Postcard</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ARD/ORF/SRF: Cult &amp; The City</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Country/Region of Production</td>
<td>Country/Region of Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258.</td>
<td>ARD: Longing for the sea</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259.</td>
<td>RTL2: Grip TV</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.</td>
<td>TV5 Monde: Itinéris</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261.</td>
<td>BBC: Chinese New Year, the biggest celebration on earth</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262.</td>
<td>PBS: Weekend Explorer</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263.</td>
<td>Travel Channel: The Best Place To Be</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264.</td>
<td>PBS: Travels with Darley</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265.</td>
<td>Globo: Globo Reporter</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266.</td>
<td>NOP1: Erica Op Reis</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267.</td>
<td>Starhub/Astro: The Travellers</td>
<td>Travelog</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Singapore, Malaysia, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268.</td>
<td>Zhejiang Satellite TV: Lost in Food</td>
<td>Reality Show</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269.</td>
<td>JTBC: Take care of the refrigerator</td>
<td>Reality Show</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea, Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270.</td>
<td>SBS: Youth is on Fire</td>
<td>Reality Show</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271.</td>
<td>Tokai TV: The Good Sun House</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272.</td>
<td>NTV: Moco's Kitchen</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273.</td>
<td>Fuji TV: Nonstop</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274.</td>
<td>Nippon TV: Shu-ichi</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275.</td>
<td>Astro: Star Quest</td>
<td>Variety Show</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Country/Region of Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yamanashi: Yamanashi live TV!</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TV Tokyo: Future Century Zipangu</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asahi Hoso ABC: Good Morning Asahi</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hokkaido Television Broadcasting: Chocolate Trip</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABS-CBN: Umagang Kay Ganda show</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kompas TV: News</td>
<td>Infotainment</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CCTV: Xun Wei Shun De Food Programme</td>
<td>Food Programme</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seven Network: Around the World with Manu</td>
<td>Food Programme</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TV1: Taste of a Traveller</td>
<td>Food Programme</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nat Geo People: Confucius was a Foodie</td>
<td>Food Programme</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sichuan TV: Chuan Gang Xie Shou Shang Si Lu</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TVBS: Chinaing</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288.</td>
<td></td>
<td>VL Sports: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SET TV: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unique Satellite TV: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Next TV: News</td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

Please refer to Chinese version for the official names of TV programmes in Mainland and Taiwan.
Film/television works which conduct location filming in Hong Kong through support services rendered by Create Hong Kong (2012 to 2016)

**Film productions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Country/region where the works were produced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>The Expendables 2</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Pacific Rim</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Man of Tai Chi</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Capture</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I Trust You</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My City, Xixi</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Fragrant Harbour</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The Flu</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Six</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Special ID</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The Love Experience</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My Lucky Star</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>攣生密碼</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2013 Black Hat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Transformers: Age of Extinction</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Hong Kong Story</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The Castle</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The Suspect</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>盜寶奇航</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>漂流瓶</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>2014 Skiptrace</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>It's Already Tomorrow in Hong Kong</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Hacker</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Documentary on the Art Scene in Hong Kong</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Ares</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Country/region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Game Fever</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>HKIFF Capsules</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Citizen B.</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Runaway</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Life Street</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Truth Like Lies</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Lost in Hong Kong</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>The Sinking Taxi</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>2015 Geostorm</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Snowden</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Checkmate</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Lady Bloodfight</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Social Cities</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Flip Flops</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Hong Kong is beautiful</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>How is the sky in your place?</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Bounty Hunters</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>2016 Ghost in the Shell</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Fox Hunt</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>American Boxed In.</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Love Sonia</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Lost in Hong Kong</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>In Transit</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Show Me Your Love</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>幼兒怨</td>
<td>Mainland/Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Pu Chu Qu 3</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>North East Past: Po Ma Zhang Fei</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Feng Zhong You Duo Yu Zuo De Yun</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>私房貓</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>香港大師</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Television programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Country/region where the works were produced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Rubicon TV AS (The Amazing Race Norway)</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Borgen/The Castle</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Music Video of Audreas Bourani</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Qipao</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Mission in Hong Kong</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>NHK (基礎英語香港篇)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>House Hunters International</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>World's Busiest</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>聖火採集</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>新華電視 (香港回歸十五週年專題)</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>光陽的故事</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>原鄉</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>MasterChef Indonesia</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Legend Fighting Championship</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Buddy Season 11</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>金田一少年之事件簿</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>AR Music Video</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Island Secrets (Travelogue)</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>X-Perfect (Travelogue)</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Global History</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Fire—Flavor—Facts</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Observational documentary</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Pounworld</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>De Par En Par</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian History Mysteries</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Programme Filler</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Wan Nee Tee Ror Koi</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>World perfect map</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Telematin</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>The Gateway</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Mister Around The World</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Via Pra Onde (Brazilian Travelogue)</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Wie is de Mol</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Hairy Bikers</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>HGTV 'House Hunter International'</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>My Planet</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Country/region where the works were produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Barclays Asia Trophy</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Supermodel Me</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Entertainment News</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>BBC 'British Airways'</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Nitro Circus Live (MTV Channel)</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>華麗上班族</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Covert Affairs (1)</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Hawaii 5-0</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Okinawa (Documentary)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Covert Affairs (2)</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Extreme School 2</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>我的博士老公</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>2014 NBC News (Sochi Winter Games)</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Fuji TV (New Year Festival)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>NTV travelogue</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>BS Fuji TV (Travel by tram)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Larkin and Dafe</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Yolanthe Sneijder Cabau</td>
<td>Netherland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>The Amazing Race</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Casar to the Rescue</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Disney</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>你照亮我星球</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Entertainment Tonight</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Travel TV: Wahlburgers</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Channel News Asia—IT Figures</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Temptation</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>One Child</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>鄧小平紀念館</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Human (Documentary)</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Abalone Wars</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Night Noodle Market</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Vol 920</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>KLM Music</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>China Close Up 2</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Detlef Muss Reisen</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Asia's Got Reisen</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Cities by the Sea</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Country/region where the works were produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>The Amazing Race China</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>The Ivory (Documentary)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Ishti Kutum (Drama)</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Treasures of the Earth</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>7 days of Romance</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>On the right track</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>世界真夜中散步</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>天才在左．瘋子在右</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>綜藝玩很大</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Des Trains pas comme les autres</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Dreamboat</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Another Stories</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Music video for the band &quot;U2&quot;</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>如果愛</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>The Dog Rescuers</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>The Wine Show (Documentary)</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Accelerated Evolution</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>Twofour Broadcast (Documentary)</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Luas De Saturno music video</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>Kahi music video</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>The History Hustle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>The Amazing Race</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>Royal Pains</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>BBC Health Fix</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>My Trip</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>BBC documentary</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>Better Late Than Never</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>Luxe Asia</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>Once in a Lifetime</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>原來是你</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>Austria Next Top Ten Model</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>王祖藍特輯</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>A Story of Space</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>Mon Nouveau Monde/My New World</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>小情人(湖南衛視)</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>Home Sweetie Home</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>你好喬安</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Country/region where the works were produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>Kitchen Impossible</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>Man Finds Food</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>4 Corners</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116. 2016</td>
<td>Man Finds Food</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>Flight 920</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>我們相愛吧</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>Live Art—Hack Space</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>My Father, My Expert</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>Verruckt nach Meer (Travelogue)(ARD TV)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>外遊快拍</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>TG5 News report</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>ABS-CBN (ANG Probinsyano)</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>France TV News Channel promotion</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>Popcorn Loop</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>English Detective</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>The Ultimate Brocation Deck</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>Monkey Life</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>NHK News Live</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>The Real Housewives of Beverly Hills</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>Hogie the Globehopper</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>Wingin' It Travel Show</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.</td>
<td>Live Art—Hack Space (Arte TV)</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td>Stupefiant (France 2)</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.</td>
<td>60 Minutes (M6 TV)</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td>CNY2016: The Biggest Celebration on Earth</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td>Pro Bono Asia</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td>4 Corners</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td>Globetrotting with Gul!</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.</td>
<td>Around the World in 80 Dishes</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td>Better Off Abroad</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.</td>
<td>Rolex China Sea Race 2016</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.</td>
<td>The Geissens—a very glamorous family</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

The information above only covers cases of location filming in Hong Kong by non-local film/television crews handled by CreateHK. The actual number of film/television works shot in Hong Kong should be higher.
Long-term development of the retail industry

9. **MR SHIU KA-FAI** (in Chinese): President, regarding the long-term development of Hong Kong's retail industry, will the Government inform this Council:

   (1) of the total floor area of the retail shops in Hong Kong in each of the past 15 years, with a breakdown by the capacity (i.e. private entities, the Hong Kong Housing Authority and the Hong Kong Housing Society) of the owners of the properties where the shops were located;

   (2) of the projected total floor area of the retail shops in Hong Kong in each of the coming 10 years, with a breakdown by the capacity (i.e. private entities, the Hong Kong Housing Authority and the Hong Kong Housing Society) of the owners of the properties where the shops are located;

   (3) whether it assessed, in the past five years, the demand for floor areas of retail facilities and shops; if so, of the assessment method and outcome;

   (4) of the percentage of tourists' spending in Hong Kong in the value of total retail sales in each of the past five years (with a tabulated breakdown by major type of retailers);

   (5) given that the Planning Department conducted in 1996 and 2005 respectively the Review on Shopping Habits (which comprised surveys on households and retailers as well as structured meetings with major stakeholders) with a view to understanding the shopping habits of Hong Kong people and the perceived retail hierarchy, whether the authorities have plans to conduct such a review afresh to provide reference information for the long-term development of the retail industry; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

   (6) given that in announcing the outcome of the Review on Shopping Habits conducted in 2005, the authorities indicated that online shopping was not prevalent and was not expected to become popular
in the future in Hong Kong, whether the authorities have plans to conduct in-depth studies on online shopping; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR DEVELOPMENT (in Chinese): President, the retail industry, constituting one of the major economic activities in Hong Kong, is categorized as a commercial use in terms of land use. The Government has been monitoring the market demand for commercial floor space and is committed to increasing the supply of sites, space and hardware for economic uses in order to facilitate the developments of different economic activities and maintain Hong Kong's competitiveness. At present, the Government does not have any specific policy for retail as part of the commercial activities. The development and choice of commercial uses for economic land and floor space would more appropriately be market-driven, which allows business operators to respond to the fast-changing market situations and make timely and flexible decisions. The existing planning system, including the statutory plans, has embodied sufficient flexibility to facilitate retail activities in many land use zones. For example, "retail shops" is an always permitted use on the land zoned "Commercial" in the Central Business District and major shopping areas. In the "Residential (Group A)" zones, retail shops are also always permitted in the lower three storeys of buildings. Developers can also propose change of land use for sites considered suitable for development of retail business via planning applications.

Having consulted the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau, Innovation and Technology Bureau, Office of the Government Chief Information Officer, Rating and Valuation Department ("RVD"), Census and Statistics Department ("C&SD"), Housing Department ("HD") and Planning Department ("PlanD"), my replies to different parts of the question are as follows:

(1) and (2)

According to the information of RVD, statistics of the total stock for the private retail premises at the year-end of 2003 to 2016 are listed in Table 1 below.
Table 1: Private Retail—Stock at Year-end (2003 to 2016)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central and Western</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wan Chai</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hong Kong</strong></td>
<td>2 638</td>
<td>2 636</td>
<td>2 640</td>
<td>2 617</td>
<td>2 616</td>
<td>2 625</td>
<td>2 628</td>
<td>2 647</td>
<td>2 696</td>
<td>2 742</td>
<td>2 774</td>
<td>2 778</td>
<td>2 755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yau Tsim Mong</td>
<td>1 523</td>
<td>1 565</td>
<td>1 565</td>
<td>1 603</td>
<td>1 616</td>
<td>1 618</td>
<td>1 674</td>
<td>1 707</td>
<td>1 719</td>
<td>1 725</td>
<td>1 728</td>
<td>1 733</td>
<td>1 731</td>
<td>1 754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sham Shui Po</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowloon City</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong Tai Sin</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwun Tong</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kowloon</strong></td>
<td>3 549</td>
<td>3 576</td>
<td>3 590</td>
<td>3 699</td>
<td>3 730</td>
<td>3 751</td>
<td>3 739</td>
<td>3 786</td>
<td>3 790</td>
<td>3 841</td>
<td>3 841</td>
<td>3 856</td>
<td>3 904</td>
<td>3 947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwai Tsing</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsuen Wan</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuen Mun</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuen Long</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Po</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sha Tin</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sai Kung</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islands</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Territories</strong></td>
<td>2 796</td>
<td>2 826</td>
<td>2 842</td>
<td>2 878</td>
<td>2 983</td>
<td>2 996</td>
<td>2 996</td>
<td>2 993</td>
<td>3 015</td>
<td>3 037</td>
<td>3 054</td>
<td>3 075</td>
<td>3 109</td>
<td>3 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>8 982</td>
<td>9 038</td>
<td>9 073</td>
<td>9 195</td>
<td>9 330</td>
<td>9 371</td>
<td>9 363</td>
<td>9 429</td>
<td>9 500</td>
<td>9 621</td>
<td>9 637</td>
<td>9 679</td>
<td>9 791</td>
<td>9 870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

* RVD does not have the relevant statistical data in 2002 or the breakdown by ownership.

# Measured on the basis of “internal floor area” which is defined as the area of all enclosed space of the unit measured to the internal face of enclosing external and/or party walls.

Private retail stock is based on rating records. The sum of individual items might not add up to the respective total because of rounding.

Source: RVD
Retail as part of the commercial activities is an industry with ever-changing market conditions, and the use of economic sites and floor space for retail purposes is a market-driven commercial decision. The Government does not have a forecast of retail floor space in the future.

On the other hand, from 2006-2007 till now, the total internal floor area of retail shops under the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") is listed in Table 2 below. Since HA only maintains the relevant information from 2006-2007 onwards, we are unable to provide the information before then.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Internal Floor Area of Retail Shops under HA (sq m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>141 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>153 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>145 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>154 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>155 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>163 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>185 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>192 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>197 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>201 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>213 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HD

The estimated total internal floor area of retail shops under HA for the period from 2017-2018 to 2020-2021 is listed in Table 3 below. However, the figures are subject to change due to alternation or renovation of existing premises or change in the detail designs of new projects. For HA projects estimated for completion in 2021-2022 and afterwards, most of them are still at the stage of preliminary planning and design, thus we are unable to provide the relevant information at this stage.
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Estimated Total Internal Floor Area of Retail Shops under HA (sq m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>226 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>239 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>254 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>273 400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HD

The total internal floor area of commercial (including retail) use in properties under the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HKHS") in the past 15 years and the estimated total internal floor area of commercial (including retail) use in properties under HKHS in the coming 10 years are listed in Tables 4 and 5 below respectively.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Internal Floor Area of Commercial Use under HKHS (sq m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>92 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>92 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>92 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>92 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>92 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>92 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>92 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>92 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>92 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>92 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>92 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>93 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>93 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>95 759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>98 913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HKHS
Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Estimated Total Internal Floor Area of Commercial Use under HKHS (sq m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>100 077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>100 077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>101 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>101 866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>101 866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-2023</td>
<td>107 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-2024</td>
<td>109 009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024-2025</td>
<td>109 009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025-2026</td>
<td>110 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026-2027</td>
<td>110 269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HKHS

(3) and (5)

PlanD conducted a "Study on Shopping Habits" in 1995 with regard to the development of the society at that time. The aim of the study was primarily to look into the shopping habits and trends of Hong Kong people at that time in order to facilitate appropriate revisions to the standards and guidelines on retail facilities in Chapter 6 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines ("HKPSG"). Subsequently, PlanD conducted another study called the "Review on Shopping Habits" in 2004 to identify the shopping choice habit and expectation of Hong Kong people. It also explored the new trends in the retail sector at that time, including assessment of the impact of the cross-boundary shopping activities and new shopping modes such as e-shopping, on the provision of retail facilities, in order to facilitate further revision of the relevant planning standards and guidelines.

In light of the findings and recommendations of the two studies on shopping habits, the standards and guidelines on retail facilities in Chapter 6 of HKPSG were revised in 1998 and 2009 as appropriate. The revisions included setting out the shopping preference and trend of the general public; the retail hierarchy; the broad approach for estimating the demand for retail facilities; and the main considerations of retailers and developers in the development of
retail facilities. The guidelines stress that retail development is primarily market-driven and should be effectively addressed by the private sector in response to market situation. In this connection, the relevant planning standards and guidelines mainly serve as a reference and should be applied with flexibility. At present, the relevant bureau and departments do not have any plan to further revise the said standards and guidelines concerning retail facilities, and PlanD has no plan to carry out another study on shopping habits. The Government will continue to make reference to the data compiled by C&SD and relevant market researches to closely monitor the development of retail industry in different aspects.

It is noteworthy that the above studies were not intended to assess the demand for retail facilities and their floor space. As mentioned above, the Government has been working vigorously to increase land supply for different economic activities, including land and floor space for commercial uses. The existing planning system has provided retail business operating on commercial floor space with adequate flexibility. Since the use of commercial floor space for retail use is a market-driven commercial decision, solely assessing the demand for retail floor space is not meaningful.

(4) According to the information of C&SD and the Hong Kong Tourism Board, the total spending on goods in Hong Kong by visitors is estimated to be around 35% to 42% of the total value of retail sales in Hong Kong from 2012 to 2016 (Table 6 below). In addition, as the categorization of the total visitors' spending on goods is different from that of the total values of retail sales, the respective share by broad type of retail outlet is not available.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HK$ (million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Total spending on goods in Hong Kong by visitors</td>
<td>158,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Total value of retail sales</td>
<td>445,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share (i)/(ii):</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: C&SD and Hong Kong Tourism Board
(6) C&SD has conducted a series of the "Thematic Household Survey on Information Technology Usage and Penetration" on an annual basis since 2000. Information on usage of online purchasing services has been collected once every two years and the latest round of the survey was conducted during April to July 2016. Based on data collected through the latest round of the survey, some 1,701,200 persons aged 15 and over in Hong Kong had used online purchasing services for personal matters during the 12 months before enumeration, constituting 27.8% of all persons aged 15 and over in Hong Kong.

On the other hand, C&SD has also conducted a "Survey on Information Technology Usage and Penetration in the Business Sector" to collect information relating to information technology usage and penetration from establishments in the business sector. The survey was conducted annually from 2000 to 2009, and has been conducted once every two years since 2013. Based on data collected through the latest round of the survey, the value of business receipts from selling of goods, services or information through electronic means amounted to $400.6 billion in 2014, representing 4.7% of the total business receipts of all selected industry sectors in 2014.

Public library services

10. **MR LAU KWOK-FAN** (in Chinese): President, regarding the services provided by the public libraries ("libraries") under the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD"), will the Government inform this Council:

   (1) of the average monthly (i) attendance figures and (ii) numbers of loans of books and other materials of various libraries last year, with a breakdown by the District Council districts in which the libraries are located and type of libraries (i.e. major, district and small libraries);

   (2) of the reasons why the current opening hours of small libraries are only 56 hours per week at the most; whether LCSD will extend the service hours of those small libraries with higher utilization rates (e.g. Fanling South Public Library); if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
(3) given that some residents have relayed to me that the computer workstations at the Fanling South Public Library are not installed with word processing software for use by the public, of the current number of computer workstations for use by the public at various libraries which are installed with word processing software, and whether LCSD will consider installing such software in all computer workstations; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(4) given that LCSD has currently installed a total of 12 book drop boxes in three major MTR interchange stations (i.e. Central, Nam Cheong and Kowloon Tong stations) only, whether LCSD will install book drop boxes in other MTR stations for the convenience of the public; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Chinese): President, the Hong Kong Public Libraries ("HKPL") of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD"), currently comprising 70 static libraries and 12 mobile libraries, provide diversified library services for the public. Under the structure of public library services, major and district libraries serve as the backbone while small libraries and mobile libraries play a supplementary role in enhancing the library service network. In response to the public demand for longer opening hours of libraries, the Government has, since April 2009, allocated additional resources to standardize and extend the weekly opening hours of all major and district libraries from 61 or 62 hours to the present 71 hours, providing services for the public seven days a week. My reply to various parts of Mr LAU’s question is as follows:

(1) The monthly average attendance figures and numbers of loans of library materials of all major, district and small libraries in Hong Kong in 2016 with a breakdown by District Council district are tabulated at Annex.

(2) As the backbone of public libraries, major and district libraries currently provide services for the public seven days a week. As for small libraries that play a supplementary role, their opening hours are relatively shorter. The 21 small libraries in urban areas are open six days a week for a total of 50 hours, and the weekly opening hours of 11 small libraries in the New Territories range from 14 hours (those located at remote areas) to 56 hours. Overall speaking, the existing opening hours of different types of libraries have catered for the needs of most people.
The opinion survey conducted by LCSD from September to November 2014 revealed that 83% of the respondents considered the existing opening hours "very convenient" or "convenient". In view of the substantial resources and manpower required for library operation and the need to strike a balance between public needs and resource efficiency, LCSD has no plan to extend the opening hours of 32 small libraries at this stage. The Fanling South Public Library which commenced service in August 2016 is currently open for 56 hours a week. LCSD plans to collect and analyse the data of library usage at different time periods to explore, without extending the weekly opening hours, the possibility of revising the opening periods of the library with regard to the circumstances in the district. LCSD will report timely to the North District Council.

(3) At present, LCSD provides about 1,930 computers with Internet connection at 70 static libraries. Computer and Information Centres have been set up in 30 static libraries (mainly major and district libraries), and about 550 computers in these centres are installed with word processing software. As for small libraries, the computer facilities therein mainly allow users to gain access to information on the Internet, as well as the libraries' multimedia and digitized resources, e-books and online databases, to facilitate their seeking of information, leisure reading and self-learning.

HKPL will review the computer facilities and services from time to time to meet public needs.

(4) LCSD has provided book drop service under a trial scheme at three major Mass Transit Railway ("MTR") interchange stations, namely Central, Kowloon Tong and Nam Cheong since late September 2011, and completed a review on the scheme in 2013. Apart from analysing the usage of the service, LCSD collected public views through an opinion survey. The findings revealed that as the majority of the readers still preferred visiting the libraries in person to return and borrow books on the same occasion, the usage of the service was below the planned capacity. The monthly average usage of the book drop service in 2016 was about 44% of the planned capacity. In view of the habit of the library users and the cost-effectiveness of the service, we have no plan to extend the service to more MTR stations at this stage.
On the other hand, LCSD plans to provide on a trial basis three self-service library stations, one each on Hong Kong Island, in Kowloon and in the New Territories at convenient locations with heavier pedestrian flow and far from existing libraries. The self-service library stations will provide round-the-clock services such as borrowing, return, payment and pickup of reserved library materials. After launching the trial scheme in 2017-2018, LCSD will conduct timely review to evaluate the effectiveness of the trial scheme taking into account factors such as utilization, cost effectiveness, feedback of users, sustainability and complementarity with other library services.

Annex

Monthly Average Attendance and Numbers of Loans of Library Materials of Public Libraries in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Public Libraries</th>
<th>Monthly Average Attendance</th>
<th>Monthly Average Numbers of Loans of Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Western</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>66 699</td>
<td>64 494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Shek Tong Tsui</td>
<td>46 141</td>
<td>38 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Smithfield</td>
<td>23 744</td>
<td>19 345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Chai Wan</td>
<td>49 597</td>
<td>44 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Point</td>
<td>26 528</td>
<td>19 607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarry Bay</td>
<td>42 705</td>
<td>42 401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Electric Road</td>
<td>21 811</td>
<td>19 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siu Sai Wan</td>
<td>34 345</td>
<td>23 637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yiu Tung</td>
<td>15 693</td>
<td>13 464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>49 761</td>
<td>44 867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Ap Lei Chau</td>
<td>19 714</td>
<td>22 942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pok Fu Lam</td>
<td>19 133</td>
<td>17 898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>12 940</td>
<td>10 783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wan Chai</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Hong Kong Central Library</td>
<td>331 941</td>
<td>135 753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Lockhart Road</td>
<td>48 783</td>
<td>37 960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Wong Nai Chung</td>
<td>14 881</td>
<td>9 691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Type of Library</td>
<td>Public Libraries</td>
<td>Monthly Average Attendance</td>
<td>Monthly Average Numbers of Loans of Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowloon City</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Kowloon</td>
<td>53 243</td>
<td>63 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>To Kwa Wan</td>
<td>43 711</td>
<td>36 013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Hung Hom</td>
<td>28 208</td>
<td>28 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kowloon City</td>
<td>20 025</td>
<td>19 984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Lam Tin</td>
<td>77 697</td>
<td>57 584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ngau Tau Kok</td>
<td>48 803</td>
<td>36 822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shui Wo Street</td>
<td>48 673</td>
<td>44 477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Lei Yue Mun</td>
<td>13 945</td>
<td>17 730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sau Mau Ping</td>
<td>13 624</td>
<td>16 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shun Lee Estate</td>
<td>14 347</td>
<td>18 744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Lai Chi Kok</td>
<td>62 798</td>
<td>57 032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Po On Road</td>
<td>82 984</td>
<td>45 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Shek Kip Mei</td>
<td>24 771</td>
<td>28 803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Un Chau Street</td>
<td>24 699</td>
<td>18 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Ngau Chi Wan</td>
<td>37 875</td>
<td>37 024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Po Kong</td>
<td>68 492</td>
<td>39 921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Fu Shan</td>
<td>18 083</td>
<td>11 945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lok Fu</td>
<td>22 309</td>
<td>20 078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lung Hing</td>
<td>25 812</td>
<td>17 487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsz Wan Shan</td>
<td>31 577</td>
<td>23 492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Fa Yuen Street</td>
<td>49 471</td>
<td>38 719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yau Ma Tei</td>
<td>51 731</td>
<td>43 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Tai Kok Tsui</td>
<td>36 822</td>
<td>28 525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsim Sha Tsui</td>
<td>13 672</td>
<td>25 649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Territories</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Cheung Chau</td>
<td>18 912</td>
<td>7 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tung Chung</td>
<td>35 724</td>
<td>57 730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Mui Wo</td>
<td>3 902</td>
<td>2 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Lamma</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>1 431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peng Chau</td>
<td>2 820</td>
<td>3 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Lamma</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tai O</td>
<td>2 669</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Type of Library</td>
<td>Public Libraries</td>
<td>Monthly Average Attendance</td>
<td>Monthly Average Numbers of Loans of Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwai Tsing</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>North Kwai Chung</td>
<td>39 911</td>
<td>27 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Kwai Chung</td>
<td>56 611</td>
<td>53 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsing Yi</td>
<td>64 081</td>
<td>50 821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Fan Ling</td>
<td>55 635</td>
<td>45 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheung Shui</td>
<td>71 310</td>
<td>45 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Fanling South&lt;sup&gt;(1)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10 682</td>
<td>9 486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sha Tau Kok</td>
<td>2 531</td>
<td>1 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sai Kung</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Sai Kung</td>
<td>26 416</td>
<td>27 560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tiu Keng Leng</td>
<td>82 231</td>
<td>85 833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tseung Kwan O</td>
<td>59 979</td>
<td>85 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sha Tin&lt;sup&gt;(2)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Sha Tin</td>
<td>106 349</td>
<td>120 678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Ma On Shan</td>
<td>80 622</td>
<td>65 775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Lek Yuen</td>
<td>19 852</td>
<td>12 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Po</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Tai Po</td>
<td>96 278</td>
<td>64 060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsuen Wan</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Tsuen Wan</td>
<td>109 401</td>
<td>102 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Shek Wai Kok</td>
<td>10 196</td>
<td>8 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuen Mun</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Tuen Mun</td>
<td>115 095</td>
<td>105 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Tai Hing</td>
<td>33 404</td>
<td>18 594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Butterfly Estate</td>
<td>17 950</td>
<td>13 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuen Long</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Ping Shan Tin Shui Wai</td>
<td>109 618</td>
<td>101 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Yuen Long</td>
<td>82 630</td>
<td>37 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Tin Shui Wai North</td>
<td>33 248</td>
<td>15 075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

(1) The Fanling South Public Library (Small Library) commenced service in August 2016.

(2) Excluding the Yuen Chau Kok Public Library which was fully commissioned on 30 March 2017.

Review of the Native-speaking English Teacher Scheme

11. **MR MICHAEL TIEN** (in Chinese): President, some teachers' associations have relayed to me that the remuneration package for English teachers appointed under the Native-speaking English Teacher ("NET") Scheme should be reviewed. For instance, the medical allowance provided for NETs (i.e. a single appointee and a married appointee may be reimbursed up to $1,400
and $5,400 per year respectively for taking out medical insurance) has not been adjusted since it was set in 1997, and such amounts are insufficient to cover related expenses nowadays. On the other hand, at the meeting of the Panel on Education of this Council held on 14 December 2015, officials from the Education Bureau ("EDB") indicated that EDB was studying the feasibility of providing an additional NET for public-sector primary schools with a greater number of classes and would design a pilot plan based on the study findings. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the latest progress of the study conducted by EDB on providing an additional NET for public-sector primary schools with a greater number of classes;

(2) of the respective percentages of retention and attrition of NETs in public-sector primary and secondary schools in each of the past three school years;

(3) whether it has studied the relationship between the remuneration package for NETs and their decisions to stay on or leave the service; if so, of the details; if not, whether it will conduct such a study; and

(4) whether it has plans to review the remuneration package for NETs, including raising their medical allowance?

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION (in Chinese): President, the Government introduced the Native-speaking English Teacher ("NET") Scheme, comprising the Enhanced NET Scheme in Secondary Schools and the NET Scheme in Primary Schools ("Primary NET Scheme"), to public sector secondary schools and primary schools in the 1998-1999 and 2002-2003 school years respectively. Through this Scheme, it is expected that NETs can bring into the language classrooms of local schools their professional experience, different teaching styles and ideas, and cultural literacy that can help enrich students' literacy experiences and the language learning environment. Playing a complementary role as resource teachers, NETs collaborate with our local teachers to enhance the strategies for curriculum development, language instruction and assessment.

It needs emphasizing that the NET Scheme is one of the measures in support of English Language Education in Hong Kong. Under the steer of the Standing Committee on Language Education and Research, a range of initiatives, through the use of the Language Fund, is put in place to improve the English learning environment and to strengthen support for English learning and teaching.
in local primary and secondary schools, including school-based support services, the Professional Development Incentive Grant Scheme for Language Teachers, and a range of language activities to enhance students' exposure to and interest in English. Under the latest Grant Scheme on Promoting Effective English Language Learning in Primary Schools, which was announced in March 2017, primary schools are invited to apply for a grant of not more than $350,000 for use within one to two school years to support the development of their school-based English enhancement measures. One of the possible ways for the use of the grant is to employ additional teachers or teaching assistants to help provide students with more opportunities to use English in authentic contexts, assist or work in collaboration with existing English language teachers in implementing school-based curriculum initiatives, and/or create space for existing English language teachers to develop school-based English Language curriculum and learning and teaching resources.

Our reply to the questions raised by Mr Michael TIEN is as follows:

(1) Regarding the proposal to provide an additional NET for public-sector primary schools with a greater number of classes, the Education Bureau conducted, by way of sampling, a case study of six public-sector primary schools which employed Native English-speaking Teaching Assistants ("NETAs") in the 2015-2016 school year. Through interviews and observation, the study collected data and information on such aspects as the source of funding, the recruitment, employment package, qualifications and deployment of NETAs, and the views of stakeholders, including school principals, English panel chairs and English teachers, NETAs, as well as students and parents of some of the case study schools. The Education Bureau is carefully considering the findings of the case study in connection with those of the second large-scale evaluation of the Primary NET Scheme, which has been completed. As planned, the reports on both studies will be disseminated in August 2017.

The study of the recruitment and deployment of NETAs in the six sampled schools reveals that there were marked variations in terms of the employment terms and effectiveness among NETAs working in the six case study schools. In schools where NETAs were more effectively utilized, the main success factors include effective distributive leadership, good communication and collaborative culture, effective planning and deployment, etc. By contrast, in schools where NETAs were less effectively utilized, the main issue
lies in the lack of a mechanism to support the collaboration between NETAs and other English teachers, to take care of NETAs' professional development and to monitor and provide feedback on NETAs' performance.

As to the second evaluation of the Primary NET Scheme, the overall findings show that the Scheme had a positive impact on the learning and teaching of English in primary schools in that it contributed to the improvement in students' general proficiency, literacy skills, oral fluency and accuracy, and that it helped boost students' confidence and motivation. With the support from the Advisory Teachers of the Education Bureau in promoting co-planning and co-teaching, it also enhanced local English teachers' repertoire of pedagogical practices and their use of English in the classroom.

For the long-term development of the NET Scheme, we will make reference to the findings of the two studies mentioned and carefully consider various factors, which include the support that schools require, the latest developments related to the NET Scheme, the supply of and the demand for qualified NETs, and the long-term financial implications.

(2) The respective rates of retention and attrition of NETs in primary and secondary schools in each of the past three school years are set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Retention Rate</th>
<th>Attrition Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>Secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

* Retention rate refers to the percentage of the number of NETs who have their contracts renewed upon expiry in that particular school year against the total number of NETs completing the contracts in that particular school year.

