

OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Thursday, 16 November 2017

The Council continued to meet at Nine o'clock

MEMBERS PRESENT:

THE PRESIDENT

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

THE HONOURABLE JAMES TO KUN-SUN

THE HONOURABLE LEUNG YIU-CHUNG

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE CHAN HAK-KAN, B.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHAN KIN-POR, G.B.S., J.P.

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

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE CLAUDIA MO

THE HONOURABLE MICHAEL TIEN PUK-SUN, B.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE STEVEN HO CHUN-YIN, B.B.S.

THE HONOURABLE FRANKIE YICK CHI-MING, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE WU CHI-WAI, M.H.

THE HONOURABLE YIU SI-WING, B.B.S.

THE HONOURABLE MA FUNG-KWOK, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHARLES PETER MOK, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHAN CHI-CHUEN

THE HONOURABLE CHAN HAN-PAN, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LEUNG CHE-CHEUNG, S.B.S., M.H., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE KENNETH LEUNG

THE HONOURABLE ALICE MAK MEI-KUEN, B.B.S., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE KWOK KA-KI

THE HONOURABLE KWOK WAI-KEUNG, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE DENNIS KWOK WING-HANG

THE HONOURABLE CHRISTOPHER CHEUNG WAH-FUNG, S.B.S., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE FERNANDO CHEUNG CHIU-HUNG

DR THE HONOURABLE HELENA WONG PIK-WAN

THE HONOURABLE IP KIN-YUEN

DR THE HONOURABLE ELIZABETH QUAT, B.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MARTIN LIAO CHEUNG-KONG, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE POON SIU-PING, B.B.S., M.H.

DR THE HONOURABLE CHIANG LAI-WAN, J.P.

IR DR THE HONOURABLE LO WAI-KWOK, S.B.S., M.H., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHUNG KWOK-PAN

THE HONOURABLE ALVIN YEUNG

THE HONOURABLE ANDREW WAN SIU-KIN

THE HONOURABLE CHU HOI-DICK

THE HONOURABLE JIMMY NG WING-KA, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE HO KAI-MING

THE HONOURABLE HOLDEN CHOW HO-DING

THE HONOURABLE SHIU KA-FAI

THE HONOURABLE WILSON OR CHONG-SHING, M.H.

THE HONOURABLE YUNG HOI-YAN

DR THE HONOURABLE PIERRE CHAN

THE HONOURABLE CHAN CHUN-YING

THE HONOURABLE TANYA CHAN

THE HONOURABLE CHEUNG KWOK-KWAN, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE HUI CHI-FUNG

THE HONOURABLE LUK CHUNG-HUNG

THE HONOURABLE LAU KWOK-FAN, M.H.

DR THE HONOURABLE CHENG CHUNG-TAI

THE HONOURABLE KWONG CHUN-YU

THE HONOURABLE JEREMY TAM MAN-HO

MEMBERS ABSENT:

DR THE HONOURABLE JUNIUS HO KWAN-YIU, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LAM CHEUK-TING

THE HONOURABLE SHIU KA-CHUN

THE HONOURABLE KENNETH LAU IP-KEUNG, B.B.S., M.H., J.P.

PUBLIC OFFICERS ATTENDING:

MR TSE CHIN-WAN, B.B.S., J.P.

UNDER SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, AND
SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

THE HONOURABLE LAU KONG-WAH, J.P.

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS

CLERKS IN ATTENDANCE:

MR KENNETH CHEN WEI-ON, S.B.S., SECRETARY GENERAL

MISS ODELIA LEUNG HING-YEE, DEPUTY SECRETARY GENERAL

MS ANITA SIT, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

MISS FLORA TAI YIN-PING, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

MR MATTHEW LOO, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Good morning. This Council will continue with the discussion on the proposed resolution moved under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance.

Mr WU Chi-wai, please speak.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION UNDER THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY (LABELLING OF PRODUCTS) ORDINANCE**Continuation of debate on motion which was moved on 19 October 2017**

MR WU CHI-WAI (in Cantonese): President, I speak in support of the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order.

It has been eight years since the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") was fully implemented in 2009. MEELS initially only covered room air conditioners (cooling capacity not exceeding 7.5 kW), refrigerating appliances (total storage volume not exceeding 500 litres) and compact fluorescent lamps and is gradually expanded to cover washing machines and dehumidifiers. Now, at the third phase, the Government proposes to include televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, room air conditioners of reverse cycle type and washing machines.

President, the basic goal of MEELS is to help the general public choose suitable electrical products by learning about their energy efficiency performance, thereby reducing carbon emissions and their carbon footprint to alleviate the impact on climate change and air quality. Regrettably, from 2009 up till now, the implementation progress of MEELS has been rather slow. Of course, I note the Government's explanation that the slow progress is due to the need to find the right tools and standards to make MEELS applicable to different types of household electrical appliances. This is the first point.

As known to all, during these eight years, with the advancement in technology, more and more electrical products with various degrees of energy efficiency are available in the market, but members of the public fail to get hold of any information. For example, for popular products like electric ceramic

cooker, or electric heater and blanket that we use in winter, we know nothing about their energy efficiency.

In fact, perhaps I am not knowledgeable, yet I still think it boils down to a simple arithmetic issue. The energy efficiency is calculated by the effect produced by an electrical appliance divided by the amount of electricity it consumes, and then we can get a ratio. From this perspective, is it possible for the Administration to speed up its work and include more electrical products in MEELS? In this way, more consumers can, through energy labels, know how to choose the right electric products, thereby making a contribution to reducing carbon footprint and carbon emissions, and alleviating global warming. But why is the progress of MEELS so slow? Why is the progress of the work of testing and setting standards so slow?

According to the newest report of the Consumer Council, a major problem of MEELS is that for products having the same energy grading, the energy efficiency performances of the highest and the lowest energy-efficient products vary greatly, which is not at all desirable. The authorities should better define the grading, so that the public can have a better idea of the actual energy efficiency of the electrical products, and at the same time, manufacturers are encouraged to take proactive actions to enhance the energy efficiency of their products, rather than just meeting the minimum requirements. A more positive effect will hence be created to stimulate manufacturers to make greater efforts in developing products of better quality.

It is necessary to greatly improve MEELS, and the Government's extra effort is urgently required. Otherwise, I have reasons to deduce that the slow progress of MEELS is due to the Government's red tape. Hong Kong already lags behind the prevailing situation, but the Government still fails to vigorously tackle the problem, and has not put on its agenda the problem of global warming which requires serious attention and active response.

I would like to take this chance to talk about the Government's red tape perceived by us. There is one incident that I have taken to heart. When we discuss energy efficiency, we are anxious to encourage the public, consumers and even product manufacturers to look squarely at the problem. However, the Government has a different attitude when dealing with this issue. I clearly recall, maybe many other colleagues may also recall, when we discussed the replacement of the lighting system in the Kai Tak Tunnel, we had argued for a

long time. As a matter of fact, Members from the pro-establishment camp and the pan-democratic camp, as well as other non-establishment Members had all clearly expressed the view that since the lighting system in the Kai Tak Tunnel was to be procured in 2019 and commissioned in 2020, there were no reasons why the Government refused to pledge in the tender documents that it would adopt the latest standard and use LED products. Instead the Government only stated that the existing T8 fluorescent lamps would be replaced by T5 fluorescent lamps.

President, this is a matter of attitude. Members of the public can hardly sense the Government's commitment to properly handle the issue. It cost the Government over \$80 million to replace the lighting system in the Kai Tak Tunnel, but after spending all this money, the energy consumption could only be reduced by 2%. How could such a result convince the public that the Government was determined to reduce carbon emissions? From this incident of replacing the lighting system in the Kai Tak Tunnel, the public queried whether the Government was willing to make efforts to achieve good results, or whether various government departments were hindering one another or whether each department had its own agenda. For example, the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department would project the situation in 2019 based on the conditions of today, hence such a criterion was adopted in tendering.

Electrical products or products related to energy efficiency evolved rapidly. A new generation may replace the old products within three months. A new world will emerge in three years' time. A few years ago, no one could have imagined there are so many types of LED products today with such high energy efficiency. When the Government invited tenders and applied to the Finance Committee for funding, why did it refuse to commit that products that meet the newest standards would be procured? When I was an Urban Council member, I already held this attitude by requiring the then Urban Services Department to procure more up-to-date products with higher speeds, such as computers. There is a time gap in the implementation of government policies. The problem of time gap can only be resolved by requiring the successful tenderer to deliver the latest products; otherwise we will always get outdated products. Hence, with regard to products with energy labels, our targets are consumers and manufacturers. I very much expect the Government to make greater efforts in this respect and keep abreast of the market's development.

One other point, Hong Kong people's sense of saving energy is very weak. Although much has been done in the eight years since 2009, the electricity consumed in air conditioning in Hong Kong was estimated to reach 1.4 billion kWh in 2016. Of course, when society is more affluent, people pursue a more comfortable life. Because of that, if members of the public have to use air conditioning, the Government should encourage them to buy air conditioners with higher energy efficiency, so as to reduce carbon emissions and carbon footprint. The consumption of 1.4 billion kWh of electricity is tantamount to releasing 8 200 000 tonnes of carbon dioxide. If we can reduce 10% of the electricity consumed, we will reduce the emission of 820 000 tonnes of carbon dioxide. That is a remarkable result.

However, will the Government make greater efforts? Is it enough just to rely on energy labels? Are there any means to encourage energy saving other than energy labels? Of course, that involves another big problem. When the Government negotiates with the two power companies over the agreement of their franchise, can it require the two companies to reach an energy-saving target, so that they will more actively consider how to save energy and reduce carbon emissions. Can the Government also provide incentives to people to change their habits of consuming electricity, and at the same time, choose electrical products and household appliances with higher energy efficiency, thereby reducing electricity consumption?

I do not want to speak too much about climate change but I feel that Hong Kong is also affected by climate change. Today, the entire city is enshrouded in heat island effect and everyone can feel it. When society was less affluent, the city of Hong Kong was much cooler. Today, under the heat island effect, the city is very hot. The heat comes from the layout and design of the city, as well as the products that consume energy, especially air conditioners, and the large amount of exhaust emitted by cars. Of course, these are not the tasks to be dealt with by the Secretary now but the objective of MEELS is to reduce carbon emissions and carbon footprint of the whole city. We must make greater efforts to stop the aggravation of global warming.

In the last legislative session, we spent a large sum of money, \$10 billion, to replace diesel vehicles to adhere to the latest Euro VI emission standards so as to reduce air pollution. This is related to carbon emissions because when air pollution and energy consumption are very serious in the city, it will naturally backfire and affect the living standard of all people in the city. When air quality deteriorates, everyone's health is at stake.

Therefore, President, apart from supporting the proposed resolution moved under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance, I also urge the Government to make more vigorous effort to save energy and reduce carbon emissions, and at the same time, look squarely at the lack of coordination among various government departments in dealing with air pollution and handling the prescribed products under MEELS (*The buzzer sounded*) ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Your speaking time is up. Please stop speaking.

MR WU CHI-WAI (in Cantonese): ... Thank you, President.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, I speak in support of the proposed resolution moved under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the Ordinance"). The Government is going to implement the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS"), covering five types of prescribed products. According to the Government, after the implementation of MEELS, 105 000 tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions will be reduced and 150 million kWh of electricity will be saved. It is hoped that this will reduce the impact on climate change, or global warming, and at the same time help members of the public save money.

We absolutely support the further expansion of the coverage of MEELS because it will let consumers know the energy efficiency performance of various electrical products, giving them clearer and more transparent information when they shop for such products. It will also promote competition among different products. It is hoped that consumers will choose more energy-efficient products, thereby reducing carbon emissions and energy consumption, alleviating the impact on global warming.

President, the problem now is that the progress of the implementation of MEELS is too slow. The Scheme was implemented under the Ordinance (Cap. 598) in 2008 in three phases. The first phase was implemented in 2009, the second phase in 2011 but it is not until this year, 2017, that the third phase is implemented.

According to the Government, the third phase of MEELS covers products the electricity consumption of which represents 70% of the total consumption of household electrical appliances. This is a good thing. Two years ago, when WONG Kam-sing, Secretary for the Environment, announced the Energy Saving Plan for Hong Kong's Built Environment 2015~2025+, he said that, "In Hong Kong, more than half of our total annual energy use is in the form of electricity consumption, with buildings accounting for about 90 per cent of the city's electricity use. Promoting green buildings and enhancing building energy saving has been one of our priority tasks."

The Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 enacted now will certainly help enhance building energy saving and reduce carbon emissions. However, nowadays there are an increasing number of electronic products, such as mobile phones, computers, iPad, electronic games, etc. which are very often in standby mode and constantly consuming electricity. According to a study conducted by the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department, for a general household which has 10 electrical appliances in standby mode, the total electricity consumption will increase by 3%. Hence, besides implementing energy efficiency labelling, the Government is also duty-bound to explain and educate the public, when shopping for electronic products, apart from energy efficiency, they should choose products that have low standby electricity consumption level. The authorities should also include in MEELS the indicator of standby electricity consumption level.

Just now I quoted Secretary WONG Kam-sing's remark that buildings account for about 90% of the city's electricity use but the energy efficiency of buildings is not transparent at all. Greenpeace once pointed out in its article that even though the Energy Saving Plan for Hong Kong's Built Environment 2015~2025+ aimed at lowering energy intensity by 40%, the authorities only set the target of saving energy but lacked the policy to lower the energy consumption of buildings. The main reason is that energy consumption of buildings is not transparent at all, making it impossible to analyse the energy levels of different types of buildings and hence reduce their carbon emissions.

According to YEUNG Man-yau, Greenpeace Campaigner, over 50 countries and places have already implemented some highly transparent energy policies for buildings, such as requiring commercial or residential buildings to submit an annual report on electricity consumption performance, to be uploaded to government websites, and formulating energy labelling of buildings. Hence, when buildings are put up for sale or for rental, consumers can decide whether

such buildings meet their needs. This is very important. For example, in France, when consumers consider buying or renting a flat, they can make reference to the energy efficiency data compiled by the local government, taking into account the floor area, rent, direction and location of the property.

Apart from household electricity consumption which takes up a rather big proportion, as well as the above mentioned energy consumption of consumer products or buildings, we should also take note of electricity consumption in other areas. According to the Hong Kong Energy Statistics Annual Report, 2016 edition, commercial users took up 65.7% of the year's total electricity consumption while domestic users took up 27.2%. Commercial users' electricity consumption is almost three times that of domestic users. As such, should we also consider how to lower the commercial users' electricity consumption in order to protect the environment?

Lighting used in the commercial sector wastes a lot of electricity and causes light pollution. Consumption or shopping are of course Hong Kong's edges, but is it necessary to display advertisements on large screens and light boxes? The luminance level of big screens is gravely high. In Causeway Bay or along Nathan Road in Mong Kok, light pollution has reached a level that can hardly be tolerated. According to some residents living next to the big screens in Causeway Bay, if their unit face the big screens, they have to wear sunglasses at night when washing dishes in kitchen. This is almost unheard of in other parts of the world. Some residents have to place thick ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr Fernando CHEUNG, this Council is discussing the several types of electrical products covered by the proposed resolution moved under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance rather than light pollution. Please speak on the subject of this debate.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): Get it. What I mean is, if energy labels of household electrical appliances can bring about an annual energy saving of 150 million kWh, it is a great achievement. Since the electricity consumed by commercial users is almost three times that of domestic users, apart from MEELS, the Government should also consider how to restrict electricity consumption in other areas. I mentioned light pollution because it also has a direct impact on energy saving.

When the hustle and bustle died down after the introduction of the Charter on External Lighting ("the Charter"), it does not seem to have any effect. For example, District Council members have found that nine new external light box installations have been put up in Causeway Bay after the Charter was introduced. I want to point out, if the Government is serious about promoting energy saving, it has to look squarely at the present energy wastage in Hong Kong. It cannot just slowly include a few more household electrical appliances in the list of mandatory energy labelling in each phase; rather, it should focus on areas what consume the most electricity. Since the commercial sector consumes so much electricity, apart from the Charter, are there other means to save energy? The situation has not been improved after the Charter was launched. On the other hand, can the mandatory requirement of displaying energy labels on individual household electrical appliances effectively lower the electricity consumption of the entire building? As I mentioned earlier, the situation is not transparent at all.

President, if the Government is really determined to save energy, it should carry out the work in various aspects simultaneously; rather than only targets a few electrical appliances. Besides, even if MEELS covers 70% of the products, it is still not enough. Why not cover all other electrical appliances?

When it comes to energy saving, it would be great if Prof YIU Chung-yim was here because he is far more familiar with energy saving than I. There are many ways to cut down the energy consumption of household electrical appliances, or the energy consumption in a residential flat or housing estate. I remember Prof YIU once launched a programme "A Novel Planning Model"—I do not know its Chinese title—in Chi Fu Fa Yuen where he lived and its goal was "four zeros", namely zero wastage of energy, zero waste production, zero waste of food and zero waste of water. This programme succeeded with flying colours. By launching 40-odd programmes, Chi Fu Fa Yuen lowered its electricity consumption by about 40%, saving about \$1 million in electricity tariff. The management of the estate ultimately received the Certificate of Merit under the Hong Kong Award for Environmental Excellence. These programmes need to be regulated by law, but if the community and the local residents can take the initiative to implement the programmes, apart from saving energy consumption for the purpose of saving money, if residents of each district can aim at protecting the environment ... I wonder if Prof YIU's "four zeros" programme can be extended to more communities, but I hope that the Government will not only focus on individual ordinances, but also visit various districts to learn about the real situation and provide more resources and assistance to help each district

save energy. These practices not only encourage the public to save energy but also help them build good social relationships. It is hoped that in the end everyone will take up their own responsibility to protect the Earth and stop the aggravation of global warming.

With these remarks, President, I support the proposed resolution moved under the Ordinance.

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): Good morning, President. I speak to give my views on the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("the Amendment Order"). To begin with, I indicate my support regarding the general direction of the Amendment Order.