# Attrition rate refers to the percentage of the number of NETs opting not to renew their contracts and leaving the NET Scheme for reasons other than retirement against the total number of NETs completing the contract in that particular school year.
(3) Under the prevailing practice, an eligible NET with satisfactory performance is entitled to a cash retention incentive payable at 5% of his/her current base salary in the third and fourth years of continuous service, and a cash retention incentive payable at 10% of his/her current base salary from the fifth year of continuous service onwards. In addition, the Education Bureau reviews the special allowance\(^{(1)}\) for NETs annually according to the existing adjustment mechanism. Specifically, when conducting the review, the Education Bureau has to consider factors such as the average rental prices for the type of accommodation involved, the attrition rate of NETs and the affordability of the Government.

As reflected from the stable attrition rate, showing a trend of gradual decline as well, the remuneration package for NETs is considered very attractive. The adjustment mechanism of special allowance is also effective and well-established. In fact, the special allowance has been adjusted upward for several times, as in the 2008-2009, 2011-2012, 2014-2015 and 2016-2017 school years, to the current level of HK$20,989 per month. Hence, the Education Bureau considers that there are no sufficient grounds to justify the proposed study of the relationship between the remuneration package for NETs and their decisions to stay on or leave the service.

(4) Apart from the base salary, an eligible NET is entitled to various fringe benefits including special allowance, passage, baggage allowance, medical allowance, gratuity and cash retention incentive, etc. Details are set out in the Annex.

As regards medical allowance, the present maximum rate during the contract period is HK$1,400 per year for a single NET and HK$5,400 per year for a NET accompanied by spouse and/or children. To our knowledge, there are alternative medical insurance plans available in the market which are under the maximum rate of medical allowance. We have also shared such information in the liaison meetings with the NET association concerned. Just like the local residents, NETs are also entitled to public health care services. Besides, they can flexibly use the

\(^{(1)}\) The special allowance aims to assist NETs in meeting the cost of living, mainly accommodation cost, in Hong Kong.
special allowance for meeting various needs. The existing remuneration package for the NET Scheme is adequate. Taking a NET of starting salary point in 2016 as an example, the special allowance, medical allowance and gratuity receivable add up to about 90% of his/her base salary.

The Education Bureau has been engaging NETs in discussion and exchange of views on matters related to the NET Scheme through various means, including regular liaison meetings with the NET association concerned. We will follow the established and effective practice and review the remuneration package for NETs from time to time to attract quality teachers to become NETs.

Annex

Remuneration Package for Native-speaking English Teachers

Under the Native-speaking English Teacher ("NET") Scheme, a NET whose normal place of residence is outside Hong Kong is entitled to passage, baggage allowance, special allowance and medical allowance according to the terms of the employment contract. Highlights of such benefits are as follows:

Passage

Reimbursement of expenses on one return standard economy class air ticket from country of origin by the most direct route for each NET, his/her spouse and each of the accompanying children under the age of 18, up to a maximum of five persons including NET, for each two-year contract.

Baggage Allowance

Reimbursement of baggage expenses from country of origin to Hong Kong is provided on first appointment. The maximum rate is HK$1,300 for a single NET and HK$5,000 for a NET accompanied by spouse and/or children. As for NETs leaving the NET Scheme upon completion of service and will not be in another employment under the NET Scheme, the maximum rate of baggage allowance for the homebound trip is HK$3,300 for a single NET and HK$6,500 for a NET accompanied by spouse and/or children.
Special Allowance

Eligible NETs are entitled to a monthly allowance of HK$20,989 fixed over the contract period from the 2016-2017 school year onwards. The rate is subject to adjustment according to the prevailing rate upon NET entering into a new contract of employment or upon renewal of contract under the NET Scheme.

Medical Allowance

Medical allowance is provided as reimbursement for NET to undertake medical insurance within the contract period. The maximum rate of allowance is HK$1,400 per year for a single NET and HK$5,400 per year for a NET accompanied by spouse and/or children.

Gratuity

15% of the total current base salary over the contract period payable on satisfactory completion of each contract.

Retention Incentive

A cash retention incentive payable at 5% of the current base salary of a NET who has served two years of continuous service and is in the third and fourth years of continuous service, and a cash retention incentive payable at 10% of the current base salary from the fifth year of continuous service onwards upon satisfactory performance.

Safe deposit boxes

12. MR WONG TING-KWONG (in Chinese): President, it has been reported that as safe deposit boxes for rent in banks have been persistently in short supply in recent years, more and more non-bank institutions are engaged in safe deposit box business. However, some members of the public doubt whether it is safe and reliable for them to store their valuables in the safe deposit boxes provided by such institutions. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:
(1) whether it knows (i) the total number and year-on-year rate of increase/decrease of bank deposit boxes, and (ii) the ratio of the total number of bank deposit boxes to the number of applicants for renting them, in each of the past five years, and set out the relevant figures by District Council district;

(2) whether it knows (i) the current average waiting time for bank deposit boxes and (ii) the reasons for the persistent short supply of them;

(3) whether the authorities will study the provision of incentives or assistance to encourage banks to provide more safe deposit boxes for rent by the public, e.g., encouraging banks to provide safe deposit boxes in buildings which are conveniently accessible by transport and in compliance with the relevant requirements; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(4) whether it knows the total number of safe deposit boxes currently provided by non-bank institutions; and

(5) how the authorities currently regulate the safe deposit box business operated by non-bank institutions to protect the rights of renters, including whether they have stipulated the circumstances under which such institutions will be held responsible for the loss suffered by renters; whether they have assessed if the protection currently afforded to such renters is adequate; if they have assessed, of the details?

SECRETARY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND THE TREASURY (in Chinese): President, apart from providing deposit and lending services, banks will usually take into account market factors as well as their own business strategies in considering whether or not to offer other services, such as safe deposit box services.

As the regulatory authority, the Hong Kong Monetary Authority ("HKMA") expects banks to maintain good banking practices when providing services, and to properly manage the relevant risks associated with their businesses. These requirements are also applicable to safe deposit box services.
The provision of safe deposit box services by banks is not subject to the approval of HKMA. HKMA also does not collect the relevant information in respect of the number and waiting time of safe deposit boxes provided by banks and their distribution by district.

HKMA will maintain close liaison with the banking industry to ensure that banks properly manage the relevant risks associated with their safe deposit box services.

As regards the provision of safe deposit box services by non-bank institutions, it is a matter of general commercial operation. The Administration does not collect the relevant statistics.

Markets outsourced by the Hong Kong Housing Authority to single operators for management

13. DR PRISCILLA LEUNG (in Chinese): President, the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") has adopted since 1988 a single-operator arrangement for letting markets in public rental housing ("PRH") estates, under which a single tenancy for a market is awarded to an operator, who will be responsible for the management of the whole market, including subletting market stalls to individual stall operators. All markets in PRH estates completed from 1997 onwards have been let under the single-operator arrangement. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the number of newly completed markets in PRH estates that will be let under the single-operator arrangement in the coming five years;

(2) given that some single operators calculate the rents payable by individual stall operators according to the operation modes of different trades and the business turnover of the stalls, whether HA will include a provision in new contracts for single-operator markets to specify the maximum rent levels that single operators may charge stall operators;
(3) whether HA has currently put in place any mechanism to monitor the quality of single operators' management of markets and rate of increase in rents that stall operators are charged; if so, of the effectiveness of the mechanism; if not, the reasons for that;

(4) whether HA has currently put in place any mechanism or set up any committee to handle complaints lodged by stall operators against single operators; and

(5) whether HA will take over the management of a market which has been let to a single operator when most of the stall operators of the market have closed down their business due to their inability to afford the rents, so as to ensure that such markets will continue to serve the residents in the neighborhood; if HA will not, what HA will do to meet the residents' shopping needs?

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Chinese): President, my consolidated reply to various parts of the question raised by Dr Priscilla LEUNG is as follows:

The Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") has adopted a single-operator letting arrangement for its markets since 1988. Under this arrangement, a single tenancy is awarded to an operator who will let parts of the leased area to individual stall operators, and will be responsible for the management of the whole market. The purpose of implementing single-operator markets ("SOM") is to leverage on the expertise and flexible management and operation mode of the private sector, with a view to providing better shopping choices and service environment for residents.

Since 1997, all HA's new markets in public housing estates have adopted the above mentioned single-operator letting arrangement. There are currently 22 markets under HA, 6 of which are SOMs. It is anticipated that a total of 12 new HA markets will be completed in the coming five years and the single-operator management mode will continue to be adopted.

To achieve the purpose of providing better shopping choices and environment through flexible management and operation as mentioned above, it is necessary for HA to allow single operators sufficient flexibility in the
management of the markets to deal with the changing business environment. Based on this principle, single operators can select individual stall operators and negotiate with them on the rents and terms of letting on a commercial basis. As HA has no contractual relationship with individual stall operators, it is not appropriate for HA to intervene or participate in the negotiation or agreement between the operators and individual stall operators. HA also does not set a ceiling for the rent or rate of rental increase. However, to ensure the protection of stall operators, HA will, by means of standard terms in tenancies with single operators, restrict single operators from charging stall operators fees other than rent, air-conditioning charges, rates and management fees. Furthermore, air-conditioning charges and rates cannot exceed the actual amount required to be paid by single operators. In addition, the increase in management fees can only be commensurate with the increase in the Nominal Wage Index published by the Census and Statistics Department, and cannot be imposed more than once a year. Single operators are required to submit a monthly return to HA setting out all fees collected from stall operators.

There is an established mechanism in place for HA to assess the performance of the single operators and to monitor the management quality of the markets, including regular inspections of markets by frontline staff of the Housing Department ("HD") to ensure that the operators comply with the tenancy requirements and maintain the quality of their management services. HD will assess the performance of the operators every two months, taking into account views of Estate Management Advisory Committees, District Council members and local residents. Through the performance assessment system, HD encourages the operators to maintain communications with stall operators and other stakeholders. This includes holding regular meetings so that the stall operators and other stakeholders may reflect their views to the operators for follow-up and improvement, as well as fostering good relationships between the operators and various stakeholders, which will facilitate the effective and smooth operation of the markets. In fact, whether the operator is capable of managing the daily operation of the market in an effective and smooth manner is HA's most important consideration when making decisions on tenancy renewal.

For those operators who fail to fulfil the tenancy requirements, including situations where the market cannot be operated effectively because most stall operators cease their operations, HD will arrange meetings with the operator and issue warnings. If the poor performance persists despite warnings, HA has the right to terminate the tenancies concerned before their expiry and not to invite the
relevant single operators to submit bids for other HA’s SOMs for a specified period of time. If the tenancy of a SOM is terminated, HA will arrange re-tender as soon as possible, so that the new single operator can take over the market as early as possible and maintain services to residents.

The current monitoring measures for SOMs implemented by HA enable an appropriate balance between the practical circumstances of commercial operations and shopping needs of residents, and have been operating effectively. HA will review the letting arrangements for SOMs from time to time. The most recent review was completed in early 2017, under which a series of measures were put forward to enhance the protection of stall operators and the monitoring of the operators, so that the single-operator letting arrangements can be implemented more effectively. The recommendations were endorsed by the Commercial Properties Committee of HA in March 2017 for implementation. (1)


Industrial accidents

14. MR CHAN KIN-POR (in Chinese): President, the first four months of this year already saw 11 fatal industrial accidents, and this number is higher than that (i.e. nine cases) in the first half of last year. Regarding industrial accidents, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the number of fatal industrial accidents in each of the past five years, together with a breakdown by cause of accident (such as excessive fatigue of employees arising from meeting tight work schedule or insufficient manpower, employees lacking relevant training, and a lack of safety equipment in workplace);

(2) of the manpower establishment of the Task Force on Improving Work Injury Protection for Employees in High-risk Industries which was set up by the Government in February last year, as well as the measures recommended by the Task Force which have been implemented and the effectiveness of such measures;
(3) of the respective numbers of prosecutions instituted in each of the past five years against employers for holding them liable for industrial accidents and, among such cases, those in which the employers were convicted, as well as the penalties imposed in general and the highest penalties imposed; and

(4) whether the Government will consider increasing the penalty for employers who have been held liable for industrial accidents, such as disqualifying those contractors who have been involved in serious industrial accidents from, or suspending their eligibility for, bidding for public works contracts; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Chinese): President, my reply to the question raised by Mr CHAN Kin-por is as follows:

(1) In 2012 to 2016, the number of industrial fatalities is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of industrial fatalities</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Labour Department ("LD") investigates into each fatal industrial accident to identify its causes, ascertain the liability of the duty holders and initiate prosecutions. LD only compiles breakdown of industrial fatalities by types of accidents (e.g. "fall of person from height", "contact with electricity or electric discharge", "struck by falling object") but does not keep statistics by causes of accidents in the way stated in the question.

(2) The Task Force on Improving Work Injury Protection for Employees in High-risk Industries ("TFWIP") coordinated by LD examines and implements improvement measures relating to employees' compensation insurance ("ECI"), compensation for work injuries and therapy/rehabilitation services, etc. Improvement measures implemented include: stepping up publicity and promotion of taking out adequate ECI coverage by employers, improving the arrangement of medical clearance for injured employees, organizing
training on occupational medicine for medical professionals and staff of the Hospital Authority involved in work injury assessment, streamlining the preparatory work for work injury assessment, establishing a premium-adjustment mechanism for selected high-risk industries (including the repair, maintenance, alteration and addition sector and the recycling industry), and launching a dedicated web page on ECI for public access. The above improvement measures would help improve work injury protection for employees in high-risk industries. TFWIP comprises representatives of relevant bureaux/departments and public bodies, with supporting services provided by two Labour Officer grade staff of LD.

(3) In the past five years, the number of summonses issued to employers/contractors/proprietors in respect of industrial accidents and their fines are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of summonses heard</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>1 023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of convicted summonses</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum fines ($)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average fines ($)</td>
<td>8,983</td>
<td>11,314</td>
<td>12,183</td>
<td>13,118</td>
<td>17,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) The Development Bureau expresses that following the established mechanism, the Government can take regulating actions according to the provisions as stipulated in the Contractor Management Handbook against a contractor, who is on the List of Approved Contractors for Public Works, if the contractor has performed poorly or has been involved in serious incidents in any public or private sector works contracts. The regulating actions may include issuing warning letters to the contractor concerned, requiring an independent safety audit, suspending the contractor from tendering public works contracts or even removing the contractor from the List of Approved Contractors for Public Works depending on the level of severity. The current regulating mechanism is considered effective and has served as a deterrent to contractors.
With a view to raising the deterrent effect of court penalties, LD has been adopting different approaches to impose heavier penalties upon duty holders. Such efforts include submitting comprehensive information to the Court for reference in sentencing, which covers the serious consequences arising from the accidents in question, the number of accidents concerned, and the highest penalty sentenced on similar cases in the past, etc; and depending on the circumstances of individual cases, requesting the Department of Justice ("DoJ") to consider filing a review or an appeal to the Court in respect of the conviction and the penalty when necessary. With the implementation of the above mentioned measures, the fines imposed by the Court on convicted cases related to fatal industrial accidents in the construction industry have increased in recent years when compared to the past. LD will, in consultation with DoJ, review those provisions in relation to penalties under occupational safety and health legislation, and amend the law if necessary to further enhance the deterrent effect of penalties.

Promoting Confucian ideology and values

15. **MR MA FUNG-KWOK** (in Chinese): President, at present, Christianity, Catholicism, Islam, Taoism, Confucianism and Buddhism are the major religions in Hong Kong. Confucianism advocates the teachings and ideology of Confucius. The Chief Executive said in 2014 that Confucius, being referred to as "the model teacher for ten thousand ages", had far-reaching influence upon Chinese history and society, and it was worth the efforts to disseminate and promote the five virtues of "benevolence, righteousness, propriety, wisdom and integrity" advocated by Confucius, which were the core values of the Chinese nation. The Government has endorsed the third Sunday of September as "Confucian Day" since 2014. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) given that a Confucian leader has proposed to make "Confucian Day" an additional general holiday each year, to be offset by deleting "Easter Monday" so as to make the total number of days of general holidays each year unchanged, and it is learnt that such proposal is supported by the leaders of the other five major
religions, whether the authorities will consider such proposal and conduct a public consultation exercise accordingly, so as to collect public views and seek a consensus in society in this respect; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(2) of the measures in place to promote Confucian ideology and values?

SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Chinese): President, after consulting the Home Affairs Bureau, my reply to the question raised by Mr MA Fung-kwok is as follows:

(1) General holidays are specified in the Schedule to the General Holidays Ordinance ("GHO") (Cap. 149). The existing arrangements have been formulated after years of extensive consultation. Any proposed amendment to GHO would have significant implications for different quarters in the community. There must be broad-based support and clear consensus of the community before it can be pursued. Since there is yet to be a broad demand for designating "Confucian Day" as a general holiday to be offset by deleting "Easter Monday" in the community, we need to handle the matter carefully.

(2) The Government respects the freedom of beliefs and welcomes different religious bodies to organize memorial and celebration activities during respective religious festivals.

The teachings of Confucianism have been the core values in Chinese society. Every year, Confucian bodies in Hong Kong organize celebration activities for the birthday of Confucius such as ceremonies to worship Confucius and music recitals for citizens to learn about the thoughts of Confucius and the culture of Confucianism. The Government also supports Confucian bodies to designate, since 2014, the third Sunday of September as "Confucian Day" to mark the birthday of Confucius and spread the Confucianism culture.
Protecting government documents taken out

16. **MR LAM CHEUK-TING** (in Chinese): President, on the 25th of last month, the window of a saloon car for use by the Secretary for Development was smashed and a briefcase inside the car compartment which belonged to the Secretary (containing a tablet computer and a batch of government documents) was stolen while the car was parked at the Hong Kong Science Museum in Tsim Sha Tsui. The authorities subsequently issued a statement that the Development Bureau, after learning about the incident, had forthwith halted the operation of the stolen tablet computer through remote control, and that the stolen documents did not contain personal data of the public. However, some members of the public are worried about lawbreakers exploiting for benefits the confidential or business sensitive information (e.g. Executive Council papers or land planning information) contained in the stolen documents. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) among the stolen documents, of the respective numbers of those classified as (i) top secret, (ii) secret, (iii) confidential and (iv) restricted, as well as the number of those containing business sensitive information about land planning, etc.;

(2) whether the stolen tablet computer has been installed with any email software for handling official business; of the respective numbers of documents stored in the tablet computer which have been classified as (i) top secret, (ii) secret, (iii) confidential and (iv) restricted, as well as the number of those containing business sensitive information about land planning, etc.;

(3) whether it has investigated if, in this theft case, the placing of the briefcase in the compartment of an unattended saloon car by the government official concerned has violated the relevant information technology security guidelines; if it has investigated, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(4) whether the authorities will revise the relevant guidelines and take improvement measures to prevent the recurrence of similar kind of incidents; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?
SECRETARY FOR DEVELOPMENT (in Chinese): President, having consulted the Security Bureau, Innovation and Technology Bureau, as well as Department of Justice, our reply to the four-part question is as follows:

(1) to (3)

Regarding the incident occurring in Tsim Sha Tsui on 25 April 2017 where the window of a government car was smashed and a briefcase inside the car carrying a tablet computer and government documents was stolen, the Development Bureau has promptly and successfully deleted all data stored in the computer through remote control that night after the incident. The stolen tablet computer and documents were recovered by the Police on 26 April.

Development Bureau has reported the theft of the tablet computer and government documents to the Government Security Officer and the case will be handled according to the established procedures. As legal proceedings are in progress, we have no further point to add.

(4) The Government’s Security Regulations stipulate guidelines on the handling of classified Government documents, including what to observe when such documents are taken outside office. However, such details should not be disclosed due to security reasons.

The Government has also formulated a comprehensive set of "Government Information Technology Security Policy and Guidelines", in order to tackle information security threats and cyber attacks of various nature. The Guidelines were reviewed and revised in late 2016 by making reference to the latest international standards and industry best practices, including strengthening the encryption requirement for storage of sensitive information. The requirement has appropriately covered mobile devices.

We will keep and handle classified documents and mobile devices containing classified information with great care in accordance with the relevant government policies and regulations, including the Security Regulations and the "Government Information Technology Security Policy and Guidelines".
Service concession arrangement for the Hong Kong section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link

17. **MR CHAN HAN-PAN** (in Chinese): President, the Hong Kong section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link ("XRL") is expected to be commissioned in the third quarter of next year, and will be operated by the MTR Corporation Limited ("MTRCL") under a service concession approach. It has been reported earlier that the Government has not yet commenced discussions with MTRCL on the operation of XRL, and the management of MTRCL is worried that there may not be sufficient time for it to carry out the preparatory work for the commissioning of XRL (such as staff recruitment). In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

1. of the time it plans to hold discussions with MTRCL on the operation of XRL; the terms of service concession, other than service concession payments, to be included in the contents of the discussions;

2. whether it has assessed the time needed by MTRCL for preparing for the commissioning of XRL; if so, of the outcome; and

3. whether it has formulated criteria for determining the XRL fees; if so, of the publication date of the criteria; whether such criteria involve the pegging of XRL fees to service concession payments?

**SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING** (in Chinese): President, the Special Administrative Region ("SAR") Government and the MTR Corporation Limited ("MTRCL") are pressing ahead in full speed with the works and the pre-commissioning preparatory work of the Hong Kong section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link ("XRL") with a view to commissioning the Hong Kong section of XRL in the third quarter next year. The overall progress as at end-March this year is 90%.

The reply to various parts of Mr CHAN Han-pan's question is as follows:

1. Since the Chief Executive in Council endorsed the Dedicated Corridor Option for constructing the Hong Kong section of XRL in April 2008, the Government has been taking forward the project on
the basis that MTRCL will be invited to operate the Hong Kong section of XRL under a service concession approach in future. The Government has openly expressed the above intention on various occasions and MTRCL has been fully aware of it. Under a service concession approach, the Government provides the funding under the Public Works Programme for constructing the Hong Kong section of XRL and ultimately owns the railway. MTRCL is entrusted by the Government to undertake the design, construction, testing and commissioning of the Hong Kong section of XRL and is subject to monitoring of the Highways Department for implementation of the project. Upon the completion of the project, the Government may vest or lease the Hong Kong section of XRL to the Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation ("KCRC") which is wholly owned by the SAR Government and then KCRC may grant the operation of the Hong Kong section of XRL to MTRCL under a service concession approach.

The arrangement of service concession agreement will include the period and payment of service concession, as well as the requirements for MTRCL to provide services according to prescribed standards and surrender the assets upon the end of the service concession, etc. The Government has already commenced discussions with MTRCL on this basis and will announce the outcome in due course.

(2) The Government and MTRCL have been actively taking forward various pre-commissioning preparatory works. For instance, MTRCL's first batch of 31 high speed train drivers have completed training and assessment, and will participate in the cross-boundary dynamic tests of trains that will commence as scheduled in mid-2017. MTRCL will continue to carry out training and assessment of the remaining batches of high speed train drivers.

On the operation arrangements of XRL, the Government and MTRCL, through numerous working groups with the Mainland high speed rail operator, are discussing and examining operational matters that need to be coordinated with the Mainland side, including arrangements for passenger services, train control and command,
driver and technical personnel training and assessment, rolling stock and equipment maintenance and repair guidelines etc. The related work has been ongoing.

In addition, MTRCL is developing the branding strategy of the Hong Kong section of XRL, and making preparations for tendering of service contracts, including cleaning, catering and security services in the West Kowloon Terminus. MTRCL will also employ and train staff in a timely manner for the trial operation and drills next year in preparation for commissioning of the Hong Kong section of XRL in the third quarter next year.

(3) In 2009 and 2015, the Government reported to the Legislative Council its patronage forecasts for the Hong Kong section of XRL, assuming that, to maintain the competitiveness of the Hong Kong section of XRL, its fares should be comparable to the prevailing fares of the train service to Shenzhen boundary (i.e. train service to Lok Ma Chau on the East Rail Line) and through train services. However, the actual fares can only be finalized at the time of the commissioning of the Hong Kong section of XRL. The Government is currently discussing with the Mainland railway operation authorities and MTRCL the operational details of the future commissioning of the Hong Kong section of XRL, including the specific criteria for determining the fares, and the relationship between fares and the terms of service concession. The Government will announce the outcome in due course.

Food safety of live pigs

18. MR STEVEN HO (in Chinese): President, since 2007, the authorities have implemented new surveillance measures in respect of live pigs for slaughter ("the 2007 new surveillance measures"), under which urine samples are collected from live pigs for conducting rapid tests on veterinary drug residues, and before the test results are available, pig buying agents are allowed to bid for the pigs and transfer the pigs to waiting/holding lairages for slaughtering. In early August 2016, when 40 pigs were detected to have residues of veterinary drug beta-agonists (Salbutamol) (commonly known as "asthma drug"), they had already been slaughtered and released to the market. Although the authorities
had implemented improvement measures after the incident ("the 2016 improvement measures"), some farmers are still worried that the improvement measures cannot ensure food safety and protect the rights and interests of pig buying agents. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the detailed process of veterinary drug residues testing, auctioning and slaughtering of live pigs during the following three periods of time (set out in a table):

(i) before the implementation of the 2007 new surveillance measures,

(ii) after the implementation of the 2007 new surveillance measures and before the implementation of the 2016 improvement measures, and

(iii) since the implementation of the 2016 improvement measures;

(2) of the number of cases in which urine samples of live pigs failed to pass the veterinary drug residues test since the introduction of the test in 2001; among them, the respective numbers of cases in which (i) the places of origin of the problematic live pigs were identified, (ii) the persons concerned were prosecuted, and (iii) the persons concerned were convicted, and the penalties imposed on them in general;

(3) as some farmers have pointed out that quite a number of problems are found in the existing system (including: (i) since live pigs are auctioned and mixed together in waiting lairages before the results of the veterinary drug residues test of their urine samples are available, such test results may not be admitted as evidence in the relevant prosecutions, and (ii) when some urine samples of live pigs fail to pass the veterinary drug residues test, the slaughter or retail processes concerned have to be suspended to wait for the authorities to contact hundreds of stakeholders and screen out the problematic pigs or their carcasses from several thousand pigs, resulting in considerable delays in the supply of live pigs), how the authorities will enhance the existing system to protect the rights and interests of pig buying agents and the public as well as reducing the impact on various parties when problems arise; and
as some retailers have pointed out that in the aforesaid incident in August last year, the authorities announced a list of 27 retail outlets involved right after learning about the test results, but 16 retail outlets of which were subsequently found to be unrelated to the selling of any products of the problematic pigs, whether the authorities have learnt a lesson and will ensure the accuracy of the information released so as to prevent innocent retailers from suffering losses; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Chinese): President, my reply to the question raised by Mr Steven HO is as follows:

(1) The Public Health (Animals and Birds) (Chemical Residues) Regulation (Cap. 139N) ("the Regulation") came into force on 31 December 2001. The Food and Environmental Hygiene Department ("FEHD") is responsible for the inspection of live pigs admitted to the slaughterhouses in Hong Kong with regard to residues of the agricultural chemicals and veterinary drugs prohibited and restricted under the Regulation. Urine samples are collected by FEHD from each and every consignment of live pigs entering the slaughterhouses for testing by the veterinary laboratory of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department. Pigs with urine samples tested negative will be despatched for slaughtering at the slaughter line. To ensure food safety, post-mortem inspection of slaughtered pigs will be carried out by FEHD staff to ensure the carcasses and offal are fit for human consumption before they are released to the market. The above procedures for inspection and slaughtering of live pigs have been implemented since the Regulation came into operation, and have not been amended over those periods specified in the question.

Live pig auction is a commercial operation of the trade. In 2007, the trade changed the arrangement for auctioning live pigs, from holding auctions on the following day after the pigs' arrival, to the very day of arrival. Such a change was initiated by relevant stakeholders of the trade, including live pig importers, agents, buyers, slaughterhouse operators, etc., without affecting FEHD's procedures for inspection and slaughtering of live pigs.
(2) Since implementation of the Regulation and up to 30 April 2017, there were a total of 64 cases of pig urine samples tested positive, and the place of origin of all implicated pigs could be identified. Prosecutions were initiated in respect of 13 of these cases, of which all were successfully convicted with a fine ranged from $2,000 to $10,000.

(3) FEHD has all along maintained close liaison with the trade to ensure smooth operation of the slaughterhouses. Some members of the trade had suggested postponing pig auctions until after test results of urine samples were available. The suggestion was conveyed by FEHD to the trade as live pig auction is the trade's commercial operation. Representatives of the trade, including importers, buyers, merchants' associations and slaughterhouse operators, were of the view that the existing arrangements had been in place for long and proven to be conducive to the trade's operation, without affecting the surveillance work undertaken by FEHD in safeguarding food safety. They did not support the suggestion as postponing auctions would substantially affect their workflow and increase operating costs.

To further strengthen food safety supervision, FEHD conducted last year an in-depth review on the slaughterhouse operation and system and introduced a series of improvement measures. This includes striving to complete the daily urine testing procedures earlier to allow sufficient time for the trade to take follow-up actions in case of positive test results, with a view to ensuring that timely identification and isolation of all implicated pigs can be carried out as necessary before the slaughter line commences operation. FEHD will continue to maintain close liaison with various stakeholders of the trade and review the implementation of the measures from time to time.

(4) In that incident, FEHD apologized to the affected retailers and provided a one-off exgratia payment of about $300,000 in total to cover the financial loss to the relevant retailers as a result of the disposal of the pork and offal. Besides, FEHD has set up a working group with the trade representatives to study and improve the pig tracing mechanism. FEHD will also work with stakeholders to conduct regular drills to prevent recurrence of similar incidents in the future.
Re-industrialization and industrial estates

19. MR HO KAI-MING (in Chinese): President, the Government, in collaboration with the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation ("HKSTPC"), has been actively promoting re-industrialization in recent years, and it revised the Industrial Estate ("IE") policy in 2015 so as to make more efficient use of the lands in the three IEs under HKSTPC in order to support science, innovation and technology ("I&T") based industries. On the other hand, quite a number of Hong Kong manufacturers have planned in recent years to relocate the production lines of their non-I&T industries on the Mainland back to Hong Kong and intend to apply for admission to IEs. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it knows the current number of operating companies in each IE, with a breakdown by business type;

(2) whether it knows, in respect of each IE in each of the past five years, (i) the utilization rate of the floor area, (ii) the floor area available for leasing, and (iii) the number of applications for admission received from non-I&T companies, with a breakdown by business type;

(3) whether it knows if HKSTPC has plans to expand its IEs in the next five years; of the latest progress of the authorities' plan to develop new IEs near the Liantang/Heung Yuen Wai Boundary Control Point;

(4) of the measures put in place by the authorities to facilitate the relocation of the production lines of non-I&T industries back to Hong Kong and their admission to IEs, and to support the development of such industries in Hong Kong; and

(5) as there are views that building the brand of "Made in Hong Kong" as a guarantee of good quality products is conducive to promoting re-industrialization in Hong Kong, of the policies and measures put in place by the authorities for building the brand of "Made in Hong Kong" in the next three years, and how the authorities will assist in the building of brand images for locally made products?
SECRETARY FOR INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY (in Chinese):
President, our reply to the five parts of the question is as follows:

(1) A list of industries currently operating in the Industrial Estates ("IE") at Tai Po ("TP"), Yuen Long ("YL") and Tseung Kwan O ("TKO") are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>TPIE</th>
<th>YLIE</th>
<th>TKOIE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Food and Beverages</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Biotechnology and Pharmaceutical</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Broadcasting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Information and Telecommunication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. Data Centre, Submarine Cable and Satellite)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Printing and Publishing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Support Services (e.g. Aircraft Engineering and Maintenance, Machinery Engineering Services and Maintenance, Examination, Testing and Certification)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Machinery and Parts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Plastic Resins and Plastics Products</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Green Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Others (e.g. Building Materials, Chemical and Gases, Electronics Parts and Paper Packaging)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) and (3)

Under the old IE policy, IE sites are mainly granted to qualified factory operators for them to design and build stand-alone factories. In general, factory operators in IEs need not belong to any particular industry, but the applicants have to demonstrate that their operations cannot be accommodated in ordinary multistorey industrial or commercial buildings. For those meeting the mandatory admission criteria, priority will be given to those factory operators which involve significant investment, high added value, employment of a large number of technical personnel, as well as the use of new or upgraded technology. In accordance with the above policy, the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation ("HKSTPC") had received seven admission applications in the past five years, involving industries such as data processing, telecommunication, pharmaceutical, traditional Chinese medicine, food processing, construction materials, etc.