Honestly, staff of many departments of the last-term Government sometimes voiced their grievances to us in private, saying that due to political disputes and challenges to governance authority, they suffered from tremendous pressure and many policies were severely criticized. I trust that, in the eyes of the public, the work of the Environment Bureau of the last-term Government should receive less criticism; some people might even have a good impression of its work. This is probably because the Bureau had made efforts, and at least it had made some progress in instilling in the public the concept of protecting the environment, conveying the message of reducing food waste through the Big Waster image and promoting electricity saving. However, President, as various Members mentioned yesterday and today, we certainly hope that the Bureau can make greater improvement or do an even better job. As the saying goes, "Even fingers are not equal in length". Despite my commendation of the Bureau for having done a fairly good job with some concrete achievements, its implementation of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") seems to be progressing rather slowly and the coverage is far from satisfactory, as many colleagues have pointed out

Let us look back on the history of MEELS. The first phase of MEELS, implemented in 2009, covered three types of prescribed products, namely room air conditioners (cooling capacity not exceeding 7.5 kW), refrigerating appliances (total storage volume not exceeding 500 litres) and compact fluorescent lamps. The second phase of MEELS, fully implemented in September 2011, covered some washing machines (with rated washing capacity not exceeding 7 kg) and

dehumidifiers. Now the Government intends to implement the third phase of MEELS. President, as regard the progress of implementing MEELS, we see that the second phase was implemented shortly after the first phase. However, I do not understand why the time gap between the second and the third phases is so long. I hope the Secretary can explain later. As mentioned by various colleagues earlier, although we support the implementation of the third phase ... It is indicated in the brilliant report card presented by the Government that various types of electrical appliances covered under MEELS take up 70% of the annual electricity consumption in the residential sector. To put it the other way round, according to the "half full or half empty glass" theory, 30% of electricity consumption in the residential sector is yet to be covered. What should be done to the 30%? I hope the Bureau can respond to this later.

The third phase of MEELS is an improvement. The types of products proposed to be covered in this phase are televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, room air conditioners of reverse cycle type and washing machines. Why are some product types overlapping with those covered in the first and second phases? President, people watching the television broadcast probably understand that the scope of the third phase of MEELS is extended to cover the same type of products but with different capacities or wattages. We definitely agree to this direction. However, President, just now I also mentioned that MEELS currently covers only 70% of electricity consumption in the residential sector, when can it have a full coverage? I hope the Bureau can give us an answer. Furthermore, why does the progress suddenly become so slow? Is this related to the reasons that we hear in the community, such as resistance from the business sector? Since yesterday, not many fellow colleagues from the business sector have spoken. If later these colleagues speak, members of the public may get some clues. President, I certainly do not know and do not want to speculate the stance of members from the business sector. They will probably support the Amendment Order as well.

On the other hand, members of the public wonder why the coverage of MEELS seems so narrow. As we all know, there are still many other types of electrical appliances not covered under MEELS, including some that consume a lot of electricity, such as irons, heaters, etc. Why are such products not covered? This is a question that people will ask. Certainly, MEELS, which has been implemented since 2009, is a step forward, and we acknowledge that. I hope the Government and the Bureau know about this. MEELS not only brings monetary benefits to the public, but also contribute to the well-being of "Mr Earth" in saving energy or protecting the environment. For instance, MEELS facilitates

reductions of carbon dioxide, carbon footprints and carbon emissions, improvement of the climate, and even electricity and money saving. While all these are surely important, public awareness is equally important. The ultimate purpose of the relevant legislation, plans and labelling guidelines is to change the consumers' habits in buying and using electrical appliances and enhance their energy-saving awareness, so as to enable them to contribute to the well-being of the environment while saving money. This is a direction of civic education that we endorse.

President, as I said just now, various types of electrical appliances covered under MEELS take up 70% of annual electricity consumption in the residential sector. Actually, as evident from a lot of data, environmental protection measures such as energy labelling, as well as education of consumers and members of the public, are very important. We should not take lightly some insignificant data, for the figures generated are very stunning. For instance, in 2016, the total power consumption for air conditioning in Hong Kong was as high as 14 billion kWh of electricity, which is equivalent to releasing 8.2 million tonnes of carbon dioxide. President, the figures is simply stunning. My son is a primary student, and the environmental protection concept is also taught in his school. I trust if I tell these figures to the children, they will not manage to count the number of zeros involved. President, what is the concept of 14 billion kWh? It is equivalent to the total annual generation of two coal-fired power plants. Hong Kong people is really formidable; the figure is really stunning.

Certainly, in Hong Kong it is very difficult to ask members of the public not to turn on the air conditioners. Despite the high power consumption for air conditioning that I just mentioned, are we going to turn the air conditioners off? Given the hot and humid climate in Hong Kong, that will be difficult, thus I hope there is happy medium that allows us to do something for the environment and save money while using electricity. I trust no member of the public would say no to this. The weather of Hong Kong in recent years ... the average temperature between June and September 2017 was very high, reaching nearly 30°C, and worse still, the weather was sultry with very high humidity. People turn on air conditioners not simply for cooling down, but also for getting dry.

Having considered public views and social objectives comprehensively, I think MEELS is indeed a good direction, enabling the general public to save money and be environmental friendly, as well as make a contribution to the environment.

President, Dr Fernando CHEUNG made some remarks just now, but you considered that he had digressed and did not allow him to continue. However, I think what he said was slightly related to the current subject, so please allow me to say a few words. Actually, that was not a digression. I hope the Bureau can, apart from focusing on household electrical appliances, extend the same concept to commercial electrical appliances and even the electricity or air conditioning consumption in the business sector. Why do I say so? Let me give an example which Dr Fernando CHEUNG did not mention just now. The air conditioned buses of Hong Kong are world famous for being freezing cold, which has also been reported in the news overseas. As far as I know, bus air conditioning is not regulated. What should be done? I know that regulating bus air conditioning is not a target of the third phase of MEELS; however, since the Bureau intends to deal with household air conditioners, is there a need to deal with bus air conditioning as well? The air conditioning is so cold in some restaurants (especially the chain ones) that their customers have to put on sweaters even in summer, and the contrasting temperatures inside and outside the restaurant can easily make people sick.

When Dr Fernando CHEUNG talked about light-emitting billboards just now, I immediately thought of one nearby. People working in the Legislative Council Complex or the Central Government Offices may see it often. Every time I pass the International Finance Centre ("IFC"), I wish to raise some views. In the Halloween that just past, I drove my son to Lan Kwai Fong for getting some fun. When passing IFC, we saw the festive lighting there. My son asked me, "Wow, why are there so many beautiful lighting decorations?" Though it was a festive day, I did not find it good to have so many lighting decorations. On the ground floor of IFC, there were plenty of very beautiful light bulbs resembling a star-studded sky. I reckon there were tens of thousands of bulbs. I found this odd as there are always other means of illumination for that place. Even if it is for beauty's sake—I know this kind of buildings may sometimes have to consider the aesthetic factor—can a pragmatic approach be taken to strike a happy medium for the purpose? There were decorative lighting chains reaching almost 100 m in length, and a few meters in width and depth. The small bulbs on the chains resembled a star-studded sky. I have no idea of the energy consumption if the lightings were turned on all the time. President, this example is related to the subject under discussion now. If we care about the environment and electricity consumption, we should adopt a more unified policy and practice what we preach in every aspect. I hope the Environment Bureau will include the above situation in its scope of regulation as soon as possible.

Lastly, President, as I mentioned earlier, we agree that MEELS should be extended further, and the speed should be expedited as the progress is rather slow. Moreover, we also want to know the reasons for the slow progress, and hope the Bureau can tell us frankly. Fellow colleagues from the business sector can also speak on this issue. Are there frequent complaints from the business sector, saying that they are merely agents of electrical appliances, yet they have to comply with numerous rules and regulations imposed by the Government and bear high cost? I have indeed heard such comments from an acquaintance of mine, who is an agent. Certainly, he did not lie, as costs have really increased. However, I hope friends in the business sector will understand, their own operating cost is a kind of cost to them, but social costs are much higher. I do not mean the social costs of Hong Kong alone; rather, I mean the global costs. I hope everyone will move towards this consensus and improve the environment.

With these remarks, President, I support this resolution and hope that MEELS can proceed more expeditiously with an extended scope. Thank you, President.

MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): Good morning, President. Today, we discuss the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the Ordinance"). In fact, we would like to enter the final stage of the discussion because the resolution has the general support of Members.

The Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") was introduced in 2008. Since then, the Ordinance requires that energy labels should be shown on all prescribed products offered for sale in Hong Kong to inform consumers of the products' energy efficiency performance. This amendment exercise mainly seeks to include televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, room air conditioners of reverse cycle type and washing machines (with rated washing capacity exceeding 7 kg but not exceeding 10 kg) in MEELS. Simply put, the purpose is to extend the coverage of MEELS to include electrical appliances commonly used in our daily lives.

We support the resolution because after the implementation of MEELS, the estimated annual reduction of carbon dioxide emissions is 105 000 tonnes and the potential annual energy saving is 150 million kWh. Apart from tackling climate change, the initiatives will also help people save money which is very practical. Tackling climate change seems to be a far-fetched topic to us, but I believe we

can initiate changes in ourselves, our city and our system to achieve this objective. Hong Kong should not withdraw itself from participating and we would like to cooperate. It is also an undeniable fact that MEELS help us save electricity and money. If we are informed of the energy efficiency of electrical appliances, we can save more electricity and it will be a win-win situation. That is also the direction of enacting the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("the Amendment Order").

Besides, this legislative exercise will further extend the scope of MEELS to cover more electrical appliances to inform consumers of their energy efficiency, increase the transparency of product information and enhance the competitiveness of the businesses. Furthermore, MEELS will provide the impetus for the market to supply more energy-saving products for consumers to choose from. Most important of all, the information provided will enable consumers to make comparison and be better informed.

While we are concerned about the practical function of energy labels, we expect the Government to further tighten the standards of these labels, so that consumers can really choose the most energy-efficient electrical appliances. President, the Government needs to consider further details, e.g. are energy labels simple and easily understood by consumers; should there be subdivisions within the same grade; and will other means of showing the energy efficiency of electrical appliances be adopted?

Let us consider the history of MEELS. The scheme originated in February 1991 when the Governor in Council instructed the Government to formulate a policy to increase energy efficiency. In April 1991, the Energy Efficiency Advisory Committee was established to advise the Government on proposals to improve energy efficiency and to formulate a comprehensive long-term energy efficiency policy. Since 1991, MEELS has been progressing very slowly. It seems that we must step up our efforts given that the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department introduced a Voluntary Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme in 1995, but MEELS was introduced only in 2009, to be implemented in three phases to gradually include different electrical appliances.

The first phase of MEELS, which covered three types of products, including room air conditioners, refrigerating appliances and compact fluorescent lamps, was fully implemented on 9 November 2009. The second phase, the scope of which was extended to cover two additional types of electrical appliances, i.e. washing machines and dehumidifiers, was fully implemented on

19 September 2011. Six years later in 2017, the Government finally introduced the third phase. In other words, the Government spent a total of 22 years to extend the scope of MEELS. Twenty-two years have elapsed since 1995 and the Government should not proceed in such a slow pace any more. It would be best to let consumers clearly understand MEELS, and as I said in my introduction, how can Hong Kong withdraw from tackling climate change?

On the other hand, we have to consider how to fully utilize electricity. President, the concept of sustainable consumption involves the concern about the standby mode of electrical appliances. Apart from promoting energy saving, waste reduction and a low-carbon lifestyle, and extending the scope of MEELS to cover more electrical appliances so that the public can choose energy-saving products—which is certainly a much-welcome initiative—I think the Government should also try its best to promote sustainable consumption. In promoting sustainable consumption, the Government should not adopt a broad-brush approach to promote the reduction of consumption and purchases. It is certainly desirable to make the best use of everything, but more importantly, the Government should encourage proper use of products. It is entirely inadequate to rely only on energy labels to identify and buy energy-saving electrical appliances. The Government should also educate the people and make them understand the relationship between energy saving and their lives and the importance of energy saving.

It is not difficult to save energy in our daily lives; it is actually very simple. Members may immediately think of reducing the use of electrical appliances or reducing standby power to save energy. According to a study conducted by the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department ("EMSD"), there are about 10 to 20 electrical appliances in standby mode in an average home. What does it mean if an electrical appliance is in standby mode? For example, you turn on the television though you are not watching, or you turn on the air conditioner for no good reason and use it as a fan when you do not need air conditioning. We are not experts, but we do know that many electrical appliances have standby mode and electricity is still consumed when not in use. If we turn off all electrical appliances which are in standby mode, we can save at least 3% electricity in our homes. The saving of 3% does not sound much, but the simple act of turning off electrical appliances which are in standby mode can already save electricity. Encouraging the public to take this action is certainly not enough, but educating them is the first step.

Meanwhile, as Hong Kong people own more and more electronic products, there is a growing use of such products in standby mode. Some people will not even switch off their mobile phones at all. In order to promote low-carbon living, apart from introducing MEELS, the Government can also educate the public to buy electrical appliances with low standby power consumption. We can imagine that the electricity used when these appliances are in standby mode will also be lower. In fact, it is worthy for government officials to note this point and even consider including the level of standby power consumption of electrical appliances in MEELS, so that we can be aware of how much electricity, money and energy we can save when the electrical appliances are in standby mode.

Furthermore, we noticed that in the test of 14 models of split-type room air conditioners (i.e. air conditioners) conducted earlier by the Consumer Council, it was found that although all of the samples met the requirements of Grade 1 Energy Label, the power consumption differed; and by how much? Presumably, surprisingly, the power consumption of products belonging to the same grade of energy labels differed by 20%. In other words, the power consumption of two air conditioners with the same grade of energy labels differed and if we calculate the difference of the electricity charges, they differed by as much as 24%. This brings out the question of whether energy efficiency can be better graded, for the electricity consumption levels of electrical appliances with the same grade of energy labels can surprisingly differ by 20%. Under the circumstances, can the original purpose of introducing energy labels really be fulfilled?

A person using an electrical appliance with the worst-performance in energy efficiency has to pay about \$1,249 for electricity charge each year, while the electricity charge for the best-performance brand is \$940, representing a difference of \$300. The amount of \$300 may not seem much, but small sums will add up to big amounts in time. If every household can use energy-saving electrical appliances and reduce a big amount of electrical charges in a year, it will be nice too. If the power consumption of electrical appliances with the same grade of energy labels differs greatly, how useful are the energy labels?

At present, there are many split-type room air conditioners in the market for consumers to choose from. In order to further promote sustainable consumption, I suggest the Government further raise the standards of energy labels in the long run to urge the industry to improve their designs and produce products with higher energy efficiency. It is unreasonable to have great differences in energy efficiency within the same grade and we have to avoid this

problem. Regarding whether subdivisions should be included under the same grade, I hope public officials can further consider the matter after they have understood the information and views given in our further discussion.

In fact, energy saving is a big topic. Hong Kong can take reference from overseas practices to fully promote energy saving. For example, in France, real estate agencies will provide energy-efficiency indicators (similar to energy labels in Hong Kong) of properties for lease or sale in each pamphlet. Before a property is offered for lease or sale, its energy-efficiency performance will be certified by an expert and the certificate will be given to the buyer or the tenant for reference during the transaction process. Before the French buy or lease a residential property, they will consider its area, rent, price, bearing, location and energy efficiency. That is a better approach.

Certainly, considering the present situation of Hong Kong, the approach is also related to whether people can purchase a home. If they can, there should be options for them to choose from. Of course, if we have the idea, it will be a good direction because that will provide an incentive for property owners to improve the energy efficiency performances of their properties. Can Hong Kong take reference from the practice in France? For example, Hong Kong can promote green buildings and green homes so that efforts in saving energy are not restricted to introducing energy labels in electrical appliances, but also include achieving effectiveness in carbon reduction.

The idea of green buildings is an internationally recognized way of effectively tackling climate change and achieving the targets of the Paris Agreement. Buildings account for 90% of the total electricity consumption in Hong Kong and they are the main source of carbon emissions. Thus, promoting energy saving and the reduction of greenhouse gas emission in buildings are currently the most important tasks for us.

President, as Hong Kong uses more clean energy (renewable energy), our annual electricity charges may continue to rise. Thus, people will become more concerned about the power consumption of their electrical appliances and they would prefer to buy the most energy-efficient electrical appliances by means of an indicator. This approach will not only tackle climate change, but also save money. That is an undeniable fact and a direction. Hence, we have to consider whether the Government's current proposed amendments to the Ordinance can make it easier for consumers to identify the energy efficiency performances of electrical appliances. In the example given by me earlier, the energy efficiency

performances of different electrical appliances with the same grade of energy labels and the electricity charges incurred differ greatly. I hope to hear from public officers later regarding whether the Government can, under the circumstances, enable consumers to make an informed choice to buy energy-saving electrical appliances by means of energy labels.

President, finally, I hope that attention can be paid to the Amendment Order and more electrical appliances can be included in MEELS. The most important thing is, as I said earlier, how to tackle climate change. We must assess the effectiveness now in the hope that we can achieve an annual energy saving of 150 million kWh, which is equivalent to an annual reduction of carbon dioxide emissions of 105 000 tonnes.

In conclusion, if the scope of MEELS is extended, we can achieve annual electricity saving of 600 million kWh. This will help to achieve the latest target set in the Policy Address in January this year of reducing carbon intensity by 65% to 70% by 2030 compared with the 2005 level. We hope that it is not a slogan, but an achievable target.

President, I so submit.

MR CHAN HAK-KAN (in Cantonese): President, I speak in support of the proposed resolution moved under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the Ordinance").

President, the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("the Amendment Order") is not controversial. If my memory does not fail me, I should be the second pro-establishment Member who has spoken since yesterday. The first pro-establishment Member who spoke is the Chairman of the relevant Subcommittee and the next one is me, while all other Members who have spoken are pan-democratic Members. I am really very thankful to them for their sudden concern about the work relating to environmental products and I certainly cannot speculate their motives. However, apart from requiring some products to show energy labels, if we refrain from filibustering in the Chamber, we can use less air conditioning and reduce electricity consumption to save energy, reduce emissions and promote environmental work.

President, the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") is nothing new and it was launched in 2009. In its initial phase, MEELS only covered compact fluorescent lamps, room air conditioners and refrigerating appliances. Later, washing machines and dehumidifiers were included and now, a number of electrical appliances such as televisions; storage type electric water heaters; and induction cookers are also included. I noticed that many Members indicated yesterday that the Secretary has not done enough and they hoped that other types of products could be included as well. I also agree to require other types of products to affix energy label; otherwise manufacturers will not have any incentive to produce energy-saving electrical appliances and consumers cannot rely on energy labels to buy energy-saving electrical appliances. Thus, it will be good for MEELS to cover additional types of products. After the Amendment Order is passed, manufacturers will produce more energy-saving products and we will naturally have more choices. When my staff members procured an air conditioner and a refrigerator for my office, they chose electrical appliances with energy labels indicating higher energy efficiency. The effectiveness of the Amendment Order is evident. I support the Amendment Order and agree with many pan-democratic Members that more electrical appliances should be included in MEELS and that is important.

(THE PRESIDENT'S DEPUTY, MS STARRY LEE, took the Chair)

I have noticed that the Government has done well in its consultation work this time and I commend the Government for it. Deputy President, the Government conducted a very comprehensive consultation in 2015, the targets of consultation included trade associations, professional bodies, education institutions, power companies, product manufacturers, importers and suppliers, and the Consumer Council. Nevertheless, it seems that the Government has only done well in consultation regarding this matter, but not in another case. The Under Secretary would know that I am talking about the consultation on the Producer Responsibility Scheme on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment ("the Scheme"). When the Government conducted consultation on the Scheme, it omitted to consult some members of the trade and caused a very big problem. Five or six big container trucks surrounded the Legislative Council Complex and 100 000 people in the trade might become unemployed.

I hope that when the Government enacts legislation in the future, it will not only consult a small group of people, but should consult all relevant stakeholders, just like what it did in relation to amending the Ordinance. If not, it may face

strong resistance when implementing the laws. I hope that the Policy Bureau will learn from the good experience of conducting this consultation exercise and apply the knowledge in other environmental work because the environmental policies formulated by the Government will necessarily affect many different stakeholders. Many people support the Government, but policies can affect the livelihood, living habits and economic behaviour of many people and I hope the Policy Bureau can take note of it.

Finally, I would like to say that including more electronic appliances in MEELS is a good thing. Deputy President, I so submit.

MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I speak in support of the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 for the implementation of the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") as I consider it an important step in the right direction for the pursuance of the environmental policy.

The Secretary stated in his speech that, in the January 2017 Policy Address, the Chief Executive set for Hong Kong the carbon reduction target of reducing carbon intensity by 65% to 70% by 2030 compared with the 2005 level. This ambitious target is an important benchmark. Moreover, in 2015, the Government announced the Energy Saving Plan for Hong Kong's Built Environment 2015~2025+ ("Energy Saving Plan") and set the target for reducing our energy intensity by 40% by 2025 relative to the 2005 level. These targets were mentioned by the Secretary at different committee meetings and on various occasions. Members had debated on these targets and considered them in line with the general direction of the environmental policy.

Regarding MEELS, the Secretary talked about behaviour change—which is quite an important point—in his speech. The first phase of MEELS was introduced in 2009, covering air conditioners, refrigerating appliances and compact fluorescent lamps. After that, the Schedules to the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance were further amended to extend the scope of MEELS to washing machines and dehumidifiers in 2011.

After the implementation of the first two phases of MEELS, when people shop for electrical appliances, they now pay attention to energy efficiency in addition to price and design so as to pick the right products. The Government,

therefore, further extends the scope of MEELS this time to cover five additional appliances, namely televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, washing machines (with rated washing capacity exceeding 7 kg but not exceeding 10 kg) and room air conditioners of reverse cycle type.

The first and second phases have shaped a new consumption pattern. My observation is that people are now more aware of how everyday electrical products will impact on the environment and energy consumption. I also believe they have become more willing to buy energy-efficient appliances to do good for the environment and the climate, as well as save energy. The Secretary talked about influencing behaviour in his speech, if people are more willing to buy energy-efficient appliances, it reflects that MEELS has affected consumer behaviour, and a change in consumer behaviour will eventually affect the behaviour of product manufacturers and suppliers. Will they increase the supply of energy-efficient products and take this as their future marketing strategy? When energy-efficient products become the mainstream in the market, will the products with low energy efficiency, though inexpensive, be phased out by market forces more quickly? This is how the market is changed by influencing consumer behaviour.

In view of this, the Government should implement the third phase of MEELS. In its estimation, 150 million kWh of electricity can be saved by introducing the third phase and MEELS as a whole can help save 600 million kWh of electricity. These figures are very impressive.

Earlier this year, the Legislative Council scrutinized the Promotion of Recycling and Proper Disposal (Electrical Equipment and Electronic Equipment) (Amendment) Ordinance 2016 (Commencement) Notice 2017 ("the Notice") and the Product Eco-Responsibility (Regulated Electrical Equipment) Regulation ("the Regulation"). It is another piece of legislation which seeks to change people's behaviour with the use of labels. The Secretary should remember that the Notice and the Regulation, though related to the producer responsibility scheme ("PRS"), involve labelling which allows the public to distinguish whether an electrical product can be recycled.

When the Subcommittee was scrutinizing the Notice and the Regulation, I proposed an amendment to require such labels be affixed to electrical products as mandatory labelling can directly enhance consumers' environmental awareness. While the labels referred in the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance seek to inform consumers of the energy efficiency of electrical appliances, the labels under the Regulation intend to tell the public whether an

electrical appliance can be recycled. Considering that these two types of labels were similar in form, I proposed an amendment to the Regulation to highlight the importance of the recycling labels. Although the Subcommittee did not support mandatory labelling on electrical products in its scrutiny of the Regulation, this important piece of legislation was a step forward.

As regards the future disposal of electrical products, including how to inform the public of their energy efficiency and recyclability, I think it is fairly important to give clear indication on the products. Under PRS, a major concern was whether the affixing of recycling labels should be made mandatory to electrical products. During the scrutiny, members of the Subcommittee had argued about "four categories of electrical equipment and one category of computer products", including printers, scanners, computers and televisions. Why did the Government not propose mandatory labelling? That was because key stakeholders (i.e. major manufacturers and importers) had, in the consultation, voiced their concern over the technical difficulties of affixing such labels to their products in the process of production or importation. I fully understood this point; some other members also stated the technical difficulties in practice.

Going back to the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance, I note that the Secretary stated in paragraph 5 of his speech that there had been a three-month consultation and views were received from trade associations, the Consumer Council, professional bodies, education institutions, and so on. It is certainly good for the Government to conduct extensive consultations. However, if the Government wishes to influence public behaviour in areas like energy saving or recycling by requiring labelling on electrical appliances or other products in the future, I would say that it should step up its efforts in consultation so as to balance the right to know of consumers and the operation needs of the trade. I do not understand why mandatory labelling works under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance but not PRS. In reality, they both involve the same group of trade members.

Overall speaking, our environmental policy allows people to learn about the energy efficiency of electrical products by reading the relevant labels. Yet, we do not have labels to indicate whether an electrical appliance can be recycled. The policy is not consistent in the eyes of the public. Therefore, if labelling is likely to give rise to operational difficulties, I hope that the Government can, in the future, spend more time to convince the manufacturers or importers and help them adapt to the environmental policy of Hong Kong.

The Secretary also stated in his speech that energy saving was an important means for mitigating the adverse effect of climate change, and that was why the Government set a target in the Energy Saving Plan. In order to achieve this target, the Government must commit itself to introducing supporting measures. Meanwhile, the public must work together to change their behaviour. To the public, climate change is a remote or abstract concept, but it actually affects us every day and has profound impact.

According to the World Meteorological Organization ("WMO"), last year made history, with a record global temperature, exceptionally low sea ice, and unabated sea level rise and ocean heat. Extreme weather and climate conditions in Hong Kong and around the world have continued into 2017. WMO issued its annual statement on the State of the Global Climate ahead of the World Meteorological Day in March, saying that the datasets maintained by global climate analysis centres had confirmed the influence of human activities on global warming. Climate change is something substantial. It is not that remote or abstract and is proved by strong scientific evidence.

The Government, apart from working on laws and policies, should strengthen its efforts in education and publicity. As energy saving is the ultimate goal of MEELS, I hope the Government will learn from overseas experience by drawing reference to international or national practices and targets. Here are some examples for its reference. Let us see the case of the United States. Its annual total consumption of energy is 1.632 billion tonnes of oil equivalent, with the transport sector taking up the largest proportion of over 30%, followed by the production sector and the residential and commercial sector, each of which accounting for more than 20%.

The United States has, however, formulated key energy efficiency policies. For instance, under the Climate Action Plan announced by the former President OBAMA, the goal was to double energy productivity by 2030 relative to 2010 level and initiatives had been proposed to address climate change. This Plan had three pillars. Firstly, cut carbon pollution, and this was the major principle; secondly, prepare for the impacts of climate change; thirdly, lead international efforts to combat global climate change. The Government may take the specific energy saving measures in the Plan as reference.

Those measures share some similarities with the initiatives in Hong Kong. First of all, they seek to cut energy waste in homes, businesses and factories with

the goal of becoming at least 20% more energy efficient by 2020. Meanwhile, efficiency standards are set for appliances and federal buildings to reduce carbon pollution by at least 3 billion metric tonnes cumulatively by 2030. Post-2018 fuel economy standards for heavy-duty vehicles will also be developed. Deputy President, I do not have time to read them out one by one and I hope the Government can refer to them by itself.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): So far, 18 Members have spoken in this debate. I remind Members that you should focus on the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance instead of speaking on climate change or other issues which are not directly related to the subject.

Does any other Member wish to speak?

DR HELENA WONG (in Cantonese): I speak in support of the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("the Amendment Order"). I thank the Deputy President for reminding us of the debate subject but Members are free to decide what to say in their speeches. Deputy President has no right to interfere.

The Government pledged in the 2016 Policy Address to expand the scope of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") to cover more electrical appliances. In fact, MEELS has been implemented for years; the Government is just expanding the scope to cover more electrical appliances this time.

I was not a member of the relevant Subcommittee but I understand how labelling works as I am following up on food and drinking water issues. For consumers, no matter the subject is related to safety of drinking water and food or the issue of energy efficiency now under discussion, their concern is whether there are concise and sufficient information to facilitate them in making an informed choice in making purchases. When shopping for electrical appliances, if consumers care about the environment and the potential catastrophic impact of global warming on the Earth, they may wish to contribute to protecting the environment by buying appliances that meet their needs and are low in energy consumption. Energy labels can help consumers make a choice because they

normally only pay attention to price and design but have no idea which models are more energy saving.

However, why should energy labelling be made mandatory? The reason is simple. The reason is that we are concerned about global warming. Deputy President, you have heard Members speaking for some time, and some other Members have mentioned this issue earlier. Yet, I wish to explain to the public why energy labelling is necessary. Some traders may consider labelling an additional task which causes them trouble. As in the case of discussing food safety issues, whenever Members suggest that food labels should clearly specify whether the food products contain excessive sodium, sugars, fat and saturated fat, certain Members from the business sector (including Mr Tommy CHEUNG) will always raise their objection, as they think this suggestion will add burden to food traders and push up costs.

In fact, we should not be that short-sighted. In our current discussion about energy labelling of electrical appliances, we should also look further ahead. While the absence of such labels will not bring us the doomsday right away; if we do not take proactive action now, climate change will develop in a way that no one would love to see.

There are lots of causes, both natural and human, for climate change and the absence of energy labels is not the sole factor. For the natural causes, we can do nothing about them in the Council. There are at least two such causes. First, solar activity; second, volcanic eruption.

The Sun is a living, not a dead thing which directly influences the temperature of the Earth. During periods of active solar activity, the exchange of cold and warm moist air between the poles and the equator will become less frequent, causing a rise of temperature in areas of human settlement. However, solar activity is not always active. Sometimes, the Sun may seem like falling asleep. Our science knowledge tells us that the Sun may from time to time shoot out flares like a volcano. When the solar activity is inactive, there will be relatively more exchanges of cold and warm air between the North and the South. The temperature in human settlements will then fall.

The second cause is volcanic eruption. It is hard for man to accurately predict volcanic activities. Some dormant volcanoes may wake up in a sudden, emitting carbon dioxide, which will add to the greenhouse effect when it gets into the atmosphere. Volcanoes will also emit lots of dusts and particulate matters,

which are capable of blocking sunlight to the Earth temporarily and reflect it to the space. With less solar energy reaching the Earth's surface, the climate will become cooler for a short time.

According to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the definition of "climate change" is a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods. Most of the scientists consider human activity as the major factor contributed to the current climate change. Volcanic eruption and solar activity just mentioned are natural causes, and the United Nations has given us a new insight. According to the United Nations, human activity is the main culprit for global warming. At this point, it is natural to ask: How does human activity worsen the greenhouse effect?

How does human activity create the greenhouse effect? Here is an example. Humans, by burning fossil fuels, produce a large amount of carbon dioxide. While the emission of this greenhouse gas keeps on raising the temperature on Earth, massive logging by humans has weakened the Earth's ability to absorb carbon dioxide. As the emission outpaces the absorption of carbon dioxide, a lot of greenhouse gases, mainly carbon dioxide, will then accumulate in the atmosphere. In recent years, a number of studies have shown that the ozone layer can no longer absorb ultraviolet radiation effectively as it is getting thinner. A series of consequential effects pose impacts on the global climate. Can we humans, being part of the Earth, reduce carbon dioxide emissions to slow down global warming? I think it is the responsibility of everybody.

In fact, Hong Kong has participated in the work of saving the Earth and improving the environment by trying to reduce carbon emissions and implementing MEELS, a scheme launched by the Government in phases. The first phase was introduced in 2009. However, the Government would never push too far whenever it rolls out a new scheme. I am not sure if it acts out of fear of opposition, and MEELS is no exception. When MEELS was first introduced in November 2009, it only covered three types of prescribed products, namely room air conditioners, refrigerating appliances and compact fluorescent lamps. In the second phase, which was implemented in September 2011, the scope of MEELS was extended to washing machines (with rated washing

capacity not exceeding 7 kg). Meanwhile, dehumidifiers were included in the Schedules but mandatory labelling only applied to those with a rated dehumidifying capacity not exceeding 35 litres per day.

Now, the Administration gets ready to implement the third phases of MEELS and proposes to include the following types of electrical appliances, which are televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, room air conditioners of reverse cycle type (with heating and cooling functions) and washing machines (with rated washing capacity exceeding 7 kg but not exceeding 10 kg). Induction cookers have only become popular in recent years. We might not have such products 10 years ago. By virtue of the Amendment Order, the Administration presently seeks to put televisions, storage type electric water heaters and induction cookers under MEELS. Subject to the passage of the Amendment Order, the Administration will introduce another amendment order to the Legislative Council for MEELS to cover room air conditioners of reverse cycle type and the aforesaid type of washing machines.

Although MEELS has been introduced since 2009, the awareness of energy saving remains low among the public. I think the Environment Bureau may have to enhance public education to teach people how to read energy labels when buying electrical appliances. I also call for more government efforts to strengthen law enforcement by, say, inspecting whether shops comply with the statutory requirements on energy labelling.

According to the statistics of green groups, in the year of 2016 alone, air conditioners in Hong Kong consumed 14 billion kWh of electricity, suggesting an emission of more than 8.2 million tonnes of carbon dioxide. As we all know, summer in Hong Kong is so hot that we have to pay more for electricity for several months in a year as we can hardly concentrate on our work or studies without switching on the air conditioners. The Government has recently agreed to pay electricity bills for schools in future. In the past when the Government did not foot the electricity bills for schools, how could students stay attentive in class and how could teachers avoid sweating during the steaming hot days? In fact, schools would turn on air conditioners but they charge students for the air-conditioning fees. Therefore, the so-called "free education" previously did not cover air-conditioning fees. In the Policy Address of this year, Carrie LAW finally took on board the view of the Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union ("HKPTU") ... I have to declare that I am an Executive Committee member of

HKPTU. We had been striving for years for the inclusion of air-conditioning grant for schools in the recurrent education funding ...

(THE PRESIDENT resumed the Chair)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr Helena WONG, you have digressed. Please speak on the subject of this debate.

DR HELENA WONG (in Cantonese): President, I have not digressed, just that you were absent just now and returned to the Chamber.

President, just now I accounted for the natural and human causes for global warming and the phased development of MEELS. As the current situation of Hong Kong is not satisfactory, I myself and the Democratic Party strongly support the Amendment Order and wish that all Members will stand up for it.

Just now, I said that the studies of green groups in 2016 indicated a high level of energy consumption in Hong Kong, despite the implementation of MEELS since 2009. I am just speaking on the energy consumption of air conditioners and thus I definitely have not digressed.

However, is it good enough for the Administration to include a few more electrical appliances in the Schedules? Of course not. It will not be sufficient to save the Earth or reverse the global greenhouse effect. The Environment Bureau should therefore push ahead with law enforcement and step up public education, so as to ensure that consumers will make good use of energy labels to make wise purchase choices.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): President, I speak in support of the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance. As a number of Members have talked about the content of the resolution, I am not going to repeat. To put it simply, the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") to be introduced has included five additional types of electrical appliances.

I would like to analyse MEELS from three perspectives. First, a number of colleagues have pointed out that MEELS had been progressing slowly and inefficiently. What did they actually mean by that? Second, from a macro perspective, what is the role played by energy labels in energy saving and emissions reduction? Third, as energy labels are being applied to household appliances, what can we do to further promote public awareness of energy saving?

First, a number of colleagues have pointed out that the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department ("EMSD") launched the voluntary energy efficiency labelling scheme in 1995; and it was not until 22 years later that MEELS has entered its third phase. MEELS has so far covered a total of about 10 types of products, which appears to be progressing rather slowly. In my view, we cannot criticize MEELS for progressing slowly simply based on the justification that it took 22 years to come to this stage. We need to understand the operational logic of this policy tool as a whole. We can draw reference from the experience of the European Union.

It was only in the early 1990s that the European Union ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, as a reminder, the Council is now debating on the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance, but not on energy efficiency in general. Your speech should not fall outside the scope of the five types of electrical appliances prescribed in the resolution. You may follow up on other issues relating to energy efficiency in relevant Panels.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): President, I have not digressed from the topic. In fact, the scope of study defined by the Government is rather wide. According to government documents, the implementation of the third phase of MEELS would result in a reduction of 105 000 tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions and a saving of about 150 million kWh of electricity. These two figures on electricity saving and emissions reduction have been provided by the Government. Based on these two figures, Members have been discussing whether it would really be effective to apply the mandatory labels on these five types of products, as well as the overall importance of this government policy on Hong Kong's emissions reduction work. In my view, it is absolutely reasonable for this discussion to be conducted on the basis of the government documents, which will facilitate public understanding of the relevant issues.

The Secretary has also clearly stated that he cited the Energy Saving Plan for Hong Kong's Built Environment 2015 ~ 2025+ in the second paragraph of his speech. I hope the President would not consider that only a discussion on the new five types of electronic appliances under MEELS would fall into the scope of the debate.

I hope that the President will allow me to continue with my speech. As I said just now, I hope that Honourable colleagues and the public can understand how MEELS works. As the main target of energy labels, manufacturers have been subject to pressure progressively. Hong Kong has classified energy labels into five grades, whereas the European Union has at least 7 to 10 grades. The higher the grade, the more colourful the label is. The Grade 1 label, which is green in colour, bears a positive meaning. As such, manufacturers are more inclined to produce Grade 1 products. The European Union has put in place a system with grades A*, A**, A*** etc. Upon the launch of MEELS, the Government may progressively impose restrictions on manufacturers on three main fronts. First, the threshold for products meeting the requirements for Grade 1 energy label should be progressively raised. In fact, the Hong Kong Government has already been working on this.

Some Honourable colleagues have cited a recent survey by the Consumer Council on energy efficiency of room air conditioners bearing the Grade 1 energy label. It was found that these products varied widely in terms of energy consumption. Hence, the scope of products with Grade 1 energy labels will be progressively narrowed, marking the first step in imposing restrictions on manufacturers. The second restriction is a ban on the sale of energy-intensive products. The European Union is ahead of us in this regard. According to news reports, since 2014, the European Union banned the sale of vacuum cleaners above 1 600 W. Third, the input power of banned electrical appliances will be progressively lowered. The current ban on vacuum cleaners targets vacuum cleaners of 1 600 W. This will be progressively lowered to 900 W. These restrictive measures have been implemented as a full package.