In the past five years, the land utilization rate of the three IEs is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TPIE</th>
<th>YLIE</th>
<th>TKOIE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Government revised the IE policy in 2015, with a view to supporting "re-industrialization", attracting high value-added technology industries and manufacturing processes. Since then, HKSTPC will build and manage specialized multistorey industrial buildings for rental to multiple users, and consider applications for admission from different sectors. HKSTPC would still consider granting land to meritorious applicants to build stand-alone factories in exceptional cases. HKSTPC is currently developing a Data Technology Hub and an Advanced Manufacturing Centre at TKOIE. They are expected to be completed in 2020 and 2021-2022 respectively.
Apart from building new multistorey industrial buildings, HKSTPC would encourage factory operators in IEs to surrender premises which have not been fully utilized, and identify suitable premises to be refurbished for leasing. In the past five years, HKSTPC had two buildings surrendered by grantees available for lease. The factories concerned are located in TPIE and YLIE, providing floor area of 17 416 sq m and 7 930 sq m respectively, which are both fully occupied at present. In the meantime, HKSTPC is refurbishing a surrendered factory in TPIE which would provide a gross floor area of 8 500 sq m. It is anticipated that tenants can move in at the earliest in September this year.

In the long run, the Government is planning to expand YLIE on a site of about 16 hectares in the Wang Chau area to the southwest of YLIE. The Government has also provisionally identified a site of about 56 hectares near the Liantang/Heung Yuen Wai Boundary Control Point for the long-term development of IEs. HKSTPC is now carrying out a preliminary planning study, which is expected to be completed by the end of this year.

According to the information provided by the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau, the Government's policy on support for industry is to create a business-friendly environment for the trade and provide them with timely and appropriate support so that our trade can flourish. Some enterprises, especially those engaging in high-end manufacturing, are well-positioned to consider performing high value-added production processes that are less land and labour-intensive in Hong Kong. Hong Kong enterprises, including those interested in relocating their operations back to Hong Kong, can obtain support through the support schemes under various government departments and quasi-government organizations in areas such as financing and enhancing their overall competitiveness.

As regards technological support, the Innovation and Technology Fund ("ITF") was established in 1999 to finance applied research and development ("R&D") projects that contribute to innovation and technology upgrading in manufacturing and services industries in Hong Kong and promotion of innovation. There are various funding programmes under ITF, including the Innovation and Technology Support Programme, the University-Industry
Collaboration Programme, the Enterprise Support Scheme, the Patent Application Grant, etc. One of the aims of these funding programmes is to encourage more R&D from universities and enterprises and promote "re-industrialization". Besides, the Hong Kong Productivity Council ("HKPC") has been assisting the manufacturing sector to move towards high value-added production and gradually into "Industry 4.0", including organizing international conferences and seminars on industrial innovation strategy, and establishing the "Industry 4.0 Upgrade and Recognition Programme" with the Fraunhofer Institute for Production Technology, Germany. HKPC will inaugurate the "Industry 4.0" technology demonstration centre this year to showcase and promote information exchange on the concept and smart features of "Industry 4.0".

(5) As advised by the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau, the Trade and Industry Department ("TID") seeks to assist Hong Kong enterprises in developing brands and exploring the Mainland and overseas markets. Its SME Export Marketing Fund provides financial support to small and medium enterprises ("SMEs") in participating in export promotion activities, while the SME Development Fund provides financial support to non-profit-distributing organizations to carry out projects to enhance the competitiveness of SMEs in general or in specific sectors in Hong Kong. In addition, the Government launched the $1 billion Dedicated Fund on Branding, Upgrading and Domestic Sales in June 2012 to provide funding support to Hong Kong enterprises and non-profit-distributing organizations, so as to assist enterprises in enhancing their competitiveness and furthering their business development in the Mainland.

TID co-organizes seminars from time to time with the Hong Kong Trade Development Council, local business associations and other relevant organizations and invite renowned local, Mainland and overseas entrepreneurs and experts to share their experience in establishing brands and market development strategies. In addition, TID disseminates practical information related to brand development to enterprises for reference through various channels (such as brand promotion website).
Reclamation works under the project of the expansion of the Hong Kong International Airport into a Three-Runway System

20. DR YIU CHUNG-YIM (in Chinese): President, according to a paper submitted by the Airport Authority ("AA") to this Council, marine sand from the Pearl River Delta Region will be used for the reclamation works under the project of the expansion of the Hong Kong International Airport into a three-runway system ("3RS reclamation works"). However, it has been reported that the contractor concerned has failed to source sufficient marine sand for the reclamation works and therefore has switched to use mechanical sand (i.e. sand made by crushing rubbles with machines). Some environmental groups have pointed out that the large amount of fine particles contained in mechanical sand are difficult to settle and will therefore be suspended in the sea for a long period of time, causing an unacceptable level of pollution to the waters in the vicinity of the reclamation area. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it knows if AA has permitted the contractor of the 3RS reclamation works to wholly or partially switch to use mechanical sand for the reclamation works; if AA has, of the quantities of mechanical sand that has been and will be used as well as their respective percentages in the total quantity of sand needed for the reclamation works;

(2) whether it knows the respective places of origin of the marine sand and mechanical sand currently used for the 3RS reclamation works;

(3) whether the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") knows that the contractor of the 3RS reclamation works has switched to use mechanical sand for the reclamation works; whether such practice (i) complies with the requirements set out in the relevant environmental permit and (ii) requires the approval of the Director of Environmental Protection; if approval is required, whether the Director has granted such approval; whether EPD has assessed the immediate and potential impacts of such practice on the environment; if so, of the outcome; and

(4) of the manpower currently deployed by EPD to monitor the 3RS reclamation works; the number of site inspections, conducted by EPD officers from 1 January to 31 March this year, of the 3RS reclamation works?
SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Chinese): President, the reclamation works for the three-runway system ("3RS") of Hong Kong International Airport ("HKIA"), which involves the formation of around 650 hectares of land and requires an estimated 100 million cu m of filling materials, commenced in November 2016. In response to the questions raised by Dr YIU Chung-yim, our consolidated reply with input from the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") is as follows:

(1) We understand that the Airport Authority Hong Kong ("AAHK") contracted out the reclamation works through open tender. The tender documents set out that the selected contractors are responsible for sourcing the required filling materials. The tender documents do not specify the type(s) of filling materials to be used in the reclamation works, but specific requirements on the filling materials are prescribed in the contracts in terms of particle size distribution, etc. The Environmental Permit ("EP") for the 3RS project also sets out stringent requirements on the fines content of the filling materials. For the purpose of mitigating any possible impact on water quality during construction of the 3RS project, Condition 2.26(i) of the EP stipulates that "a maximum of 10% fines content shall be adopted for sand blanket and 20% fines content for marine filling below +2.5 mPD prior to substantial completion of seawall."

Although the tender documents specify that the sourcing and procurement of filling materials are the responsibilities of the contractors, AAHK has carefully studied the possible sources of filling materials and conducted market research before tendering out its reclamation works. Generally speaking, there are three types of filling materials that can fulfil the 3RS reclamation requirements for marine filling below +2.5 mPD, namely, marine sand, manufactured sand and suitable filling materials from works sites in Hong Kong. Market research shows that the latter two types of filling materials are limited in supply but there would be sufficient marine sand from sources within the Pearl River Delta ("PRD") as well as from within the region for the 3RS project.
As at end of April 2017, about 2 million cu m of filling materials have been used in the reclamations works of the 3RS project, of which around 23 000 cu m were marine sand; 20 000 cu m were suitable filling materials from works sites in Hong Kong; and the remaining were manufactured sand. As the procurement of filling materials is done by the reclamation contractors, AAHK is not able to predict the amount of manufactured sand that will be used by the contractors in the reclamation works.

(2) According to documents provided by the contractors, AAHK advised that the manufactured sand and marine sand were imported by the contractors from the PRD region and Vietnam respectively.

(3) As aforementioned, the EP issued by EPD for the expansion of HKIA into 3RS sets out the quality requirements for filling materials. Of which, a maximum of 10% fines content shall be adopted for sand blanket, and there is no specification on whether the filling materials should be marine sand or manufactured sand. The EP also requires that silt curtains should be installed around the construction site to avoid adverse impact on the surrounding water body. In addition, the EP requires the AAHK to regularly submit environmental monitoring and audit ("EM&A") reports to EPD. The Environmental Team of AAHK responsible for EM&A work has been ascertaining the compliance of the EP requirement for the contractors' filling materials through testing of sand samples conducted by independent accredited laboratory. EPD also conducts random inspections of the sand sample testing results. As of March this year, no violation of the above requirement has been found.

(4) The Regional Office (South) of EPD is responsible for surveillance of the construction works of the 3RS project against the relevant pollution control legislation. During the period from 1 January to 31 March 2017, the Regional Office (South) conducted 13 surprise inspections on the construction works of the 3RS project.
GOVERNMENT BILLS

First Reading of Government Bill


EMPLOYMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL 2017


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 Government Bill


EMPLOYMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL 2017

SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Cantonese): President, I move the Second Reading of the Employment (Amendment) Bill 2017 ("the Bill"). The Bill mainly seeks to amend Parts VIA and IXB of the Employment Ordinance to provide that where processing a claim for reinstatement or re-engagement by an employee who has been unreasonably and unlawfully dismissed, the Labour Tribunal ("LT") should be empowered, without the agreement of the employer, to make an order for reinstatement or re-engagement if it, taking into account the circumstances of the claim, considers that the order is appropriate and compliance with the order by the employer is reasonably practicable. The Bill also proposes that if the employer fails to reinstate or re-engage the employee according to the LT's order, the employer should pay a further sum to the employee, failing which will constitute a criminal offence.

Under Part VIA of the existing Employment Ordinance on employment protection, if an employee who has been unreasonably or unlawfully dismissed seeks reinstatement or re-engagement, even if LT rules in favour of the employee and considers that an order for reinstatement or re-engagement is appropriate, LT
should still secure the employer's agreement before the order can be made. The Labour Advisory Board ("LAB") has reached a consensus upon repeated discussions that for unreasonable and unlawful dismissal cases, the requirement to secure the employer's agreement should be removed. On the basis of the consensus, the Government tabled the Employment (Amendment) Bill 2016 ("the 2016 Bill") last year proposing to amend the relevant provisions in the Employment Ordinance. In scrutinizing the 2016 Bill, members of the Bills Committee expressed various views. In accordance with the standing practice, the Labour Department reported the views of members of the Bills Committee to LAB for consideration. After further deliberation, LAB reached a consensus that the original legislative proposal in the 2016 Bill should remain unchanged, while the proposed ceiling of the further sum should be raised from $50,000 as proposed in the 2016 Bill to $72,500. Since the 2016 Bill lapsed at the end of the 2012-2016 Legislative Council term, we have incorporated the latest proposals consented by LAB in this legislative proposal and tabled the Bill afresh.

I will now brief Members on the contents of the Bill. The Bill mainly deals with unreasonable and unlawful dismissals. An unreasonable and unlawful dismissal means a dismissal which is both unreasonable and unlawful. By unreasonable dismissal, an employee is dismissed other than for a valid reason as specified in Part VIA of the Employment Ordinance, and valid reasons include: the conduct of the employee, his/her capability/qualification for performing the job, redundancy or other genuine operational requirements of the business, compliance with legal requirements, or other reason of substance which LT sees fit. Unlawful dismissal refers to dismissals specified in Part VIA of the Employment Ordinance which are in contravention of labour legislation, that is, an employee is dismissed under the following circumstances, including: dismissal during pregnancy and maternity leave, during paid sick leave, after work-related injury and before determination/settlement and/or payment of compensation under the Employees' Compensation Ordinance or by reason of the employee exercising trade union rights or giving evidence for the enforcement of relevant labour legislation.

The Bill proposes that for unreasonable and unlawful dismissals cases covered under Part VIA of the Employment Ordinance, if the employee demands reinstatement or re-engagement, the employer's agreement will no longer be a prerequisite for LT to make the reinstatement or re-engagement order. Yet, before making the order, LT should award that the order is reasonable and
compliance with the order by the employer is reasonably practicable. As proposed under the Bill, before making the award, LT should allow both the employer and the employee to present their cases on the making of the order, and should consider the various factors for each case.

The Bill also proposes that for unreasonable and unlawful cases, if the employer fails to reinstate or re-engage the employee in accordance with the LT's order, apart from paying the employee the terminal payment and compensation ordered by LT under the existing requirement, the employer should also pay the employee a sum set at three times the employee's wages, subject to a maximum of $72,500. If the employer wilfully and without reasonable excuse fails to pay the further sum, the consequence will be the same as for an employer who at present wilfully and without reasonable excuse fails to pay the employee compensation awarded by LT. Both are regarded as an indictable criminal offence, subject to a maximum fine of $350,000 and three years' imprisonment upon conviction.

Furthermore, the Bill also clarifies that the obligation to re-engage the employee under an order for re-engagement all along rests with the employer; re-engagement of the employee by the successor or associated company of the employer will only be regarded as in compliance with the re-engagement order if specified conditions and procedures are satisfied.

Consequential to the above amendment proposals, the Bill also amends the pertaining procedures under the Labour Tribunal Ordinance and its subsidiary legislation for LT to implement the various proposals after the Ordinance takes effect.

 Honourable Members, the legislative proposals of the Bill have been in the making for years. Over the period, LAB has repeatedly discussed the principles and details of the Bill. With a spirit of seeking common ground and mutual understanding, an agreement has gradually been made to reach this comprehensive proposal which is considered as practicable and acceptable by both the employers and the employees. I wish to point out that the current proposal, which has been carefully considered by the Government after balancing the interests of employers and employees, represents the consensus reached by representatives of employers and employees after repeated discussions. Moreover, for employees who have been unreasonably and unlawfully dismissed, the procedures for claims proposed by the Bill are simpler. Without the need to go through complicated and lengthy legal procedures, the employee will be able to obtain substantive compensation faster. I implore Members to adopt a
practical approach and support the Government's proposal on the basis of the consensus reached by representatives of employers and employees of LAB so that the Bill, which has been in the making for years, can be passed expeditiously to offer better protection to employees who have been unreasonably and unlawfully dismissed.

Thank you, President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the Employment (Amendment) Bill 2017 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): Committee stage. Council is now in committee to continue the consideration of the Schedule to the Appropriation Bill 2017 ("the Bill").

Committee will continue to conduct the sixth debate in this meeting, and then committee will proceed to vote on the amendments to the 58 heads in the Schedule to the Bill.

After voting on the amendments, committee will proceed to the seventh debate on the sums for the 58 heads standing part of the Schedule, the eighth debate on clauses 1 and 2 standing part of the Bill, and the relevant votings, as well as the voting on the motion for the Third Reading.

It is estimated that committee will finish the debate on all the amendments at around 1:30 pm today, then I will put the amendments to vote. When Members are voting on the amendments, I will suspend the meeting for 15 minutes at around 4:00 pm for Members to take a break. Depending on the progress of the meeting, I will appropriately adjust the duration of the break.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee now continues to conduct the sixth debate. The themes are "Education, Manpower, Youth, Arts and Culture and Sport".

At last week's meeting, the public officer had spoken in this debate, and one Member who has proposed amendments had spoken again. I now call upon other Members who have proposed amendments to speak again. This debate will come to a close after the relevant Members have spoken.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai, do you wish to speak again?

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Yes. Chairman, I will speak on Amendment Nos. 53 and 55: Resolved that head 53 be reduced by $71,000,000 and $41,000,000 in respect of subhead 000, which is equivalent to the Home Affairs Bureau's full-year estimated expenditure on the Funding Scheme for Youth Internship in the Mainland ("Internship Scheme") and the Funding Scheme for Youth Exchange in the Mainland.

Every year, the Home Affairs Bureau provides funding for application by non-profit-making organizations to promote schemes for youth exchange and internship in the Mainland. As at 2017, the Government has earmarked $112 million for these two schemes. There are three major reasons why I propose to reduce the estimated expenditure on these two schemes: Firstly, the funding provided for youth has become the financial support for the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("LOCPG"); secondly, youth work has become united front work; and thirdly, internationalization is tantamount to Mainlandization. I cannot accept all these three reasons.

First of all, why has funding for youth turned into financial support for LOCPG? As a matter of fact, the two Schemes are vetted and approved by the Commission on Youth ("CoY") appointed by the Home Affairs Bureau. After
doing some researches, we found that a total of $110 million was granted to the Internship Scheme under the Home Affairs Bureau last year, of which as high as 60% of the funding went to the pockets of pro-establishment associations. Many members of these associations have strong pro-establishment background. More importantly, after looking up the information, we found that several CoY members are also the persons-in-charge or even patrons of these non-profit-making organizations. In other words, after CoY received funding from the Bureau, its members then granted the money to associations to which they belong. This is tantamount to making backroom deals whereby funding was granted to CoY members' own associations. This is how resources of Hong Kong people are all controlled by pro-establishment associations. How can we give our consent?

Take the Y.Elites Association as an example. Both CoY Chairman LAU Ming-wai and CoY member Kenneth FOK are members of Y.Elites Association, and funding is granted on a self-approval basis. Worse still, the Honorary Adviser of Y.Elites Association is LAU Kong-wah. Why is this organization not a government body but a non-profit-making organization? Why doesn't the Government take charge of the schemes itself, but has to "pass off fish eyes as pearls" by purportedly providing funding to non-profit-making or neutral organizations, but actually providing funding to its own organizations?

Under the appointment of LAU Kong-wah, many members of these non-profit-making organizations come from the pro-establishment camp. Among them, the Honorary Sponsors of the Hong Kong United Youth Association ("HKUYA") and the Hong Kong Youth Power Association are LEUNG Chun-ying and ZHANG Xiaoming respectively. The schemes of these associations receive a considerable sum of subsidy year after year, and just the above mentioned three associations received $4.35 million last year. Is this actually a transfer of public funds of Hong Kong people to LOCPG for forging a united front? More outrageous still, the organizing bodies of the Internship Scheme would arrange their members to travel to places outside Hong Kong for recruitment. I do not understand why recruitment is conducted abroad but not in Hong Kong. All expenditures incurred during recruitment, including air tickets, accommodation and venues are covered by the subsidy, subject to a ceiling of $50,000. Under the Internship Scheme, staff members of the organizing bodies are funded by public money to travel to Europe and the United States for recruitment in name, but in reality, they are travelling for fun, with air tickets and hotel fees being paid by public coffers. Who will ultimately benefit from these
schemes? While the funding is supposedly used to promote youth internship, the money has in fact been used to finance united front work. What kind of wrongdoing is this? Is this what Hong Kong people would wish to see?

Secondly, youth work has become united front work. On the face of it, these schemes provide young persons with internship opportunities in the Mainland. With a funding of $71 million, it is anticipated that 3,500 young persons can participate in the schemes. In other words, each young person joining the scheme will receive $410 to $490 a day, depending on where they go. If calculated on the basis of 30 days a month at a lower daily subsidy of $410, the average subsidy for each young person will be $12,300. How much will an ordinary Hong Kong student get a month by taking part in local internship scheme organized by large-scale organizations? Between $6,000 and $7,000. In other words, the Government offers huge money to attract young persons to take up internship in the Mainland.

It does not matter if young persons go to the Mainland for genuine internship, but what actually have they done in the Mainland? Under the Internship Scheme, do young persons, who are paid several hundred dollars a day, go to the Mainland for sightseeing or internship? Neither of them. As reported in 2015, the Guangdong Communist Youth League mentioned in its web page the so-called "青年同心圓計劃" (Youth Circle of Care Programme), under which more than 100 exchange events were organized for youths from Guangdong, Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan. Aiming to recruit about 40,000 youth participants, the Programme sought to cultivate a stronger sense of national identity, promote the reunification of people's hearts and enhance their sense of national pride. This was indeed united front work rather than internship. Thus, the united front work should be financed by LOCPG, but not public funds of Hong Kong people.

With regard to the root-seeking exchange tours participated by more than 2,000 university and secondary students from Hong Kong, they were jointly organized by associations having a strong pro-China stance, such as HKUYA, the Hong Kong Volunteers Association, the Federation of Hong Kong Guangdong Community Organizations, the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups and the Hong Kong New Generation Cultural Association. All these associations received funding for exchange programmes in the Mainland, and the relevant programmes are indeed blatant infiltration of the Communist Party of China ("CPC"). So, why should Hong Kong taxpayers foot the bills?
Thirdly, internationalization is tantamount to Mainlandization. For youth work and education work conducted over the years, it is weird that internationalization means Mainlandization. China is seen as a part of the international world and the majority of the resources and quotas have been reserved for Mainland students. At a meeting of the Finance Committee held earlier, I discussed the issue with Secretary for Home Affairs LAU Kong-wah. According to the estimate of the Bureau, in 2017-2018, 21 000 people will take part in programmes for exchange in the Mainland, but only 1 300 people will participate in programmes for exchange in other overseas countries. How come the number of people participating in programmes for exchange in the Mainland will exceed the total number of people participating in programmes for exchanges in other countries of the world? Over the years, in respect of education and youth work, internationalization is tantamount to Mainlandization. What benefits will this bring to Hong Kong students? I do not mind students undertaking internship in the Mainland, but I wonder why the quota and subsidies earmarked for internship in other countries are so negligible? Why do we still have the wishful thinking that young persons in Hong Kong have global vision? The Secretary's response is very ridiculous. He said that not all overseas countries were willing to have bilateral exchanges with Hong Kong, thus the scale of international exchange was relatively smaller. If our objective is to help young persons develop a global vision, the Government should not mind whether the exchanges are bilateral or unilateral. If there are obstacles in conducting bilateral exchanges, the Government should switch to unilateral exchanges, so as to create more opportunities for local students to face the world and broaden their horizons in different parts of the world. Therefore, the explanation given by the Secretary is nothing but specious. The questions at issue are: why the allocation of resources by the Home Affairs Bureau has been so tilted, and whether this approach of resource allocation is conducive to young people.

In 2017-2018, the Government estimates that $100 million will be set aside for the Mainland scheme, but only $14 million will be allocated for the international scheme, which is 10 times less than the former. This is indeed a deceiving conspiracy which seeks to use the resources of Hong Kong people to carry out united front work. Therefore, we absolutely cannot support the relevant funding proposal.

All in all, I agree that young persons in Hong Kong should take part in internship and exchange programmes, and it is also normal for them to take part in internship and exchange programmes in the Mainland. The point is that we
must attain a balanced development, such that Hong Kong students have a chance to meet people from different parts of the world having different culture and background. The Government should not engage in backroom deals by providing funding to its own associations, and implementing programmes in the name of internship but forging a united front in reality. If this is really the case, LOCPG or CPC should pay out of their own pockets and should not use the public funds of Hong Kong people. My speech ends here and I so submit.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr IP Kin-yuen, do you wish to speak again?

MR IP KIN-YUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I have proposed two amendments this year, respectively seeking to reduce the financial provisions for the Territory-wide System Assessment ("TSA") and to reduce "Head 156—Government Secretariat: Education Bureau" by $895,000 in respect of subhead 000, an amount roughly equivalent to the estimated expenditure on the emoluments of the Secretary for Education from 1 April to 30 June this year. I have already spoken on the amendment to reduce the financial provision for TSA during the debate and the Secretary for Education responded last week. As it is now time to sum up, I would like to further speak on the amendment to reduce the emoluments of the Secretary.

I wish to stress that the purpose of reducing the emoluments of Eddie NG is to ensure that justice is served, even though the amount involved is just his last three months' emoluments. As we all know, he will definitely leave the Government three months later. This amendment also serves an important symbolic function that government officials should be accountable to the community. Since Eddie NG has performed badly in policy implementation and lacks commitment to education, leaving behind a host of problems and various adverse situations, he does not deserve to be remunerated.

Chairman, Eddie NG has two nicknames; one of them is "No-good NG" which we are all familiar with and another is "Simon Fan". "Simon Fan" sounds like "a waste of resources" in Cantonese. This nickname is created by top officials of the Education Bureau. When these officials tried to brief Eddie NG on certain issues and policies, Eddie NG was inattentive and these officials thus have a feeling of "a waste of resources". Ming Pao columnist WANG Sze-lai has repeatedly quoted this nickname. What I want to say is that this nickname
does exist. In fact, having such a Secretary was not easy for officials of the Education Bureau, they have to be responsible for many issues and they cannot give full play to their strengths.

Owing to the lack of a good leader, the overall performance of the Education Bureau has been greatly undermined. "Simon Fan" has not attended to his proper duties and does not focus on handling his business. As we all know, he is the "Secretary of Tourism" in Hong Kong. Before he became the Secretary for Education, he was the Chairman of the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority ("HKEAA"), and we already saw some clues back then.

At that time, HKEAA was striving to get overseas recognition of the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education Examination, so the staff concerned had to visit different places for lobbying and explanations. Originally, the task should be taken up by technical staff or professionals, but Eddie NG, being the then Chairman but not a professional, strived to participate in the visit, the professionals concerned were puzzled.

Soon after he assumed office as the Secretary for Education, he stressed the importance of overseas visits, and his top priority was overseas visits. After LEUNG Chun-ying made a commitment to introduce 15-year free education, Eddie NG said that he ought to visit a number of countries, one of which was Vietnam. Why should he visit Vietnam to learn about kindergarten education in that country? Even Education Bureau officials were perplexed.

In the past few years, Secretary for Education Eddie NG visited many places in the name of conducting studies, and the number of overseas visits has increased year on year. He conducted four overseas visits in 2012-2013 and the number of visits increased each year to 17 in 2016-2017. The total expenditure of overseas visits over the past five years, including the expenses of the accompanying officials, had amounted to $3.16 million. As a comparison, the former Secretary for Education Michael SUEN only conducted 17 overseas visits within four years from 2008-2009 to 2011-2012 and the expenditures incurred was only 1.43 million. What a big difference.

Have we ever heard about delegations being led by Under Secretaries, Permanent Secretaries or Deputy Secretaries? Almost all delegations were led by Eddie NG. We are all aware that he did not need to participate in so many
visits but he insisted on joining the visits, and at this stage, he is still conducting overseas visits. As far as I know, about a month ago, he still arranged a visit at the final stage of his term of office. What kind of work attitude is that?

Nonetheless, there are some places that he will not visit. Last March, he did not attend the International Summit on the Teaching Profession held in Berlin, Germany. In 2011, the United States Government initiated the Summit and the first Summit was held in New York. At the time, countries around the world attached great importance to this Summit and Hong Kong also sent officials to attend. The Summit is now hosted by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development ("OECD"), ministers of education and trade union representatives from dozens of countries will attend as it is a very special and effective international conference. Prof CHENG Kai-ming from the University of Hong Kong has also highlighted this Summit in his column.

Nonetheless, something very strange happened last year. The organizer had constantly approached me in my capacity as the representative of the Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union, asking me if the Secretary for Education of Hong Kong would attend the Summit. I also found this odd and wondered why they did not directly ask the Secretary. I later learnt that the Secretary had not attended the Summit. At the Summit, the organizers indicated that it was originally proposed that the next Summit, i.e. the Summit this year, would be held in Hong Kong. As they had all along failed to get a reply from the Secretary for Education, eventually the Summit was not held in Hong Kong. Feeling strange, I thus asked the organizers, including responsible officers of OECD. It turned out that they indicated in the year before last that they intended to hold the Summit in Hong Kong this year, and all parties concerned also look forward to coming to Hong Kong to attend the Summit. Nevertheless, as the Secretary for Education had not responded to the inquiries from the organizers and a formal application had not been submitted for holding the Summit in Hong Kong, the Summit will be held in Scotland this year.

It does not matter if the Secretary has not submitted a formal application; in fact, the Summit will not necessarily be held in Hong Kong. Nevertheless, as the Secretary had all along been reluctant to present a clear picture or give a clear account of the situation, various countries have very negative impressions on Hong Kong, which is a disgrace to Hong Kong.
I am not going to talk much about external affairs. How is the relationship between the Secretary for Education and the Legislative Council? Eddie NG was very lazy in the past few years and he was not willing to meet with Members. I had complained to former Chief Secretary for Administration Carrie LAM in private or on a semi-public occasion about Eddie NG's reluctance to meet with Legislative Council Members. As Honourable colleagues are aware, at the beginning of each legislative session, many Policy Bureaux will brief members of relevant Panels on their work in future, such as legislative exercise and other plans. How often do members of the Panel on Education have the chance to listen to the Secretary's briefing these few years? Never. Not only me as a democrat did not have the opportunity to communicate with Eddie NG, when I attended a talk organized by the Law Society of Hong Kong with another heavyweight pro-establishment Member, he also complained that he never had a chance to discuss with Eddie NG about education policies. As we all know, Dr LAM Tai-fai is a former Member and the former Chairman of the Panel on Education in the last term; he also complained about not having the opportunity to communicate with Eddie NG as he was not willing to discuss with Members.

Perhaps the most serious incident was the cyber-attack against me in early April this year. The message circulated included "the harm caused by HKPTU and IP Kin-yuen". The contents were not totally true and we were being discredited. I became accustomed to these rumours but I later learnt that Secretary Eddie NG was only involved in spreading this message to attack a Legislative Council Member from the education functional constituency. I believe that must be a big scandal. Knowing that the Secretary's term of office is coming to an end, I do not want to waste my time on him. I also believe that members of the education sector who have received this message can exercise judgment. In any case, I believe this must be the first time in history that the Secretary, as an accountability official and a public officer, has maliciously participated in attacking a Legislative Council Member.

Eddie NG did not attend to his duties and he was reluctant to attend the public hearings held by the Panel on Education of the Legislative Council. Even if he attended the hearings, he only attended one session but not the other sessions. For example, for the public hearing held early this year on student suicide and the public hearing held recently on TSA, he only attended one session and missed the other two sessions. The Secretary, like all Members, has to handle many different things at the same time. Public officers must weigh the
importance of matters and be aware of their basic responsibilities. As the Secretary for Education, how could he not attend the public hearing held by the Panel on Education to listen to public views? Instead, he attended the dinner hosted by the Hong Kong Swatow Merchants Association Limited. In fact, no problems would arise even if he did not attend the dinner. Today, several Directors of Bureaux are present but Eddie NG is not present to listen to Members' speeches.

Chairman, I think the problems with Eddie NG are really too numerous. I will not elaborate on these problems because we have heard a lot these few days. I just want to say that the problems with Eddie NG are also the problems with Chief Executive LEUNG Chun-ying. Over the past few years, why did LEUNG Chun-ying pick Eddie NG as the Secretary for Education and pay no heed to his performance? LEUNG Chun-ying had replaced two Directors of Bureaux but did nothing to Eddie NG.

For five years, education in Hong Kong has come to a standstill and Eddie NG has to bear great responsibilities. However, five years have passed and things cannot be reversed; I just want to take this opportunity to accord justice to Hong Kong people. We have to know what kind of person the Secretary is; what he has done and what responsibilities he has to undertake. His responsibilities include legal responsibilities, official responsibilities and even moral responsibilities. As an important international city, Hong Kong should have a better education system and a more responsible and outstanding Secretary for Education.

I would like to remind Members that all public officers should be aware of their responsibilities. At this time, I appeal to those willing and capable persons not to be afraid to take up responsibilities. If they do not have the courage to take up responsibilities, people like Eddie NG will be do so; and Hong Kong cannot afford to bear the consequences.

Chairman, I so submit.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr HUI Chi-fung, do you wish to speak again?
MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I wish to speak again.

Mr LEUNG, for this debate session, I have proposed a Committee stage amendment to reduce "Head 156—Government Secretariat: Education Bureau" by $895,000 in respect of subhead 000, which is roughly equivalent to the estimated expenditure on the remuneration of the Secretary for Education for three months.

I would like to highlight one point, I do not propose this amendment to reduce the estimated expenditure on the remuneration of the Secretary out of spite. I do so because Secretary Eddie NG is indeed the culprit for stalling education development in Hong Kong. He has also failed to attend meetings of the Legislative Council and maintain good communication with Members. As a result, he has caused harm to the education sector as a whole and has stalled the development of education in Hong Kong for a long time.

I note that I am not the only Member who proposes amendment to reduce the estimated expenditure for the remuneration of Secretary for Education Eddie NG. Instead, a squad of Members has proposed similar amendments. Apart from amendments to reduce the estimated expenditure for the Secretary's remuneration, another squad of Members has proposed amendments to reduce the estimated expenditure of the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority ("HKEAA") for printing the assessment papers of the Territory-wide System Assessment ("TSA"). Eddie NG does not even attend our meeting today, perhaps because he is shameful or he does not have guts or the time—perhaps he has to attend another reunification celebration event—to face our criticisms. For this reason, I am all the more convinced that the estimated expenditure for his remuneration should be reduced.

Originally I have no intention to speak on the Budget again after Secretary Eddie NG has given his responses. But we are indignant about one statement he made. Previously we criticized him for not attending the public hearings held by the Legislative Council on TSA or student suicide or that he did not sit through the meeting and left after hearing some views. It turned out that he left to attend an event organized by the Swatow Merchants Association ("the Association") to celebrate Hong Kong's reunification. As just mentioned by some Members, the event was also attended by other public officials—I only knew about it after reading the relevant press reports—including Chief Secretary Matthew CHEUNG
and probably Secretary Dr KO Wing-man as well. Since the event was also attended by the Chief Secretary and other Directors of Bureaux, it should be alright even if Secretary Eddie NG did not attend. But he chose to celebrate Hong Kong's reunification and attend the event organized by the Association. Why? According to the Secretary, he did so because the Education Bureau is implementing life planning education. Hence, he should establish a closer tie with the business sector so that more start-up or internship opportunities might be provided for students.