Now we are going to replicate the European Union's experience in Hong Kong. We notice that the Government has made some progress with regard to restrictive measures. At a minimum, MEELS has been expanding its coverage of product types and raising the standards for energy labels. However, compared with the European Union, we are still far from adequate. This point has been mentioned by a number of Honourable colleagues just now. For example, Mr Jeremy TAM has highlighted the absence of energy efficiency measures on vehicles and the lack of energy accreditation for buildings. I have

noticed that the European Union has even put in place energy efficiency measures on car tyres. Be it consumption or noise emission, the European Union coverage is wider than that of Hong Kong. However, we can still strive to catch up.

In terms of the coverage of labels, should the scope of Grade 1 energy labels be progressively narrowed? Compared with the European Union, the Hong Kong Government is indeed progressing slowly. I hope that the Government can expedite its work on narrowing the scope of Grade 1 energy labels.

The third point may be the priority. In the next phase of MEELS, apart from adding other electrical appliances to tighten up the labelling system, will the Government consider banning the import and sale of energy-intensive electrical appliances? Hong Kong's failure to implement the full package of restrictive measures will give rise to the following situation. In fact, many policies of Hong Kong have the same problem. That is, after Hong Kong had drawn reference from a full package of measures of other countries, we would only implement the package in part, resulting in a Hong Kong version which is slightly inferior to its foreign counterpart. One of the reasons for this is that the Government often does not allow the public to see the full picture. This is the second view I am going to elaborate on.

With regard to the full picture, according to this government document, the third phase of MEELS will include the following five types of products, including: televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, washing machines (with rated washing capacity exceeding 7 kg but not exceeding 10 kg) and room air conditioners of reverse cycle type. It has been estimated that 105 000 tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions will be reduced and 150 million kWh of electricity will be saved per annum. Without making any comparison, it is actually not very meaningful to provide the public with these figures. At the beginning of my speech, I have cited some people as saying that the Hong Kong Government had been acting slowly. However, what does high efficiency actually mean? It is essential for the Government to provide a comparison or a full picture to help the public and the Legislative Council understand the gain in efficiency from the inclusion of these five types of products. I would now like to provide the President, Members and the public with a picture for reference. For example, compared with Hong Kong's annual electricity consumption of some 40 billion kWh, the saving of about 150 million kWh of electricity will account for about 0.3% of the total. Since MEELS was implemented in 2009, upon the completion of the current phase,

600 million kWh of electricity can be saved every year. In other words, about 1% of annual electricity consumption will be saved. These are the overall effectiveness of energy labels.

As for carbon emissions, I do hope that the Government will provide the public with relevant data for reference every time it introduces a measure to reduce emissions or save energy. What actually are Hong Kong's responsibilities and objectives in respect of emissions reduction, and to what extent will MEELS contribute to achieving these objectives? Frankly speaking, it is not easy to find an answer directly only by reading the transcript of the Secretary's speech or the information online. After all, how much can MEELS contribute?

According to the Government, Hong Kong's carbon intensity will drop by 65% to 70% by 2030 compared with the 2005 level, which is equivalent to 26% to 36% of absolute reduction. According to the statistics released by the Government this year, compared with 2014, Hong Kong has made remarkable progress in emissions reduction in 2015; the total reduction of 3.4 million tonnes of carbon dioxide emission accounted for 7.55% of the total, marking a return to the 2008 level. As the public should have been aware, between 2014 and 2015, the use of more natural gas had resulted in a reduction of 3.4 million tonnes of carbon emissions for the whole year. By comparing this figure with the annual carbon emission reduction target of 105 000 tonnes under phase three of MEELS, we will probably get an idea of the effect of the new resolution. After it is passed, the reduction in carbon dioxide emission is about 30 times the reduction resulted from the two power companies switching to using natural gas. The contribution of MEELS will more or less reach that level. However, I hope that the Government will tell us the relevant full picture. We are now debating on the policy relating to MEELS, which has already entered its third phase. The entire set of policies should be finalized in the future. I think that the Government has the responsibility to tell us the contribution of this set of policies. After all, to what extent will MEELS contribute to the overall reduction target, and how many tonnes of carbon emissions will be reduced in the end based on government estimation? I believe that it is vital for the public to be presented with this picture.

Lastly, I would like to add one point. In fact, while these household appliances are used at home, electricity bill indicates electricity consumption and electricity tariffs only, making it difficult for the public to know the extent to which the energy efficient electrical appliances they have purchased can contribute to energy saving for their family as a whole. In my view, EMSD may

consider improving the mode of calculation available on its website. Currently, the mode of calculation is oversimplified. Only a list setting out the estimated electricity consumption of various electricity appliances is available for the public to do the calculation on their own. EMSD has not provided a bespoke calculator for public users to calculate the electricity consumption of different types of electricity appliances, nor has it educated children to monitor the types of electricity appliances purchased by their parents. EMSD should help each family set their own target so as to fulfil their own responsibility in respect of energy saving and emissions reduction.

Thank you, President.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): President, this morning we conducted a very meaningful debate on the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("the Amendment Order") moved by the Secretary for the Environment. We know very clearly that the Amendment Order seeks to include three types of electrical appliances, i.e. televisions ("TVs"), storage type electric water heaters and induction cookers in the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS"). However, as stated by the Secretary in his opening speech, to combat climate change, the Chief Executive set a new carbon reduction target in the 2017 Policy Address and hoped to reduce carbon intensity by 65% to 70% by 2030 compared with the 2005 level. Therefore, our debate will have a wider scope, covering climate change and emissions reduction, and I hope the President will understand that.

In the third paragraph of his opening speech, the Secretary said that encouraging behavioural change is one of the effective measures for energy saving. To enhance public awareness of energy-efficient products, the Government has implemented a series of measures since 2008. The Government has implemented MEELS since 2008 but TVs were not covered at that time. TVs are finally covered nine years later in 2017.

Of course, it is better late than never and it is the best time now. Why do I say so? The role of TVs in homes has now changed greatly, which is very different from that in 2008. Although I have not compiled any scientific statistics, I know that the audience ratings of TV stations are worse than before. However, TVs are switched on for a longer time now, so they consume more electricity. If the law promotes members of the public to buy TVs that are more energy-efficient, we will be able to save more electricity and reduce emissions;

this is more environmental friendly and we can better tackle the challenges brought by climate change.

President, what exactly were the changes to TVs in the past few years? Many TVs currently have built-in set-top boxes and even built-in hard disk video recording functions. More importantly, we can now use TV for Internet access, synchronize our phone to TV and use phones to remote control TV. Some people even connect TV to computer, meaning that TV can replace computer and they do not need to work on the computer in the study room. So, despite the declining audience ratings of many traditional TV stations, the time people spent on TV has not decreased. They use TV to surf the Internet, watch online TV programmes and movies, and even make online purchase. As TV is getting more and more closely related to our daily life, its energy efficiency function has become more important. If TVs are energy efficient, users will pay less for electricity and the target of emissions reduction can be achieved.

In fact, with the continuous improvement of the production technology, nowadays TVs are more energy efficient and energy saving than the huge analogue TVs in the past. I believe that 70% to 80% of the households in Hong Kong have bought ultra-thin TVs, which are more energy efficient than the large TVs before. Nevertheless, with the inclusion of TVs under MEELS, I hope manufacturers will be encouraged to produce more energy-efficient TVs. Yet, the fact that the Government has only recently included TVs in MEELS indicates that we are lagging far behind other regions.

President, Vietnam mandatorily required the display of energy labels on TVs in 2014, and in 2015, it prohibited the production and import of products that did not meet the lowest energy efficiency. Therefore, we hope the Government can explain why we only include TVs in MEELS until now.

I am rather disappointed that the Government has only included TVs in MEELS, while other products with similar functions as TVs, such as set-top boxes, have not been included. In recent years, new models of set-top boxes have been developed with increasing functions; some set-top boxes also have the functions of video recording, viewing pay TV programmes and Internet access. I am not going to elaborate. As set-top boxes are energy-intensive, they get hot when in operation. Some TV stations are really nice as they will remind consumers to switch off set-up boxes when not in use, so that resetting and programme updating are possible. However, set-top box manufacturers seldom voluntarily participate in MEELS, so I suggest that the Government should actively consider assessing the energy efficiency of set-top boxes and including

them under MEELS as appropriate, so as to encourage set-top box manufacturers to attach more importance to energy efficiency. The Government may regard set-top boxes as transitional products and the problem will be solved when TVs have built-in set-top boxes, as in the case of smart TVs. Yet, as many people still buy set-top boxes manufactured in the Mainland for viewing TV programmes from various parts of the world, the proposal is still worth considering.

Furthermore, I think computer monitors should also be included in MEELS. Today, I fail to see the difference between computer monitors and TVs, and computer monitors are used for a longer time than TVs. It is a great pity that computer monitors are not covered under MEELS. The Energy Efficiency Index ("EEI") currently used to assess TVs is actually also applicable to computer monitors. EEI is calculated by taking the average electricity consumption (expressed in Watts) of TV after it has been switched on for 10 minutes divided by 20 W, plus the screen area (expressed in square centimeter), divided by 100 and then multiply by 4.3224 W. This formula is very complicated and we may ignore it. The most important point is the relation between the average electricity consumption 10 minutes after a TV has been switched on and the TV screen size. If this formula is applied to computer monitors, the same index can be calculated. Hence, I hope the Government will consider including computer monitors in MEELS, so that members of the public can buy more energy-efficient computer monitors.

After the inclusion of TVs in MEELS, I hope the Government will comply with the Amendment Order in three aspects. First, it should proactively require government departments and statutory bodies to procure TVs with Grade 1 energy label. After the enactment of legislation, the Government often regulates others but not itself and sets guidelines targeting others but not itself. The Government has to comply voluntarily as the law cannot monitor the Government and it can refuse to comply.

Second, the manpower of the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department ("EMSD") must be increased to conduct regular random checks on TVs. The third point is very important. The Government should educate the public on the proper use of TVs. In the past, elderly people liked to leave the radio on all day, even when they were sleeping, simply because they wanted to have some sounds to keep them company. Today, as TV stations have 24-hour news channels, elderly people now leave the TV on all day. They are not watching, but they just want to have some sounds to keep them company. But when they receive the electricity bills, they will find that the electricity charges increase substantially after the installation of free digital TV. As it turns out, if

wives, husbands, elderly persons—I do not want to pinpoint any gender or age groups—who leave the TV running all day, and only turn down the volume when they go to bed, a lot of electricity will be consumed. I hope the Government will educate the public in this regard.

At present, statutory bodies under government departments are one of the major buyers of TVs. For example, hospitals under the Hospital Authority ("HA") have installed TVs to show the order of patients waiting for drugs. TVs are installed in every ward and they are switched on for an extended period of time. The Government indicates that it will allocate \$200 billion to HA for hospital expansion and construction; TVs will definitely be on the list of procurement. If the Government requires HA to procure TVs with Grade 1 energy labels, this will help lower HA's electricity expenses.

TVs are also widely used in primary and secondary schools. There are hundreds of primary and secondary schools in Hong Kong and TV is installed in each classroom for students to watch educational TV programmes. Can the Government require schools to procure TVs with Grade 1 energy labels so as to reduce the schools' electricity consumption?

In addition, the Government should include TVs in MEELS and assume the responsibility of ensuring that the energy efficiency of TV products are up to the standard as stated in the energy labels at all times. Since there are a large number of TVs in the market, I hope the Government can timely increase the staffing establishment of EMSD and the departments concerned, step up random checks and inspections of TVs in the market to ensure that their energy efficiency conforms to the grading as shown on the energy labels.

I would like to raise another more important suggestion, and I strongly request the Government to take action. I ask the Government to adopt a more stringent and clearer mode of energy labelling to classify TVs with different levels of energy efficiency. At present, there are five grades of energy labels for televisions: Grade 1 energy label is the lowest grade with EEI equal or less than 0.4. However, if we look at the grading in the European Union, we will realize that the grading system in Hong Kong is excessively simplified. Presently, the European Union actually calculated EEI of TVs in the same way as Hong Kong but there are 10 grades, namely G, F, E, D, C, B, A, A+, A++ and A+++. In Hong Kong, TVs with EEI 0.4 belong to Grade 1, but by the European Union standard, they belong to Grade B, which is not the most energy efficient because there are higher grades such as A, A+, A++ and A+++. According to the grading in Hong Kong, EEI 0.1 or 0.4 all belong to Grade 1, but the classification

of the European Union is more detailed. For this reason, I think the European Union labelling system provides consumers with much clearer information and can facilitate them in buying genuine energy-efficient televisions.

The Consumer Council conducted a random test on 14 models of 2 HP inverter split-type air conditioners in May this year. It was found that though all air conditioners had Grade 1 energy label, the difference in energy consumption could be as much as 20%, and difference in electricity charge each year could be as much as \$300, i.e. 24%. In giving this example, I do not want to digress from the subject to discuss air conditioners; I just want to point out, after the Government has included TVs in MEELS, consumers may not be able to save the largest amount of electricity due to the rough classification of the energy efficiency grading, as evident from the study conducted by the Consumer Council on air conditioners as I have just mentioned. Therefore, I hope that the Government will expeditiously implement the energy labelling system of the European Union, so that consumers can easily buy more energy-efficient TVs. The Government should not only complete part of the work and left the other part undone. I am not sure when the 10-grading system that I have just proposed will be implemented.

This subsidiary legislation proposes to include another type of electrical appliance i.e. induction cookers, in MEELS. I think we all welcome this initiative. In recent years, induction cookers have become increasingly popular, and as the technology has matured, people can use induction cookers for cooking. Nonetheless, the Housing Department prohibits open-fire cooking in many subdivided units or studio flats, and requires residents to use flameless induction cookers for cooking which is relatively safer. However, some people intentionally do not comply with this rule. As the use of induction cookers will become more popular, mandatory requirement of energy labels to be shown on all induction cookers sold in Hong Kong is a step forward. I hope the Government can perfect the policies through inter-departmental cooperation.

Yet, President, we are now dealing with a "pocket-it-first" proposal. Some think that we should not raise objection; I do not intend to raise objection, I just hope that the Government can make more specific pledges. So, President, I now move a motion that the debate be now adjourned under Rule 40(1) of the Rules of Procedure and I will give Members a detailed account of the reasons when I speak later. Members should take it easy; even if they oppose, I hope that they will listen to my intent first before stating their position.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): As Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has moved a motion that the debate be now adjourned, this Council will now deal with this motion first.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, please speak on the motion you moved.

Motion under Rule 40(1) of the Rules of Procedure that the debate be now adjourned

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): President, I may not use up my 15-minute speaking time. Regarding the current proposal to include televisions in the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS"), I definitely consider it a correct direction. However, if the current energy labels that I find outdated are still in use, members of the public may be misled, and manufacturers of the most energy-saving televisions may be unfairly treated. In order to press the Government for introducing more precise and detailed energy labels, I now move this motion for adjournment. One may say that I am putting pressure on the Government; or one may say that I want to give Members a chance to express their views to the Government. After listening to the speeches made by Members yesterday and today, it seems to me that there are still many areas that have not been talked about.

At present, there are five grades of energy efficiency for televisions. Since I have already talked about the relevant formula in my last speech, I am not going to repeat it here. A product with an energy efficiency index ("EEI") lower than or equal to 0.4 may obtain a Grade 1 energy label, which is already the best and the highest energy efficiency grading in Hong Kong. However, this actually cannot help consumers choose the most energy-saving television.

Earlier on, I mentioned that the European Union classified televisions into 10 grades in terms of energy efficiency. At present, EEI 0.4 already falls into Grade 1 in Hong Kong; yet in the European Union, it merely falls into Class B, which is not the class for the most energy-efficient products. According to the energy efficiency grading of Hong Kong, the rating of EEI 0.1 or 0.4 falls into Grade 1. Under this grading regime, members of the public may not effectively know whether the television they buy has the highest energy efficiency, i.e. lowering electricity bills; they also do not know if the television can most effectively reduce emissions, so as to achieve the best energy efficiency in response to climate change, as stated by the Secretary in the early part of his

speech. Honestly, to some middle-class people, electricity charges may not be their most crucial consideration. Although they may be hesitant if the electricity bill is too high, they will go for a television that is expensive but more energy-efficient. They do so out of greater love rather than for self-interest. As pointed out by the Secretary, we have to encourage behavioural change of consumers. As energy labelling is one of the effective measures for energy saving, why do we not make it perfect? If the European Union 10-grade system is introduced, members of the public can certainly identify which television models are most energy-efficient—that is, those with an EEI at 0.1—and buy the most energy-saving product. Conversely, if people of Hong Kong fail to know that televisions with Grade 1 energy labels actually cover a wide scope, even if the relevant subsidiary legislation is passed and the exercise of legislating for the relevant definitions is completed by the Government, we can still only buy televisions with European Union Class B energy efficiency.

Some Members may think that "Slow Beat" is nitpicking, and we should just "pocket it first". As we have waited nine years before the Government is willing to include televisions in MEELS, we will not be berated for "pocketing it first". Our "pocket-it-first" approach will only be berated in respect of the constitutional reform. I hope to push the Government, in the course of debate, to explain to us today, and if that is not possible, then at a later stage, why it does not introduce the European Union 10-grade system. The Government might consider the 10-grade system a rather trivial matter, but will it undertake to implement such a system in future? Will it, after the debate on the adjournment motion, take up the task and subsequently submit a proposal to the Legislative Council, so that the 10-grade system can be implemented within this year? Regarding the 18-month grace period provided by the subsidiary legislation, will it allow more time for the Government to do a better job? In fact, there is indeed a big difference between 0.1 and 0.4. Let me give an example. According to the Government's formula, a 40-inch television with an EEI at 0.4 will consume 84.24 W of electricity after switching on for 10 minutes; whereas for another 40-inch television with an EEI at 0.1, only 21 W of electricity will be consumed after switching on for 10 minutes. However, under the current MEELS, the two 40-inch televisions with an average electricity consumption of 21 and 84.24 W in a 10-minute time belong to the same grade, and the energy labels to be shown on these two products are the same. Therefore, members of the public have to read the specifications in detail to find out which television is better.

Secretary, perhaps no one will support me. I do not know if the pro-establishment will support me or not because they do not even bother to listen. Nonetheless, I am rather fair. If it is not possible to improve the grading system for energy efficiency labelling at the present stage, I think the Government should formulate measures to help members of the public choose televisions with higher energy efficiency. Otherwise, I can conversely say that the Government is misleading the public and being unfair to manufacturers of the best energy-saving televisions.

As technology advances, televisions with higher energy efficiency might be launched in the future. Legislation simply cannot catch up with technology. Nevertheless, as we have the chance to catch up today, why should we not do so? Perhaps all manufacturers will be able to produce televisions at EEI 0.1 grade next year. I would not rule out that some manufacturers might be willing to put in efforts and scientific research resources to produce products that can get European Union Class A energy efficiency grading. At present, as a product at EEI 0.4 grade can already get Grade 1 energy efficiency in Hong Kong, manufacturers need not seek higher goals.

Concerning my example of two 40-inch televisions with the same Grade 1 energy efficiency, upon the implementation of MEELS, will it be unfair to those products with better energy efficiency performance? The Government may say, in addition to energy efficiency grading, the annual energy consumption of television will also be shown on energy label currently. Consumers may know which television performs better in energy saving by comparing the annual energy consumption of different televisions, so there is no need to introduce more stringent grading for energy efficiency. If the Government really thinks so, its disregard for consumers is well reflected. When energy label was first introduced, energy efficiency grading was indicated boldly in red to facilitate the public in identifying instantly which products are energy-efficient. General consumers may not necessarily be aware of the differences in annual energy consumption. For instance, we may not be aware of the differences in annual energy consumption of our household electrical appliances, but we will be attracted by the bright-coloured energy grading. In fact, energy labels of the European Union also indicate the annual energy consumption. Why do we have to introduce such a stringent and fine grading system? This is because most consumers will read the large prints and simple information first. If we introduce a more precise grading system, people can get the most accurate information in the shortest time and make the most rational choice that meets the

highest energy efficiency. Therefore, if the Government decides not to do so, it has to explain its decision to the public.

Lastly, the views that I put forward actually echo the latest report published by the Consumer Council ("CC"). I also mentioned in my earlier speech that CC was also concerned about the inadequacies of the current energy labels. Does this reflect that CC has likewise paid no attention to the annual energy consumption shown on the labels? Certainly not. The role of CC is to examine whether energy labels are misleading from the perspective of consumers. Since CC also opined that the current labelling scheme might be misleading to consumers, it conducted a study and published the results. CC conducted a study on air conditioners last time. While air conditioners are only used in summer, televisions, the theme of this discussion, are turned on around the clock in some families—please do not do so because much harm will be caused, yet the President may not let me explain as I may have digressed. Thus, if the Government's grading is too simple and consequently, someone unknowingly buys a television with higher energy consumption, causing personal loss and damaging our environment and planet, who should bear the responsibility?

Finally, I would like to tell the democratic Members, while most of them spoke in support of the Government's motion just now, I now move an adjournment motion; even if they eventually do not support me, I have no bad feelings. Nevertheless, we should make good use of our speaking time to express our views on the rough energy efficiency grading. If the Government undertakes today to draw a schedule and illustrate in detail at the next meeting how it is going to refine the grading system or further include other electrical appliances in the scheme, I have no strong views whether Members vote against my motion or abstain from voting.

President, I so submit.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Members who wish to speak will please press the "Request to speak" button.

I now propose the question to you and that is: That the debate on the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance be now adjourned.

Mr Jeremy TAM, please speak.

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): First of all, I do not support the adjournment motion moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen. I have discussed the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the Ordinance") with the authorities. As a matter of fact, various places in the world are doing the same thing and a consensus has been forged to introduce energy labels as far as possible. Although the industry hopes that the grace period can be extended, both the industry and consumers are psychologically prepared for the amendment of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") by the Government. Hence, if we suddenly adjourn the debate now, I wonder when the debate will resume; I am also afraid that people's enthusiasm for this subject will cool down and government publicity will inevitably be stalled again. I do not want to see all these happen.

Upon the implementation of MEELS, it is estimated that 105 000 tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions will be reduced and 150 million kWh of electricity will be saved per annum. Hence, MEELS not only alleviates the impact on climate change but also helps people save money. Also, I fully support the current extension of the coverage of MEELS to include more types of electrical appliances, thereby enabling consumers to know the energy efficiency performance of the products concerned, enhancing the transparency of product information, and at the same time increasing the competitiveness of the products. In particular, for those manufacturers who have the heart to reduce the wastage of global resources, it will be unfair to them if the implementation of the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("the Amendment Order") is further delayed. If we delay in passing the resolution, even though their products are better than others in terms of quality and energy efficiency, consumers will not be aware of the merits of their products, and as a result, manufacturers cannot benefit from the legislation.

Consequent to the implementation of MEELS, new products will be introduced into the market because some manufacturers may find that MEELS helps promote the sales of the new products that they are developing or about to be introduced into the market. If we adjourn the debate on the resolution now, it will have great impact on these manufacturers and also reduce the choice of consumers. Undeniably, the progress of MEELS is very slow. The Electrical and Mechanical Services Department ("EMSD") launched the Voluntary Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("VEELS") in 1995 but it was not until 2009 that MEELS was implemented. MEELS will be implemented in three phases to gradually cover various electrical appliances.

The first phase of MEELS, fully implemented on 9 November 2009, only covered three types of products, namely room air conditioners, refrigerating appliances and compact fluorescent lamps. The second phase, fully implemented on 19 September 2011, covered two more types of products, namely washing machine and dehumidifier. Then six years later, after a long gap, the Government now implements the third phase. From 1995 up till now, 22 years have gone by. Hence, we should not delay any longer. Although many Members may think that MEELS is not perfect and there is much room for improvement, I think we can let it take effect first on a trial basis and then conduct a review as soon as possible to see if other products can be covered.

Also, I think that the Government should actively promote sustainable consumption. Sustainable consumption does not mean to cut all consumption across the board; rather the idea of using things properly and wisely is advocated. It is not enough to solely depend on energy label to differentiate energy-saving electrical appliances. The Government should make more effort to educate the public how to reduce wastage in their daily lives. For example, EMSD has once pointed out, assuming a household has 10 to 20 electrical appliances in a standby mode, if all of them are switched off, it can reduce 3% of the household's electricity consumption.

There are more and more electronic products in the market but many of them are not included in the Schedule to the Ordinance. Hence, I understand why Mr CHAN Chi-chuen wants to adjourn the debate on the resolution. For instance, what products are under the "exclusion category"? It is very interesting to note that soy milk maker is included in the "exclusion category". However, regarding some electrical appliances operating for long periods of time and consume electricity continuously, such as electric mosquito repellent, should they be examined? Hence, the later the Ordinance takes effect, there will be an increasing number of unregulated new products consuming global resources, and people cannot save money.

Let us look at some overseas examples. In France, real estate agents are required to provide, on the promotion leaflet, the energy consumption indicator of the unit for rental or sale. The indicators, similar to Hong Kong's energy label, are certified by experts and the relevant certificates are presented to the buyer when a transaction takes place. Of course, this policy involves a wide range of matters, which I do not think the Ordinance can cover for the time being. Some

colleagues consider such provisions desirable as they are formulated from the perspective of the energy efficiency of a residential building as a whole, instead of regulating each electrical appliance. But as I said just now, if we suddenly adjourn the debate on the resolution now, we will mark time or even retrogress.

Actually, green buildings and green living are not confined to cutting down on the energy consumption of electronic products. I have already talked about this issue. The international community also recognizes that green buildings can help reduce the impact on climate change ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Jeremy TAM, please speak on this motion. The Council is now dealing with the adjournment motion. What you said just now has already digressed from the subject.

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): Thank you, President, for reminding me. I think we should not support the adjournment motion. But that does not mean I am completely satisfied with all the provisions of the present legislation. One of the provisions that I am most dissatisfied with is related to petrol vehicles. However, I will not arbitrarily adjourn the debate on the resolution just because I am unhappy about the provisions on petrol vehicles, but I think that is a very important factor for consideration. Some colleagues may endorse my viewpoints about petrol vehicles and thus support the adjournment motion. Let me explain my viewpoints.

President, the number of vehicles in Hong Kong has increased 45% in the last decade, but the Government only puts petrol passenger cars under the Voluntary Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("VEELS"). In other words, the display of energy label on petrol passenger car is not mandatory but voluntary; the same applies to diesel cars or trucks. However, President, concerning unleaded petrol cars, according to the statistics provided by the Census and Excise Department, the import volume in 2006 ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Jeremy TAM, you have digressed. Please speak on the motion in question.

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): Alright. President, I meant to say that I understood why some Members wanted to adjourn the debate on the resolution. If some colleagues, after listening to my remarks about vehicles, wish to adjourn the legislative process of the resolution, I would find this regrettable. Of course, the relevant authorities should understand why I keep talking about vehicles because they cannot ignore the energy consumption of cars. However, if we adjourn the legislative process of the resolution today, apart from affecting the manufacturers of electrical products whom I mentioned earlier, vehicles will also be affected. While the Government has not included vehicles in MEELS, it has at least included them in VEELS. Many vehicles are already ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I remind you the last time that you have digressed.

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): President, I understand. I just want to explain why the issue on vehicles may make some colleagues think there is a need to adjourn the debate, because vehicles do consume large amount of petrol ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Vehicles are not covered under the proposed resolution.

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): President, vehicles are covered under VEELS.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): The proposed resolution moved under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance does not cover vehicles. Please speak on the adjournment motion. If you continue to digress, I will order you to stop speaking.

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): Get it. Thank you, President, for reminding me. If so, I may have mistaken because the Ordinance does cover vehicles and that is why I bring it up. Besides, the paper I have in hand also

says that the scope of VEELS will be extended to cover petrol passenger cars. Therefore, vehicles really ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr TAM, you may follow up the matters you have mentioned in the relevant Panels. The subject of the present debate is: the debate on the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance be now adjourned. We are not discussing the Voluntary Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme. Please speak on the adjournment motion.

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): Get it. Thank you, President. In that case, I would like to say a few more words to conclude. From the perspectives of consumers and manufacturers (certainly not from the perspective of power companies), as well as in consideration of the Earth's resources and reduction of power consumption in Hong Kong, it is certainly better to have the Amendment Order than not. Besides, if the resolution is adjourned, in view of the fact that many bills are awaiting scrutiny, President, I am afraid that if the adjournment motion is passed, a big problem will arise because the Amendment Order may likely be stalled till next year or the year after next. As an 18-month grace period is provided by the Amendment Order, how should the grace period be handled? The period may not have an expiry date. During this period, I definitely do not want Hong Kong people become another kind of Big Waster who keep wasting electricity unnecessarily. The passage of the resolution will also help people save money. Hence, President, finally I still want to say the same thing. I hope that our colleagues will not support the adjournment motion. Thank you, President.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): President, the Legislative Council has spent a long time yesterday and this morning debating the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("the Amendment Order"). The majority of Members support the Amendment Order, which has also been discussed by the relevant Subcommittee. Why then did Mr CHAN suddenly move an adjournment motion? I could not understand right away, but upon hearing his detailed explanation, I spent some time analysing his justifications for moving the adjournment motion and what would happen if the resolution proposed by the Government is not adjourned. I have made a preliminary comparison to see if it is compatible with my initial feelings.

We have debated for a long time, during which no one has expressed any objection to the Amendment Order. Even the product manufacturers are basically psychologically prepared. If the resolution is suddenly adjourned, many possible outcomes may be resulted.

Mr CHAN certainly wishes to force the Government to make more pledges. He has even made known his conditions for withdrawal of his adjournment motion. When the Secretary later speaks on the adjournment motion, if he asks Members to stop the adjournment process and undertakes that he would, in accordance with Mr CHAN's aspirations, refine the classification; include more types of electrical appliances in the energy labelling schemes and set a timetable for the implementation of such schemes; set an example for the public after the implementation of the schemes, and further raise the standard for the same type of electrical appliance sometime later, then Mr CHAN would withdraw the adjournment motion. As the Secretary has to make a final speech regarding the main debate in any case, if the Government really responds accordingly, Mr CHAN has expressly or implicitly indicated that the democratic Members or even other colleagues will oppose the adjournment motion.

As I cannot speak again after the Secretary has responded, I have to tell Members now what I think, i.e. what I will do if the Government makes the pledges; and what my stance is if the Government refuses to make the pledges.

Actually, the Government has already considered the Amendment Order for a long time and the Subcommittee has also lobbied the Government for some time. Our colleagues have expressed various views during the debate in the past two days. According to the report submitted to the House Committee, members of the Subcommittee from various political parties and groupings have adopted all possible means, tough or soft, to lobby or urge the Government to make more pledges. If the Government paid heed to Members' demand, it should have made those pledges in the Subcommittee. Will the Government suddenly accede to the demands just because of the adjournment motion moved by Mr CHAN? I am not optimistic. Hence, I first assume that the Government is not willing to make any pledges, and then I have to consider even if Mr CHAN's adjournment motion is passed, can the Government be forced to take some actions? This is the so-called "pocket it first" theory. What exactly will we "pocket" at the moment? President, we are not talking about pocketing the constitutional reform package first. We are all aware of the trend of global warming, issues such as energy saving, public interest, saving the Earth with combined forces, need not be further elaborated. The present problem is: given

that the Government is unwilling to take tougher measures, set the timetable or make any pledges, and we have to "pocket it first", if the implementation of the Amendment Order is delayed or even negated, how big are the impacts?

Just now, Mr TAM said that we should not delay the implementation of the Amendment Order, otherwise manufacturers who are prepared for the Amendment Order will be adversely affected. It is better to have the Amendment Order than not. We must remember that after the Amendment Order is enacted, a stricter Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") will be put in place. However, before the enactment of legislation, there is the trend that many manufacturers will introduce more energy-efficient products. It should be noted that all consumers like energy-efficient products; we need not talk about big moral issues or principles, as long as the products are energy-efficient, they are good enough. The prices of energy-efficient products could be higher but just like the environmental-friendly cars, their prices are higher but use less petrol each month. By the same token, energy-saving electrical appliances are more expensive but if consumers think that they can get more benefits, they will buy them.

Hence, even though the Amendment Order is yet to be passed, the prescribed energy-saving products to be included in the Voluntary Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme have already been announced. Manufacturers are aware that consumers like to save money, although those products are not mandatorily required to ... Of course, I understand the demerit of not imposing mandatory requirement. Some electrical products claim to have better quality and more attractive appearance, but they are less energy efficient than those of other brands. However, despite the advertisements, if we do not adjourn the legislative process of the Amendment Order and expeditiously mandatorily require energy labels to be shown on the prescribed products, when consumers shop for those products, they will naturally make a comparison of the energy efficiency of various products, especially the products they already consider to be energy saving, and they will also make reference to the advertisements, pamphlets or online publicity, or they will review comments from posts on mothers' web page or consumer web pages, etc. in order to make a wise choice.

As a matter of fact, if a certain product is mandatorily required to display an energy label, its energy efficiency cannot be concealed. Hence, if the legislative process of the Amendment Order is not adjourned, and mandatory requirement is imposed, it will have very direct and important advantages.

Regarding Mr TAM's comments that "manufactures of quality products are not encouraged, but even being penalized", I do not think the situation is that bad. If manufactures display energy labels voluntarily, they can state in the label the detailed grading of the European Union standard, as mentioned by Mr CHAN when he moved the adjournment motion. Even though the European Union standard has yet to be implemented, manufactures can on their own initiative state whether their products have attained Grade A or B by the European Union standard. As not all manufacturers will affix energy label to their product, it is difficult for consumers to make a comprehensive comparison. But if a certain manufacturer advertises the energy efficiency of his products, consumers will naturally pay more attention, and ask questions such as, are there more advantages in buying these products; are these products more environmental friendly; can their act contribute to saving the Earth? Hence, I do not think Mr TAM's argument that "manufactures of quality products are not encouraged, but even being penalized" does not have strong justification.

President, the other point is, should we "pocket it first"? In respect of the resolution concerning the Amendment Order, if it is not adjourned but is passed ... I also said yesterday that MEELS should cover more electrical appliances. Just now Mr CHAN mentioned television, which is covered in phase three of MEELS. Nowadays more and more people, not only young people, watch television programmes on computer screens (one kind of LCD monitor) far often than switching on their television sets. Hence, if Mr CHAN's adjournment motion is passed, I believe that the Government will very soon propose to include LCD screens in MEELS because this is the world's general trend. If we pass the Amendment Order and negative Mr CHAN's adjournment motion, what impact will it make?

We must remember that if the Amendment Order is passed, MEELS will cover electrical appliances that consume 70% of the total household electricity consumption, which is a relatively big step forward. Even if the passage of the Government's motion only makes a small step forward, I will consider whether not taking this step forward is insignificant, because if the Government slightly procrastinates, the Secretary said just now that it may take some time before the legislative process can re-start again. I believe that if we adjourn the legislative process of the Amendment Order, the Government will at least include more types of electrical appliances in MEELS and it may not re-submit the resolution in two weeks' time to the Legislative Council and beg for endorsement. Instead, the Government may take on another path and make a bigger step forward.

As the Amendment Order has been in the pipeline for some time, and in the meantime, the Government has also been engaged in other business, including the work concerning LCD monitors, if we adjourn the debate on the Amendment Order now, I believe the Government will indeed make a bigger step forward very soon. Because of that, when I first learnt about the adjournment motion moved by Mr CHAN, I thought I should oppose it, but as I heard more of his reasons, I began to struggle. Frankly, I am somewhat wavered. However, it also came to my mind that electrical appliances such as television and storage type electric water heater are very durable and can last many years. Of course, if one wants to replace them for a newer model, that is another story.

Therefore, if we pass the adjournment motion now, how many months will the implementation of the Amendment Order be delayed? As new models of electrical appliances are constantly being churned out and their prices continue to drop, in particular as people are much better off than before, they tend to go after the feel-good factor, such as bigger screen and higher resolution. Hence, if people buy electrical appliances during this time, and the display of energy label is not a mandatory requirement, they may not replace the appliance for at least a few years. If they do not replace the appliance shortly, then even if those appliances are covered under MEELS later, they may have missed the crucial time.

To conclude, I understand that Mr CHAN wants the Secretary to make some pledges in his final speech. Assuming that the Secretary will not make any pledges or any further pledges, and having weighed the pros and cons, I tend to oppose Mr CHAN's adjournment motion. My reason is that the Government's policy is forward-looking. Will moving an adjournment motion create some misunderstandings or mislead society into going backward and give the public a feeling that this Council is against the protection of our environment? I believe there is little chance this would happen. In particular, manufacturers will not be misled because they have a perfect idea what the Government's policy is. They even realize that if they stop improving the energy efficiency of their products, they may be caught by surprise in case the Government suddenly raises the standard of the energy label and if so, they will have difficulties in operating.

I understand that the Hong Kong market is very small. When manufacturers raise the energy efficiency standards of their products, their target is not Hong Kong as its population is small. But they have the incentive to raise the quality of their products to meet the European Union standard as their target is

the big European Union market. Hence, as they continue to improve the quality of their products, they will take the chance of the Government's issuance of new standards to begin dumping, dumping all the products that will be outdated in the next phase of technological development.

MR KENNETH LEUNG (in Cantonese): President, yesterday we spent the better part of the late afternoon debating the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the Ordinance"), and today Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has moved that the debate be adjourned under Rule 40(1) of the Rules of Procedure. President, in order for me to support this motion for adjournment, I must be satisfied that any one of the three conditions that I am going to discuss—any one of the three conditions, not all of them—is met.