I think his answer is not only absurd, but nonsensical. I dare ask the Secretary—or any official from the Education Bureau attending the meeting on his behalf—whether Eddie NG had ever said something, just anything, about education to the Chairman of the Association on that night? Had he ever said anything about providing more opportunities to young people? Had any specific plan been made? All along, had the Secretary ever told us anything about the Bureau's cooperation with the Association to further promote life planning education? Or had any relevant study been undertaken by the Bureau? Nothing, there is nothing at all. Notwithstanding the many meetings held by the Panel, I have never heard anything about the matter. But today he dared say that he attended the reunification celebration event organized by the Association for the sake of promoting life planning education. What kind of nonsense is that?

For fear of misunderstanding the Secretary, I visited the Association's website to ascertain whether the Association had indeed provided many opportunities to young people and students. Members can also check out the Association's website themselves. The first thing I saw on the Association's home page was news about the last Legislative Council election with the Association expressing support for the election teams of Wilson OR, Starry LEE, KWOK Wai-keung and Stanley NG, and so on. What kind of association is this? What kind of reunification celebration event is it? Is it more important than the public hearing held by the Legislative Council to discuss TSA? Is it more important than receiving views from parents, the organizations concerned and the education sector?

For this important reason, I must stand up and lash out at Eddie NG. My focus is not the matter itself, but the absurdity and senseless it reflects on the part of some public officials in how they speak and how they act. It is precisely because of such attitude of the public officials and such shamelessness of Eddie
That Hong Kong's education sector has been suffering for the past five years. Instead of achieving any positive results, we just got entangled in endless disputes and arguments. That is why we heard of the plight of parents during the TSA public hearing.

A number of cross-party Members met with Chief Secretary Matthew CHEUNG and the Under Secretary for Education the day before yesterday to further discuss the matter of TSA. Our greatest concession is that even if TSA should resume this year, can the Education Bureau give an undertaking that should any parents or schools choose not to participate in the assessment, they will not be regarded as breaking school rules or they need not bear any consequence? That is really the crux of the parents' demand. As expected, Secretary Eddie NG did not attend the meeting, and no undertaking has been given by the Chief Secretary and the Under Secretary. The meeting ended on a low note.

Actually, Members can be quite naive—perhaps it is just me and some Members who are naive—in hoping that the minds of public officials can be changed after just one meeting. As far as TSA is concerned, our discussion is no longer about an education issue. In other words, we are no longer discussing the matter from a theoretical point of view, say, what kind of assessment is best for students, or what kind of assessment can reduce the incentive of drilling? The Government only cares about maintaining its authority or saving its face. As LEUNG Chun-ying put it, "Even if TSA is to be scrapped, it will be someone else's decision after 1 July." Clearly, he is putting students, parents and schools in a difficult position. He is not concerned about the education issues involved, but about the authority of his administration, as well as political wrangling.

I am really angry as a parent. That is why a number of Members have propose amendments today, seeking to reduce the estimated expenditure of HKEAA for printing assessment papers of TSA, as well as the estimated expenditure for the remuneration of Secretary Eddie NG. I hope that the next-term Government will heed public views in the selection of accountability officials.

Once during a discussion on certain education issues, an official from the Education Bureau came over—I will not name names—and whispered to us, "If you want to discuss these issues, you had better discuss with me instead of with
the Secretary." He even gave us a look which according to my interpretation suggested that, "If you discuss those issues with me, it will be more efficient and effective for the Secretary doesn't know a thing at all." Even Secretary Eddie NG's subordinates have little respect for him. That is why he should return three months of his remuneration because it is paid by public money. That is why I said at the outset that I propose to reduce the estimated expenditure for his remuneration for three months not out of spite, but for very good reasons.

Although I have only been a Member of the Legislative Council for six-odd months, I have met other Directors of Bureaux in charge of the policy areas I am responsible for, and most of them are willing to communicate with Members, say, through telephone conversations or tea gatherings. In most cases, they would agree to meet with us. If they have other prior engagements, they would ask senior Administrative Officers in the Bureau or the Permanent Secretary to attend the meeting on their behalf. Secretary Eddie NG is the only exception for he neither answers our calls nor attends our meetings. He invariably fails to show up whenever public hearings are held by the Legislative Council. Moreover, he always goes on overseas duty visits and never attends our meetings. His is a hopeless case, and I do not want to talk about his problems anymore. As Mr IP Kin-yuen said a moment ago, it is simply a waste of time and effort if we continue to criticize Secretary Eddie NG. Is there any other public official whom Members consider it a waste of time to criticize? That is why I will stop wasting my time on Eddie NG. Instead I want to use the remaining speaking time to talk about my other amendments, that is, the one to reduce "Head 95—Leisure and Cultural Services Department" in respect of subhead 000 by an amount which is roughly equivalent to the annual estimated operating expenditure of the Antiquities and Monuments Office ("AMO").

As I said earlier, Hong Kong's policy for the conservation of antiquities and monuments calls for a profound and comprehensive review or reform. As we can see, much work for the conservation of antiquities and monuments …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr HUI Chi-fung, the subject of antiquities and monuments is not covered under this debate session. Please speak in relation to the theme of this debate.
MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): Okay, I will speak on the theme of this debate. I hope … But Chairman, isn't the said amendment covered under the theme of the sixth debate?

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): You just said "95" which is not covered under the theme of this debate.

MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, we are now having the sixth debate, right?

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): This is the sixth debate, but you mentioned just now that you were speaking on Amendment No. 95.

MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): AMO falls exactly within "95".

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Amendment No. 95 is not covered under the theme of the sixth debate.

MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): What I mean is Amendment No. 83.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Okay, please continue with your speech.

MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I should be able to continue with my speech, just that you might have made a mistake.

My amendment seeks to deduct the annual estimated operating expenditure of AMO because the work of conserving antiquities and monuments in Hong Kong is really riddled with flaws and loopholes. For monuments which are most deserving to be conserved, the most spectacular or the most precious in terms of historical value, they have become rubble. Moreover, AMO is
indifferent to those antiquities and monuments which are relatively modern but have high conservation value. It does not even bother to conduct any study or research on those items.

Based on my experience over the years in the community monitoring the work of AMO, I know that when it comes to old civilian buildings or architectures which are neither official residence nor government buildings, AMO would go as far as fabricating historical information in order to facilitate demolition by the Development Bureau or the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA"). As I mentioned in earlier speeches, the Antiquities Authority (that is, the head of AMO) is the Secretary for Development. Under the system of the Secretary for Development being the Antiquities Authority, AMO will very often follow the overall direction of the Development Bureau, as well as the direction of redevelopment of URA.

Is AMO assisting development or genuinely carrying out work to conserve antiquities and monuments? I think it is the former case. That is why I hope that with my amendment to reduce the estimated expenditure under the relevant subhead, the shoddiness of AMO's work will be made known in society. A profound and comprehensive discussion, debate or reform is required for various matters, ranging from the composition of the Antiquities Advisory Board ("AAB") to the entire framework of antiquities and monuments conservation, so that genuine professionals (including those in the fields of architecture, culture, history, archeology and anthropology) can join AAB and AMO.

During previous discussions on some conservation proposals, we noted that officials specializing in archeological or historical researches in AMO would not disclose any information to the public, and they were most reluctant to respond to questions raised by experts in the community. In one case, the relevant official had underestimated the age of an old tenement building by 100 years. I do not know if the said AMO official made the mistake in order to tie in with the plans of the Development Bureau or URA to demolish the building, or was it just a careless mistake? If those officials are professional grade staff with major responsibility in historical, archeological or cultural researches, I think they have insulted themselves by what they did. If they disregard their own professional knowledge in heritage conservation and adjust, vary or change their assessments to suit the wish of AAB, the Chief Executive, AMO or the Secretary for Development to undertake particular development projects, I think they have insulted their own professionalism and credibility.
For the above reasons, I propose this amendment to reduce the annual estimated operating expenditure of AMO. Some officials may respond by saying that if the estimated expenditure of AMO is reduced, the entire department can no longer operate, and all its work in the conservation of antiquities and monuments, as well as its archaeological studies would be halted. Of course, just like other expenditure items in the Budget, the Government can definitely apply for provisional funding immediately, taking into account the public opinion expressed in Council as well as the views of conservation experts to reorganize and reform AMO.

Given its setting, AMO is actually neither fish nor fowl. As the amendment I propose in relation to AMO comes under head 95, that is, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD"), even the Chairman has made a mistake for he thought I had deviated from the subject. LCSD is responsible for managing parks, recreational facilities and AMO. But although AMO is under LCSD, it must follow the instructions of the Antiquities Authority (which is a position held by the Secretary for Development). Hence, AMO is neither fish nor fowl. Since both the Financial Secretary and the Secretary for Development are present today, I hope they will listen to public views on the entire policy for the conservation of antiquities and monuments.

I so submit. Thank you, Mr LEUNG.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Nathan LAW, do you wish to speak again?

MR NATHAN LAW (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, today I will still speak on Hong Kong's youth policy. The amendment I propose is related to head 53, which seeks to reduce the estimated expenditure on the International Youth Exchange Programme ("IYEP") 2017-2018 amounting to $2.9 million.

Last week, I put forth some views on the University Grants Committee and the Research Grants Council. The scope of this session is very wide. Today, I will express my views on IYEP and other related programmes such as Funding Scheme for Youth Internship in the Mainland ("Internship Scheme").
It has been reported earlier that the estimated expenditure on the Funding Scheme for Youth Exchange in the Mainland ("Exchange Scheme") has greatly increased in recent years from $20 million to $41 million, and that the expenditure on the Internship Scheme has even been increased to $71 million, which has aroused great concern among many Members. Dr LAU Siu-lai has just now expressed views on those Schemes and earlier, she also put a question to the Home Affairs Bureau on the reasons for increasing the expenditure on those Schemes. The Secretary said that the additional provision was provided due to the increasing demand. But on the other hand, the funding for IYEP has remained more or less the same over the years. Is it the case that all young people flock into the Mainland without thinking of joining exchange programmes in other countries? I do not believe this is the case.

The Bureau has also introduced a new IYEP recently. I will talk about it later. I wish to point out, while the Government increases the funding for Mainland exchange programmes, it neglects the international exchange programmes. This practice of favouritism is not due to the increasing demand, but due to political considerations, and the interests of many parties are involved. I hope that in the future reviews, the Government will truly promote exchange programmes that have practically taken into account the genuine needs of young people in Hong Kong. I believe Hong Kong youths are more eager to join overseas exchange programmes and there is a greater demand in this respect.

First of all, let us take a look at IYEP. According to the information provided by the Commission on Youth, IYEP was introduced in 1979 under the name of Commonwealth Exchange Programme and as its scope was later extended to cover other countries, it was renamed IYEP. IYEP is different from the Exchange Scheme, which, as reported by the press, mainly aims at spending huge sum of money on feasting and sightseeing.

Under IYEP, firstly, the authorities have direct contacts with the governments of the target overseas countries to organize youth exchange activities. As the so-called community organizations or youth organizations are not involved in the process, the chance of allowing such organizations to reap profits or achieve certain political purposes will be reduced. That is commendable. With Hong Kong authorities directly contacting their counterparts in overseas countries, the quality of the exchange programmes can
be assured. Secondly, reciprocal visits will be held. While Hong Kong youths visit overseas countries for exchanges, young people in such countries will visit Hong Kong in return. This kind of two-way exchange programmes is positive and meaningful.

Recently, I am rather sceptical about the Bureau's reply to Members' question. First of all, the Government has significantly increased the estimated expenditure on IYEP by 62%, amounting to $2.92 million. When we asked for the reasons, the Bureau said that as part of the celebration activities for the 20th Anniversary of the establishment of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, more international youth exchange activities would be organized, allowing young people to travel to distant countries for exchanges, and hence more money was needed.

I am totally baffled by this answer. How is IYEP related to the celebration of the reunification? It would make more sense to relate exchange programmes in the Mainland with the reunification celebration. In fact, many people have pointed out that the so-called reunification celebration activities are like a master key that fits all, which is "crying up wine and selling vinegar". It totally boggles my mind how IYEP is related to reunification celebration.

The second reason given by the Government was that young people could go to countries further away. Actually, as young people nowadays visit European countries, by distant countries, does the Government mean they will travel to see the Aurora Borealis? I do not believe that is the true reason. I propose this amendment because I think the Government is perfunctory in reply to our question, which is very specific: Why is there an increase in the estimated expenditure? Can more information be provided? The Bureau's reply was that in order to celebrate the reunification and allow young people to go to distant countries for exchanges, additional provision is needed. I believe both are not the real reasons for increasing the estimates. I hope that when answering our questions in future, the Home Affairs Bureau will make better preparation and do not give us such specious reasons. To enhance street cleansing service is for celebration of reunification; to conduct exchange programmes in overseas countries is for celebration of reunification; to hold concerts is also for celebration of reunification, the replies are very perfunctory indeed.
Since the Government has set aside additional public funds amounting to $3 million, some questions have arisen. For example, as there are issues of safety and insurance relating to the youth exchange programmes in overseas countries, are the organizing bodies reliable? In the past three years, all contracts on organizing exchange programmes have been awarded to the same organization through open quotations. Is there sufficient transparency? Is the direction clear? It seems that the Home Affairs Bureau has not given us a clear answer.

All the above questions are related to the basic criteria for reviewing the exchange programmes, but the Home Affairs Bureau has all along been reluctant to give a clear account to the public. The Bureau has not informed the public whether the funding on the young exchange programmes is properly spent, and what purposes are served in organizing such exchange programmes, especially exchange programmes in the Mainland, and what benefits young people can get by participating in such programmes.

In respect of the Exchange Scheme, I wish to cite an example. Last year, an organization, the Unleash Foundation, was granted funds to organize an "Inter-provincial Cultural Exchange and Voluntary Teaching tour" for Hong Kong youths, and some Mainland youths paid reciprocal visit to Hong Kong six months later. A total of 150 people participated in the activity and $470,000 was spent. In the same year, the New Territories Youth Society held a two-week exchange programme "Beijing, Beijing" with similar activities and participated by 50 people, and it received a funding of $450,000 from the authorities. What are the criteria adopted by the Commission on Youth in determining the amount of funding granted to programmes having 150 and 50 participants respectively? Are the contents of the exchange activities being monitored? What is the ratio of activities for exchanges, sightseeing and studies? No papers have been made public, and no criteria have been announced. Despite such low transparency, the Home Affairs Bureau has no intent to review or improve the present practice, and it continues to grant funding to these community organizations using similar criteria. Dr LAU Siu-lai queried about these organizations and wondered if the Government is granting money to its fellow organizations, fattening political groups that are closely related to the Government and sharing political spoils with them. I believe the answer is obvious to all.
Another absurdity about these exchange programmes is, as I said earlier, that all activities are related to the celebration of the reunification. For example, both the Sichuan Wolong Natural Reserve Internship Programme and the Beijing Palace Museum Conservation Internship Programme are organized in the name of reunification celebration. Hence, I support Dr LAU Siu-lai’s amendment to reduce the Home Affairs Bureau's estimated annual expenditure on the Internship Scheme and the expenditure on IYEP that I have mentioned earlier.

Moreover, I wish to raise another question about a new IYEP item. This year's Budget proposed to allocate an additional $100 million to expand IYEP, which was a new initiative. When compared with the estimated expenditure on infrastructure projects, $100 million may not be a large sum of money, but I have to perform my due diligence to ask the Government how the money will be spent. The Government has only responded briefly, saying that $3 million will be used in this financial year, how about the $100 million? According to the Government, the money will be spent over a span of six years. But how much will be spent each year? No answer has been given, and the Government has not told us under what framework the $100 million will be spent. It has not told us about its idea concerning the new initiative, whether the expenditure will gradually increase year on year or when an average amount will be spent over the period of time.

Let us assume that this is not a case of Legislative Council Members querying government expenditure. If an employee asks his employer to give him $100 million to carry out a certain plan, and in the proposal he writes, "I have not decided when to use $100 million; I have only decided to use $3 million in the first year and then see what happens afterwards." The employer will certainly ask the employee why he does not first apply for $3 million and then apply for more funds after seeing how things go. This is the reason why we pursue on this issue. Therefore, if the Government adopts this approach when applying to the Legislative Council for funding approval, it is indeed hardly acceptable.

The new IYEP is different from the old IYEP and is similar to the Exchange Scheme, which is to subsidize certain community organizations to organize overseas youth exchange activities. Just now I queried the background of those community organizations, and whether political spoils were involved. If the same logic is applied to the new IYEP initiative, the sum of $100 million
may well be divided among those organizations of various backgrounds and fatten them. Hence, this IYEP initiative will be degraded into the overseas version of the Exchange Scheme, only benefiting such organizations.

(The Chairman's Deputy, MS STARRY LEE, took the Chair)

Therefore, I had proposed an amendment to reduce the expenditure of $100 million, but Mr LEUNG ruled that the amendment was not targeted at this year's estimated expenditure and hence could not be proposed. That was absolutely ridiculous. Even though the funding applied under the Budget was $100 million, it was unreasonable that we could only seek to reduce $3 million this year since the Government was going to spend the money over a span of six years. Such a ruling certainly restricted Members' power to express their views about the Government's expenditures. Besides, by using his power this way, Andrew LEUNG, the President of the Legislative Council colluded with the Executive Authorities to deprive Members of their power to monitor the Government and their chance to discuss certain controversial initiatives. I express my deep regret to this situation.

Lastly, I wish to speak on the directions of the Government's cultural policy. In this year's Budget, the estimate on the Programme of culture has increased by 0.5% compared to last year but most of the resources are allocated to major art companies. The nine major art companies naturally receive an ample supply of resources each year. I am not seeking to reduce their estimated expenditure, but I hope that the Government will lend a hand to small art groups that receive little assistance. These art groups usually receive funding through the Advisory Committee on Arts Development and the Hong Kong Arts Development Council ("ADC").

There is a plan under ADC called ADC Artspace which provides studios at concessionary rent in a building in Wong Chuk Hang for artists, but performance venues are not included. Besides, the success rate of art groups getting a studio is only about 50%, that is, 26 out of 50 groups succeeded in getting one studio. The assistance is far from sufficient. These art groups and artists must rehearse in their own studio. Even if they are granted the funding, they still need to find a venue to perform. The authorities simply ignore the genuine needs of the cultural sector.
As regards the cultural sector, I very much hope that the Government will not only provide funding for the nine major art companies but will also assist the small art groups. The Government should understand that its policy on commercial buildings and industrial buildings provides small art groups with very little space for survival. It should provide more support and assistance for them.

I so submit.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, do you wish to speak again?

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, I once said in this Chamber that a parliament can do anything except turning a man into a woman. It is really eye-opening for me to see that a man can be turned into a woman just now. After the Chairman had left, the Deputy Chairman, a woman, took the chair. This Council can even turn a man into a woman, which is remarkable indeed.

The Deputy Chairman is now chairing the meeting. So what is the point I am trying to make? The debate session is now drawing to a close. I once said that this Council cannot turn a man into a woman, which has nevertheless come true now. However, no matter how powerful this Council is, if the Chairman is taking a position inclined toward the Government, the Council will be rendered impotent. In other words, the Legislative Council has become impotent. The practice of "tailoring the filibuster" has proven this point. I have no idea whether Mr Andrew LEUNG has had a meeting with LEUNG Chun-ying to discuss how to handle the matters of the Legislative Council. After being brought to light by Mr Holden CHOW, the flaws of the Council and the fact that it has been manipulated by the Government have become blatantly obvious.

I would now talk about reducing the remuneration of staff of the Labour Department and other expenses. Workers in Hong Kong need standard working hours ("SWH"). Many people have criticized me for only paying lip service when striving for SWH, which in fact is definitely not the case. I read out the top 10 cities with the longest working hours—I am not talking about countries as Hong Kong should be compared with other cities: Hong Kong, 50.11 hours; Mumbai, 43.78 hours; Mexico City, 43.48 hours; New Delhi, 42.57 hours;
Bangkok, 42.13 hours; Dubai, 42.03 hours; Nairobi, 42 hours; Taipei, 41.17 hours; Jakarta, 40.42 hours, and Bogota, 40.30 hours. This survey has covered places all over the world.

The failure of the Government to legislate for SWH is to blame for the longest working hours of Hong Kong workers. If working hours is standardized at 40 hours per week in Hong Kong, Hong Kong will be ranked lower or will even disappear from the list. However, working hours has not been standardized in Hong Kong. When Secretary for Labour and Welfare Stephen SUI was the Commissioner for Labour back then, he had not proposed the implementation of SWH. As the Secretary for Labour and Welfare at present, he has not implemented SWH either. Even if he stays in office in the future, he will not do so as well.

As far as I know, some Members of the pro-democracy camp have met with Carrie LAM, only to find their time totally wasted. She said that she would not implement measures which were not feasible, and as such she would not legislate for SWH. The incumbent Chief Executive LEUNG Chun-ying deceived The Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions ("FTU") back then into supporting him, thus enabling him to get 150 nominations; consequently he crept out of his doghouse to take the helm as the Chief Executive. However, he has now reneged on his pledge. Even Legislative Council Members belonging to FTU are reluctant to meet with him now, preferring to keep him out of their sight. The implementation of the SWH policy has been pledged by the current LEUNG Chun-ying administration, but so far, nothing has been proposed. Instead, the authorities have proposed the implementation of contractual working hours.

What is "contractual working hours"? It is similar to a mortuary photo, taken as a record of the state of death of a deceased person. However, it can do nothing to remedy the situation. When Donald TSANG was in office, he had intended to legislate for SWH. According to the then Government, it was necessary to coordinate with employers for two to three years. Should coordination fail, the Government would enact legislation. I had filed a judicial review against those remarks made by Donald TSANG. When appearing in court, Donald TSANG accused me of filing a lawsuit for political interests and canvassing votes. He added that the Government had embarked on implementing a working hours regime by requiring kind-hearted employers to enter into contract with workers; and the Government would only consider other options when this measure had proved unsuccessful. The Government has taken the lead to implement a working hours regime for security guards by setting their
working hours at eight hours instead of 12 hours. Has LEUNG Chun-ying delivered on his promise now? Should I file a judicial review against him? He is now picking on me as he knows that I have no money for taking legal action. He has attacked me by trying to disqualify me as a Member. As such, how do I get the money to file a judicial review on SWH? As all of my money has been spent on the disqualification lawsuit, this has in effect benefited them.

The current working time regime, applicable to millions of the working population in Hong Kong, is extremely evil. First, I have said countless times that if no SWH regime is put in place in Hong Kong, workers will be dismissed for not working overtime. According to the working hours specified in contracts, workers may have to work for 10 hours. If a worker tells his boss that he cannot work overtime today for he has some other engagement, the boss certainly has the right not to grant approval. In this way, workers are not protected on the job. They may not get overtime pay, meaning that they have just worked for nothing.

In the absence of SWH, the expression "death by overwork" will not be substantiated. If SWH is in place, workers can finish work after working for a specified number of hours. If their working time is extended, they can take their boss to court to recover any overtime allowances unpaid. In addition, if long working hours has resulted in disabilities or even death of workers, request for compensation can also be made. Even when workers may be willing to sacrifice their health and work long hours to earn more income, if they died or suffered from disabilities due to overwork, their employers must still be held responsible. If a worker changed five jobs and each employer asked him to work overtime, if he died from overwork over an extended period of death, claims for compensation can be filed against all of his previous employers.

The case that I am going to mention is viewed by many people as a tragedy. An elderly man who has been employed as a green minibus driver has been working day and night. One day he came down with flu. As he was worried that he might lose his job by taking sick leave, he stuck it out after taking some medicine. After he hit a pedestrian by accident, he was immediately arrested by law enforcement officers and charged with reckless driving causing grievous bodily harm. For the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge project items, the China Overseas Holdings Limited ("COHL") and the Asia Allied Infrastructure Holdings Limited ("AAI", formerly known as Chun Wo Development Holdings Limited) are among the contractors. AAI is neither a subsidiary of COHL nor a Hong Kong-funded company. It has been taken over
by an Inner Mongolian company recently. These two companies have been exploiting local workers. As Secretary Stephen Sui should also be aware, COHL has been notorious. The bridges built by COHL in China and Africa had accidentally collapsed. Their projects in Manila and Jakarta were also not feasible; and COHL’s top managers had been convicted of bribery in both Hong Kong and Manila. Why are such enterprises, which had caused deaths and injuries, be allowed to take part in the projects? Are the lives of workers worthless? The authorities are not even willing to implement SWH. As the saying goes, "without a pair of compasses and a set square, it is hard to draw a perfect circle and a square". For this reason, the remuneration of the Secretary should be reduced.

In addition, excessively long working hours has led to another problem, resulting in further fragmentation of work. For example, if a boss has to hire an employee to take up 16 hours of workload. He may ask one worker to work really hard for 12 hours, and then hire a part-time employee to take up the remaining four hours of workload, resulting in the fragmentation of work. The work should have been undertaken by two workers, but now, one worker has to work extra hours, while the other part-time worker can hardly earn enough to make ends meet. The Low-income Working Family Allowance has thus come into being. I had also cited the following case in this Chamber before. A couple was sad for the husband lost his job. A few days later, the wife managed to get a job, and they were certainly happy. The husband was previously employed as a bartender with a monthly salary of $11,000 to $12,000. It turned out that his wife was employed for the same position, but the salary was only $9,000, which was $3,000 less. How could the employer be so mean to his workers?

Let me explain further. As the working hours of one worker is too long, two shifts of work can be combined into one, rendering the other worker unimportant. In order to bring in some income for the family, some women have no alternative but to work for a meagre income to improve the living conditions of their children, or to pay for their tuition and textbook fees. In the absence of SWH, these women have been exploited to the fullest. As such a big employer, the Government has outsourced its responsibility through the outsourcing system. If asked whether it has implemented SWH for its employees, the Government will certainly answer in the affirmative. The truth is that the Government has outsourced its work and allowed contractors to treat outsourced workers in an inhumane way.
I met a woman while I was serving my community service order. I asked her what offence she had committed and why she ended up in the same situation as mine. Back then, I was prosecuted for charging at police officers in a protest outside the official residence of Michael SUEN. She said to me: "Councillor LEUNG, as the social worker had not reminded me, I had forgotten to declare my income from working out of home." The Judge concerned was really terrific. While nothing could have escaped his discerning eyes, he had been out of touch with reality. The Judge had imposed a heavy sentence on her to serve 240 hours of community service order. That woman was as sturdy as a cow and her skin as dark as charcoal. Her job was to prune and irrigate flowers and grasses on the streets. Such cases have arisen because outsourced workers have not been protected in respect of working hours.

I consider it meaningless to continue the discussion on SWH. As Financial Secretary Paul CHAN is here today, I would take this opportunity to talk about universal retirement protection. When he was a Member in 2011, he once proposed in the Chamber that the Hong Kong Government should cash in all its shares in public utilities, and use the approximately $120 billion for implementing universal retirement protection. I had voted in support of him back then. Had I cast the wrong vote? At present, in his capacity of the Financial Secretary, will he dare confront Carrie LAM and say, "If you want me to stay as the Financial Secretary in the next administration, I will accept the offer subject to one condition, that is, I should not let Legislative Council Member 'Long Hair' down at least. I criticized the SAR Government in 2011, and now I have joined the SAR Government as the Financial Secretary. If you want me to accept the offer of reappointment, please implement immediately the proposal I made back then." I wonder if Financial Secretary Paul CHAN dares to make such a suggestion to Carrie LAM. If he dares, I will praise him as remarkable and immediately invite him for a beer by phone. Will he do so, or will he be as capricious as the Communist Party of China? Financial Secretary Paul CHAN, please show your manhood as a Member back in those years and tell Carrie LAM …

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, please focus your comments on the debate themes.
MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Rarely can I meet Financial Secretary Paul CHAN. He comes and goes without being noticed. What Financial Secretary CHAN said in 2011 had earned my respect for him. I gave him "three points" for that. If he dares not make the suggestion to Carrie LAM today, I will subtract "seven points" from him.

I am a dignified person. My filibustering in the past five years only aimed to strive for universal retirement protection. The "tailoring of the filibuster" by the Chairman today has made it impossible for us to make more comments. However, Andrew LEUNG should never be complacent. I will definitely file a judicial review. When Financial Secretary Paul CHAN was a Member, filibustering had yet to appear. It was not until he became an official that he had an experience with filibustering. If he wishes to put an end to filibustering, he should walk his talk by selling the shares; even if he does not do so, he should at least make such a proposal.

Deputy Chairman, you have once worked with Financial Secretary Paul CHAN. Do you believe in him? You believe in him, and so do I. It is reasonable for Hong Kong people not to believe in the Government because it has often reneged on its promises. I have to make clear in this Chamber today that we would be an accomplice of the evil-doer if we do not filibuster. Although the Government has already earmarked a funding of $50 billion for universal retirement protection, a portion of it has been used to subsidize capitalists for offsetting Mandatory Provident Fund payment. Paul CHAN, I have expressed support for you in 2011, and so do I in 2017. With respect to your proposal back then, please implement it immediately! Implement it expeditiously!

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr KWONG Chun-yu, do you wish to speak again?

MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, I will continue to speak on the amendment mentioned in my previous speech. Simply put, with the Appropriation Bill 2017 coming to this stage, what we can do is to seek to reduce the emoluments of officials who have performed poorly and I will surely continue to criticize LAU Kong-wah. Thus, at this stage, I will surely make all-out effort to stop high ranking officials from getting a pay rise easily, yet it seems almost impossible to reduce their emoluments. We are not making the
demand without justifications. I must stress again that when LAU Kong-wah is acting as the Secretary for Home Affairs, he has adopted the same approach of making no comments when he attended meetings years back. He has not done anything and has not spoken a word on policies for which he is responsible.

Where was LAU Kong-wah when I talked about the recent incident of Hidden Agenda in this Council last week? Where is he now? He has gone overseas to attend the Venice Biennale. The reason given for his attendance is that the theme of the Venice Biennale this year is "Viva Arte Viva", and as the Secretary for Home Affairs, he has to attend the event to show his concern about arts. Does he care about arts in Hong Kong? What has he done in promoting the development of arts in Hong Kong? The policy on industrial buildings is under his purview, but he has not done anything in this regard. He has neither assisted in promoting the policy, nor cut the red tape. In fact, many people who have different dreams have moved into industrial buildings to produce various kinds of music in response to the Government's policy on industrial buildings.

Deputy Chairman, in theory, we should have a Policy Bureau to spearhead the formulation of a policy on cultural and arts for Hong Kong so that we can keep abreast of the times, and in particular, we have to consider the situation of some of our neighbouring cities. Taiwan, which is near Hong Kong, is a place which nurtures culture and arts. There are more examples if we consider cities further away. I believe no other places are worse than Hong Kong where people are arrested for forming a band. Some people may say that since these people have broken the existing law, they should be arrested and prosecuted. But what has the Home Affairs Bureau, which is responsible for policies on culture and arts, been doing? I really fail to see what kind of leading roles officials of this Bureau have played. They just watch users of premises under their purview being continuously suppressed by different government departments.

Thus, it is not groundless for me to propose an amendment to reduce LAU Kong-wah's emoluments. He has not dealt with a series of problems, including the policy on industrial buildings and the promise to build youth hostels which are now still non-existent. Talking about youth hostels, I must stress again that if LAU Kong-wah was really smart, he would not say that youth hostels could only be built after some non-governmental organizations ("NGOs") had provided the land, and that the failure to provide even one hostel unit in 2017 despite the announcement of the Youth Hostel Scheme in 2011 had nothing to do with the Government. If the Secretary thinks that this is an important task, should he
show his leadership in arranging to hold meetings for explanation and assisting in
the coordination of land allocation to build youth hostels so as to provide
accommodation for young people?

The Secretary has done nothing. He said that as the completion dates of
some of the projects were now available, tens or hundreds of units would be
provided in the future to take forward the Youth Hostel Scheme and relieve the
plight of young people who saw no hope to be accommodated now. What is
wrong with the Secretary? What has the Government been doing all these
years? The Government has only been building tens or hundreds of youth hostel
units and I cannot see what the Secretary has done in promoting the work.
When he attended the meeting of the Panel of the Legislative Council, he
adamantly said that some youth hostel projects had been completed, but the
progress of others had been hindered. Thus, we cannot expect the Secretary for
Home Affairs to take forward the Youth Hostel Scheme at all.

First of all, the Secretary has not resolved the problem of youth hostels.
Secondly, as I said last time, members of the public did not endorse that lands
should be used as golf course or occupied by yacht club. This is also a problem
which the Home Affairs Bureau should handle, namely, the problem of public
resources used by expensive private sports clubs operating on land granted under
private recreational leases. On the one hand, the Secretary said that there was
insufficient land and the Government could only use land provided by NGOs to
build youth hostels. On the other hand, he allows many private clubs to use a lot
of land resources. If land is granted to some uniformed groups and
non-profit-making groups, we may still accept the arrangement because the
general public can still use the land, but should the Government only charge yacht
club and golf club nominal premiums?

Eleven private recreational clubs charge a membership fee ranging from
$100,000 to $500,000 and their members join the clubs mainly for dining. Yacht
club and golf club are exclusively open to the rich but not the general
public, yet the Government only charges them nominal premiums. For example,
a club in Sheung Shui only pays a premium of $1,000 and its members can enjoy
the facilities thereof. Which Policy Bureau should be held responsible? No
one is aware that it is again the Home Affairs Bureau headed by LAU Kong-wah
which should be responsible for reviewing the outdated laws. It should not
allow yacht club and golf club to continue occupying our land resources when
there is no land for building houses and youth hostels.
In June 2014, the Home Affairs Bureau set up an inter-departmental working group to review the policy of private recreational leases. At present, the leases of 11 private recreational clubs are due to expire, but since the review has not been completed, the leases are renewed under short-term tenancies. I do not know what LAU Kong-wah has been doing. The inter-departmental working group was set up in 2014, three years went by and it is now 2017, but the review has yet to produce any results. Should the emoluments of this Secretary be reduced? LAU Kong-wah is as annoying as Eddie NG, but he is smarter in that he does not speak much. LAU only says what is necessary at meetings and remains silent afterwards. People who prefer to keep quiet all their lives can avoid making mistakes. But, if you think carefully, you will notice that LAU Kong-wah has actually failed to do many things which he should have done. For example, he has not implemented an effective policy on industrial buildings; the promise on building youth hostels has vanished into thin air and he has not resolved the problem of charging golf club or yacht club nominal premiums.

What has LAU Kong-wah been doing? He has granted funding to the Hong Kong Army Cadets Association to which he belongs, Deputy Chairman. LAU Kong-wah wears three hats. He established the Hong Kong Army Cadets Association ("HKACA") which, with the support of the Home Affairs Bureau, defeated other long-established uniformed groups in competing for the use of a vacant school premises as its training grounds. HKACA also plans to spend $60 million on renovating the premises, out of which $30 million will be provided by the Board of Management of the Chinese Permanent Cemeteries under the purview of the Home Affairs Bureau. LAU Kong-wah acted swiftly in handling the application of his fellow organization, but he has not done anything for groups which are in dire straits, including Hidden Agenda which insists on pursuing its music aspirations, as well as other groups in industrial buildings facing eviction by government departments. He should have protected such groups. He acts swiftly to handle matters related to his fellow organization and tells us that there is no conflict of roles. Matters relating to his fellow organization can be settled in several months to a year, but for other matters, nothing has been accomplished by him in several years. Against this background, I propose to reduce his emoluments.

I propose that the deducted amount of $890,000 should be returned to the public coffers. The money may not help many people, but I do not think it should be given to LAU Kong-wah. At this stage, we have to award officials according to their merits. I will not criticize every Director of Bureau, but LAU
Kong-wah really cannot be spared. What should he do to become a competent Secretary for Home Affairs? Just now, I have listed a few major policy areas of the Home Affairs Bureau, which he has not dealt with them at all. If my memory does not fail me, it has been reported in the news that even Madam Liza WANG considered LAU Kong-wah's performance unsatisfactory. I do not know what the next-term Government will become of, but some Directors of Bureaux of this term should really be dismissed.

I do not know what the arrangement of the next-term Government will be, but if LAU Kong-wah is to remain as the Secretary for Home Affairs, the cultural and arts policy of Hong Kong will surely become a mess. In fact, there are many outstanding tasks, including reviewing the outdated Factories and Industrial Undertakings Ordinance. Members must not think that all performances held in industrial buildings are necessarily organized by young people. Take South Korea as an example. It has a strong soft power and the cultural soil to nurture different kinds of people with the creativity to produce novels, films, television dramas, music, etc. thereby building up a strong and powerful image for South Korea. Although the real South Korea may not be as perfect as depicted in the television dramas and films, the variety of its cultural products has exhibited its soft power.

Hong Kong used to be a pioneer of soft power. In the 1980s, the soil of Hong Kong had nurtured many singers and enabled the production of many films. Many Hong Kong people had, through their creativity power and intelligence, achieved great success with little resources; and the tiny place of Hong Kong had won international fame. Today, the cultural industry in Hong Kong is dwindling and suffering from the doldrums. Some people say that it has nothing to do with the Government, but if that is true, we will not have such a lousy policy on industrial buildings. After the tenants of industrial buildings have moved in, they have to meet various requirements of the Fire Services Department, the Buildings Department and the Lands Department. The Government can also inform the owner at any time that an encumbrance is imposed on the property because it has been used for holding a certain event for a non-industrial purpose. Under the existing policy, it is illegal to hold the event in an industrial unit, but the young people concerned insisted on holding the event even if they would be arrested. How should this problem be solved? As I said earlier, the Director of Bureau and the Policy Bureau that should be responsible for this matter had kept silent and done nothing. The young people were arrested merely for doing their work.
In fact, the Home Affairs Bureau can undertake a number of tasks. It will be best if the problem of private recreational leases can be resolved, so that the golf club and the yacht club will pay reasonable market rent. If these clubs operate well, they will bring revenue to public coffers, which is a good thing; if they operate poorly or if they consider the rent too costly, they should return the land to the Government. The land can be used for building youth hostels under the purview of the Home Affairs Bureau. The proposal put forward in the Policy Address 2011 will then be taken forward to provide a suitable number of youth hostels to accommodate young people, so that their dreams of having their homes in the city can be realized.

Furthermore, how can young people make money? They need money to pay property mortgage, they need money to pay rental to live in youth hostels. In fact, some young people in Hong Kong have insisted on doing creative work. Hong Kong should not be such a deplorable place where only the financial industry can survive. We still have a creative industry in which many people use their intellectual power to earn big money with little resources. Although these people have their workplaces, government officials often make lives difficult for them by requiring them to meet some requirements that can hardly be met. Such an outdated cultural and arts policy should be reviewed afresh. If the Secretary is committed in his work, he should visit members in the community and feel the ambience. He can attend a couple of concerts or visit premises in an industrial building to observe how artists produce ceramic artworks or other creative works. Then, the Secretary will understand the commitment of these people and consider giving them a chance by formulating a suitable policy which will help them give full play to their talents, so that their products will not only shine in Hong Kong, but in the international world. With this approach, the Secretary will be happy and he can also create a revolving door. After three revolving doors have been created, there will be hope for some of the young people concerned under today's discussion on the Appropriation Bill 2017.

However, while the Government intends to formulate a youth policy which brings hope, it has assigned the work to Secretary LAU Kong-wah who is hopeless. Is he committed in his work? After observing him for some time, I conclude that there is not even one single task which he has done well. Thus, my demand to reduce his emoluments is not a reckless deed, it is not directed against him personally, but it is well-grounded. I am not being so harsh as to
say that he has not performed well enough in the past and should have performed better. I am only saying that he has not said anything and has not done anything. His performance is so bad that I cannot expect him to do worse. How come such a Director of Bureau has the cheek to ask taxpayers for three months' emoluments amounting to $890,000? He can do so. His biggest strength is that he can still keep his synthetic smile even in the face of many rebukes.

While we cannot resolve the problems encountered by young people in cultural, arts and creativity, we have to face such a poor Director of Bureau, how can Hong Kong people stand such a situation? Thus, Deputy Chairman, I insist on proposing amendments to reduce the emoluments of some high-ranking officials and I believe Hong Kong people will not oppose. I insist on reducing LAU Kong-wah's emoluments. Thank you, Deputy Chairman.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki, do you wish to speak again?

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, as you can see, our senior officials under the accountability system, other than Secretary Stephen SUI, who is present ... He should listen to our debate anyway. Admittedly, Secretary WONG Kam-sing is also present, but he was wrong not to sit through the earlier session during which environmental issues were discussed. Still, Paul CHAN is the worst. He left after sitting here for just a little while. God knows where he went to. A change of government is right around the corner. Some Directors of Bureaux will be able to retain their posts, some will have to leave their posts, and some are waiting in suspense to see if they will be reappointed. It is perhaps because of this that their morale is extremely low. However, what Hong Kong people are concerned about is not their morale but whether they deserve their emoluments, or whether they should be paid such money.

Seeing that Secretary Stephen SUI is present, I would like to talk about manpower and labour policies first. I am very disappointed that he was absent from the Panel on Manpower's meeting on the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge ("HZMB") yesterday. HZMB is now dubbed the "Bridge of No Return". Thousands of workers who work there every day are worried that they may lose their lives at HZMB anytime.
Since the first fatal accident occurred at HZMB in 2012, the HZMB project has claimed the lives of over 10 workers. After each of these fatal accidents, there was a period of peace, but such a period was invariably followed by the death of another worker. What the authorities did was like closing the stable door after the horse had bolted. After the Labour Department, the Highways Department and the Development Bureau put on a "big show" by sending officers to the scene for inspection, things remained as they were, and accidents resulting in the deaths of workers happened again.

On 25 October 2012, an accident occurred in a large steel cell on a site of HZMB, leaving 1 worker dead and 14 injured, after which the works there were once suspended. On 19 October 2014, a bridge module at Scenic Hill collapsed, leaving 1 worker dead and 4 injured; the authorities issued four suspension notices. On 7 April 2015, near a pier at the "Bridge of No Return", a subcontractor died after being hit by a falling object while he was operating a crane to work against the clock for the construction of the HZMB Boundary Crossing Facilities; the authorities put on a "big show" by issuing four suspension notices. It was not long before history repeated itself. On 27 October 2015, a worker died after being struck by a metal cage containing oxy-acetylene cylinders; the authorities again put on a "big show" by issuing four suspension notices. On 23 April 2016, an imported worker working on the HZMB artificial island fell into the sea and died; the authorities issued two suspension notices.

On 29 March 2017, there was another accident, in which the safety belts of the workers involved were found to be hooked to a work platform. How could such an absurd incident occur? Were there not many labour officers and safety officers responsible for monitoring site safety? As it transpired, they only went through the motions of checking the documentation. Two workers died in this accident. Once again, the authorities put on a "big show", but this time around they issued as many as 20 suspension notices, probably in response to the bitter criticisms levelled at them. Do you think that was the end of the saga? Just in this month, on 5 May to be exact, another accident occurred when a 36-year-old worker got an electric shock that mutilated his hands beyond recognition. It was the third industrial accident relating to HZMB in 38 days.

What penalties have the authorities meted out in respect of these accidents? The sum of the fines imposed on the whole HZMB project is less than $1 million, but the total funding for the project amounts to $115.7 billion. The contractors can certainly afford to pay $1 million in fines; they can afford 10 times or even 100 times that amount. Will they find it "painful" to pay the fines? Of course
not, because if there are cost overruns, applications can be made to the Finance Committee for supplementary provisions. It is not up to the Labour Department to decide these matters, since the whole project is for the Government and large consortia … Many of the large consortia participating in the project are Chinese state-owned enterprises, including China Harbour Engineering Company Limited ("CHEC"), China State Construction International Holdings Limited ("CSCI") and Chun Wo Development Holdings Limited ("Chun Wo"), which is owned as to about 50% by an Inner Mongolian consortium. Having obtained the project contracts, they are not afraid of the Government at all. They have obtained the contracts at low prices, and in the event of cost overruns, the Government will apply for supplementary provisions. Given that the contracts have been signed, they will not commence the works if the Government does not pay them. And if the project is delayed because of that, the Government will be reproached by the Mainland authorities. The National Development and Reform Commission once said arrogantly, "The bridge has been linked up to Hong Kong's door, but the works on the Hong Kong section have yet to be completed."

The current situation in Hong Kong is extremely awful. All parties are making money together—it is not that Hong Kong people are making money; but that Chinese consortia, Mainland property developers and certain consortia and rich people in Hong Kong are making money together. $115.7 billion? The amount will of course be more. Recently, the Government has, on the grounds of attaining its sports policy objectives, applied to this Council for an allocation of $31.8 billion to construct the Kai Tak Sports Park. The Labour Department will be busy. I wonder how many workers will die because of the Three-Runway System project, which is estimated to cost $141.5 billion. As for the project of constructing artificial islands in the central waters, which is very likely to be bulldozed through and carried out, it is estimated to cost $400 billion. Coveting these chunks of "fat pork", large consortia will have no regard whatsoever for labour rights and interests.

Two days ago, a worker who had been working 20 hours a day jumped off a building and died, leaving behind his wife and two kids. Hong Kong does not deserve to be called an affluent city. "689" LEUNG Chun-ying always brags about how well Hong Kong has been doing as a member of "Nylonkong"; as regards the Belt and Road Initiative and the development of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Bay Area, he pretends to be authoritative and keeps saying that Hong Kong should play a leading role in these areas. He is most adept at taking credit, but he pays no attention to serious incidents with fatalities. Why should he pay attention to them? He simply has no time to pay attention to them.
What we can see now is that public funds amounting to tens of billions of dollars or some $100 billion are being snatched or stolen from us and spent on meaningless "white elephant" projects, even at the cost of sacrificing the lives of Hong Kong people. What kind of labour policy is that? Who will fear the relevant legislation? The prosecution threshold is too high. Actually, everyone knows that those who stand to profit must be the big bosses of such consortia as CSCI, CHEC and Chun Wo. With layer upon layer of exploitation, how much money can subcontractors earn? Nonetheless, the ones who will be prosecuted are bound to be subcontractors at the bottom of the hierarchy. What options do they have? All they can do is carry out the project within the tender budget, and strive to work against the clock and reduce costs, because the more costs they can reduce, the more money they can earn. Will the authorities arrest WANG Yan, the Managing Director of CHEC, or the Chairman of CSCI? Of course not, for they are high-ranking Mainland officials. These people can continue to take as much money from Hong Kong as they like, and they may possibly be able to pocket $1 trillion or even $2 trillion.

Over the next decade or two, many construction projects will be carried out in Hong Kong, and they will definitely drain all the money from our public coffers. As these people are getting so much money, they ought to shoulder some responsibility. Assuming that the Government and those large consortia and Chinese builders have formed a coterie for sharing money, the Government should at least do something for grass-roots workers. But has it done so? Of course not. The Government is hopeless. What it has done for grass-roots workers is nothing to write home about, whether in terms of standard working hours, the minimum wage, or occupational safety currently under discussion.

I wish our legislation could empower the authorities to ferret out and settle accounts with those who have made the most money behind the scenes. In fact, some overseas countries have already enacted such legislation: depending on the specific requirements of such legislation, principal contractors may be held liable. However, such legislation will never be enacted in Hong Kong. At the meeting of the Panel on Manpower yesterday, Carlson CHAN put on a show, saying that the authorities were conducting a review and would take action after the review. If he could ferret out those who are pulling the strings behind the scenes and send them to prison, I would cut my head off for him. In the eyes of those people, the deaths of 10 workers are no big deal, as one can count them all on the 10 fingers of one's hands, and it does not matter if 10 more workers are dead, for the project has been funded to tune of some $100 billion, and hundreds of billions of dollars are waiting to be taken in the future. What has the Government stooped to now?
As announced by Secretary WONG Kam-sing earlier on, the Government and the two power companies have entered into new Scheme of Control Agreements with a term of 15 years; in other words, these two large consortia will be able to make easy money for 15 years. Please stop pushing Hong Kong towards inferiority!

The sports and cultural policies of Hong Kong are really mind-boggling. Our sports policy is another gold mine. A site originally set aside for building indoor games halls and ball courts has ended up being turned into a "mega event" product that comprises a 60 000 sq ft dining arcade. The Government intends to give $30-odd billion as a gift to large consortia and, for fear that they might not submit tenders, proposes to provide each unsuccessful tenderer with $60 million. To put it bluntly, this is hush money—the Government has probably decided on a particular tenderer; if this money is not offered to the other tenderers, they simply will not participate in the tender exercise because they know pretty well that the Government is being unfair. In doing so, the Government will be squandering people's hard-earned money.

Yesterday, a large consortium purchased a prime site for some $23 billion. Do you think this is a huge amount? This is barely comparable to one fifth of the funding for the HZMB project. How can it be called a prime site? A mere $20-odd billion is not even enough to cover the cost of constructing the Kai Tak Sports Park. At present, a lot of infrastructure projects are still waiting to be funded. What is more ridiculous is that the Government has proposed to spend $20 billion to $30 billion building an environmentally friendly monorail, while such an idea has been rejected by the rest of the world. Any project introduced in the name of environmental protection or sports development can be a "rip-off".

Also, on the cultural front, the West Kowloon Cultural District ("WKCD") has become an "independent kingdom". When Henry TANG applied to the Legislative Council for an allocation of $20-odd billion for the WKCD project, he asserted that $20-odd billion was enough and that the Government would never apply for any supplementary provision for the project. Now, as he had left the Government, he does not have to take care of this matter anymore. Currently, the Government intends to give land worth over $100 billion as a gift to the consortia concerned; in the future, its senior officials will change jobs and join those consortia, taking up key positions such as chief executive officers and making money together. Directors of Bureaux serving under the accountability system do not have to worry about their retirement life, as they may move on to greener pastures where there are many good jobs with annual salaries of over $10 million for them to choose from.
What can the general public say? The legislature has become a tool of the Government. At meetings of the Public Works Subcommittee and the Finance Committee, each Member has only four minutes, three minutes, two minutes or one minute to speak in each round of questions. So how many questions can Members ask? What questions can be asked? Regardless of what questions Members ask the Government, the Government always say in response, "Do not ask; just believe; believe the Government." What can we believe? This is utterly outrageous. Things contrary to the interests of Hong Kong happen in the Legislative Council every day. "Rip-off" projects and "life-threatening" projects are being introduced on all sorts of pretexts. Sports, culture and environmental protection have become the best name choices for projects designed to empty the public purse. The President of this Council—I am not talking about you; you are only the President's deputy—is even more anxious than the Government, and he has limited the debate time to 60 hours. It follows that the Government does not have to pay heed to Members' aspirations at all. As long as the Government manages to get through these 60 hours, the Appropriation Bill 2017 will certainly be passed. What kind of government is this? What kind of legislature is this? What kind of politics is this? Very soon, in less than 50 years, Hong Kong will find itself aligned with the Mainland, and all kinds of shady dealings marked by unfairness, injustice, corruption, bribery or pork-barrelling will gradually emerge in Hong Kong, but the masses and grass-roots workers will be out of luck.

I so submit.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr Fernando CHEUNG, do you wish to speak again?

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): First of all, I will mainly speak on "Head 90—Labour Department" ("LD") concerning the part on manpower resources.

Dr KWOK Ka-ki spent a lot of time talking about the issue of work injuries and industrial safety of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge ("HZMB") project, which was discussed at the meeting of the Panel on Manpower held yesterday. In fact, with regard to the HZMB project and the overall industrial safety, we have been requesting LD to admit that our industrial safety performance is not very good when compared with the present world standard. The HZMB project
alone had cost the lives of 10 people and record shows that more than 600 workers were injured, which have indeed revealed a lot of problems. However, yesterday, in response to my question about improvement measures and Members' questions about his views on the situation that workers' work safety has not been duly safeguarded given that the project had taken many lives and undermined the health of many workers, the Commissioner of Labour just kept stressing that the proportion of work-related injuries of the HZMB project was fairly good. Of course, he dared not say it was satisfactory but insisted that one accident or the loss of one life was too many. As regards the improvement measures, he said that the authorities would organize seminars, review international legislation and explore the possibility of imposing heavier penalties. Review of legislation and imposition of penalties are good suggestions, but it is uncertain when the work will be completed as there is no timetable at all. What he said are just empty words.

We had pointed out to the Finance Committee, the Public Works Subcommittee and the Panel on Development of the previous term of the Legislative Council that the HZMB project was very large in scale, but most of the contractors engaged had very poor track records. As pointed out by other Members earlier, the projects undertaken by China Harbour Engineering Company Limited in other places, such as Indonesia, Malaysia or Harbin in China, were highly unsatisfactory. There were incidents of collapse of bridges and accidents causing fatalities and injuries. Why did we still engage such a contractor? How come the weighing of industrial safety is only 3% whereas tender price is 60% in respect of the assessment criteria of the tender? How come Safety Supervisors or Officers monitoring industrial safety at the site are employed by and accountable only to the contractors? This is tantamount to conducting investigation by peers, thus there is a need to reform such a system.

How come we often discover cases of non-compliance in connection with the requirements of life jackets and safety belts for works over water? How come these problems still exist despite thousands of inspections conducted? There is nonetheless no answer to these questions. Reporters of HK01 once shot a film at the sea, which showed that most of the workers working over water did not wear lifejackets or hook their safety belts to a fixed anchorage; and there were no toe-boards when dismantling scaffolds. All requirements had not been complied with. The media was able to identify so many problems by paying only one visit to the sea, so there is no excuse at all.
And yet, Deputy Chairman, I do not want to focus my speech on the HZMB project alone. I am going to discuss the general labour issues in Hong Kong, and the most prominent problems are long working hours and low wages. Concerning the problem of long working hours, I think this is known to all. As highlighted in the study conducted by UBS last year, while the global average weekly working hours was 36.5, Hong Kong was 50, which was 38% higher than the global average. For Mumbai of India, which ranked second in the world, the average weekly working hours was 43.75, less than 44 hours. Since the establishment of the Standard Working Hours Committee in 2013, the issue of standard working hours has been discussed for four years, but so far no progress has been made. This is one of the labour issues that the current-term Government vowed to deal with, but it has been a total failure. The findings of UBS's study also found that while employees in Hong Kong enjoy 17 days of holidays on average, which are of course general holidays, employees in the rest of the world enjoy 23 days of holiday. The issue has been discussed for many years and we have requested the Government to align labour holidays and general holidays. At present, there are only 12 days of labour holidays but there are 17 days of general holidays. Many grass-roots workers have 5 days of general holidays less than general employees. Why is the Government so reluctant to align the holidays? Although the issue has been discussed for quite some time, the problem still remains unresolved.

Deputy Chairman, another issue is low wages. It was only until 1 May this year that the Government revised the minimum hourly wage upward from $32.5 to $34.5. Minimum wage was implemented in 2011 and is subject to review once every two years, but this two-year review cycle is not a common practice. Although not all countries have implemented minimum wage, countries which have implemented minimum wage are in the majority. For advanced countries or regions where minimum wage has not been implemented, people's wages are pretty high. Take Northern Europe as an example, wages are agreed by the Government, trade unions and business sector altogether and they are generally higher than those in countries or regions which have implemented minimum wage. Though we have been striving for many years, the minimum wage level is still $34.5 per hour at present.

Deputy Chairman, I have some data of last year. The hourly wage of Canada was about $73, the United Kingdom $81, the Netherlands about $88, Ireland $89, New Zealand $90, Belgium over $92, France about $98 and Australia about $116. The hourly wage of Hong Kong, however, was revised to
Hong Kong is an advanced city, and the above mentioned hourly wages are the figures of an entire country. Wages of individual cities are often higher than what I have just read out.

Compared with Australia, our wage level of $30-odd per hour is not even one third of its hourly wage, it is only about one fourth. Hong Kong people have good work ethics and are very willing to be self-reliant and work hard, but they have all along been exploited. At the meeting of the Panel on Manpower held yesterday, we learned that the median wage published recently is only $16,000, but it is already 4% higher than that of last year. This situation is uncommon as our median wage has remained unchanged for many years. Therefore, it is really amazing that the median wage has increased from $10,000-odd to $16,000 this time. And yet, frankly speaking, how can a person support his family with a wage of $16,000 nowadays? Even if he only has to support himself but not a family, expenditure on rent alone takes up a major part of his wage. In fact, the 90-percentile median wage is only $40,000. Hence, according to the median wage, half of Hong Kong's wage earners earn less than $16,000, how can they sustain a living? They even have difficulties in making ends meet, not to mention getting a roof over their heads.

Two days ago, I visited the hostel for street sleepers. A young man told me that he had a job, but still he could not afford to pay the rent. He said that he was left with no choice. He did not want to apply for Comprehensive Social Security Assistance, but what he earned from his job was not enough to pay for the rent, given that the rent of a subdivided unit was as high as $4,000 to $5,000. If he wanted to have a family, the rent of a unit that could accommodate an entire family might even cost more than $10,000. Therefore, the current labour market is already distorted. Although many efforts have been made to safeguard wages and working hours, we still lag behind others.

Now, I will talk about the offsetting arrangement of Mandatory Provident Fund ("MPF"), which is another issue that LEUNG Chun-ying pledged to tackle after he resumed office. And yet, so far, he has merely set the direction. At a special meeting held recently to discuss the Budget, the Secretary indicated that a proposal would be finalized before he left office. However, honestly speaking, is it possible to finalize a proposal in the remaining two months and then forge a consensus? It would be better to leave the issue to the next-term Government. Carrie LAM also has a view on this issue. When we met lately, she indicated that she was determined to address the offsetting issue. Let us wait and see what
the next-term Government will do. I nonetheless hope that the MPF offsetting arrangement, which runs contrary to the original intent of providing retirement protection, will really be abolished as this arrangement is absolutely unacceptable under the MPF Scheme. We are all aware that the purpose for setting up MPF is to provide retirement protection for all wage earners, but the offsetting arrangement has nothing to do with retirement protection at all.

The focus of the Secretary's speech on the Budget also covers foreign talent, importation of labour and the employment of ethnic minorities ("EM"). With regard to the employment of EM, the Secretary has frankly admitted that only two job centres of LD have employed staff who can communicate in EM languages and assist placement officers to find jobs for EM. Once again, the Government has missed the crux of the problem. At present, LD has recruited a number of Employment Services Ambassadors to work in job centres. They are only trainees of the Youth Employment and Training Programme who have to undergo six-month on-the-job training, after which they also become unemployed. It is therefore unrealistic to expect these young people to find jobs for EM. If we need to recruit staff, why don't we employ EM as placement officers?

There have been requests in the community that the Government should launch a job matching programme for EM so that they can enjoy specialized services. However, after considerable discussions, the so-called specialized counter is still unavailable. There is no specialized counter for EM in LD's job centres, nor is there any interpreter to help them.

As for foreign domestic helpers, it has been reported that they have very little protection and some of them have to live in toilets or at the back of the kitchens. The so-called guidelines can do nothing to help them face the exploitation of agencies.

Deputy Chairman, the 15-minute speaking time is insufficient because just for manpower alone, there are still plenty of issues that I have yet to touch on. I can only hope that the next-term Government can rectify these problems.

**DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, do you wish to speak again?
MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Deputy Chairman, this Council is now dealing with the sixth debate. Since I am the mover of the first Committee stage amendment in this debate, I have already spoken once. Although I have proposed 67 amendments on the Appropriation Bill this year and 45 of which are approved by the President, I can only speak twice on average in each debate, once at the beginning and once at the end of the debate. This is the second time that I speak in this debate.

In this debate, I have only proposed four amendments. However, in my first speech, though I spent 15 minutes discussing the estimated expenditure on printing assessment papers of the Territory-wide System Assessment ("TSA"), I still have not finished what I want to say. In this speech, I will focus on discussing the proposal to reduce the estimated expenditure on the celebration of the 20th Anniversary of the Establishment of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, but probably I will not have time to speak on the amendment regarding the Labour Department. I would like to tell the general public again, the President has only approved 185 amendments and given 60 hours for debates this time around. To be fair, members of the public who have been listening and watching the proceedings will agree with me that not much time has been spent on doing headcounts, even at this time when there are only three members in the Chamber. I do not even have enough time to speak on the amendments proposed by me; and I do not have the chance to explain why I support or oppose the amendments proposed by other Members, not to mention speaking to refute the arguments raised by Members who have not proposed amendments.

In this debate, some pro-establishment Members have spoken and I encourage them to speak. I remember Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan made a speech last week which I find him rather amusing. He asked why the pro-democracy Members only talked about TSA in the discussion on education problems as if it was the only issue in education. That is certainly not true. We want to discuss many education problems. Apart from TSA, we would also like to discuss issues about Secretary Eddie NG and the exchange activities conducted overseas or in the Mainland, and so on, but do we have enough time to do so? Under the meeting arrangement prescribed by the President, we do not even have the time to clearly explain the problems of TSA and rebut the nonsensical remarks of Eddie NG. Thus, if Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan thought that our discussion on education was not comprehensive in that we only talked
about TSA, he should side with us and ask the President to give us more speaking time. If Members can speak for an unlimited number of times, I believe our discussion on education problems will not only touch on TSA.

Next, I will rebut Secretary Eddie NG's remark made last week in response to Members' speeches. Secretary Eddie NG really likes making empty talks, making senseless arguments and refuting everything. Talking about duty visits, Eddie NG was called "Secretary of duty visit". Some Members have proposed amendments to reduce the estimated expenditure on his emoluments and I will certainly give my strongest support. Eddie NG is second only to the Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development in terms of the number of duty visits made. I am not saying that Directors of Bureaux cannot make duty visits and any Director of Bureau can do so, but does Eddie NG have to make so many duty visits? When compared with other Directors of Bureaux and with his predecessors, is it necessary for him to make so many duty visits?

Do Members know the reasons given by Eddie NG for making the duty visits? He said that if a duty visit was made by a Director of Bureau, the receiving organization would respond differently. For example, if an issue for discussion was proposed by the Director of Bureau, the other party would attach more importance to it. I certainly understand such a rationale. Secretary, if you, your secretary or your Political Assistant give me a call, the rate of my response will differ, right? Nonetheless, does it mean that everything should be done by the Director of Bureau? Is it necessary for him to visit all the countries concerned to establish a good rapport with the people, so that they will provide the necessary documents to him three days earlier? If the visits are made by civil servants, will the counterpart delay the provision of documents for a month? Certainly, it is not wrong to say that if the duty visit is made by a Director of Bureau, people will attach more importance. Luckily Eddie NG will not stay in his position in the next Government. Otherwise, when he implements schemes concerning the Belt and Road Initiative, he will have to visit all the Belt and Road countries one after another! After the proposal on the Hong Kong Scholarship for "Belt and Road" Students has been discussed at the meeting of the relevant panel, the authorities dare not submit the funding application to the Finance Committee for approval. Does it mean that Secretary Eddie NG has to visit all the countries concerned? Does the Secretary have to visit Kyrgyzstan, Azerbaijan and all the African countries concerned one after another to forge connectivity?
Furthermore, many Members mentioned the public hearing on TSA held recently by the Legislative Council. Secretary Eddie NG attended only one session and left to attend an event organized by a merchants association of Shantou or Shanwei, or a Chaoshan residents association. Certainly, Eddie NG defended why he only attended one session of the public hearing. He said that he had only reserved time to attend one session of the public hearing and he had another appointment afterwards. First of all, that was not the first time that the Legislative Council held a public hearing on TSA. As we all know, every time a public hearing is held on this topic, a host of organizations or individuals will request for attendance to voice their views. The Secretary should have reserved the whole evening for the public hearing and listen to the views of members of the public, parents and educational groups in support of or oppose TSA. However, Eddie NG only reserved time to attend one session, knowing very well that there was more than one session.

Another point made by Eddie NG is even more absurd. He said he had to attend an event organized by a merchants association to celebrate the reunification of Hong Kong. It would be justifiable if he had to attend the reunification celebration event organized by the education sector, but the event he attended was organized by a merchants association! He also claimed that his attendance at the event would facilitate the promotion of life planning of students as many representatives of merchants associations would also be present. He must be out of his mind! That is why Mr SHIU Ka-chun began his speech by saying that the Secretary's attendance would really help in promoting life planning, but that was the life planning of his life in his twilight years. By attending the event, the Secretary can get to know more people and meet representatives of merchants associations. Therefore, Members should definitely support all amendments to reduce the estimated expenditure on the emoluments of the Secretary for Education, whether it is to reduce his emoluments for one month, three months or one year.

(THE CHAIRMAN resumed the Chair)

Next, I am calling on Members to support Amendment No. 159 proposed by me to reduce the estimated expenditure on printing assessment papers of the Basic Competency Assessments ("BCA") amounting to $1.68 million. Will reducing the estimated expenditure on printing assessment papers stop the administration of BCA in June?
I propose this amendment to halt the implementation of BCA. Not all Primary Three students in Hong Kong were required to take the oral test held last time; they were chosen at random to take the test. However, all Primary Three students in Hong Kong have to participate in the written test to be conducted next month. Earlier, 35 Members signed a joint petition opposing the resumption of TSA or the administration of BCA. Our position is very clear, but some pro-establishment Members may back out now. Thus, when we went to the Tamar Central Government Offices last Monday to meet with Chief Secretary Matthew CHEUNG, only one pro-establishment Member, Mr Michael TIEN, joined us. Anyway, when Amendment No. 159 is put to vote later, I hope Members who had signed the joint petition demanding for abolishing or shelving Primary Three TSA or BCA will be present in the Chamber and support my amendment.

I propose this amendment to convey a clear message to the current-term Government, LEUNG Chun-ying's Government and Secretary Eddie NG, and to tell Carrie LAM clearly that I will support her in honouring her election pledge. That is what a genuine working relationship is all about. I support Carrie LAM's election pledge and will help her honour the pledge of postponing BCA for Primary Three students. I hope that parents and schools will see that Members of the Legislative Council have voted for the said purpose. The Chairman may say that even if Members seek to reduce an estimated expenditure of $1.68 million in respect of a certain subhead, the Government can still allocate funding from other sources for the same purpose. In other words, Members' amendments only serve to state their stance, while in the eyes of the Government, the amendments are only related to a sum of money. Moreover, the assessment papers have been set long ago, will it be possible that there is no money to pay the bill?