The first condition is that before I can support this motion for adjournment, I must be satisfied that the Government will be able to introduce, within a very short period of time (possibly within 12 months), another set of amendments to the Ordinance which are more effective, more comprehensive and more extensive, so that the currently proposed third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") will become a dispensable measure causing disturbance to people. However, I do not think the Government will be able to submit a more comprehensive or extensive set of amendments to this Council in 12 months. In my opinion, if the Government is to come up with a more comprehensive set of amendments, it should ponder the question raised by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen just now: How come Hong Kong's energy labels are presently classified into only five grades while those of the European Union are classified into 10 grades?

President, I would particularly like to talk about televisions ("TVs"), which are one of the new product types proposed to be included in the third phase of MEELS. TVs can be classified into several major categories. They have evolved from cathode ray tube TVs—that is, TVs of the 1960s and 1970s—to more energy-efficient plasma TVs, and thereafter to liquid crystal display ("LCD") TVs of the 1990s, and light-emitting diode ("LED") TVs. The modes of display of TVs are many and varied. Of course, we all know that cathode ray tube TVs, being the traditional TVs used by all households in the 1970s and 1980s, are very power-consuming. As regards plasma, LCD and LED TVs, as well as those organic light-emitting diode ("OLED") TVs marketed to us by

product sellers these days, can the existing five-grade system for energy labels enable consumers to differentiate between these different types of TVs in terms of power efficiency, so that consumers can, on a more informed basis, select and buy TVs which are more energy-efficient? The answer is no. This is because ultimately, plasma, LCD, LED and OLED TVs may all be given Grade 1 energy labels, and so consumers are unable to obtain sufficient information. Subdividing the energy efficiency grades can definitely give consumers more information and options.

Moreover, when shopping for a TV or other electrical appliances, a consumer will compare the prices of different models. For example, he may discover that a particular model is \$3,000 more expensive than another model which is more power-consuming, but at the same time he will also calculate how much electricity or how much in electricity costs he can save a year if he buys the first model. He will assess ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Kenneth LEUNG, let me remind you that now is not the time for a substantive discussion on the labelling of energy-efficient products.

MR KENNETH LEUNG (in Cantonese): Okay, I have just finished talking about TVs. President, let me continue to elaborate on the first condition, which is, unless the Government can introduce a more comprehensive and extensive set of amendments to the Ordinance, I will not support the motion for adjournment moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen.

There is another thing that I think the Government has failed to do, and that is ... President, you must allow me to talk about this, as it is related to electrical products, as well as energy labels for electrical products. The Government has in place the Buildings Energy Efficiency Ordinance to enforce the relevant codes, and yet the Ordinance currently under discussion is not directly connected with the Buildings Energy Efficiency Ordinance. Why? In fact, buildings account for 90% of Hong Kong's electricity consumption. What things in buildings use electricity? President, there are four types of installations that use electricity in buildings. While all of them are electrical products, they are not regulated under the Ordinance because they are not household electrical appliances. These four

types of installations are lighting systems, air-conditioning systems, lifts escalators. All these are products that use electricity, but as they are not household electrical appliances, they are not covered by the Ordinance. However, the problem is that our assessment of the energy efficiency of buildings is based on such ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Kenneth LEUNG, as for this matter mentioned by you, you should follow it up in the relevant Panel instead of discussing it in this debate on the motion for adjournment. Please speak on this motion.

MR KENNETH LEUNG (in Cantonese): President, I take your point. My argument is that I do not think the Government will be able to propose a more comprehensive labelling system in 12 months. If the Government will be able to do so, I will support Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's motion for adjournment, so as to urge the Government to withdraw the current amendments and then submit a better proposal to this Council, because people will be greatly disturbed if only minor amendments or piecemeal changes are made each time.

Well, if the first condition is not met, are there other conditions or reasons which can make me think that it is necessary to adjourn the debate on amending the Ordinance? Yes, I may think so if what the Ordinance seeks to realize is completely useless and not conducive to combating climate change. This can be one reason. Why do we have to save electricity? The ultimate goal of saving electricity is to curb climate change. President, you must allow me to talk about one thing, and I will be very brief. As undertaken by many countries in the Paris Agreement adopted on 12 December 2015, all signatories aim to hold the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C and pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C, so as to curb global warming. Why does the Government have to implement MEELS? One reason is that the Government hopes MEELS can prompt people to use highly energy-efficient products, thereby directly or indirectly curbing the rise in the temperature of the surroundings. However, if MEELS does not work and is just window dressing, then I will see it as a measure causing disturbance to people, in which case it is unnecessary for us to amend the Ordinance to implement the third phase of MEELS.

The information provided by the Government to this Council clearly shows that the third phase of MEELS may only result in an annual reduction of carbon

dioxide emissions of 105 000 tonnes and an annual energy saving of 150 million kilowatt-hours. In the circumstances, is the third phase of MEELS not an utterly inadequate measure that cannot achieve anything when it comes to combating climate change, reducing temperature or curbing the rise in temperature? Yet, President, I do not feel that this is the case. Why? Because Hong Kong is not only an international city, but also a member of the C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group ("C40"). We must exert all our strength to set an example in combating climate change. As one of the C40 Cities, Hong Kong ... President, I have to explain. C40 actually comprises 90 cities rather than just 40 cities; of course, it was made up of only 40 cities at its inception. If the Government withdrew the current proposal because of Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's motion for adjournment, it would set a very bad example.

C40 includes different cities on five continents, and each continent has a different focus of attention. In the case of Hong Kong, which is situated in the subtropical region of Asia, the focus of attention is on electrical products because Hong Kong people often use air conditioners, computers, TVs, and so on. Given that C40 has not launched any worldwide initiative for many years, and Hong Kong can certainly lead C40 to do something to save electricity and energy, we should not say at this juncture that we are not taking any measure in view of its limited effect. Should all the 90 cities of C40 act in concert, their action will cover 650 million people, and if these 650 million people are concerned about climate change and aware of the need to save energy and buy energy-efficient household electrical appliances, I believe carbon dioxide emissions may be reduced by not just 105 000 tonnes but 1.05 billion tonnes.

It is important to set such an example, or to play such a promotional or educational role, because if no city can set such an example, other cities will not follow suit. In fact, Hong Kong is a rather backward city in environmental protection. President, many countries have already indicated their intention to completely switch to electric vehicles by 2030 or 2040, and their main purpose in doing so is to combat climate change. The purpose of implementing MEELS in Hong Kong is also to combat climate change, and as mentioned by Mr Jeremy TAM, Hong Kong has a Voluntary Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme in place as well. President, as you probably think that this topic has no direct relevance to the present motion, I will stop talking about it. Even though what we can do is limited, we must go ahead. With this principle in mind, I oppose Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's motion for adjournment.

That said, there is one more condition that I have to talk about, and if this condition is met, I will also consider supporting Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's motion for adjournment. This condition is: the third phase of MEELS being infeasible. Actually, any labelling scheme, be it a food labelling scheme or energy labelling scheme, is bound to be opposed by the industry as it will increase the costs, or rather, operating costs, of the industry. But, President, we must understand that these operating costs are not to be incurred for just one or two years, but can be spread over a longer period of time.

In the long run, MEELS will cause electrical product manufacturers and distributors to increase their competitiveness, because they are all competing to manufacture and sell products with high energy efficiency. However, I think the existing MEELS is deficient. Why do some electrical product distributors affix energy labels to the surfaces of products (such as air conditioners) for consumers to see? This is because those are Grade 1 energy labels. As regards electrical products that are more power-consuming, consumers simply cannot find energy labels on the products when looking at them, because the energy labels are on the insides of the products. While the Government has implemented MEELS, there is no requirement as regards where to affix an energy label to a product. This is not very fair to those members of the industry who comply with the energy efficiency grading standards.

This being the case, does MEELS cause disturbance to people or put great pressure on the industry? I do not think so, because as we can see, the voice of opposition from the industry has not been very strong during the implementation of the first and second phases, and the Government has proposed an 18-month grace period for the third phase. But, President, I must emphasize that I think the Government seems to be completely lax in implementing MEELS. For one thing, the problem of where to affix an energy label as I mentioned just now is very strange.

I have asked some members of the industry whether MEELS has put great pressure on them. They have, of course, taken the opportunity to tell me that they think MEELS is not very good as it has imposed many restrictions on them. But if the Government announces—I hope the Government will do so—that its ultimate aim is to require all household electrical appliances in Hong Kong to bear energy labels, then all sellers or suppliers of household electrical appliances will be competing on the same platform, and will affix very eye-catching energy labels to the specified parts of the products. As long as we can create a level

playing field, this approach is absolutely harmless to the industry. Therefore, I am sorry that I cannot support (*The buzzer sounded*) ... Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's motion for adjournment.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, please stop speaking.

MR CHARLES PETER MOK (in Cantonese): President, I speak in opposition to the adjournment motion moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen. I think I am going to speak for less than 15 minutes.

President, when I last spoke, I pointed out some shortcomings in the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS"). I have mainly discussed two issues and the first issue is about public awareness and whether members of the public attach importance to energy labels, which is certainly related to education. I think that the authorities have not done enough in this respect, but that is not necessarily related to problems with the law. To a very large extent, that is attributed to the implementation problems by the departments concerned. Even if there are inadequacies in this respect, it does not mean that we should stop implementing the third phase. Apart from making legislative amendments, I hope the authorities will spare no effort in educating the public and enhancing their awareness. Despite this shortcoming, I think it is not necessary to adjourn the motion debate or stop implementing the third phase.

Earlier, I have also pointed out another shortcoming, that is, whether it is still necessary to use labels. Are there any other new technologies or means to replace labels? According to the laws previously or recently enacted, after the introduction of the recycling arrangements, recycling labels are also required to be attached to the electrical appliances concerned. In respect of energy labels and recycling labels, are there a lack of coordination on the implementation of policies, as well as the enactment and enforcement of legislation? Even so, that is not a strong reason for not using the latest technology. Some Members have also pointed out earlier the shortcomings in implementing MEELS; for example, consumers may not be able to see energy labels on the products. But if we stop implementing the third phase in order to force the Government to do better, I am afraid this approach will not be beneficial.

These are the two shortcomings in relation to the third phase of MEELS. I hope the Secretary will respond later. More important still, in future when the Government formulates and implements policies, as well as promotes education, it should resolve these two major problems pointed out by me.

Next, I would like to briefly explain, from other perspectives, why we should not support the proposal of Mr CHAN chi-chuen to stop the legislative amendment exercise to implement the third phase of MEELS.

First, from the consumers' perspective, the bigger the energy labels the better, for they can easily be seen by consumers when selecting products. Consumers also have to understand the information given in energy labels. Having energy labels are always better than not having such labels. They provide consumers with easily comprehensive information on the energy consumption level of electrical appliances. Certainly, the authorities should introduce policies to draw consumers' attention to energy labels. I believe it is right to implement MEELS. A number of Members have made many good proposals including grading; I hope the Government will consider these proposals in the future so that consumers can make right choices when purchasing products. It is commendable to include some new products in the third phase of MEELS. From the perspective of helping consumers make the right decisions, I cannot find any convincing reason to support the non-implementation of the third phase. I also think that we should not wait any longer. Thus, I think we should not support the adjournment motion.

(THE PRESIDENT'S DEPUTY, MS STARRY LEE, took the Chair)

Many Honourable colleagues have mentioned business operators just now; the second point I would like to make is exactly related to business operators. I am probably one of the few democrats who will consider the views of the business sector. Will business operators necessarily have negative views on MEELS and raise objection? I would like to give an example. Earlier when we discussed the proposal on recycling labels, I came into contacts with many business operators and manufacturers and they all welcomed the proposal. So, business operators may not necessarily criticize MEELS for increasing operating costs and causing inconvenience, and they may not be worried about their

consumers realizing that their products consume a lot of electricity. Based on my experience, I believe that manufacturers and local dealers will not mind making greater efforts out of their responsibilities for the planet or business considerations. So, we need not worry that the business sector will not cooperate. Consumers today are also very clever; if MEELS is well implemented, it will provide more information to the public and the business community will also have competitive edge.

Another very important point is that Hong Kong is not the only place in the world where mandatory labelling scheme is implemented. As I just said, Hong Kong is not in a leading position in the world in this respect and it may even be lagging behind. According to information in hand, more than 40 countries in the world including Europe, North America, Australia, Asian countries and even Mainland China, have introduced varying degrees of mandatory labelling schemes for different types of electrical appliances. Most of these schemes cover more types of products and impose more requirements than that in Hong Kong. If Members argue that the debate on the motion should be adjourned for further discussion by the business community because business operators and the business community may have opposing views, I think they are over-worried and totally unnecessary. On the contrary, I believe many business operators prefer implementing the third phase so that they can show consumers that their products are energy saving and they can thus have competitive edge. Therefore, we should not worry about that. The business community has adapted to this practice and they are able to comply.

It is worth mentioning that the mandatory labelling schemes in many places such as the European Union not only cover all products that have been included in the first, second and third phases of MEELS in Hong Kong, but also cover many products that we have not regulated. For instance, products related to the sector to which I belong, such as computers and servers, and set-top boxes mentioned by some Honourable colleagues just now, are regulated. Although many people know that when they leave home or when electrical appliances are not in use, they should turn off the power supply, many of them have not done so. I have connected my television and a few set-top boxes to a main switch at home and I switch it off when I leave home every day. Deputy President, I think this is all about education; I know this is a digression but I just want to express my hope that the Government will do a good job in education.

The third point is about the Earth. Hong Kong needs to reduce carbon intensity by 70% by 2030 compared with the 2005 level. Electricity now takes up 70% of carbon emission in Hong Kong. Hence, if we are to save energy, we should exhaust all methods to achieve this target. We should try our best to reduce emissions in Hong Kong and do something for the Earth.

Now, let me briefly present the fourth point. Deputy President, as you know, the Hong Kong Government is continuously promoting the development of a smart city. In many countries, environmental protection and the use of smart energy are important elements of smart cities. Apart from transport and government services applications, energy conservation, emissions reduction and waste management are also important elements of smart cities. I think the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance is in line with the general direction of the development of Hong Kong

Whenever we talk about the development of a smart city, we will talk about smart homes, and smart home appliances are certainly used in smart homes. In fact, the Environment Bureau should also be responsible for ... Deputy President, I have not digressed from the subject and I have said that in passing. Speaking of electricity, apart from electrical appliances, smart meters are also involved. Smart meters that can tell us the electricity consumption of each electrical appliance are very important. The Environment Bureau should promote a smart meter policy in the future, but I will not go into details because that is not directly related to the subject and the legislation currently under discussion. Yet, this is related to the work of the Environment Bureau.

In any case, we all know that the Government will unveil a smart city blueprint for Hong Kong in December and I believe that it will touch upon a smart environment. To build Hong Kong into a smart city is in line with the overall government policy, there is no reason for us to stop dealing with the legislative amendment seeking to implement the third phase of MEELS. Therefore, I do not support the adjournment motion.

Deputy President, lastly, I would like to give an example to illustrate that relying on MEELS is really not enough. The third phase of MEELS covers several types of electrical appliances including storage type electric water heaters. Among the electrical appliances covered, storage type electric water heaters may consume most electricity because I really do not know how to turn them off ... yes they can be turned off, but many people will not turn them off.

In recent years, more and more buildings have been installed with storage type electric water heaters. As the residential units today are becoming smaller—I found that all problems in Hong Kong are actually real estate problems—the toilets or bathrooms in many units are "dark toilets" of enclosed design which are unsuitable for installing gas or LPG water heaters. For many families, electric water heater is really the only option and there is no substitute. This also reflects ... Deputy President, while members of the public will not replace electric water heaters very often, if they really need to replace them, it is very important for them to know more about the electricity consumption of different models of electric water heaters. The residential units in Hong Kong have become increasingly smaller so there is no substitute for electric water heaters for many families. Therefore, the electricity consumed by Hong Kong people using storage type electric water heaters for bathing may continue to rise, which is a cause for concern.

Deputy President, I have said that I would not speak for more than 15 minutes. With these remarks, I oppose the adjournment motion moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and I hope that the proposed resolution will be passed as soon as possible.

MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I share the views of other Members who are against the motion moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen to adjourn the debate on the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the proposed resolution"). I am going to focus my speech on several areas. I will try not to repeat the views expressed by other Members before and will avoid going into the specific details of the relevant ordinance. I oppose the adjournment motion. In the previous two policy addresses, carbon reduction and energy saving targets had been set to mitigate the impact of climate change, and the policy objective to improve the environment had been put forward. This adjournment motion, if passed, will move us further and further away from these targets and may even lead us in the opposition direction. I will express some views in this regard.

As I said earlier, I originally intended to speak in support of the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedules) Order 2017 ("the Amendment Order"). I hope that this adjournment motion will not put a halt to the deliberation on the proposed resolution. The Secretary has just

pointed out that encouraging behavioural change is one of the effective measures to save energy. Once it is passed, the adjournment motion will not only hinder the behavioural change of the public and manufacturers of electrical appliances, but will even give rise to undesirable behaviour. Manufacturers and the public will receive a wrong message which will be detrimental to achieving the policy objectives.

The passing of the adjournment motion will deal a severe blow to the environmental protection measures of the Government. The Secretary has reiterated on many occasions his commitment to mitigate the impact of climate change. Hong Kong will fail to fulfil all of its responsibilities and targets under the Paris Agreement, in defiance of the international agreement and its responsibilities as a member of the international community.

A number of Members, including Mr James TO, have asked these questions: Are there any other energy-saving measures which are more effective than the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS")? Can the Government further explore the availability of other measures which are significantly more effective in attaining the objectives in respect of energy saving and carbon reduction? The Secretary may respond to this later. If more effective measures are available, it will make sense to adjourn the debate. Just now, a Member suggested that a better mandatory labelling scheme might be re-introduced to the Council within 12 months, under which more areas would be covered and even tax incentives would be offered in addition to MEELS, with reference to the energy-saving measures of other jurisdictions. I will talk about this point later. If better measures are available, the adjournment motion may also become meaningful. However, based on our analysis, the Government may not be able to come up with better measures in the short term, given that no mention has been made of such measures in the previous speeches of the Secretary or in the policy addresses.

I am going to elaborate on these arguments, I hope the Secretary will listen attentively and other Members will consider whether they should support the adjournment motion moved by Mr CHAN. First, the Government has affirmed its policy objectives in the policy address of this year and last year. It has clearly stated its specific commitment to reduce carbon emission and has laid down specific targets to reduce carbon intensity by 65% to 70% by 2030 from the 2005 level. This strong commitment to achieving the target is of great

significance. The Energy Saving Plan for Hong Kong's Built Environment 2015~2025+ published in 2015 laid down a 10-year plan aimed at reducing energy intensity by 40% by 2025 from the 2005 level.