That is not the case. We hope that the Council will, after discussion, give a very clear message to schools and parents, that is, even though the Government sticks to its own way, even though this sunset government will not listen to public opinion and insist on resuming TSA or administering BCA, the Legislative Council has sided with the public and agreed that TSA/BCA should not be held this year. Why will this approach be effective? During our meeting with Chief Secretary Matthew CHEUNG on Monday, some Members already pointed out that the Government would not possibly accede to demand and took the initiative to abolish or stop BCA for it was unable to back down with grace. However, could the authorities convey a clear message to members of the public, Primary
Three students, parents, schools, teachers and school sponsoring bodies that no consequences would arise if they decided not to participate in the assessment? In other words, no reprisals would be taken, they would not be reproached or interrogated and they could consider on their own whether they would participate in the assessment.

During the meeting, the Chief Secretary and the Under Secretary for Education were not willing to make an open statement to that effect. What is the open statement presently made by the Government? It says that if parents have other views and consider that their children should not participate in the assessment, they may contact the schools. That is the statement made by the authorities. What will happen after the parents have contacted the schools? Will the authorities subjected them to reprisals or blacklist them? The authorities are silent on these questions. During the meeting, we asked the Chief Secretary and the Under Secretary to pledge that there would be no adverse consequences if the schools decided not to participate in the assessment. They were also unwilling to give such a promise and only said that they would discuss with the schools in question. In fact, there is a different kind of punishment, for the schools will be bombarded with questions. If someone claims that he thinks differently and asks to be exempted from the assessment, the authorities will fix him, counsel him and impose pressure on him while claiming that they are helping him to solve the problems, so to speak.

Nevertheless, if the Legislative Council passes this amendment, schools, teachers, groups and parents will be assured that the whole world and all Hong Kong people (including Members of the Legislative Council) do not support the assessment; and only a few education officials still insist on conducting the assessment for they cannot bear to tell others, in their own mouth, that the assessment will be cancelled after all. Hence, if we pass this amendment, it will help everyone.

Some government officials will disagree and say that many schools actually wish to participate in the assessment. I have told them not to play such a trick on me. If some schools wish to participate in the assessment, they are free to do so. Arrangements can be made for them to participate in the assessment twice or three times a year or even every month. That has nothing to do with me. In fact, many schools do not wish to participate in the assessment and we are now asking to give them a free choice.
Schools which are eager to participate in the assessment wish to have their standards assessed. What they are saying is that participating in the assessment is tantamount to receiving medical check-ups; they will be provided with the relevant service and after the check-ups, they will be provided with reports showing their strengths and weaknesses! Some Hong Kong people love getting petty advantages, and some parents consider the advantages of the assessment outweigh its disadvantages. They think that participating in the assessment is like getting medical check-ups for their children. Anyway, that is the analogy which they have drawn.

To me, that is certainly not the case. Receiving a medical check-up is painless, whereas participating in the assessment under the TSA or BCA system is painful. Some people have repeatedly said that the assessment is "painless" and "low-risk" and that "A small effort a day pays; it builds up your skills without drills". That is like reciting chants to hypnotize oneself. I mean Secretary Eddie NG is trying to hypnotize himself by saying "all will be well", "all will be well". Besides, he resorted to sophistry and said that last year, 50 schools were randomly chosen to participate in the assessment and this year, the scope of the pilot scheme would be extended to cover all schools instead of those chosen at random. My response is that if the authorities really want to conduct an experiment, they should respect the subjects to be examined. Even if samples should be taken, are the people chosen willing to participate in the experiment? If they feel pain in the process, they should have the right to refuse to take part in the experiment. I once drew analogy. The Nazi Germany *(The buzzer sounded)* … took samples from the people in this way back then.

**CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, please stop speaking.

**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): This debate has now come to a close.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will put to vote the amendments.

The order of voting on the amendments, their contents and objectives are set out in Appendix II to the Script. As Amendment Nos. 1, 18, 24, 28 and 52 have been moved, the relevant Members may not move these amendments again.

Among 185 amendments, there are certain amendments which are proposed by different Members but identical. After committee has voted on one of those amendments, no votes will be cast on the remaining amendment(s) with the same contents.

As Members have been provided with a table on the order of voting, which has set out the contents and objectives of the amendments, will movers please note that when they move amendments, they are only required to read out the wordings set out in the Script and the Amendment No. set out in table, and they need not read out the contents and objectives of the amendment.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No. 1.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 21 be reduced by $117,362,223 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 earlier on 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 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung and Mr SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr James TO and Mr KWONG Chun-yu did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Dr Helena WONG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting and Mr HUI Chi-fung did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 26 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 21 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 27 were present, 10 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.

MS STARRY LEE (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of the amendments to or clauses of the Appropriation Bill 2017, committee do proceed to each of such divisions immediately after the division bell has been rung for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Ms Starry LEE be passed.

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

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, how are you? It is a routine business to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute, why then why do I raise objection? First, many pro-establishment Members also find it tiring to run around in one minute. I do not make this up. At least half of the Members have complained to me that they are afraid of spraining their ankles while running to the toilet either on this side or on that side in a minute.
Chairman, I have not made things up. Once a Nepalese lady came to attend a hearing in the Legislative Council and she fell on the stairs. As the steps of the stairs are wide apart, I think it is inhumane to ask us to run back within one minute. Honestly speaking, now that you have "tailored the filibuster", we have ample time. Why not reasonably extend the one-minute time limit?

I recall that Mr CHAN Chi-chuen once demonstrated that he could run back in one minute. While Mr CHAN Chi-chuen can do so, it does not mean that Dr Elizabeth QUAT can do the same. I am not saying that she moves slowly but women take more time to use the toilet, otherwise there not be a queue outside the female toilet. Men do not have this problem. Hence, we have to be reasonable. To shorten the duration of the division bell to one minute can of course shorten the meeting time, but for the sake of the safety of 69 Members, excluding the Chairman … Honestly, there is another problem. Mr WONG Ting-kwong suffers from sleep apnoea, sometimes he will doze off. I am not humiliating him. I am only explaining to the television audience that Mr WONG dozes off during meetings because of his physical condition, not because he is lazy. Understand? I also suffer from sleep apnoea and I sometimes doze off too.

Being a Member of this Council is somehow insane. If we do not suffer from physical disabilities due to prolonged sitting, we might suffer from early psychosis as we did not realize that the document has been amended and still faxed it to other people, just like what Mr Holden CHOW has done. He must have been under great pressure. Hence, I urge all Members, including those from the pro-establishment camp, to support my opposition to this motion. As for how long the duration of the division bell should be, various political parties and groupings can ask the Chairman to suspend the meeting for five minutes, so that they can hold a meeting outside to decide whether it is more appropriate to extend the duration to one and a half minutes or two minutes.

Chairman, I understand your kind intention. You have taken great pains to save the meeting time of the Legislative Council. This year, you have come up with a new initiative and that is Members are only allowed to read out the Amendment No., just like the Mark Six Lottery. Chairman, while we cannot object to your decision, I must humbly draw your attention that our meetings are open to the public and members of the public will not look up our scripts and
papers on the Internet to see what we are voting for. Hence, if you do not allow Members to read out the contents of the amendments, you are in fact limiting the public's right to know.

As a matter of fact, it also goes against the principle all along upheld by the Legislative Council of being open to the public. Fellow Members, previously there was no live television broadcast of our meetings. It was only available much later. If I wanted to learn about the news concerning the former Legislative Council, I had to read *Wah Kiu Yat Po* because its reports were most detailed. When I was young, I liked to read the speeches and articles of Members such as NGAI Shiu-kit. I learnt much from his literary talent.

Later on, someone suggested broadcasting the meeting live on television to allow more people to know what the Legislative Council did and hence there was the live broadcast. In recent years, apart from live television broadcast, sign language interpretation is also available. As stated in the Bible, let those who cannot hear hear, let those who cannot see see and let the cripple walk. Hence, if we, for the sake of speeding up the operation of this Council, go against the fine tradition of this Council of being open to the public to hold the Government more accountable, I consider it unwise to do so.

Of course there are different levels of wisdom. I hope that the Chairman will withdraw the decision after hearing my humble representation. Otherwise, we will be strongly censured by members of the public as they will query the functions of this Council. If Members are only allowed to read out the numbers 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, one may wonder if it is the Mark Six Lottery. It should not be so. Fellow Members of the pro-establishment camp, I know that someone is coordinating your voting, but you have to voice out your views even on trivial matters. Otherwise, the performance of this Council will just continue to deteriorate. I do not think that the Chairman does a poor job in management and allows Members to waste the time. What is the problem then? The problem is that, to a great extent, we do not have enough time to put questions to the Government, which deprives us of the chance to hold it accountable, and as a result, our time is wasted.

The Government should lobby Members, especially pro-establishment Members, and speak to their "class monitor", "vice class monitor" or others, so as to coordinating the rest time of Members. It should make greater efforts and
spend more time to lobby Members of this Council, including those who pretend to be convinced, such as Mr LAU Kwok-fan. Where is Mr LAU Kwok-fan now? Mr LAU Kwok-fan is very brave today …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, committee is now debating on the issue about the duration of the division bell. You have digressed from the question for some time now. Please speak on the subject.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): I consider that the duration of the division bell is related to the well-established operation of this Council. I think that the one-minute ringing time will expose Members to mental pressure and cause behavioural disorder, such as handing documents that have been revised to other people or making mistakes in their voting. All such actions should not have happened. Chairman, such incidents did happen before, such as the anecdote of the so-called 8:28 voting result. What happened then was at the very last minute, some Members requested an extension of the division time but was rejected by the then President Mr Jasper TSANG. He said that the bell had been rung, and he could do nothing about it. If President Jasper TSANG had your wisdom today, the outcome would be very different. If he allowed Members to wait one more minute, the voting result of 8:28 would not have happened, right? Fellow pro-establishment Members, I only do this for your sake, not for my sake. I will never make mistakes because I act with "one heart, one mind" and do as I say.

Chairman, time and space are relative, according to EINSTEIN. When time is compressed, space will shrink. This Chamber is a solemn place and we must be serious and cannot act perfunctorily. If ringing the division bell for one minute will be detrimental to Members' physical and mental well-being, so much so that it will distort Members' original voting intent, then I think I have the responsibility to fight against this harsh policy. Is this a harsh policy? Members can ponder upon it. Members of the pro-establishment camp, please stop murmuring in the lift, stop murmuring in the cafeteria and stop murmuring in the ante-chamber. Please stop complaining to me that you do not have enough time to go to the toilet in one minute, and wish that the bell will not be rung any more.
Fellow Members, be brave. Today is the time for us to determine our own fate. When you oppose the ringing of the division bell for a minute, you can open the door to heaven. The road to hell is very narrow, right? Hence, I hope that everyone will agree with me. Various political parties and groupings can later spend 10 minutes to conduct a political consultation to decide whether the division bell should be rung for one minute, one and a half minutes, two minutes or two and half minutes. This is the basic function of this Council. We should vote according to our conscience, our needs and our responsibility towards our voters. Thank you, Chairman.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I oppose Ms Starry LEE’s motion that seeks to shorten the division time from five minutes to one minute, and I also do not agree to the theory of "toilet-going" put forward by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung just now. As a matter of fact, the Legislative Council of the last term had spent some time discussing this topic. Some new Members who had not participated in the discussion can do so later. The question at point was whether one minute was sufficient for one to finish his business in the toilet. Of course, by business, we meant urination, defecation was quite another story. I could finish in one minute, but Mr Michael TIEN complained that he had to conduct the urination business in two parts. Was it true? If urination needs to be done in two parts, it is a big problem. He clarified that the whole business consisted of two parts, urination and washing hands, and if he only had one minute, he did not have time to wash his hands. So, he had to urinate first, rush to the Chamber to vote and then wash his hands afterwards. This was what he said. I am not making it up. That was what he meant by finishing his business in two sessions, but he is not present today.

Frankly speaking, Members do not need to be present all the time for voting. There are 40 odd pro-establishment Members. Under good coordination, only 35 Members are required to be present in the Chamber to form a quorum. Hence, I do not want to spend time discussing the toilet business any more. You can decide which Members stay in the Chamber to vote and which Members can go to the toilet. What is the big deal for not voting for one or two amendments?

However, Chairman, this morning some reporters wanted to interview me at the microphone stand outside. They wanted me to draw a conclusion about the filibusters. I turned them down. Who would be interested in discussing
filibusters now? At present, what attracts most people's interest in Hong Kong is the farce involving "689" and Holden CHOW. People no longer care about whether the Budget will be passed as it will eventually be passed.

In fact, the true reason for my decline is that I cannot draw a conclusion on something that has never existed. But of course, even though I have not filibustered and I deny that I have filibustered, Members will still say I have filibustered when they speak later. I just want to tell the public that if I filibuster, I will not do it this way as I have not proposed an adjournment motion in accordance with Rule 40(4) of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") when the Council is in committee.

I know that the Chairman or Ms Starry LEE wish to save time by proposing to shorten the division time from five minutes to one minute. The consideration is based on the time factor. However, sometimes we must consider the relation between cause and effect—I am not talking about karma. For example, Chairman, you have come up with a new initiative this year, disallowing Members to read out the objective of their proposal to reduce, say $1,117,362,230, and they are only allowed to read out the Amendment No. The purpose is of course to save time. If the time saved by shortening the division time or disallowing Members to read out the contents of the amendments will be allocated for Members to hold more debates, we could discuss beforehand. For example, you can say: do not oppose shortening the duration time of the division bell from five minutes to one minute, and do not criticize me for only allowing you to read out the Amendment No., for the time saved will be allocated to you. If that was the case, I think it is negotiable.

However, that is not the case. Chairman, in this debate lasting 50-odd hours, the number of times for ringing the summoning bell has been greatly reduced and more Members have spoken. The situation of "Long Hair" speaking for the eighth time or "Slow Beat" speaking for the ninth time no longer happened. We have only spoken one to three times in each debate session. I recall that I spoke three times in one session only. Consequently, we do not have the chance to express our views on many amendments. If the Chairman told us earlier that the time saved would be used for Members to expound on their amendments, negotiations could certainly be held. But I am afraid that the time designated for Members to make representations at meetings of the Legislative Council and the Finance Committee is getting less and less. At the meeting of the Finance Committee, when we uttered something that was just slightly
irrelevant to the topic, the Chairman Mr CHAN Kin-por asked us to submit the amendments on the Commercial Crime Bureau before 12 o'clock. We need not amend RoP for the Chairman himself is RoP.

Just now, we said that each Member can only speak on one or less than one amendment and we do not have sufficient time to speak. How come we oppose your decision to shorten the division time from five minutes to one minute? As pointed out by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung just now, it is very mechanical simply to read out the Amendment No. I guess that next year, the Chairman may not even allow us to vote. He may just allow us to read out the Amendment No. and press the voting button, and then he will read out the voting result. What is the point of that? Do we read out the Amendment No. to be put to vote for the Mark Six Lottery? Owing to this rule, the entire voting procedure has become meaningless. Likewise, as the Chairman has limited our debate time, making it impossible for us to discuss many amendments, our proposed amendments have been criticized as frivolous and trivial, as well as not proposed for the purpose of discussion. Not that we do not want to discuss the amendments, we do not have time for discussion.

Therefore, back to the subject, later members of the public who hear or watch the proceedings of the Council may only hear Mr CHU Hoi-dick say, "I move Amendment No. 2 set out in Appendix II of the script". That will be the practice in the next 8 or 10 hours. If you do not change this decision, the audience must look up on the Internet the contents of Amendment No. 2 moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick. Then you have to give the audience five minutes to look up the information. If I ask you to find out what the contents of the amendment are, you may not even be able to do so, or Members may not know how to find the information. If I ask Members what Amendment No. 18 is about, of course you need not look it up because in any case, you will all mechanically press the button to vote against the amendment. For those who really want to get involved or observe the business of the Legislative Council, they have to make more efforts. As we want to make the Legislative Council more transparent, we have arranged the simultaneous interpretation services in three languages and also in sign language. We wish to arouse the interest of more members of the public in the Legislative Council meetings so as to increase their observation and involvement. But now we are only allowed to read out the Amendment No., and if members of the public wish to get involved, they should be given time to find out …
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, please speak on the motion on shortening the duration time of the division bell from five minutes to one minute.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Certainly, Chairman, but it seems that you have not listened to my speech. I have been speaking on the subject all the while.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I have been listening to your speech and have given you time to speak on my ruling, but I must remind you that the Chairman's ruling is not to be debated on.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): I am not challenging or debating on your ruling. I am just talking about the cause and effect. According to your ruling, we can only read out the Amendment No. If the public or Members wish to look up the contents of the amendments, they need time to do so, and one minute is not enough. It is just that simple.

During the debates in the past few days, at times only the Member who spoke and the Chairman were present in the Chamber, and most of the times, there were fewer than 10 or even fewer than 5 Members present. I wonder if Members were staying in their office. Some would say, "'Slow Beat', you don't have to request the ringing of the summoning bell. I am listening to your speeches in the office and I may respond to what you said." But if they have not been listening, which is a reasonable assumption, after the Amendment No. is read out, they have to find out the contents of the amendment or ask the colleagues about the contents, the current situation and whether they should support or oppose the amendment. This is a reasonable analysis. But of course some Members of this Council are impervious to reason. They do not need any information whatsoever, for they only press the button to vote against the amendments. Hence, if you allow Members to read out the contents of the amendment, as well, I may even support Ms Starry LEE's motion.

Finally, I wish to take this opportunity to air some views. While some Members think that we are wasting time to scrutinize the Budget, we consider that there is not enough time for scrutiny. The Chairman's role is to strike a balance. In the Government's view, it would be best if we are banned from
proposing any amendments, not even one, and the Council will not be in committee, all heads, schedules, etc., will stand part of the Bill … and then voting, good-bye. But it should not be like that.

No matter it is norm or anomaly, everything will continue to change. I believe that more Members will propose amendments and debate on them seriously in future. We have also set a good example this time. Sometimes, we agree among ourselves in private not to request headcounts. If someone wishes to speak, let him make good use of the time to speak, no matter he succumbs to the reality or whatever. To sum up, the time limit set by the Chairman is an objective restriction.

Lastly, we consider that the allocated debate time is insufficient. Later on when we come to the stage to vote on heads and schedules standing part of the Bill, we can continue to speak. I know that the pro-establishment Members will attack us at that stage, lest they would be considered to be helping us in filibustering. In fact, the issue of filibustering or not filibustering does not exist. I hope that Members will vote against Ms Starry LEE’s motion which seeks to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I speak in support of the remarks made by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung and oppose Ms Starry LEE’s motion.

I have two reasons. Firstly, I protest against your decision to shorten the duration of our debate on the Budget so that we do not have enough time to speak. Secondly, I want to make a sincere request on behalf of persons with disabilities and hearing impairment.

First of all, Chairman, with regard to this year's Budget, I have put forward a number of amendments. However, apart from these amendments, I also have strong views of and I am highly dissatisfied with various government services. Hence, I wish to take this opportunity to talk about my envisaged community and my vision for Hong Kong. And yet, since the time for discussion has been greatly shortened, I simply do not have a chance to speak again after I have spoken on my amendments. In order to save time, much of the precious time for debate has been sacrificed. I think Members are well aware of the voting result. We could have shared our envisaged community and carried out lobbying in the course of debate, but this valuable process has been shortened.
Chairman, you have also introduced a new initiative this year, asking Members only to read out the Amendment No. but not the contents or objective thereof. In that case, members of the public who have not been listening to our debate may not know the objective of an amendment, so I do not think this initiative merits support. Therefore, my first reason to oppose the motion is that the Chairman has, in an attempt to save time, caused the loss of a great deal of valuable discussion time and opportunities for exchanges.

As for the second reason, I sincerely hope that the duration of the division bell will remain at five minutes. Let me explain to Members the situation of persons with hearing impairment.

Due to the oath-taking case, I had approached some sign language experts of the Legislative Council and learnt about their grievances. Persons with hearing impairment are very interested in the debates of this Council, but since the tempo of our debates is very fast and Members are eloquent speakers, thus when translating Members' speeches into sign language, sign language interpreters have great difficulties to catch up with the tempo, and some of the contents may be missed out and render the translation inaccurate. When we speak, we pronounce a syllable very quickly, but sign language interpreters may need to use a number of hand gestures to express the relevant meaning.

Sign language interpreters sometimes need to interpret Members' speeches in a very condensed form. For example, for the term "Hong Kong Special Administrative Region", they may express it as "local government", "Hong Kong Government" or "Government". Hence, there is often a conversion of vocabulary. And yet, regardless of how condensed the expressions may become, the interpreter must make hand gestures very quickly in order to convey the full meaning. Another example is, the hand gesture for the word "Hong" of "Hong Kong" is very similar to that for the word "bread". For the word "bread", the hand gesture is hand down and then fingers open, but for the word "Hong" of "Hong Kong", the fingers spread open right away. Therefore, if the hand gestures are made too fast, persons with hearing impairment may only see a sign language interpreter making some movements but cannot accurately get what he is trying to convey, not to mention that the meaning has been greatly condensed. Therefore, no matter how hard the sign language interpreters work, the translation of speeches given at the Council meetings into sign language is futile and persons with hearing impairment are unable to understand our debate at meetings.
I understand that it would be rather impossible to expect Members to speak slower during debates so that sign language interpreters can have more time to do the translation. Also, many people will not endorse this practice. Therefore, given that we now have plenty of time during the voting process of amendments, why don't we try to synchronize with persons with hearing impairment and show our recognition of their needs? Let us take the first step to embrace and create a barrier-free society, so that we can synchronize the slowest with the fastest. Only in so doing can we manifest the spirit of a civilized and inclusive society.

Although the Chairman has decided that we can only read out the Amendment No., I still hope that after the division bell rings, Members will have five minutes to read out in full the contents of the amendments such that persons with hearing impairment, who have all along failed to catch up with the tempo of discussions at Council meetings or failed to hear or see our discussions, could at least have a chance to synchronize with us and consider the contents and objectives of the amendments altogether. Only in this way can we build a genuine inclusive society, which is also the underlying spirit of providing sign language interpretation during live television broadcast by the Legislative Council.

After all, the speaking time of this Budget debate has already been greatly reduced by the Chairman and we are now left with ample time, so why don't we synchronize with persons with hearing impairment to genuinely achieve the vision of a civilized society? I eagerly hope that the Chairman will take heed of my views. I so submit.

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): Chairman, speaking of whether the duration of the division bell should be five minutes or one minute, and, in particular, the urination issue brought up by the Honourable "Long Hair", I must tell Members some general knowledge and why his point is valid. All mammals, regardless of size and sex, take 21 seconds to urinate, give or take 13 seconds; that is to say, the average urination time for a mammal is 34 seconds. Just now I heard Mr CHAN Chi-chuen say that Mr Michael TIEN did not wash his hands after using the loo. This kind of bothers me. We also teach children that after using the loo, they should wash their hands before doing anything else. So, it is very unreasonable to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute.
Chairman, you have taken away a lot of time from the whole debate, thus making it impossible for Members to conduct the scrutiny and voting in a serious manner. Actually, there is no pressing need for you to do so. Some officials used to put on a show in public at times like this. Say, I would have expected Secretary Prof K C CHAN or Financial Secretary Paul CHAN to put on a show before the microphones, saying that Members should pass the Appropriation Bill 2017 as soon as possible, or else the Government would face a fiscal cliff, fail to pay salaries, and so on. Now, in cooperating with the Administration and setting a time limit of 60 hours for the whole debate, the Chairman has deprived the legislature of its important function to solemnly monitor the Government through its scrutiny of the Budget, which is one of the key functions of the Legislative Council under the Basic Law. This is shameful.

But then, anything can happen in an unjust legislature. As we all know, half of the seats in this Council are held by functional constituency Members, including pro-establishment and royalist Members. Therefore, any unreasonable things allowable under the provisions of the Rules of Procedure can happen, and these include the imposition of restrictions or limitations on Members' speeches. Many Members, even those proposing the Committee stage amendments had no chance to explain clearly why they had to propose them. This is all because of the unreasonable time limit.

When Jasper TSANG was the President, he allowed Members as much time as possible to debate, even to the extent of using holidays like Saturdays and Sundays. That was reasonable. Royalist or pro-establishment Members would definitely defend the Government and, more importantly, push for a time limit. But this should not be the only consideration. Jasper TSANG's approach was more appropriate in that he gave Members sufficient time to speak. I note that this year, many new Members have spoken enthusiastically, and many Members have delivered speeches with substance to justify many of the CSAs. In view of this, it is absolutely unacceptable for the Rules of Procedure to be continually exploited to restrict Members' speeches.

When it comes to the idea of shortening the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute, I think it would be more reasonable to make it two minutes, because I agree that sometimes Members do need to answer the call of nature, attend to other matters or receive phone calls. The total voting time will not be too long, as we have only 180-odd amendments to deal with. We will have enough time to vote by the end of May. In any event, this Budget will
be passed by our unjust legislature ultimately. Anyone who wishes to show his loyalty to the SAR Government and LEUNG Chun-ying can do so without being affected in any way. So this is much ado about nothing. It is very improper to restrict or further restrict Members' voting, which should be based on a full understanding of the CSAs. This is the first point.

Second, we have seen many pratfalls here before, some involving Members from the pro-democracy camp as well. As we all know, Members proposing the amendments are very clear about what they want to do, but pro-establishment Members do not think much about it, and more often than not, they only act on reflexes at meetings. However, there were occasions when their reflexes went wrong, and as a result, they voted against what they were to vote for, or voted for what they were to vote against. So in the end, when they are to vote for the Budget, it is possible that they may press the "No" button to vote against it, as this is the only button they have pressed in the previous stage. That will be a problem.

What I suggest can also help ensure that pro-establishment Members will not goof up. I believe Members still remember the goof that occurred the year before last. It was so shameful. I therefore suggest that Ms Starry LEE should consider the alternative of shortening the duration of the division bell from five minutes to three minutes, which is a more humane option. Quite a number of her fellow party members are of mature years and need a longer time to respond to their physiological needs. We ought to treat them better, lest any accident should happen and affect their health. Holding back urination for a long time is bad for health, and will lead to many complications.

In any case, we have done our best to make our voices heard. In my view, this is relevant to the well-being of pro-establishment Members. Regardless of whether the duration of the division bell is five minutes, one minute, two minutes or three minutes, this is absolutely relevant to their well-being. They are not disadvantaged, but under the oppression of "689", some of them have actually forgotten what they should say. To some extent, I do pity them. I think they can be called "the disadvantaged powers that be". My suggestion is that for the time being, we should perhaps consider shortening the duration of the division bell from five minutes to three minutes instead of one minute. This is a more reasonable option which will not affect the timing of the passage of the Budget, given that there is still plenty of time to go before 8:00 pm tomorrow. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung has mentioned that a Member is suffering from sleep
apnoea. I see that the Member is here. We are all concerned about his health, and we do not want him to have any accident. As a doctor, I very much hope to take care of Members' health. It does not matter whether one is suffering from sleep apnoea or a urination problem. I am just making a suggestion for Members' sake.

With these remarks, I oppose this motion.

DR CHIANG LAI-WAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, speaking of the urination issue, Dr KWOK Ka-ki really has to declare his interest as we all know what his specialty is.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung opposed the motion to shorten the duration of the division bell for the sake of the mobility and health of Members present. As the saying goes, one judges other people's feelings based on his own. In other words, people subjectively project what they perceive about one thing onto others. Mr LEUNG might oppose the shortening the duration of the division bell to one minute due to his personal reason which he would rather not say publicly. Perhaps it takes him longer than other people to go to the loo …

(Ms Claudia MO made an indication)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, please hold on. Ms Claudia MO, what is your point?

MS CLAUDIA MO (in Cantonese): I wish to raise a point of order. In my opinion, when Dr CHIANG claimed that "Long Hair" LEUNG Kwok-hung voiced his views based on his personal reason, she must be speculating on his motive. In addition, her remark was also insulting.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): It is not a point of order; and I do not consider Dr CHIANG's remark insulting.
MS CLAUDIA MO (in Cantonese): Why not?

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Ms MO, the relevant remark was not insulting. Please sit down. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, please continue with your speech.

DR CHIANG LAI-WAN (in Cantonese): My sympathy goes to Mr LEUNG who has personal reasons which he would rather not say publicly.

Chairman, if Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung has to go to the loo and he asks you for more time, I consider it necessary to take into account the need of individual Members. If necessary, the meeting may be suspended for a few minutes for all Members to wait for Mr LEUNG to return from the loo before we proceed to voting. I have no problem with that.

That said, to ensure the efficiency of the Council, I support Ms Starry LEE's motion to shorten the duration of division bell from five minutes to one minute. Thank you.

MS CLAUDIA MO (in Cantonese): Chairman, I truly hope that you could be a little fairer when you made your ruling. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan was apparently targeting one Member just now and she had speculated on his thought and motive, which I consider to be truly inappropriate. Although you have ruled out any offence or speculation, I still hope that my comments will be put on record.

Originally I did not intend to make this special speech, but I thought of what had often happened in the previous meetings of the Legislative Council. When I first became a Member of the Legislative Council in 2012, I lose my patience very easily. While the main replies of public officers have been set out in the documents placed on Members' desks, the officers sitting opposite just kept their eyes fixed on the documents and read out the contents, mumbling to themselves. On one or two occasions, I used to …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Ms Claudia MO, this is irrelevant to the motion to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute. Please focus on the motion in question when you speak.
MS CLAUDIA MO (in Cantonese): … What I am saying is related to the motion to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute. In order to save time, I suggested back then that we should proceed directly to the supplementary question-and-answer session, given that the relevant documents placed before us have rendered it unnecessary for public officers to read out the replies. Some former Presidents were really muddle-headed. They told me thoughtlessly that the usual practice was to ask public officers to speak. However, I could not remember which Member reminded me at that time, saying that although the relevant documents had been given to Members for reference, as meetings were broadcast live, some members of the public who had poorer eyesight might not see the whole screen clearly. They had to listen to the speech made by officials in order to understand the specifics of relevant items. His reminder had perfectly enlightened me. I immediately kept quiet and would only ask public officers to keep their speech concise since them.

Regarding the issue of saving the Council meeting time, I am most supportive of the argument put forward by Dr LAU Siu-lai just now. To enhance the engagement of Hong Kong people in Legislative Council affairs and politics, the contents of our debate must be easy to understand. Just imagine, when members of the public turn on the RTHK TV 32 channel to watch the live broadcast of Legislative Council meetings, they may not understand what Members are talking about from the beginning to the end.

I concur with a point made by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen or Dr LAU Siu-lai just now. I have proposed a total of two amendments which have both been approved by the President. I attach importance to these two amendments which involve issues of my real concern. Surely I will get annoyed if the Chairman does not allow me to read out the contents of my amendments later. My amendment reads: "Resolved that head 22 be reduced by $1,000,000 in respect of subhead 000 (reducing a sum roughly equivalent to the annual estimated expenditure of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department for euthanizing animals)". What is meant by euthanizing? In effect the authorities are destroying and killing the animals.

The Chairman does not allow Members to read out the contents of their amendments. By shortening the duration of the division bell to one minute, he is worried that some Members may take more than one minute to read out the contents of their amendments, and hence there is not sufficient time. I read out the contents of my amendment just now, which has proven that one minute is
sufficient. I also urge the Chairman to allow Members to read out the contents of their amendments. I do not see why Members are only allowed to read out the Amendment No. but not the contents thereof. In this way, how can the audience at home know about the contents? Is it likely that they have a copy of the amendments on their desk? Do they have to turn on their computer to see which amendments and the contents thereof are being discussed? Such attitude of the legislative organ in serving the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region is totally inappropriate.

In addition, I have also learnt that someone has proposed shortening the duration of the division bell on the ground that we do not actually have the intent to speak. I also protest against the violent, blatant abuse of power by the President by cutting short our speaking time. An unknown person accused us of only focusing on TSA when we discussed the issue of education. Even if I do not talk about TSA, I can still talk about many other issues, such as the failure of English-language teaching in Hong Kong. Students cannot even speak the most fundamental oral English. Another issue is the failure of our Chinese-language education. Does anyone still know how to write the Chinese characters of the idiom "克紹箕裘"(to follow in the footsteps of one's father)? Don't look it up on Google? What is its meaning? I would be surprised if someone knows it! As for using Putonghua to teach the Chinese Language subject, I have touched on this earlier but I did not have sufficient time. Furthermore, the drilling culture back in those years …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Ms Claudia MO, you have strayed from the question. Please focus on the motion to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute when you speak.

MS CLAUDIA MO (in Cantonese): Okay. In order to save time, the Chairman has all along refused to permit Members to speak as long as they wish, making it impossible for many topics to be discussed. As we have to wait for our turn to speak for 15 minutes at a time, after I have talked about Chinese-language and English-language teaching, I have to wait for another turn to speak again. As many Members have pressed the "Request to speak" button, the debate session has come to a close with many Members still waiting for their turn to speak for the first or second time.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Ms Claudia MO, let me remind you once again that you have strayed from the question. You should now focus your speech on the motion to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute, but not on other issues relating to this debate session.