According to the Government, under the third phase of MEELS which we are discussing today, 150 million kWh of electricity can be saved and 105 000 tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions will be reduced per annum. Three phases combined, 600 million kWh of electricity will be saved per annum. If the third phase of MEELS is voted down or delayed, how can we catch up with these targets? The Secretary must respond to this during his speech later. Other Members should also give it a thought. Mr CHAN also has the responsibility to work out the relative figures for us. Failure to achieve these targets means that the overall energy saving and carbon reduction commitment will be ruined instantly. This is the first point.

Secondly, I have talked about behavioural change just now. During my earlier speech in support of the Amendment Order, I have said—and so has the Secretary—that changing behaviour is one of the most effective energy-saving measures. Therefore, it is extremely important to change the shopping behaviour of consumers and encourage them to buy energy-efficient electrical appliances. I have just further noted that change in consumer behaviour will result in a change in the behaviour of suppliers and importers, which will gear the market ideology more toward environmental protection and energy saving.

I often compare the Product Eco-responsibility (Regulated Electrical Equipment) Regulation ("the Regulation") with the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance, given that both of them concern the use of labels to provide consumers with more information for reference. While the mandatory energy labels tell the public how much electricity can be saved, the non-mandatory recycling labels indicate whether a product can be recovered and recycled. What are the relations between the two? Why do I have to cite the Regulation as an argument for opposing the adjournment motion? By passing this adjournment motion, we will send a seriously wrong signal to manufacturers. During the discussion on product eco-responsibility, my proposal to make recycling labels on products mandatory was met with strong opposition. The opposing arguments include inconvenience, additional cost and the need to increase substantial amount of manpower; even Mr Charles Peter MOK, who represents the Information Technology Functional Constituency, has also noted that recycling labels will harm the aesthetic appeal of products. Technological

products are small, and some of them are just palm-sized. The products will not look good if affixed with a large label.

In addition, according to the information and technology sector, the products they have produced are not only sold in Hong Kong. From the perspectives of logistics and production technology, it would be a great challenge to decide when and how the labels should be affixed during the production process.

Recycling labels and energy labels are different. While the mandatory energy labels can be affixed by manufacturers themselves, the recycling labels under the producer eco-responsibility system must be obtained from the Environment Bureau. Both labels are beset with different problems. However, manufacturers may consider it a piece of good news if the adjournment motion is passed. They have been busy making preparation at various sales points and along the production line to ensure that energy labels have been affixed to their products before delivering them to the market. If the representatives of public opinions in the Legislative Council do not support MEELS, the production plans of the manufacturers for three to five years to come will likely be affected. Although energy-saving measures will raise production costs, manufacturers have also taken into account the fact that environmental-friendly and energy-efficient products are likely to attract more customers. However, the passing of the adjournment motion would mean that the public are not so supportive of MEELS and the Government does not have strong determination. Manufacturers may thus switch to focus on the production or research and development of less energy-efficient products. This will definitely deliver a wrong message to the market which may have far-reaching consequences. This is one of the reasons why the Council should not support Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's adjournment motion.

I have raised a question just now. If the adjournment motion is passed, will the Government have alternative measures in place which serve the same purpose of mitigating the negative impact brought about by climate change? As I have just noted, the Government has no alternative measures in place. I am not going to repeat the causes and severity of the global climate change issue, which is not controversial at all internationally and locally. However, I would like to talk about the measures implemented in other jurisdictions where mandatory labelling scheme has not been in place to see whether such measures can meet the targets pledged in the Policy Address.

For example, the United States has put in place measures to promote energy efficiency. Several pieces of legislation have particularly covered the standards of appliances and facilities, including the National Appliance Energy Conservation Act, the Energy Policy Act of 1992, the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. These acts, including the tax concession measures thereunder, have never been found in Hong Kong. The United States has provided tax concessions as an incentive for buying energy-efficient appliances (i.e. electrical products or other appliances). The Energy Tax Act passed locally in 1978 was authorized by the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

Tax allowances granted to buyers of new electrical products or other appliances for the purpose of improving living environment will incentivize manufacturers to develop such energy-efficient products as refrigerators, washing machines and dishwashers. For example, during the year 2008-2009, a total of 13 million of the above household electrical appliances were produced locally, saving 1.4 TWL (a unit to measure saving in electricity consumption) of electricity every year. In addition, the energy property tax credit has been granted to local investments on residential equipment, the coverage of which is even wider than Hong Kong's MEELS, including insulation measures, windows, heaters and air conditioning. Buyers of electric and hybrid vehicles are also entitled to tax allowances. Energy-efficient commercial buildings etc. have also been developed. All of the above measures have been implemented under the afore-mentioned Acts. The energy-saving measures of other jurisdictions are not the same as those of Hong Kong. One difference lies in tax incentives.

If the adjournment motion is passed, the implementation of MEELS will come to a halt. However, has the Government or the Member who moved this adjournment motion ever considered if there are other more aggressive measures available which can achieve or even over-achieve the targets more quickly? Members from all political parties or groupings should consider this question together. In the absence of relevant information or mode of calculation, I beg to disagree with Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's adjournment motion. I hope Members can consider supporting the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance and oppose Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's adjournment motion.

I so submit.

MR WU CHI-WAI (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I have expressed support for the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 in my first speech. Notwithstanding our various criticisms over the overall enforcement process, we still consider it necessary to pass the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the proposed resolution") as soon as possible. Although we are running late, it is still better than marking time.

We certainly cannot support the motion moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen to adjourn the debate on the proposed resolution. The reason is very simple. We doubt if the Government can, as suggested by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, reintroduce a better amendment to the subsidiary legislation within a short period of time even if the adjournment motion is passed. Based on previous experience, from the implementation of the first phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") in 2009 to the third phase of MEELS in 2017, energy labels have only been applied to 10 types of household electrical appliances. Among them, we should not forget that three types of prescribed products will not be included under MEELS until the next amendment. My first argument is that the short-term benefit of the adjournment motion will be the inclusion of these three types of products under MEELS earlier than scheduled. However, the inclusion of the two types of prescribed products which originally should be passed would be deferred. From this perspective, passing the adjournment motion is an unreasonable arrangement in practice, contrary to the objective of improving energy efficiency to be achieved by product labelling legislation.

In addition, a number of Honourable colleagues have expected that the passing of the adjournment motion may send a wrong signal to manufacturers, thereby changing their pattern of operational behaviour. While I think that they may be over-worried, I am still against this adjournment motion. As far as manufacturers are concerned, raising the energy efficiency of electrical appliances actually plays an important role in developing the competitive edge of their products. Hence, under the Voluntary Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme, quite a number of products have claimed to be energy efficient. I do not quite share the concern of other Members over the behavioural pattern of manufacturers. Instead, I think that the adjournment motion will send a wrong signal to the market. Consumers may assume that the legislature has changed its attitude and view on environmental protection and energy saving which, in the

long run, will definitely have a negative labelling effect on the Secretary's work to promote energy saving and emissions reduction. Consumers may even assume that the legislature may adopt an attitude of distrust toward the work of the Secretary for the Environment and even the overall plan and blueprint in respect of environmental protection and energy saving. Hence, I consider it necessary to vote against the adjournment motion in order to avoid sending a wrong signal to consumers and even the community as a whole.

During the discussion on the adjournment motion, a number of Honourable colleagues have talked about the acts of the Government. As I have said during my previous speech, energy efficiency labelling has in fact accounted for only a tiny part in the overall planning to promote energy saving, emissions reduction and an improvement in air quality and energy efficiency. As stated in the information papers provided by the Government, the positive impact of implementing the third phase of MEELS is only insignificant relative to the overall generating capacity. However, we should support MEELS even if it can only result in a slight improvement because "a journey of thousand miles begins with the first step".

However, we also have to be aware that the acts of the Government will very often affect the overall energy efficiency of the community. When I spoke on the proposed resolution, I illustrated my view using the project to replace the tunnel lighting system in the Kai Tak Tunnel as an example. In fact, I also expect that the Secretary will really respond to this later. Honourable colleagues have expressed many views about the funding proposal of the Kai Tak Tunnel project, arguing that the Government has not firmly adhered to its objectives. According to the implementation timetable of the project, the procurement and installation of the associated equipment will be completed by September 2020; the tendering process and the selection of contractor will take place in March 2018; and the contractor is expected to complete the system design by June 2018. According to the minutes of relevant meeting, the Transport and Housing Bureau has not set any quantitative targets in respect of the energy performance of the project. Although the Secretary has often indicated his emphasis on energy efficiency, he has failed to walk the talk. During our previous debate with the Secretary, we had suggested that the Government adopt the newest LED technology. He had, however, indicated that LED lamps failed to meet the efficiency requirement for the lighting system of a tunnel due to their unstable

performance. However, the procurement and installation of the associated equipment will not be completed before September 2020. In other words, the project will be completed five years after its approval. I consider it necessary for the Secretary to earnestly review the procurement culture of the Government in general. Unless this procurement culture is improved, we can never stop the Government from wasting energy no matter how much efforts we have made in actively promoting the use of energy labels by consumers and manufacturers. To achieve the goal of emissions reduction set by the Government, the participation, contribution and devotion of all stakeholders are necessary. The Government should not simply order other stakeholders to implement MEELS while continuing to waste energy itself. This attitude is absolutely unacceptable.

Despite my strong criticism of the behaviour of the Government, I do not think that adjourning this debate can change the behavioural pattern of the Government in the short term. In fact, it is not necessary to resort to the adjournment motion if the Government is willing to make a change. While Secretary WONG Kam-sing has been campaigning for and urging the Environment Bureau to change its behavioural pattern in the past five years, the Government has so far made no active response. Even the passing of the adjournment motion can only buy two to three months of time. This extra period will actually not help if the Government is unwilling to improve. If it is willing to make improvement, the Government may simply tell the public the specific target of energy efficiency of each government department tomorrow. Putting this large-scale effort aside, even every department should set a target to achieve optimum energy efficiency for its procurement policy. While looking for products for particular projects during the procurement process, government departments should give priority to items which best meet the energy efficiency standards at the time of procurement. This will significantly help the Government fulfil its responsibilities. In my view, the adjournment motion will not help much in achieving this objective. I call on the SAR Government and the Secretary to hold themselves accountable to our environment, climate and energy efficiency; actively make sensible responses; and show the public their determination to promote energy saving. Otherwise, the general public will even be sceptical about the Government's determination when it comes to some non-controversial issues. I think this scenario is absolutely unacceptable and can be avoided by the Government.

Lastly, I would like to point out that the two power companies, despite being important stakeholders in the discussion of the proposed resolution, appeared to have no clear role and positioning all along. The two power companies play a vital role in Hong Kong's energy efficiency policy. As power generators, the two companies certainly hope that power consumption will rise because it is the lifeline of their business. However, if the Government does not include any emission reduction target in the scheme of control agreements with the two companies, they will not be proactive in implementing the relevant policies.

In fact, in the negotiation with the two power companies over the past few years, the Government has only required them to make improvements by fixing minor problems and doing small favours. In return, the two companies would be offered some benefits. As the franchised power companies in Hong Kong, the two power companies have been operating in the territory for over a century. In fact, they have been making staggering profits every year as a result of the franchise, thus having become the favourite stocks of many investors in the stock market. In view of this, shouldn't they shoulder more social responsibilities?

The most direct way to fulfil social responsibility is to reduce energy consumption. As public utilities, the two power companies have an obligation to demonstrate and encourage the efficient use of electricity, with a particular emphasis on household users. The most direct way is to educate the public that the standby mode currently available in new-type electrical products cannot save energy actually. According to a number of researches, even in the so-called standby mode, an appliance will still consume 2% to 3% of power in an idle state. Educating the public to tackle the issues relating to electricity consumption properly is a direct and effective way to help raise overall energy efficiency, whereby electricity can be put to more meaningful use in a more efficient manner.

However, it is questionable whether the Government and the two power companies will make decisions from this perspective or merely based on their own interests. Evidently, even if the adjournment motion is passed, the authorities and the two power companies will not reach any agreement in the short term. It is essential for the SAR Government to show its determination and firm attitude during the negotiation with the two power companies. Otherwise, the Government will certainly end up in a disadvantaged position due to the pressure from the two companies. Given that electricity generation

provides the source of income for the two power companies, their guaranteed profits will be higher if more electricity is generated. When it comes to energy saving, the attitude and the determination of the Government will have a direct bearing on the acts of the two power companies.

Another issue concerning the overall efficiency of the energy market is that the tariff structure of the two power companies for commercial electricity consumption has defied the energy efficiency concept. Under the current tariff structure for the commercial sector, users will receive a more favourable tariff treatment for higher electricity consumption. From this perspective, it is never possible to encourage shopping malls and commercial users to reduce electricity consumption.

After all, the authorities and the two power companies must squarely face this problem. Nevertheless, even if the adjournment motion is passed, there will still be no solution to this problem. In spite of my various disagreements with the concept and practices of the Government in relation to energy efficiency, I am of the view that this adjournment motion will fail to achieve the results I have expected given its temporal and spatial constraints. To encourage energy saving and emissions reduction, and to accurately deliver to the community, the market and consumers the message that energy issue is the common concern of the Government and the legislature, I am against Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's adjournment motion.

I strongly hope that the Secretary will show the public the determination of the Government when responding to the adjournment motion or the proposed resolutions later on. Instead of providing a broad-brush statement, the Government should quantify its determination as measureable indicators. In fact, I have asked the Government time and again if energy saving targets have been set for various departments. If the Government, as the main stakeholder, can take the lead by setting energy saving targets, the attitude and views of all Honourable colleagues taking part in the decision making process will be influenced.

With these remarks, I oppose Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's motion. Thank you, Deputy President.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I speak to oppose Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's adjournment motion. Our current discussion concerns a resolution on energy labels. Once the resolution is passed, the energy efficiency performances of some electrical appliances will become more transparent. The progress of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") is actually too slow. The Electrical and Mechanical Services Department first launched a Voluntary Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme in 1995.

The Government introduced an energy efficiency labelling scheme in 1995, i.e. before the reunification. Global warming and greenhouse gas emission arising from carbon emission were already issues of concern back then. Considering that it is now 2017, we have taken 22 years to proceed to the third phase of MEELS, the progress is really too slow. We think the progress of implementing MEELS is already too slow, not to mention adjourning the legislative procedure concerned. We hope that consumers can be provided with more transparent information so that they can choose electrical appliances with better energy efficiency performances. If the introduction of MEELS is adjourned now, it will further delay the implementation of the policy.

In fact, the introduction of MEELS already came too late. The laws were first enacted in 2008. In the first phase of MEELS which was implemented in 2009, three types of products, i.e. room air conditioners, refrigerating appliances and compact fluorescent lamps were included. In the second phase implemented in 2011, two additional types of products, namely, washing machines and dehumidifiers, were added. It is now 2017, which is six years after the second phase was implemented, a few types of electrical appliances, i.e. televisions; induction cookers; washing machines; storage type electric water heaters; and room air conditioners of reverse cycle type are further included in the third phase. The progress is really too slow. Thus, we cannot adjourn this debate and delay the matter even further.

My second point is that the SAR Government has set a new emission reduction target. In 2015, Secretary WONG Kam-sing announced the Energy Saving Plan for Hong Kong's Built Environment 2015~2025+, setting the target of reducing Hong Kong's energy intensity by 40% by 2025. That was the first-ever energy saving blueprint for Hong Kong. Mr WONG Kam-sing said that to achieve this target, "we in the community must take collective actions to change our behaviour and to invest in more energy efficient products,

technologies and practices". To achieve this new energy intensity target, the Government has taken a series of actions, including dealing with the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance under discussion today.

If we adjourn this debate to temporarily shelve, or at least delay the introduction of the third phase of MEELS, I am afraid we may not be able to achieve the new energy-saving target announced by the Government in 2015. If so, what would happen? Mr WONG Kam-sing said back then: "In the coming decade, world demand for energy will rise as the global population increases. To tackle the problems arising from the burning of fossil fuels, including air pollution and climate change, it is imperative for us to be more 'Energy Aware', so that being 'Energy Wise' will become second nature to Hong Kong people. I hope the Energy Saving Plan for the Built Environment 2015~2025+ will stimulate all of us to take wiser action in order to develop Hong Kong into a low-carbon livable city."

Deputy President, I think the adjournment motion moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen today is totally unacceptable. What problems will be caused by global warming, or how will energy labels which we are discussing today affect the lives of every one of us?

Recently, global warming has become a very popular subject in the international arena. Under the leadership of Donald TRUMP, the United States surprisingly withdrew from the Paris Agreement for the reason that the Americans do not acknowledge the existence of global warming. Nevertheless, there have been adequate discussions and evidence showing that if we do not limit the carbon emission produced by people, it will cause greenhouse gas resulting in greenhouse effect which will lead to a rise in global temperature. In the past 50 years, a lot of greenhouse gas has been emitted globally. This gas absorbed the heat generated by the infrared light of the sun, retained it in the atmosphere and reflected it to the ground, causing greenhouse effect. What will be the effects of global warming resulting from greenhouse effect?

We are afraid that as the water level of the world rises, some low-lying coastal areas may be hard hit. Some low-lying countries and indeed, the coastal areas of many countries, including Hong Kong, may also be affected by global warming and climate change. As a result, there may be unusually heavy rain or drought; desertification may worsen; the ecosystem may be affected; and great

harms may be caused to our water resources, socio-economic activities and even our lives. Thus, as an international city and a member of the international world, Hong Kong cannot shed our responsibility in promoting energy efficiency and restricting emissions and overall energy consumption. Therefore, we cannot accept the adjournment motion moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen today.

I think the implementation progress of MEELS is already too slow. In fact, we should expeditiously extend its scope. Apart from items which are mandatorily required to show energy labels under the current scheme, other items have been listed in the voluntary scheme, including 22 household appliances and office appliances. Among them, 13 are household appliances, including non-integrated type compact fluorescent lamps and electric rice-cookers; and office equipment including photocopiers, fax machines, multifunction devices and printers, LCD monitors, computers and hot/cold bottled water dispensers, etc. I believe all Members sitting here are using these appliances, but unfortunately, these equipment or electrical appliances have, up till now, not been included in MEELS.

We have also noticed that the electricity consumption of commercial premises is almost three times higher than that of household premises. Noting that 90% or the majority of electricity is used by residential premises or commercial buildings, we should include some of the electrical products I just mentioned in MEELS. If these products are not regulated in a timely manner, we will only be regulating a small number of electrical products which consume relatively little electricity.

Deputy President, in restricting emissions or encouraging energy saving through MEELS to enable consumers to choose products with better energy efficiency, we are lagging far behind in the international arena. The scope of MEELS in Hong Kong is also narrower than other countries in the world. As I said earlier, the Government has set a target itself and I shall not repeat. I definitely cannot accept the adjournment motion moved at this stage.