MS CLAUDIA MO (in Cantonese): … the object of shortening the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute is to save time, but I find this idea totally unacceptable. To expedite the voting of various amendments, Members can only read out the Amendment No. hastily. I absolutely disagree with this practice. Members should be allowed to read out the contents of various amendments, and then be given a short break to take a breath.

Regarding the toilet issue, I am not going to discuss with you. I do not have a good understanding of the toilet culture, and I have little interest in it. Furthermore, I will not make fun of other people for their toileting routine. As a doctor, Dr KWOK Ka-ki has made his comments just now from a medical perspective. I do not see any problem with it at all. I also do not understand why the Chairman has not ruled that he has not strayed from the question. You obviously consider it inappropriate to discuss the toilet issue. Do you agree with this point?

I was only speculating on the thought and motive of the Chairman, which I know is likewise inappropriate. However, I really have to point out that the Chairman has absolutely no criteria to speak of. Period.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I wish to remind some new Members and senior Members who are still unclear about the relevant provisions. According to Rule 49(4) of the Rules of Procedure, Members may only move that the duration of division bell be shortened from five minutes to one minute in the event of division being claimed in respect of subsequent amendments. No other time frame options are set out under that rule. In addition, while Members have expressed many views on the practice of moving amendments, in fact senior Members should remember that Members who used to move various amendments were only required to read the wording as set out in the Script, such as "I move my amendment to amend the Schedule, as set out in the Appendix to the Script", and it is not necessary to read out the contents and objectives of the amendments.
This practice has been time-honoured, and it is nothing new. Hence, I hope that Members would not engage in further arguments here; and no debate may arise on the ruling I have made.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, you need not be irritated. At such an important voting stage of the Appropriation Bill 2017 ("the Bill"), we need to seek every chance to speak on all aspects of the problems; otherwise why should we become Members?

I would like to talk about the first reason why I oppose Ms Starry LEE's motion to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute. Regarding motions moved by us under paragraph 37A of the Finance Committee Procedure at the Finance Committee ("FC"), Mr CHAN Hak-kan is responsible for moving a motion to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute. In dealing with such a motion, I choose not to cast my vote in many cases, for I believe that the matter is no big deal. Motions moved under paragraph 37A of the Finance Committee Procedure merely serve to make clear our stand, and even if we press the wrong voting button, the worst consequence is being abused online. That is no big deal.

That said, do Members know what we are now voting on? These are amendments proposed to the Bill in accordance with Hong Kong laws and the Rules of Procedure of the Legislative Council that have legislative effect. In the case of Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's Amendment No. 1, which seeks to reduce head 21 by $117,362,223 in respect of subhead 000, so as to reduce the annual estimated operating expenses of the Chief Executive's Office to $777 …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, I have just explained that our well-established practice is that when Members move their amendments, they need not read out the contents and objectives of the amendments.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): I am not arguing with you over this point.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I have already told you about our well-established practice, and I have also made the point clear to Members.
MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): I am saying that …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Please speak on the motion to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute, as your speech just now has been totally irrelevant to the question.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): … I oppose the motion to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute, for the reason that the amendments to be put to vote are very serious and important and they have legislative effect. Among the 185 amendments, an amendment proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen especially warrants the attention of Honourable colleagues. That amendment seeks to deduct the estimated expenditure on printing the assessment papers of Primary Three Basic Competency Assessment ("BCA") Research Study. May I ask Members which amendment among the 185 amendments is the one proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen to abolish BCA? Members may not be able to give the right answer. If the duration of the division bell is shortened to one minute, Members will be thrown into disarray. They may immediately say in their WhatsApp groups: that is the amendment proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, but it may be too late for them to learn about the details of the amendment.

The amendments proposed to the Bill are different from motions moved under paragraph 37A of the Finance Committee Procedure. For the motion moved at FC to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute, I very often will not cast my vote for I believe that the motion is of no great significance. However, as regards the amendments today, the duration of the division bell must be maintained at five minutes, so that Members can, prior to casting their votes, learn about the details of each amendment, including the area it covers, the political significance and the actual effect to be produced. Since such amendments have legislative effect, we are unable to make our voting decisions within one minute.

Now I would like to talk about the second reason for opposing to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute. In the past, there were no constraints on Members' speeches during the Budget debate, but due to a decision made by former President Jasper TSANG in the last term of the
Legislative Council, he would cut off the filibuster at certain time during the debate and Members were no longer allowed to make further speeches. In the current term, the President no longer decides when to end the debate in the light of actual circumstances, but "tailors the filibuster" at the outset. I hope to draw the attention of members of the public, while Jasper TSANG cut off the filibuster in the past, the practice of "tailoring the filibuster" is adopted in the current term. "Tailoring the filibuster" is actually a change in modus operandi, as a time limit is set at the outset of the debate and Members can only speak during the prescribed time. Hence the significance of the debate has been greatly undermined. What are the reasons?

As regards the current term …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you have strayed from the question. Please speak on the subject concerned.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): I have not strayed from the question.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): You have actually strayed from the question.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): I would like to tell Members that …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, please speak on the subject concerned.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): I am about to speak on the subject, but you keep pressing me. As regards the debate in the current term of the Council, pro-establishment Members are even more inactive due to the "tailoring of the filibuster". We have seldom requested headcounts and have spoken enthusiastically, so I hope all Members will speak with enthusiasm.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, I would like to remind you again that if you continue to stray from the question in your speech, I must order you to stop speaking. Please speak on the subject concerned.

(Mr CHAN Chi-chuen stood up)

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I request a headcount, so that Mr CHU Hoi-dick can reorganize his ideas, lest he should stray from the question.

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 CHU Hoi-dick, please continue with your speech.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): I thank Mr CHAN Chi-chuen for giving me time to reorganize my ideas. While I was reorganizing my ideas, I inadvertently heard Mr WONG Ting-kwong's comment that we amused in making sickening remarks. I wonder why he considers our remarks sickening. If he believes that he needs to say something in the debate, I hope he will join in the debate, for it is a Member's duty to do so.

I have just explained the second reason why I oppose shortening the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute. Regarding the Budget debate, the President has constantly sought to shorten its duration by various means, including limiting the duration of the debate, shortening the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute, and adopting an approach that is different from the past practice, that is, not allowing Members moving amendments to read out the contents of the amendments. Just now, a colleague checked for me the past records, I found that in the past, Members could choose to either read out the contents of the amendment or otherwise, but now they are forbidden to do so.
All in all, the President believes that he can improve the efficiency of the Council, but if he goes too far, quantitative change will lead to qualitative change. The result of qualitative change is that the Legislative Council will no longer be a Legislative Council, but a rubber stamp. If you seek to prohibit Members from speaking by various means, shorten the duration the division bell from five minutes to one minute, and forbid Members from reading out the contents of the amendments, the credibility of the Legislative Council in the eyes of the public will only drop continuously. This is actually a very serious problem. We cannot treat the issue in an isolated manner. Even if we treat the motion in an isolated manner, I still oppose shortening the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute. The reason is that serious amendments that have legislative effect are involved, and the division bell cannot be rung for just one minute, not to mention that there are also our physiological problems to be addressed.

The second point I would like to convey to members of the public is that we must not go too far. If we go too far, quantitative change will lead to qualitative change. In fact, members of the public still have a bit of respect for the Legislative Council although they are already very discontented with its composition. If pro-establishment Members continue to undertake "self-castration" in this manner, the overall credibility of the Council will be lost.

Third, I would like to lodge a protest against Mr LEUNG's decision. I am not debating with you over your decision not to allow us to read out the contents of the amendments. I am only saying that you have the right to make a new decision. When you made this decision, you probably failed to take into account the problem with sign language interpretation. I really want to tell you, even if you want to save time by shortening the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute, the meeting time will not be prolonged if we read out the contents of the amendments within one minute. I hope that pro-establishment Members will understand that we have to rectify the situation raised by someone about persons with hearing impairment not being able to understand details of the discussion if we only read out the Amendment No. This is the time to test whether we are able to correct our mistakes, and whether we will, after learning the new circumstances that have arisen, take them into consideration.

Lastly, as there will probably be a break in a moment, I very much hope that pro-establishment Members will take the opportunity to talk to Mr LEUNG during the break, and persuade him to consider the conditions of persons with
hearing impairment. Hence, even if the motion to shorten the duration of the ringing of the division bell from five minutes to one minute is passed, Members moving amendments are given the choice to read out the contents of the amendment in one minute. Thank you.

MR NATHAN LAW (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, I will also speak to oppose the motion on shortening the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute.

My opposition is based on a number of premises. First of all, the issues under discussion this time around are very serious and very important. Discussions on the Budget are discussions on the future expenditures of the Government. If our amendments are passed, they will be binding. Thus, every decision made by each Member by pressing the button has a very high "gold content" and it is very important. On this premise, we have to seriously discuss and pay heed to each amendment.

On this premise, I will put forward a few arguments in support of my opposition to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute. First, I think Members need time for consideration before making each important decision. As we all know, human beings are the wisest of all creatures. According to traditional Chinese philosophies, human beings are different from birds and animals in that we have benevolence, righteousness, propriety and knowledge; and knowledge means thinking. Here, I have to redress wrongs done to pro-establishment Members. I believe they are not necessarily voting machines and they will not necessarily only press the two buttons of "Present" and "Against". I believe they will attach importance to the Budget and the relevant discussions, and will consider the objectives and contents of each amendment.

We have proposed 100-odd amendments which is a large number. A normal person cannot possibly remember all the contents of these amendments, and it will be difficult for a Member to list his/her position on each amendment after reading the contents carefully. Any Member who can do so must be very diligent and he/she must expose his/her identity to win our commendation. On this premise, I believe Members need more time to consider the contents of each amendment and decide on their positions.
Different Members may consider an amendment from very different perspectives. While some perspectives may be very simple, others may be very complex. For example, Amendment No. 1 proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen seeks to reduce the annual operating expenditure for the Office of the Chief Executive to $777. What does the number "777" represent? Some may respond with a conditioned reflex and relate it to the number of votes obtained by Carrie LAM. That may be one interpretation. Another interpretation is that the number may relate to the Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's beliefs or the so-called "Illuminati", as speculated by some people. Others may think that the number is related to the Boeing 777, and the amendment seeks to reprimand Cathay Pacific. In fact, there may be many interpretations.

Thus, if we have to consider the contents of an amendment, different perspectives may be adopted. Since the amendments will actually have a binding effect—for example Amendment No. 1 seeks to reduce more than $100 million which is a huge amount—I think Members should be given more time to consider the amendments in detail, trying to understand them from different perspectives and then make a decision on their stance. That is the first reason why I oppose shortening the duration of the division bell. Simply put, the amendments are important in nature; have far reaching implications and great in number and Members may consider the amendments from different perspectives.

The second reason is that the practice of shortening the duration of the division bell may become a culture over time, misleading people into thinking that all Members of the Legislative Council are voting machines. The consequences will be very serious. As a student studying Cultural Studies, I understand that culture is the behaviour of a person in his daily life. The behaviour of Members or certain traditions established in the Legislative Council will internalize as a culture of the legislature and affect the ideology of Members, and even their perception of the world. Why do I think that shortening the duration of the division bell to one minute will give people such an impression? According to my argument presented earlier, if Members use one minute to read out an amendment and then decide on how they should vote, objectively people will have a strong impression that Members' decisions are not based on comprehensive deliberations and rational thinking.
As such, can we reasonably infer that Members of a certain political party have a predetermined voting position on all the amendments? That is, will they definitely vote for or against the amendments, or abstain from voting? If so, the public will wonder whether these Members have formed into an alliance and they will only press buttons at meetings instead of making decisions after giving due consideration. As I said earlier, shortening the duration of the division bell will give the public an impression that Members are voting machines; they have predetermined voting positions and have no intention to discuss each amendment comprehensively and thoroughly before reaching a conclusion after careful thoughts. This will give people an impression that there is a great discrepancy between the image of the Legislative Council and its nature. When discussing any motion, Members should not base the discussion only on their own political positions, but also on justifications and facts. If a motion concerns a livelihood issue, the discussion should also be based on consensus fostered among different parties. Take TSA as an example. In fact, some pro-establishment Members may actually support reducing the estimated expenditures concerned. Should we give these Members more time to consolidate their understanding of the relevant motions and their contents?

I hope that Members will not merely have one established position and will not always press the same button. This will create a wrong impression that Members will have sufficient time to vote without thinking in one minute, hence no problem will arise by shortening the duration of the division bell to one minute. As we are well aware, the reputation of the Legislative Council and the public's trust in it are falling. If Members continue to adopt a perfunctory attitude or the attitude of Mr Almost Good Enough in handling the important motions before us, they will leave a bad impression on members of the public.

I do not hope that the tradition of shortening the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute will mislead people into thinking that Members of the Legislative Council are merely voting machines without any thoughts, and subsequently, a social culture is formed thereby people would consider that all Members of the Legislative Council have such attributes. For this reason, I oppose the proposal to shorten the duration of the division bell.

Third, many Members said that shortening the duration of the division bell would save time. I cannot but ask: Why is it necessary to save time? I think that is a very good question. As stated by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, it will be
meaningful if the time saved will be allocated to Members for debates. We can then truly perform our responsibilities as Members of the Legislative Council, namely, deliberating and debating on different subjects and discussing controversial issues on which Members and the public have various views. If the time saved will be used for this purpose, it will be very worthwhile. However, if the time saved will be used for other purposes, such as allowing Mr WONG Ting-kwong to take a nap when he feels tired, or allowing Members to return to their offices to read other documents or return home for rest, should this practice be encouraged then?

Mr LEUNG, I believe you also understand that many other Members spend very little time in the Legislative Council. When we spoke many times in debates of the Budget, argued on various controversial social issues and debated at meetings of different Panels, many Members did not attend the meetings, maybe for reasons that they considered such deeds not very useful, or they just wanted to save time. Nevertheless, such a decision may not bring benefits to the public; the Legislative Council may not consequently perform its functions better and it may not more effectively perform its duties entrusted to it by the electorates and the people. Instead, some Members may have more time for taking rest or doing other things not related to the business of the Legislative Council.

If Members have studied Economics, they will know what "opportunity cost" is. When we make a choice, of the items foregone by us, the one with the highest value is called opportunity cost. We must consider this point in making every decision. If we are scrutinizing a funding application for $1 billion, we have to consider whether there are other alternatives which allow the money to be used for better purposes, e.g. providing better value for money or increasing public revenue. With this approach, we will know if we should pick the other alternatives.

In the final analysis, I have to raise this question: Why is it necessary to save time? Why can't we perform our responsibilities as Members of the Legislative Council in a better way and deliberate in a better way; why do we have to shorten the duration of the division bell, and then take some actions that Members have no idea of them? We should learn from past mistakes. Is this approach really good for the electorates? Can this approach really help us perform our due responsibilities in the Legislative Council? I have great doubts about it.
Mr LEUNG, for the above mentioned reasons, I oppose to the motion of shortening the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute. I also hope that in the following procedure, apart from reading out the Amendment No., Members can also have the chance to read out the contents and objectives of each amendment for the benefit of the disabled, as an Honourable Member has suggested. That will not take a lot of time; instead, it will make the work of the Legislative Council more transparent.

I so submit.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I speak to oppose the motion to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute.

Voting on the Committee stage amendments proposed by Members in relation to the Budget is a serious matter. Members who propose the amendments have put a great deal of effort into their preparation. The Appropriation Bill 2017 ("the Bill") is an important legislation, and amendments proposed by Members on the Bill have legislative effect. Shortening the duration of the division bell to one minute arbitrarily will only lead to Members making their decisions hastily.

Surely, the Chairman may hold that Members already have ample time to consider their voting preferences during the debates of the Council. Although there are 180-odd amendments on the Bill—the 700-odd amendments originally proposed by Members were mostly rejected by the President—the Council has already spent many hours on the debates and hence, Members should have ample time to consider the matter. But is the theory valid? After all, there are 180-odd amendments which, legally speaking, have an impact on the Budget. It is difficult to say whether some Members will change their minds at the eleventh hour after considering certain factors or new information.

The proposal to shorten the voting time from five minutes to one minute is disrespect for these amendments. Why do Members propose the amendments? As a matter of fact, Members are bound by many restrictions when proposing amendments in Council. We can only propose amendments to reduce but not to increase public expenditure. Members still insist on proposing these
amendments even under such a major restriction because it is our way of protest, that is, our way of protesting against the Budget, against specific public officials, against the unfairness of certain policies. We propose the amendments as a gesture of protest and to highlight the injustice and unfairness of the Budget as a whole. Hence, we hope that when the amendments are put to vote in Council, members of the public will understand clearly the good reasons for proposing amendments to, say, reduce the estimated expenditure on the remunerations of specific Directors of Bureaux, heads of departments or public officials, or reduce the funding provision for the Central Policy Unit, or any other items, as I mentioned yesterday. Thus I absolutely disagree that the voting time should be shortened arbitrarily.

Chairman, when Members move the amendments, it actually takes less than one minute for them to read out the contents and objectives thereof. But just now, you do not allow Members to do so, which is totally unjustified. As mentioned by some Members a moment ago, it is important to read out the objectives of the amendments for the hearing impaired or even for all the people of Hong Kong. If a Member just mentions a certain head or subhead, those people will have no idea what the amendment is about. In other words, they will not know why the Member moves the said amendment or what the specific contents are. They will be completely clueless about the amendments. In my opinion, the Chairman's decision of not allowing Members to read out the contents and objectives of the amendments is, firstly, a departure from past practices because all along, Members are allowed to do so; and secondly, disrespect for the amendments. That is why I insist that sufficient time should be allocated for voting on the amendments.

Members propose amendments to reduce various estimated expenditures so that people will know how ridiculous the Budget is, and how many livelihood items have not been given sufficient resources. The Government has turned a blind eye to meeting public demands on health care services, education, housing and social services, to caring for the disadvantaged in society, as well as to responding to various demands arising from the wealth gap and an ageing population. Yet, it has no qualms about allocating tens and even hundreds of billions of dollars in the Budget to "white elephant" projects. Whenever proposals on resource allocation (the Budget in particular) are discussed by the Council, Members will find that the Government has no idea about properly utilizing the revenue it receives from taxation. Its only tactic is to give tax rebates to the rich, for example, the rebate of rates means giving money back to
property owners. In other words, the more property one owns, the more benefits he gets. It is the same with the rebate of salaries tax. For people like us who can afford to pay taxes, we expect the Government to use its resources properly, so that wealth can be redistributed in society through taxes.

It is natural for the law of the jungle and the wealth gap to prevail in a capitalist society. Thus the Government is duty-bound to make use of the opportunity presented by the budgets to solicit views from members of the public, and taking on board their views, especially the views of Members of the Legislative Council who are representatives of public opinions, the Government should reconsider the reallocation of social resources, including levying more taxes on the rich to provide additional resources for the needy.

The Government should allocate additional resources in areas which benefit the public in general, including the repair and maintenance of transport networks, environmental protection, as well as various areas of people-based services I just mentioned such as public health care, education, housing and social welfare. The Government should provide more resources to the disadvantaged groups in society and provide them with equal opportunities as well as support for their basic livelihood. But the reality is the exact opposite. The one-off relief measures proposed in the budgets often benefit big corporations and the rich, while the benefits to be enjoyed by the grass roots are just chickenfeed. I distinctly remember that when the former Chief Executive Donald TSANG was about to leave his office, he said that the trickle-down economics could no longer work, and he had deeply reflected on the matter after all these years. Chairman, our discussion on the Budget today is exactly meant to highlight these issues. Why then should the voting time of the amendments be shortened to one minute?

The time spent by Members in Council is money, and time is life as well. To me, five minutes is still the time of my life. So why am I willing to spend this amount of time in the Council? Why am I willing to spend my life this way? Why do we have to take the actions often criticized by pro-establishment Members, that is, deliberate filibustering, stalling the progress of the meeting, delaying the voting process, or even opposing the motion to shorten the voting time from five minutes to one minute, or seeking to adjourn the debate or the meeting, or requesting headcounts such that the summoning bell has to be rung to call Members back to the Chamber? Are we not spending our money and our lives to do those things? Why do we waste our money and our lives like that?
Chairman, I honestly think that such actions are wasting time and life. If there are other ways we can fight back, why would we make this most reluctant choice and waste our lives? Why do I not spend my life on other more meaningful pursuits? Why must I sit here and wait five minutes for voting of each amendment? Why do I not go home earlier to spend time with my daughters, write some articles or read a few good books? Why must we argue incessantly at the Establishment Subcommittee, the Public Works Subcommittee or the Finance Committee, and end up being criticized for filibustering? That is our way of protest and fighting back because the system as a whole is unjust, and the existing public policies and allocation of resources are unjust. Whenever our proposals are put to vote in the Council, they will always be vetoed because the establishment or the system itself will guarantee the defeat of Members who represent public opinions.

Procrastinating or filibustering as claimed by the pro-establishment camp, is our only choice. I also wish that the duration of the division bell could be shortened from five minutes to one minute because I do not want to sit here idling. Chairman, do you think it is good for us to remain seated for such a long period of time? What we do can cost us our health. Do you think it is a joke? You can ask taxi drivers or those workers who must sit for long periods of time whether their health has been affected or not. It can really impact our health seriously. I for one have developed kidney stones due to long hours of sitting, and when chairing a meeting, I even dare not drink any water. I always forget to drink or eat when working. That is true, and it is not something I want. But society is so full of injustice that we must speak out.

To be honest, given my teaching job at the university, I need not get involved in mud-slinging with the pro-establishment camp or opponents such as Mr Holden CHOW who is now the epitome of shamelessness. Why must we waste our time here? We are protesting with our own lives, so that we might get an opportunity for change, no matter how slim our odds are or even if it can cost us our health as well as the meaning of our lives.

We choose to do it perhaps because it is how some pro-democracy Members are born to be. We see how unjust and unfair our society is. As a social worker, my calling is to help the disadvantaged, and my mission is to fight for social justice. In this Council, I do not mind sitting four more minutes when each amendment is put to vote. I do not mind asking endless questions so that
the Government must face the public with the truth. That is how conflicts and absurdities in society could be revealed during debates in the Council. It is our responsibility as Members of the Legislative Council. We have the same responsibility so long as we are Members of the Legislative Council.

Chairman, recently, there is a video advertisement titled "The Last Five Minutes". It is about what people would do if the world should end in five minutes. I also want to know the answers of attending Members or public officials if they are faced with the same situation. Instead of shortening the voting time from five minutes to one minute, why don't we take time to consider how best our precious resources, time, money, public space, land and knowledge should be utilized to promote development in society, help the needy and improve the living standards for all the people, instead of just benefiting people with vested interests or protecting the rich and the powerful? We do not need any icing on the cake. If the Council can do more to provide timely assistance or if the public policies, legislation and budgets for resource allocation discussed by this Council can bring about social justice, we will be fulfilling our sacred responsibility as Members of the Legislative Council.

Chairman, I neither want to waste our lives nor sit here idling for four more minutes. When we insist on having these four more minutes, there is a price to pay. We insist on having these four more minutes as a gesture of protest. We insist on having these four more minutes because we want to show how ridiculous this Council is. I am aware that pro-establishment Members are helpless about having these four minutes imposed on them continuously, and they loathe us for that. Chairman, I also know very well that our side will lose when the motion is put to vote, and the voting time will be shortened to one minute. But pro-establishment Members must also pay a price for this one minute because members of the public will constantly be reminded that the Government's public policies and resource allocation proposals (including this Budget) are made against public opinion and only serve to widen the wealth gap by fueling the profiteering of rich people and big corporations. The Government is oppressing the people with this unfair political system constantly. I hope the people will remember this one minute. Those in power today should also remember this one minute for they must pay a price for it. I hope the new Government (The buzzer sounded) … will improve the situation.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr CHEUNG, please stop speaking immediately.

MR CHAN HAN-PAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, Dr Fernando CHEUNG is indeed formidable. He sublimates the time-wasting act of filibustering to a very high level, and that is, using his life to waste the time of Hong Kong and of the legislature. He puts it in a way as if he was the greatest person. He said he is a representative of public opinion, as if others are not. It is generally agreed that filibustering is a waste of time. He thinks what he is doing is the greatest and the most righteous; yet has he ever thought about how much time the legislature has wasted every year? It is the pan-democratic Members who keep wasting the time of Hong Kong people. Since he also admitted that such an act was meaningless, will he please do something meaningful? Oddly, he turns filibustering into such a meaningful thing and considers it the most important thing in life. No wonder the pan-democratic Members always engage in filibustering.

Basically, it can be said that today's filibustering has even exploited every excuse possible. We started the voting at around 1:30 pm, and the motion to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute was moved. It has been almost two hours since then, and some Members have been talking nonsense. Just now a Member said that we have to slow down our pace of speech because persons with hearing impairment cannot catch up. That is why she read out each word of the oath with a long pause between words when she subscribed her affirmation. All along, we have been speaking at this pace, can persons with hearing impairment not follow us? Do we have to adopt her pace of speech when she subscribed her affirmation, so that persons with hearing impairment can follow our arguments? I think this argument is totally deceitful.

Prior to voting in the Legislative Council, the bell will be rung for five minutes to summon all Members back to the Chamber. The voting will then be held for one minute. Basically, we shall all be seated by then, and we need not return to the Chamber from elsewhere. This is a standard practice which has been adopted all along, and it is not a new practice implemented this year. Just now the pan-democratic Members even said that they were worried about not having enough time to refer to the Agenda. Since we have been debating for so long and the Agenda has been placed on our tables, we should have a clear idea about which amendment is being voted on. How come there will be insufficient time to refer to the Agenda? Their argument only serves one purpose, and that is to waste the time of Hong Kong people by filibustering.
Several years ago, all the amendments that they had been filibustering were negatived by us. Why? That was because they sought to reduce the expenditure on firemen, payments of the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance, etc. They go wiser this year by mainly seeking to reduce the remunerations of public officers. There are amendments seeking to reduce the estimated expenditure for purchasing Dongjiang water. Without Dongjiang water, we will not even have drinking water later. Just now they were discussing the matter of responding to nature's call. If there were no water to drink, we simply do not have to bother with nature's call. They also seek to reduce the expenditure on litigation of the Department of Justice. As we all know, they do so for the Department of Justice is initiating prosecutions against them, so they hold a debate on shortening the duration of division bell from five minutes …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Han-pan, please focus your speech on the motion to shorten the duration of division bell from five minutes to one minute.

MR CHAN HAN-PAN (in Cantonese): … to one minute purely out of personal cause, and the purpose is to prolong the filibuster.

We all know the history of the legislature over the years, and the mode of voting has been adopted all along. When we return to the Chamber, there is no point we do not know which amendment is put to note. From around 3:00 pm till now, two-odd hours of taxpayers were wasted, and some hours of Dr Fernando CHEUNG's precious life were likewise gone. If he finds this act meaningless, he can actually not filibuster as what others do. Just take a look around. How many pan-democratic Members are now in this Chamber to take part in the filibuster? This game has been going on for years. Members of the public are basically very fed up, hoping that you will stop filibustering on shortening the duration of division bell from five minutes to one minute. A fellow Member, who is a medical practitioner, even said that … the urologist was just making irresponsible remarks. I have no idea why he would distort the culture and system of a parliamentary establishment with his professionalism. While I find such kind of doctor shameful, I also have a feeling of my helplessness. From the justifications they use to oppose the shortening of the
duration of division bell from five minutes to one minute, I can see that swindlers are just never short of tricks. I hope members of the public may be more discerning.

Chairman, I so submit.

MR LUK CHUNG-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I support the motion proposed by Ms Starry LEE to shorten the duration of the division bell to one minute for the rest of the divisions.

Of the different behavior of Members of the opposition camp, I appreciate the candidness and honesty of Dr Fernando CHEUNG for he admitted that he has been filibustering. Certain Members, however, took a dilatory approach and distorted the fact by claiming that they did so to help persons with hearing impairment. They have even spent a long time discussing the need to answer the call of nature. Honestly speaking, I find it very shameful to discuss "feces and urine" in this Chamber and Hong Kong people should feel ashamed of these people.

Certainly, the Legislative Council is not a rubber stamp and all subjects must be thoroughly discussed. In fact, the parliamentary system was designed for traditional British gentlemen. However, under the present political hooliganism, the Rules of Procedure have been exploited, and those who have distorted this Council are Members of the opposition camp who always stand on moral high ground.

Under the mechanism of this Council, Members should have sufficient time to discuss the Budget in various panels as well as maintain liaison with the Government both inside and outside the Council. Even for the Finance Committee, a number of special meetings had been conducted to discuss the Budget. Here, in this Council, the President has designated 60 hours for the discussion of the Budget, which I think is not a short period of time. There is no doubt that Hong Kong does have many problems, but it is impossible for Members to highlight all of them. I trust that Members should have different expertise and roles, so why can't we have a division of labour in respect of expressing our views? Chairman, why should the contents of our speeches be so repetitive? As a "novice" Member, I think the meaningless filibuster is merely killing the time and energy of everyone present at the meeting.
Concerning the deliberation standard, the key is actually to be concise and to the point. Regardless of whether a speech is in written or oral form, the standard is not determined by its length. A good speech must be concise, thus filibuster should only be the last resort when no other alternatives are available. Some people said that the injustices in society have prompted them to keep on fighting, and such injustices were attributable to the unfair parliamentary and election systems. Notwithstanding that, Members may still remember who voted down the constitutional reform proposal more than two years ago. It was the opposition camp that had deprived Hong Kong people of an opportunity to take one step forward and become more democratic, but they are now using the same reason to rationalize their filibuster. Isn't this ridiculous?

Even if Members have to filibuster, they should ascertain if the tactics deployed are effective. After filibustering for so many years, what have we achieved apart from wasting Members' time? Perhaps Members of the opposition camp do have a lot of time to spare and as there are cameras in this Chamber to enable live broadcast on YouTube and television, those Members have regarded this Chamber as a stage where they put on their best performance. However, for Members who are down-to-earth, be they returned by geographical constituencies from direct elections or by functional constituencies, they must go to the districts and liaise with the sectors to which they belong, so as to conduct studies, listen to views and address different cases. They should not spend hours sitting in this Chamber, listening to the nonsense remarks of some Members.

Chairman, I sometimes feel that I have let my electors and kaifongs down, because I do not have sufficient time to get in touch with the people as a result of filibustering. The work of Members is not to indulge in specious arguments in the Chamber, it is more important for them to be practical and realistic and listen to views. Filibustering will only make the executive-legislature relationship even more tense. Honestly speaking, as the new Chief Executive will resume office soon, don't we want to break the ice and reconcile? What is the point of launching filibustering on minor details at this moment? This shows that the opposition camp is not sincere about reconciliation and is seizing every opportunity to attack the Government by all means. The amendments which seek to reduce government expenditures are nothing but excuses to attack the Government, and such tactics have been proved unsuccessful. Although they have bumped into the wall time and again and failed, they keep bumping into the
wall, harder and harder each time. However, the door is just next to the wall. Why do they insist on bumping into the wall and keep burning our time and taxpayers' money by filibustering?

This Council still has a lot of agenda items to deal with. For example, yesterday, a Member queried why we always dealt with a bill in the same way instead of proposing an amendment bill. The Government replied that there was a long queue of agenda items pending to be handled by the Council. While this Council should have reasonable efficiency, it does not mean that Members can arbitrarily press the buttons. We should spend time improving the legislation and refining the policies, but not discussing whether the division bell should ring for one minute or five minutes.

I have deliberately avoided speaking on the Budget as I have already clearly stated my position. We wish that the next-term Government would do better, but we will definitely not resort to such an ineffective tactic of filibustering. I hope Members will bear this point in mind.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you as stated. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Dr Junius HO made an indication)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr Junius HO, do you wish to speak?

DR JUNIUS HO (in Cantonese): I specially want to right the wrongs in this solemn Chamber. My point is that pan-democratic Members are not totally without any justifications, only that the approach adopted by them has overshadowed their justifications, much to our regret. I believe voters who once voted for them must be likewise very disappointed.
At today's meeting, we debate and pass the Budget, actually this is not the first meeting for the said purpose. From October to now, members of the public have clearly witnessed, with discerning eyes, one farce after another in this Chamber. At this juncture, we have spent some 50 hours debating the Budget, and the cap set at 60 hours by the President on the duration of the debate also effectively reflects that we must strike a balance. Those who want to speak can speak as they like, as Members have spoken without interruption over the past 50 hours or so. The time has come for us to cast our votes, and the first motion aims to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute. This motion is only a routine practice, but pan-democratic Members are still making a last-ditch attempt to have their way; or to put it in another way, they still refuse to admit their failure. When the debate has come to an end, Members must calmly accept the conclusion, rather than making much ado about nothing, accusing Members of the pro-establishment camp as being rubber stamps as if only they are sensible while others are all stupid. Their superciliousness is disappointing and saddening.

They have joined the legislature in the name of the people and under the banner of democracy, but they only focus on wasting time. I no longer want to put the question on the whereabouts of Members on the other side of the Chamber, for I have already put such a question on various occasions. That said, I very much hope that Members can reason as they like and accept the outcome. Only by doing so can we demonstrate the spirit of democracy. Members should not be bad losers, and press on when their demand is not met, this is hegemony …

**CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): Dr Junius HO, please speak on the motion to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute.

**DR JUNIUS HO** (in Cantonese): Okay, I will speak on this motion. It is absolutely reasonable to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute. I hereby urge Members once again to note clearly that it is not the first time for us to propose today to shorten the duration of the division bell from five minutes to one minute. As we can all see, pan-democratic Members are merely filibustering, constantly making groundless, spurious and fallacious arguments. I hereby urge Members to steadfastly discharge their
duties, right the wrongs, break the stalemate and seek changes. The reason is that we have all been bored by the petty tricks they have resorted to in many cases.

Thank you. I so submit.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you as stated. 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 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden
CHOW, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted for the motion.

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted for the motion.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present, 20 were in favour of the motion and 1 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 26 were present, 16 were in favour of the motion and 10 against it. Since the question was agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I order that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of the amendments to or clauses of the Appropriation Bill 2017, committee do proceed to each of such divisions immediately after the division bell has been rung for one minute.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may now move Amendment No. 2.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 2 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: 
"That head 21 be reduced by $29,399,500 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick be passed.

Mr CHU Hoi-dick claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

(Mr CHU Hoi-dick read out the contents and objectives of the amendment in his seat)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you are not required to read out the contents and objectives of the amendment.

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 LEUNG Yiu-chung and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.
Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 26 were present, 12 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): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may now move Amendment No. 3.
MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 3 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 21 be reduced by $23,288,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick be passed.

Mr CHU Hoi-dick claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick 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 KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ning, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 27 were present, 13 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): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may now move Amendment No. 4.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 4 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 21 be reduced by $7,509,500 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick be passed.

Mr CHU Hoi-dick claimed a division.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick 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 KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 17 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 27 were present, 13 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 5.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 5 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 21 be reduced by $5,200,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

(Dr LAU Siu-lai read out the contents and objectives of the amendment in her seat)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Let me remind Members once again. As I stated earlier, when Members move an amendment, they are only required to read out the wordings set out in the Script and the Amendment No., and they need not read out the contents and objectives of the amendment.
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 KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 27 were present, 14 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): Mr WU Chi-wai, you may now move Amendment No. 6.

MR WU CHI-WAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 6 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 21 be reduced by $1,442,280 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WU Chi-wai be passed.

Mr WU Chi-wai claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WU Chi-wai 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 KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 28 were present, 15 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): Dr KWOK Ka-ki, you may now move Amendment No. 7.

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 7 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 21 be reduced by $1,345,280 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr KWOK Ka-ki be passed.

Dr KWOK Ka-ki claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki 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 KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 27 were present, 14 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): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may now move Amendment No. 8.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 8 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 21 be reduced by $1,244,000 in respect of subhead 000."
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick be passed.

Mr CHU Hoi-dick claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

(Mr CHU Hoi-dick read out the contents and objectives of the amendment in his seat)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, I have reminded Members time and again that when they move an amendment, they are only required to read out the wordings set out in the Script and the Amendment No., and they need not read out the contents and objectives of the amendment.

(Some Members spoke in their seats)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Members shall not speak in the Chamber except with the permission of the President.

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 SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Pierre CHAN and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.
Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 24 were present, 3 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 26 were present, 13 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): Mr KWONG Chun-yu, you may now move Amendment No. 9.
MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 9 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 21 be reduced by $1,190,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr KWONG Chun-yu be passed.

Mr KWONG Chun-yu claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr KWONG Chun-yu 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 SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 24 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 21 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 26 were present, 13 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 11.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 11 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 21 be reduced by $1,123,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

(Dr LAU Siu-lai read out the contents and objectives of the amendment in her seat)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai, I remind you once again that when you move an amendment, you are only required to read out the wordings set out in the Script and the Amendment No., and you need not read out the contents and objectives of the amendment.

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 SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 18 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 26 were present, 13 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 12.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 12 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 21 be reduced by $830,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

(Dr LAU Siu-lai read out the contents and objectives of the amendment in her seat)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai, I have reminded you time and again that when you move an amendment, you are only required to read out the wordings set out in the Script and the Amendment No. I hope you will follow my advice; if not, I will regard your conduct as grossly disorderly.

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 LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 25 were present, 3 were in favour of the amendment and 21 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 27 were present, 14 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): Dr KWOK Ka-ki, you may now move Amendment No. 13.

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 13 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 21 be reduced by $800,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr KWOK Ka-ki be passed.

Dr KWOK Ka-ki claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Pierre CHAN and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 25 were present, 4 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 27 were present, 14 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 14.

(Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung stood up)

**CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, what is your point?

**MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG** (in Cantonese): Chairman, I have a point of order. According to my experience as a Member of the Legislative Council for many years, the Chairman would only remind Members that they have to read out the wordings as set out in the Script when they have not done so. In the present case, a Member read out the contents of the amendment that she has moved as set out in the Script, but the Chairman regards such conduct as grossly disorderly. May I ask the Chairman and the Secretariat as to how I can perform the duty of a Legislative Council Member?

**CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): That is not a point of order. Please sit down.

**CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 14.

**DR LAU SIU-LAI** (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 14 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 21 be reduced by $440,00 in respect of subhead 000.")
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

(While the division bell was ringing, Dr LAU Siu-lai read out the contents and objectives of the amendment in her seat. Ms Starry LEE indicated her wish to raise a point of order)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Ms Starry LEE, what is your point?

MS STARRY LEE (in Cantonese): Chairman, the Honourable Member has time and again breached Rule 42(d) of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP"). Please enforce RoP.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai, I have reminded you time and again that when you move an amendment, you are only required to read out the wordings set out in the Script and the Amendment No. If you still do not follow my advice, I will regard your conduct as grossly disorderly and order you to leave 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.
Functional Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Pierre CHAN and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 24 were present, 4 were in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 26 were present, 14 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.

(Mr CHU Hoi-dick stood up)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, what is your point?

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I have a point of order. I wish to seek clarification from either Ms Starry LEE or yourself. Just now Ms LEE pointed out that the Honourable Member breached RoP 42 when she read out the contents of an amendment while the division bell was ringing for one minute. May I ask which rule of RoP 42 did the Honourable Member breach?

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Members shall not speak in the Chamber except with the permission of the President and they shall remain silent in their seats. That is an important rule. I have repeatedly warn some Members including Mr CHU that according to RoP 45(2), if the Chairman of a committee of the whole Council regards the conduct of a Member as grossly disorderly, he shall order the Member to withdraw immediately from the committee.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Is it RoP 42(d) that has been mentioned? Can Ms Starry LEE please clarify which rule of RoP did she say Dr LAU Siu-lai had breached?

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Regarding Dr LAU Siu-lai’s conduct, I have made it very clear that according to RoP 45(2), if the Chairman of a committee of the whole Council regards the conduct of a Member as grossly disorderly, he shall order the Member to withdraw immediately from the committee.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Which rule of RoP is actually referring to?

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): RoP 45(2).

(Mr CHAN Chi-chuen continued to seek clarification from the Chairman)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): As I said clearly, Members shall not speak in the Chamber except with the permission of the President.

(Mr CHU Hoi-dick continued to seek clarification from the Chairman)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I have made it clear that I shall order a Member whose conduct is grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the committee according to RoP 45(2).

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki, you may now move Amendment No. 15.

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 15 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 21 be reduced by $390,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr KWOK Ka-ki be passed.

Dr KWOK Ka-ki claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Pierre CHAN and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 25 were present, 4 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 26 were present, 13 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 16.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 16 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 21 be reduced by $266,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

(Dr LAU Siu-lai read out the contents and objectives of the amendment in her seat)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai, I have already reminded you time and again that when you move an amendment, you are only required to read out the wordings set out in the Script and the Amendment No. …

(Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung stood up to indicate a point of order)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, let me explain the relevant point of order first. Dr LAU Siu-lai, you have acted against my advice time and again. I now give you one last chance. Do not make me take actions that I may not be unwilling to take. For the sake of enforcing RoP, I will take actions if and when necessary. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, what is your point?
MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, according to RoP and the House Rules, Members …

(Some Members suggested that Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung raise his point of order after voting)

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 LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Mr Nathan LAW voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 25 were present, 3 were in favour of the amendment and 21 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 25 were present, 12 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, please continue with your point of order.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, in RoP, there is a specific rule governing the behaviour of Members during meetings of the Council, and the requirements are set out in subrules (a), (b), (c) and (d). As far as Dr LAU Siu-lai is concerned, there is nothing wrong with her attire. And she did not cross the floor of the Council or read newspapers, books or letters in the Chamber. So the provision concerned must be the last one, namely, "while a Member is speaking all other Members shall be silent and shall not make unseemly interruptions". After Dr LAU moved her amendment, was there any other Member speaking? If other Members were speaking, those Members were at fault. But she was just reading out the contents of her own amendment, and you forbade her to do so. In that case, you were at fault, not because you were interrupting her, but because you forbade her to read out the contents of the amendment.

Had it been the last President in the Chair, if I were to read out … If Dr LAU Siu-lai was reading out the contents of her amendment and other Members spoke to obstruct her, you should make a ruling in accordance with RoP 42(d). That is why I asked you a moment ago about your basis of enforcing RoP. And you said you could enforce RoP because you have the powers. But
that is wrong. Your basis should be RoP 42 which governs Members' behaviour. As a matter of fact, the behaviour of many Members is already unacceptable by the standard of this particular Rule. But I will not pursue because over the years, Members were allowed to eat or read other documents in the Chamber during filibusters. But if you insist on taking such actions, I will report the misbehaviour of other Members, like those who sleep or prick their noses in the Council.

I hold that you must have a reason for enforcing RoP, and we are not challenging your powers of enforcement. As far as subrules (a), (b), (c) and (d) of RoP 42 are concerned, if you insist on taking actions when Dr LAU Siu-lai has not breached any of those requirements, you can willfully evict any Member who does not follow your orders. Let me give an example. If you told me, "Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, LEUNG is not your surname.", and I replied, "No, LEUNG is my surname.", then you can say, "You refute me, so you must leave the Chamber immediately." You can very well take this action, right? But it is not how you should enforce RoP.

To be fair, your basis of enforcing RoP must be RoP 42 in relation to "Behaviour of Members during Meeting". But as Dr LAU Siu-lai has not breached any of the requirements under subrule (a), (b), (c) or (d), how can you come to the conclusion that you can exercise your powers in accordance with subrule (a), (b), (c) or (d) of RoP 42, as well as RoP 45(2)? I hold that you cannot do something like that. While I do not wish to confront you directly because we have been working together in the Council for a long time, the matter has now come to a critical point as you are about to evict her from the Chamber.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, I have already made myself very clear, and I have nothing to add. I have already given a clear explanation and have given Dr LAU Siu-lai the final warning. Surely I will be left with no choice if Dr LAU continues to do so. But I still hope that she can heed my advice and act as I have told her time and again, that is, she only needs to read out the Amendment No. when moving the amendment.

(Mr Andrew WAN stood up)
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Andrew WAN, what is your point?

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I hope you can apply the same standard and give a warning to Mr WONG Ting-kwong because he was yelling when you spoke just now.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 17.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, doesn't this Council need to discuss the point of order just raised by Mr Andrew WAN?

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I believe you have also heard Mr WONG Ting-kwong yelling a moment ago, haven't you? Chairman, are you going to apply the same standard to deal with his case? You should at least give him a warning.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I did not hear Mr WONG yelling. I will apply the same standard for all Members.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 17.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 17 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 21 be reduced by $128,470 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-yung, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 25 were present, 3 were in favour of the amendment and 21 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 26 were present, 13 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): I now suspend the meeting for 15 minutes.

4:12 pm

Meeting suspended.

5:21 pm

Committee then resumed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No. 18.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 22 be reduced by $22,700,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick earlier on be passed.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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): Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, have you cast your vote?

(Mr LAM Cheuk-ting indicated that he would not cast his 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr LAM Cheuk-ting 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, 7 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 19.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 19 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 22 be reduced by $3,000,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr LAM Cheuk-ting 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, 22 were present, 9 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): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may now move Amendment No. 20.
MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 20 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 22 be reduced by $1,500,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick be passed.

Mr CHU Hoi-dick claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting and Mr Andrew WAN, have you cast your votes?

(Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting and Mr Andrew WAN indicated that they would not cast their votes)

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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping,
Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-yung, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Andrew WAN, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting and Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 24 were present, 8 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): Ms Claudia MO, you may now move Amendment No. 21.
MS CLAUDIA MO (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 21 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 22 be reduced by $1,000,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Ms Claudia MO be passed.

Ms Claudia MO claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Ms Claudia MO 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung and Dr Pierre CHAN voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Andrew WAN and Mr LAM Cheuk-ting did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 24 were present, 8 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): Ms Claudia MO, you may now move Amendment No. 23.

MS CLAUDIA MO (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 23 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 22 be reduced by $900,000 in respect of subhead 000.")
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Ms Claudia MO be passed.

Ms Claudia MO claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Ms Claudia MO 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 24 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 22 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 23 were present, 8 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No. 24.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 25 be reduced by $658,000,000 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 earlier on be passed.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung and Dr Pierre CHAN voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 23 were present, 9 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): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may now move Amendment No. 25.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 25 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 25 be reduced by $12,607,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick be passed.

Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON
Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Andrew WAN, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting and Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 21 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 25 were present, 7 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may now move Amendment No. 26.
MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 26 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: 
"That head 25 be reduced by $2,417,500 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick be passed.

Mr Steven HO claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Steven HO 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 21 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 23 were present, 8 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 27.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 27 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 25 be reduced by $2,000,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung and Dr Pierre CHAN voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starrry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 24 were present, 9 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee will now proceed to deal with Amendment No. 28.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 26 be reduced by $540,647,000 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 earlier on be passed.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.
Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr WU Chi-wai and Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 24 were present, 7 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Jeremy TAM, you may now move Amendment No. 29.
MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 29 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 28 be reduced by $2,950,200 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr Jeremy TAM be passed.

Mr Jeremy TAM claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Jeremy TAM 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung and Dr Pierre CHAN voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr WU Chi-wai did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 24 were present, 8 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 31.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 31 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 30 be reduced by $78,890,000 in respect of subhead 118."
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Andrew WAN and Dr CHENG Chung-tai voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 3 were in favour of the amendment and 16 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 32.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 32 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 30 be reduced by $39,220,000 in respect of subhead 193.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, have you cast your vote?

(Mr CHU Hoi-dick indicated that he would not cast his 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung and Dr CHENG Chung-tai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.
Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 18 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 21 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 16 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): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may now move Amendment No. 33.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 33 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 33 be reduced by $125,192,400 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick be passed.

Mr CHU Hoi-dick claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 6 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): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may now move Amendment No. 34.
MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 34 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 33 be reduced by $18,550,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick be passed.

Mr CHU Hoi-dick claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 5 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may now move Amendment No. 35.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 35 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 33 be reduced by $6,650,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick be passed.

Mr CHU Hoi-dick claimed a division.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick 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 Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 20 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20
were present, 5 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may now move Amendment No. 36.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 36 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 33 be reduced by $1,816,100 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick be passed.

Mr CHU Hoi-dick claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick 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 SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.
Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 5 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 37.
MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 37 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 33 be reduced by $1,700,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen be passed.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 SHIU Ka-chun and Dr Pierre CHAN voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 18 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, 4 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 40.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 40 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 39 be reduced by $930,855,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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): Mr Alvin YEUNG, have you cast your vote?

(Mr Alvin YEUNG indicated that he would not cast his 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 SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr WONG Ting-kwong did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Alvin YEUNG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 18 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, 3 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 41.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 41 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 42 be reduced by $336,031,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Alvin YEUNG and Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 21 were present, 4 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 42.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 42 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 44 be reduced by $3,568,800 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

Mr Christopher CHEUNG abstained.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment, 18 against it and 1 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 21 were present, 6 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 43.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 43 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 46 be reduced by $777,000,000 in respect of subhead 014.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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): Mr CHAN Han-pan, have you cast your vote?

(Mr CHAN Han-pan cast his 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 SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.
Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung and Dr CHENG Chung-tai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Ms Tanya CHAN did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 44.
MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 44 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 46 be reduced by $1,500,000 in respect of subhead 028.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung has claimed 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 SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Ms Tanya CHAN did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 3 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 45.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 45 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 46 be reduced by $147,000,000 in respect of subhead 038.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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): Mr Martin LIAO, Dr LAU Siu-lai, Ms Tanya CHAN, have you cast your vote?

(Mr Martin LIAO cast his vote, Dr LAU Siu-lai and Ms Tanya CHAN indicated that they would not cast their votes)

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 LEUNG Yiu-chung and Mr SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung and Dr CHENG Chung-tai voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Ms Tanya CHAN and Dr LAU Siu-lai did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 46.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 46 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 46 be reduced by $1,444,000,000 in respect of subhead 040.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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): Mr Tommy CHEUNG, have you cast your vote?

(Mr Tommy CHEUNG cast his 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung and Mr SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr KWONG Chun-yu did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Ms Tanya CHAN did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 24 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 4 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 47.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 47 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 47 be reduced by $413,537,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Pierre CHAN and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Ms Tanya CHAN did not cast any vote.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 24 were present, 4 were in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, 4 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 48.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 48 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 49 be reduced by $3,176,141,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Ms Tanya CHAN did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 24 were present, 3 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, 4 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 49.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 49 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 49 be reduced by $121,908,000 in respect of subhead 661.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung and Mr SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok,
Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr KWONG Chun-yu did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Ms Tanya CHAN did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 4 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 50.
MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 50 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 51 be reduced by $132,370,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung and Mr SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr KWONG Chun-yu did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Ms Tanya CHAN did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, 5 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 51.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 51 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 51 be reduced by $2,557,200 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.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr KWONG Chun-yu did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Ms Tanya CHAN did not cast any vote.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 20 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, 5 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. 52.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 53 be reduced by $76,000,000 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 earlier on be passed.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.
Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 5 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 53.
DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 53 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 53 be reduced by $71,000,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai 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 SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 5 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): Mr SHIU Ka-chun, you may now move Amendment No. 54.

MR SHIU KA-CHUN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 54 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 53 be reduced by $58,700,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr SHIU Ka-chun be passed.

Mr SHIU Ka-chun claimed a division.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr SHIU Ka-chun 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 SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Pierre CHAN and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 3 were in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 5 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 55.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 55 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 53 be reduced by $41,000,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai 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 SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 5 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): Mr Nathan LAW, you may now move Amendment No. 56.
MR NATHAN LAW (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 56 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 53 be reduced by $2,920,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr Nathan LAW be passed.

Mr Nathan LAW claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Nathan LAW 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 SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Mr Nathan LAW voted for the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 17 were present, 4 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): Mr KWONG Chun-yu, you may now move Amendment No. 57.

MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 57 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 53 be reduced by $895,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr KWONG Chun-yu be passed.

Mr KWONG Chun-yu claimed a division.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr KWONG Chun-yu 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 SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Mr Nathan LAW voted for the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 17 were present, 5 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 59.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 59 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 55 be reduced by $84,016,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Mr Nathan LAW voted for the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 17 were present, 5 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 60.
MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 60 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 60 be reduced by $109,000,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Mr Nathan LAW voted for the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 23 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 20 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 5 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 61.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 61 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 62 be reduced by $300,000,000 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.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Mr Nathan LAW voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Ms Tanya CHAN and Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 4 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 62.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 62 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 70 be reduced by $133,000,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Mr Nathan LAW voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 5 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, you may now move Amendment No. 63.
MR LAM CHEUK-TING (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 63 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 72 be reduced by $797,250 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LAM Cheuk-ting be passed.

Mr LAM Cheuk-ting claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LAM Cheuk-ting 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Mr Nathan LAW voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

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, 21 were present, 6 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): As Mr CHU Hoi-dick is not present, committee will not deal with Amendment No. 64.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 65.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 65 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 74 be reduced by $67,000,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Mr Nathan LAW voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 21 were present, 7 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): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may now move Amendment No. 66.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 66 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 74 be reduced by $38,500,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick be passed.

Mr CHU Hoi-dick claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Mr Jeremy TAM voted for the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 17 were present, 6 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): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may now move Amendment No. 67.
MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 67 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 74 be reduced by $5,663,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick be passed.

Mr CHU Hoi-dick claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Dr CHENG Chung-tai voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 18 against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 5 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 68.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 68 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 76 be reduced by $1,285,044,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Dr CHENG Chung-tai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, 3 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 69.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 69 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 80 be reduced by $11,783,000 in respect of subhead 206.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Dr CHENG Chung-tai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan and Mr Jeremy TAM voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 17 against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 3 were in favour of the amendment 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 amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 70.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 70 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 82 be reduced by $1,034,454,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Dr CHENG Chung-tai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 17 were present, 3 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 71.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 71 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 90 be reduced by $1,221,894,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 17 were present, 5 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 72.
MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 72 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 90 be reduced by $29,000,000 in respect of subhead 700.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-yung, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung and Dr CHENG Chung-tai voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Nathan LAW abstained.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 17 were present, 3 were in favour of the amendment, 11 against it and 1 abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 73.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 73 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 91 be reduced by $1,880,030,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-yin, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 5 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 74.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 74 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 92 be reduced by $490,225,755 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, 5 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): Mr Nathan LAW, you may now move Amendment No. 75.

MR NATHAN LAW (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 75 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 92 be reduced by $15,791,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr Nathan LAW be passed.

Mr Nathan LAW claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Nathan LAW 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-yung, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Mr Nathan LAW voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 4 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): Mr Nathan LAW, you may now move Amendment No. 76.

MR NATHAN LAW (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 76 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 92 be reduced by $1,040,550 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr Nathan LAW be passed.

Mr Nathan LAW claimed a division.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Nathan LAW 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, 7 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): Dr KWOK Ka-ki, you may now move Amendment No. 77.

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 77 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 92 be reduced by $1,009,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr KWOK Ka-ki be passed.

Dr KWOK Ka-ki claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yen and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 6 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 78.
MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 78 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 92 be reduced by $329,120,000 in respect of subhead 234"
)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen be passed.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan and Mr Jeremy TAM voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 17 were present, 4 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 80.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 80 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 94 be reduced by $300,000,000 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.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan and Mr Jeremy TAM voted against the amendment.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 16 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 81.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 81 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 94 be reduced by $683,480,000 in respect of subhead 208.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Mr Jeremy TAM voted against the amendment.

Mr HUI Chi-fung did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 16 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 82.
MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 82 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 95 be reduced by $194,000,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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): Mr LAU Kwok-fan, have you cast your vote?

(Mr LAU Kwok-fan cast his 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yen and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr WU Chi-wai and Mr HUI Chi-fung 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, 21 were present, 6 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): Mr HUI Chi-fung, you may now move Amendment No. 83.

MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 83 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 95 be reduced by $106,830,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr HUI Chi-fung be passed.

Mr HUI Chi-fung claimed a division.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr HUI Chi-fung 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 James TO voted for the amendment.

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr HUI Chi-fung and Dr CHENG Chung-tai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 4 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 84.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 84 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 106 be reduced by $100,000,000 in respect of subhead 251.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr HUI Chi-fung and Mr Jeremy TAM 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, 3 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 85.
MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 85 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 106 be reduced by $592,500,000 in respect of subhead 284.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Andrew WAN did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 4 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 86.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 86 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 112 be reduced by $104,000 in respect of subhead 700."
)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 17 were present, 3 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 87.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 87 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 112 be reduced by $2,702,000 in respect of subhead 872.")

(Mr James TO stood up)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr James TO, what is your point?

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): This amendment seems to be related to the expenses reimbursements for Members of the Legislative Council under the head of expenditure relating to the Legislative Council Commission. As we are Members of the Legislative Council, I would like to ask whether a conflict of interest will be involved.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Under RoP 84(1A), in a committee of the whole Council, a Member shall withdraw when a vote is taken on a question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest except where his interest is in common with the rest of the population of Hong Kong or a sector thereof or his vote is given on a matter of government policy.
I note that as stated in Paragraph 40 of the Finance Committee Procedure, RoP 84 shall apply to the proceedings of the Finance Committee. It is also stated in Paragraph 41 of the Finance Committee Procedure that there are situations in which the usual rules regarding pecuniary interests do not apply, such as when an item proposes changes to Members' salaries and allowances as Members of the Council.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 16 were present, 3 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 88.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 88 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 112 be reduced by $5,061,000 in respect of subhead 885.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 4 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 89.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 89 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 114 be reduced by $114,067,000 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.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Mr Nathan LAW voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Jeremy TAM did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 3 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 90.
MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 90 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 118 be reduced by $548,265,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Alvin YEUNG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 17 were present, 4 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): Mr Nathan LAW, you may now move Amendment No. 91.

MR NATHAN LAW (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 91 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 118 be reduced by $5,000,000 in respect of subhead 700.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr Nathan LAW be passed.

Mr Nathan LAW claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Nathan LAW 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 WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 5 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 92.

MR CHAN CHI-CHEUN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 92 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 122 be reduced by $215,000,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-yung, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, 6 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): Mr Nathan LAW, you may now move Amendment No. 93.

MR NATHAN LAW (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 93 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 122 be reduced by $175,000,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr Nathan LAW be passed.

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

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

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Paul TSE, have you cast your vote?

(Mr Paul TSE cast his 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 James TO voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr Paul TSE did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 18 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 6 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): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may now move Amendment No. 94.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 94 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 122 be reduced by $87,500,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick be passed.

Mr CHU Hoi-dick claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick 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 James TO voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 18 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, 6 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): Mr James TO, you may now move Amendment
No. 95.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 95 be
passed, … reduced by … in respect of subhead 000.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 122 be reduced by $83,590,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the
amendment moved by Mr James TO be passed.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): Chairman, I have not finished reading out …

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): You are only required to read out the Amendment
No.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): Chairman, I protest. As stated in the Notes to
Appendix II of the Script, under RoP 69(3), the format of an amendment is "That
head … be reduced by $ … in respect of subhead …"; however, you did not allow
me to read out the amendment before the question on the amendment is put.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I have already stated repeatedly that when
Members move an amendment, they are only required to read out the Amendment
No.
MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): That is not right. Chairman, please take a good look. The format of an amendment under RoP 69(3) is stated in the Notes of this document. Why can't I read out the amendment I move? I am not reading out the objective of the amendment.

Chairman, have you gone a bit too far? As it turns out, you have been acting unfairly; not only so, you have even not complied with RoP 69(3).

Mr James TO claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr James TO 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 James TO and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 2 were in favour of the amendment and 18 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 6 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): Mr Nathan LAW, you may now move Amendment No. 96.

MR NATHAN LAW (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 96 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 122 be reduced by $7,510,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr Nathan LAW be passed.

Mr Nathan LAW claimed a division.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Nathan LAW 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 18 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, 6 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 97.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 97 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 122 be reduced by $265,750 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yen and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 18 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 7 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 98.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 98 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 122 be reduced by $219,500 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG,
Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN Mr Andrew LEUNG and Mr James TO did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 8 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): Mr James TO, you may now move Amendment No. 99.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): Chairman, a point of order.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr James TO, what is your point of order?

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): Chairman, a point of order.

RoP 69(3) provides that an amendment shall take the form of a motion (I quote) "That head … be reduced … by $ … in respect of (or by leaving out) subhead … item …". I cited from RoP 69. So, if I have to move an amendment, I will have to move a motion. Therefore, Chairman, with regard to Amendment No. 99, I shall not state the objective of the amendment, meaning that I shall not read out the wordings in the brackets, but I have to read out in full "That head 122 be reduced by $82,000,000 in respect of subhead 103", am I right?

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr TO, as in the case of moving other amendments, when Members move an amendment at this meeting, they are not required to read out the contents of the amendment. Members need not read out wordings such as resolved "that … in respect of subhead 000", they only need to read out the Amendment No. The Secretariat has already informed Members of the relevant arrangement.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): Chairman, but I have not breached RoP even if I read out the contents of the amendment. I may not read them out, but I have the right to do so, right?

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The Secretariat has already distributed the Script to all Members.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): The distribution of Script does not mean that I cannot read out the contents.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr TO, please move your amendment.
MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 99: "That head 122 be reduced by $82,000,000 in respect of subhead 103" be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 122 be reduced by $82,000,000 in respect of subhead 103.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr James TO be passed.

Mr CHAN Han-pan claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Han-pan 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 James TO voted for the amendment.

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 18 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 18 were present, 7 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 102.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 102 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 122 be reduced by $4,200,000 in respect of subhead 207.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

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

(After the division bell had been rung for one minute, the Chairman noted that a quorum was not present at the meeting)

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 proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Martin LIAO, have you cast your vote?

(Mr Martin LIAO cast his 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Andrew WAN and Dr CHENG Chung-tai voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG and Mr CHU Hoi-dick 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, 3 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 103.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 103 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 122 be reduced by $134,127,000 in respect of subhead 661.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung be passed.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 15 were present, 6 were in favour of the amendment and 9 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 104.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 104 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 122 be reduced by $103,264,000 in respect of subhead 695.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen be passed.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 16 were present, 7 were in favour of the amendment and 9 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): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may now move Amendment No. 106.
MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 106 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 122 be reduced by $51,632,000 in respect of subhead 695.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick be passed.

Mr CHU Hoi-dick claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick 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 LEUNG Yiu-chung voted for the amendment.

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 19 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 16 were present, 7 were in favour of the amendment and 9 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 107.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 107 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 135 be reduced by $3,580,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 19 against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 17 were present, 7 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): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, you may now move Amendment No. 108.

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 108 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 137 be reduced by $70,000,000 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.

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Mr Jeremy TAM voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

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, 15 were present, 4 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): Dr KWOK Ka-ki, you may now move Amendment No. 109.
DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 109 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 137 be reduced by $895,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr KWOK Ka-ki be passed.

Dr KWOK Ka-ki claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

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, 6 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 110.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 110 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 137 be reduced by $894,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

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, 18 were present, 6 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): Mr Andrew WAN, you may now move Amendment No. 111.

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 111 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 138 be reduced by $895,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr Andrew WAN be passed.

Mr Andrew WAN claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Andrew WAN 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

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, 20 were present, 8 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 112.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 112 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 138 be reduced by $894,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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): Dr Helena WONG, have you cast your vote?

(Dr Helena WONG cast her vote)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Christopher CHEUNG, have you cast your vote?

(Mr Christopher CHEUNG cast his 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Andrew WAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, 7 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 113.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 113 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 138 be reduced by $298,300 in respect of subhead 000."

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 21 were present, 9 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 114.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 114 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 138 be reduced by $223,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 21 were present, 9 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 115.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 115 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 138 be reduced by $104,100 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 19 were present, 6 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 116.

**MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN** (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 116 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 139 be reduced by $894,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 21 were present, 8 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 117.
DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 117 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 139 be reduced by $298,300 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 7 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 118.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 118 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 139 be reduced by $194,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai 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 Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 17 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20
were present, 7 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 119.

**DR LAU SIU-LAI** (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 119 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 139 be reduced by $104,100 in respect of subhead 000."

**CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.

**CHAIRMAN** (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai 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 SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.
Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr Steven HO, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 16 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 22 were present, 9 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): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, you may now move Amendment No. 120.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 120 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 140 be reduced by $2,253,000 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.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen claimed 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 SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr Steven HO, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 16 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 21 were present, 7 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 121.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 121 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 141 be reduced by $298,300 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai 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 SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr Steven HO, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 16 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through
direct elections, 19 were present, 5 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): Dr LAU Siu-lai, you may now move Amendment No. 122.

DR LAU SIU-LAI (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 122 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 141 be reduced by $194,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Dr LAU Siu-lai be passed.

Dr LAU Siu-lai claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr LAU Siu-lai 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 SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.
Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yen and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

Dr Helena WONG did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 18 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 21 were present, 7 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): Mr Nathan LAW, you may now move Amendment No. 123.
MR NATHAN LAW (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 123 be passed.

(Amendment as follows: "That head 142 be reduced by $343,000,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr Nathan LAW be passed.

Mr Nathan LAW claimed a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Nathan LAW 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 SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.
Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 18 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 24 were present, 11 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): Mr Andrew WAN, you may now move Amendment No. 124.

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 124 be passed.

(Amendment as follows:
"That head 142 be reduced by $119,000,000 in respect of subhead 000.")

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr Andrew WAN be passed.

Mr Andrew WAN claimed a division.
CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Andrew WAN 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 SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-_kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Kenneth LAU voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan voted against the amendment.
THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment and 18 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 24 were present, 11 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.

SUSPENSION OF MEETING

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now suspend the meeting until 9:00 am tomorrow.

Suspended accordingly at 7:57 pm.