Frankly speaking, even if the scope of MEELS can be further extended today, there are still differences in the energy efficiency performances of products with the same grade of energy label. For example, in May this year, the Consumer Council published a report of a test of 14 models of the split-type inverter air conditioners with both cooling and heating capacities—one type of products to be included in MEELS in this exercise. It was found that although

all the models obtained the same grade of energy efficiency, the electricity consumption among them differed by as much as 20%, and the electricity charges also differed by up to 24%. In other words, even if MEELS will immediately be implemented today ... In fact, it will not, because the suppliers of these products will still have a grace period of 18 months after the resolution is passed. Under the circumstances, should the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department and the Government further consider whether the differences found in the study of the Consumer Council are acceptable? If the electricity consumption levels differ by as much as 20% while the electricity charges differ by almost 24%, should the grades of energy labels of these products be subdivided?

Regarding the electricity consumption of appliances in standby mode, can energy labels also indicate the relevant figures? In other words, the energy label will indicate the electricity consumption levels of the product when in use and in standby mode, so that the public can make a well-informed choice. Nowadays, too many electronic products are available. If a television or a telephone is connected to the power supply all the time even if they are not in use, they will consume electricity even in standby mode.

On the whole, I think the work of this exercise should brook no delay. In the face of global warming, Hong Kong should not lag far behind other countries in respect of energy saving. The scheme to increase the transparency of product information should cover more products as soon as possible so that we can assume our responsibility in saving energy, protecting the environment and saving the Earth. Thank you, Deputy President.

MS CLAUDIA MO: I speak to support the adjournment motion. Some of the arguments would say that we are already lagging behind in our energy efficiency drive in Hong Kong and there is no reason why we should prolong this particular energy labelling exercise. Now, the problem is, I think many people did not even realize what exactly we are talking about. It is MEELS, do you know what I am talking about? MEELS, not meals, but Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling, and I did wonder what that "S" at the very end stands for. At first I thought it means more electrical appliances being included in the plan, but no, "S" stands for "Scheme"—Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme.

This is a teeny tiny thing, of course, and it is better than nothing, as I was saying yesterday. It is surely better than nothing, it aims to lower the city's

carbon consumption to start with and to help raise public awareness over energy saving. But the thing is, the Government is just not doing enough, and I have no intention to blame the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department. It is a technical department. The policy is set at an upper level, and the department just executes it. But then, it is a perfunctory scheme when it comes to saving energy in Hong Kong. Can I repeat? I am not blaming the department; I am blaming the Government as a whole over its green policy or rather, the lack of it really, or rather the lack of the actual enthusiasm, the passion for it.

Now, we are talking about the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance, it is slightly dishonest the way we put it at this Legislative Council, because the actual ordinance should be about buildings, right? It should be Buildings Energy Efficiency Ordinance, well, never mind. We are talking about tiny little electrical appliances for now, but the thing is, we should not prolong it, so we go against the adjournment motion. What difference, time-wise, would it make really? At most, I would say half a year, six months? We have prolonged this for long enough, we need to send a message to the top of the Government, the actual policy makers that we need a faster pace. Well, our electrical stoves must have labelling on them, telling how energy efficient they are. What is the big deal, really?

In the last five years of C Y LEUNG's tenure, there is no such thing about energy saving labelling. As I was saying yesterday and you heard me, nothing has been done for five years, and something suddenly becomes urgent. What is the urgency? We need to send a big, big message to this Government instead that we need something more all-round, more realistic about saving energy in Hong Kong.

Talking about stoves and little appliances of the sort, what about escalators and lifts inside buildings? They use a massive amount of energy. Everyone knew, I mean the specialists are sitting there, that our energy consumption in Hong Kong mostly come from buildings and not appliances—of course, appliances also count. But then, shouldn't we have started with bigger things about restricting the use of energy—I do not know how exactly. Shouldn't we restrict the use of energy of lifts and escalators in general? How about air conditioning, central heating and the like.

So, we need to tell the Government that doing tiny things is better than nothing indeed. But, ultimately, we need to get a proper, a more full-hearted

promise from the Government that Hong Kong is really lagging behind in energy saving in the international arena, and we must catch up and they should think twice and work even harder. I assuming they are already working hard, but government officials are just technocrats.

I really do not know what they think of carbon reduction on the energy front, seriously. They have made all kinds of half-hearted attempts and they are very good at throwing out small little things and pretend that they have done something. It is not right. As I was saying yesterday, minor things like irons should also be included? Once you do it, you might as well expand your scope of applicability, right? Use 40 minutes of this steam iron and you would consume 15 000 W of energy. It is not right. So, please could the Government rethink on the whole thing? As my Honourable colleague, Mr WU Chi-wai, was saying, "Shouldn't this Government be taking the lead?" What has the Government been purchasing, using public money? All these wasteful mentality. I don't know what exactly they have been buying. All the government purchases are not very transparent, right? What kind of electrical things exactly have they been purchasing? We do not know.

So, I would like to assure my democratic colleagues that, if you agree to this adjournment motion today, it seriously would not make that much difference to how this new rule, this mandatory labelling business, would be applied. The difference would be minute, really. It would not make so much difference time-wise, except that we need, maybe united we stand, we need to send a collective message to this Government that it is just not doing well.

Some also argue, and most of us think that as it is better than nothing, shall we not take it on board first, or "pocket" it first, as we would say in Chinese? Why not? I am not against it at all, I am most agreeable to the whole thing except I think the scope is not wide enough. And I think people up there in the power echelon should know what we at the legislative branch think and they should take into consideration our thoughts.

I was saying yesterday, and once again, Deputy President, you were here and you heard me. It is very coincidental. On Tuesday, I read in the *Independent*, which is a British paper, 15 000 scientists around the world, including Nobel laureates, sent out this new letter. It has a proper name, let me check, it is actually called "Letter to Humanity". It was saying that humankind

must do more to help save the earth. Hong Kong, come on, we are not just cosmopolitan; we are an international financial hub, right? You, as an accountant, should know. We need to show to the rest of the world that we care and we are doing our best. Mr Charles Peter MOK was saying just now that the Government was doing what he would call cow's pace (牛步). No, I call it snail's (蝸牛) pace, it is so, so slow. It is completely unthinkable in Hong Kong. In that letter published by the *Independent* which I was talking about, international scientists—not tree huggers and not just some green hippies—are warning us time is running out. Time is running out.

Hong Kong, is a pivotal centre, and our Transport and Housing chief is calling Hong Kong this. He said that we have this pivotal role on the international map, right? We must do much, much more. Now, the letter was actually written 25 years ago and it was just being renewed. I hope some government officials in Hong Kong would have read it. It is not long at all.

The letter says that cities—it did not name Hong Kong, of course—cities in general, have an economy-rooted kind of mentality and growth or development comes before conservation, and we must learn to reduce greenhouse gases and so on. We know about renewable energy. There is one line that is quite scary, it says the amount of fresh water available per head of population worldwide, has reduced by 26%. How about that? That is water supply, it has got nothing to do with the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department, of course. But it is still energy, it is still growth. It is still the earth, mother earth, our home. So, I hope this Government would really think thoroughly, think it through what has been done in Hong Kong by introducing minor, little things. Minor things would still count collectively, of course, in the end.

To finish off, I would like to mention this sort of extension socket. Last night, I actually checked the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department out online. I never knew that they actually taught people how to use an intelligent socket. Even when it is on standby mode, some clever wiring inside would stop its power flow, it will automatically conduct a power cut even when it is on standby mode. I never knew things like that. Why wouldn't the Government make it more public instead of wasting time and public money on promoting all kinds of political slogans and things? Why wouldn't the government publicize energy-saving measures to the public? Thank you.

MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I oppose the motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, which seeks to adjourn the debate on the proposed resolution moved under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance. This will not work. "Slow Beat" has good intentions to try to slow it down. In his speech, he queried whether we could do a better job, whether we could, by way of reform, do a better job of all the things that we wish to do in one stride. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen explained why he had proposed the adjournment motion. In the discussion this morning, various Members criticized the pace of implementing the energy efficiency labelling scheme in Hong Kong of being slow, slower even than "Slow Beat".

Regarding the history of energy labels, as early as February 1991, the then Governor in Council directed that a policy be formulated to increase energy efficiency and approved the establishment of an Energy Efficiency Advisory Committee. The Committee was set up in April 1991 and tasked to advise the Government on proposals to bring in early improvements in energy efficiency as well as to formulate a comprehensive energy efficiency policy in the long run. The Committee already started operation in 1991. It is thus clear that the pace of implementing the scheme has been ridiculously slow.

The Electrical and Mechanical Services Department ("EMSD") had been operating a Voluntary Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme since 1995, but the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") was introduced in 2009 only, under which different electrical appliances would be covered in three phases. The first phase covered only three types of products, namely room air conditioners, refrigerating appliances and compact fluorescent lamps. In retrospect, we will realize that we have gone through innumerable difficulties to come to the current phase. Following the implementation of the first phase of MEELS in 2009, the pace of implementing the second phase was also very much slow. In the second phase, only two additional types of electrical appliances were included, namely washing machines and dehumidifiers. Deputy President, we have waited six years for the implementation of the third phase by the Government in 2017, and we have spent 22 years expanding the scope of MEELS. If we again slacken the pace of implementing MEELS, how can we cope with global climate change?

Such a claim is not at all unfounded. If the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Cap. 598) is successfully amended, 150 million kWh of energy will be saved each year, and carbon dioxide emissions will be reduced by

105 000 tonnes each year. The total amount of energy thus saved through the expanded MEELS is expected to reach more than 600 million kWh per annum. Under such circumstances, we need to reach a consensus in the legislature. If we adjourn the debate at this moment, the Government may, as indicated by Mr CHAN, revise the scheme in response to the change of circumstances. It is naturally good for the Government to do so, but only if we enter the discussion and revise the scheme direct can our pace not be slackened.

We now need a low-carbon lifestyle, and we hope to expand the scope of applicability of MEELS to include more electrical appliances, so as to aid people in choosing energy-saving products more readily. When they make a purchase, consumers will rely on energy labels to select the most energy-efficient products, save the maximum amount of money on electricity tariff, and strive to cope with climate change.

Certainly, as we have indicated just now, the relevant amendments are not enough, and the Government needs to work harder on education, Deputy President. How closely are energy conservation and our living connected? First, it is very much easy for us to save energy in our daily life. We are already striving to save energy if we switch off water heaters, electric fans and lights that are not in use. Rightly as a Member indicated this morning, one of the issues concerning energy conservation is standby power consumption. It will be meaningless if we fail to do a proper job of public education and make more people realize that standby power consumption is one of the culprits in electricity consumption. "Slow Beat" has really given much thought to the matter, with the hope that the Government will, by way of legislative amendments, make a greater commitment to educating members of the public, telling them that it is easy to participate in energy conservation. According to EMSD studies, an average household has some 10 to 20 electrical appliances in standby mode, and if all such electrical appliances in standby mode are switched off, the total electricity consumption of that household will be reduced by 3%. Do many people know this?

Even if we do not adjourn the debate and request the Government to conduct a fresh review and propose amendments, the Government can still conduct public education on this, but it may not be able to do so with enough vigour. More and more people in Hong Kong have acquired different electronic products, but I dare not say that standby power consumption is already an issue pervasive among the public. In addition, we fail to see that the "low standby

power" function is already well known. "Low standby power" means electrical appliances can still achieve energy conservation in some measure even if they are in standby mode. Whether such appliances can be included in MEELS has yet to be discussed.

However, if at this moment we adjourn the debate and wait for the Government to take actions, I will feel somewhat concerned. As indicated by Mr CHAN, we must highlight the problems, with the hope that instant results will be produced, and that the Government will do things that it has failed to do over the past 20 years or so. As a Member indicated just now, for 14 models of split-type inverter air conditioners bearing the same grade of energy label, electricity consumption could vary by 20%, and electricity tariff could even vary by 24%. The Government can explain to the public direct, telling them that they need to pay \$1,249 in electricity tariff if they use a certain brand of air conditioner, and only \$940 if they use the best-performing brand. If they purchase air conditioners on the basis of energy labels, they will save some \$300 worth of electricity. How useful are energy labels if they are only graded but provide no details on energy efficiency? The Government needs to expedite its pace in this regard.

Even if we are not to adjourn the debate but speak on the motion debate instead, the Government is likewise duty-bound to listen to our speeches on how best to display energy labels more effectively. As I said just now, for electrical appliances bearing the same grade of energy label, electricity consumption could still vary by 20%, which is really not satisfactory. The Government should enable consumers to be able to choose among different products. Most importantly, we hope to promote sustainable consumption. We advise further enhancing the criteria of grading energy labels in the long run, so as to enable the trades to participate in the design process, and introduce products with higher energy efficiency for consumers' information.

In fact, foreign countries have been doing a great job, unlike Hong Kong which has spent 22 years implementing an energy efficiency labelling scheme. We established the Energy Efficiency Advisory Committee in 1991, but we are only now discussing which types of electrical appliances should be included in the third phase of MEELS. In the case of home purchase in foreign countries, energy efficiency labels have already been introduced for comparison purposes. In France, pamphlets of property agencies for renting or selling residential properties specify their energy consumption indicators, which affect their rents or

selling prices. The size, rent, selling price, exposure and location of a flat are naturally the factors of consideration in buying a home, but energy efficiency also turns out to be an indicator for buying or renting a flat. A consumer will be incentivized to rent or purchase a flat if he realizes that the flat helps save on energy during his inspection of it. This is certainly a distant scenario for Hong Kong, as nowadays we lament skyrocketing property prices, 300 000 people are waiting for public housing, and 200 000 people are living in subdivided units. The Government should be held accountable.

If Hong Kong does not wish to be absent in facing up to the issue of climate change, the Government should demonstrate a higher degree of sincerity in the amendments this time around. I will certainly not say that in that case, we had better have the Government revise the resolution and submit it to the Legislative Council for scrutiny afresh. I am more concerned about the slowing down of the pace of implementation if we do so, and we do not know when the Government will submit the resolution to the legislature again. We have often referred to the cases of green structures and green residences in foreign countries. Energy conservation can be achieved through not only the use of energy-saving products. If the Government wants to achieve its carbon emission reduction targets, it should consider adopting internationally-recognized and effective approaches to coping with climate change, including promoting green building and green residences, and strive to achieve the various targets under the Paris Agreement.

We understand that Mr CHAN has proposed to adjourn the debate for his view that the resolution of the Government is not comprehensive enough and needs revision. At the same time, however, we hope to make a last-ditch effort to mediate between the two sides. When passing different amendments, the Government should really consider how best to step up its efforts to benefit itself, the public and even the trades. The pressing problem at the moment is that as a larger amount of clean energy or renewable energy is being used in Hong Kong, the price of electricity per kWh may probably go up. For this reason, people are becoming increasingly concerned about whether energy labels can specify how much electricity can be saved when using a certain electrical appliance, so as to contribute their share to environmental protection. That way, there will be considerable room for improving energy labels in use currently.

Deputy President, MEELS was implemented in 2009, and its third phase will include such types of electrical appliances as televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, room air conditioners of reverse cycle type, and

washing machines with rated washing capacity exceeding 7 kg but not exceeding 10 kg. While expanding the scope of applicability of the scheme, we must not turn a blind eye to the various tasks that can complement its implementation. As I said earlier, following the implementation of the third phase of the scheme, carbon dioxide emissions will be reduced by 105 000 tonnes per annum. If we can join hands to undertake this laudable task in Hong Kong, we will not only help people save money but also enable Hong Kong to make its due contribution as an international city in the face of climate change.

I will certainly feel very much concerned if we adjourn the debate at this moment, but even if we do not support the adjournment of the debate, we do not want the Government to slacken its pace either. The Government is duty-bound to make energy labels more popular, improve product transparency and assist the trades in enhancing their competitiveness in business operation. People need to make comparisons when they make purchases. If there are powerful and effective objective indicators, according to which detailed standards are specified for avoiding the variation of 20 kWh in electricity consumption in the case of two electrical appliances bearing the same grade of energy label, people will feel very much relieved when they purchase electrical appliances. Some people may want all their household electrical appliances to be products with Grade 1 energy label, but the problem is that there is no further breakdown under the Grade 1 energy label. The perfecting of energy efficiency standards depends on the level of sincerity on the part of the Government.

I would like to emphasize once again that the subject today is electrical appliances, but apart from electrical appliances, carbon emissions reduction, environmental protection and addressing climate change are really closely connected. The Policy Address this January sets out the latest carbon emissions reduction target of Hong Kong, that is, reducing carbon intensity by 65% to 70% by 2030 compared with the 2005 level. I hope that this target will be realized rather than being merely borne out in letter. We should now begin with the minor tasks, begin with efforts made by ourselves, and efforts made by residents. We hope that when we purchase electrical appliances, we will be able to know which types of electrical appliances can help us save the maximum amount of energy that can be saved with the application of technologies nowadays.

I still have my final one-minute speaking time. The reason why I believe Mr CHAN has given much thought to the matter is that he considers that the implementation of a scheme in a bold and resolute manner is better than its

protracted implementation over a span of 22 years. We have waited six years since the implementation of the second phase of MEELS. We absolutely understand Mr CHAN's intentions. We are also concerned about how many years later will the fourth phase of MEELS be implemented. We hope that officials will respond to this question in their replies later on, indicating whether the Government has an ultimate timetable and when a resolution will be submitted to the Legislative Council again. We need to cater to the needs of people from various social strata, protect nature and safeguard the rights and interests of the trades. Most importantly, if Hong Kong does not wish to be absent in addressing global climate change, the Government must render its support policy-wise.

For this reason, I oppose the adjournment of the debate on the proposed resolution moved under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance. Deputy President, I so submit.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Deputy President, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has proposed a motion under RoP 40(1) to adjourn the original ongoing debate on the proposed resolution moved under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance. The third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") will include five additional types of products, namely televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, washing machines and room air conditioners of reverse cycle type. Deputy President, I speak in opposition to this adjournment motion of Mr CHAN Chi-chuen.

I have just watched a Facebook video in my office. Since the assumption of office by Donald TRUMP, the new President of the United States, people have been gravely concerned that the United States, which is a world power, not only adopts an equivocal attitude toward climate change but also refuses to acknowledge that climate change is attributable to human activity, claiming that carbon emissions in the United States should be increased rather than reduced. In that Facebook video, Kathleen Hartnett WHITE, the top environmental adviser newly appointed by him, takes questions from members of the Congress in a way similar to that in which Hong Kong officials take questions in this Council, and she surprisingly says that she has doubts about the link between human activity and climate change. Deputy President, as the United States still wields its economic clout in the world for the time being, and one of its principal officials

adopts such a conservative and retrogressive attitude toward climate change, the roles played by other places, particularly China, will be ever more important. This is actually not a new claim.

In addition, when I visited the United Kingdom some time ago and chatted with a local adviser in charge of climate change, I got to know that they actually know very well what is happening. At the climate change conference in Paris, two targets were set, of which one is to ensure that global average temperature rise by no more than 2°C compared to pre-industrial times, and the other, a more positive one, is no more than 1.5°C. However, they admitted that the 1.5°C target is already a failure, and there is only the remaining 2°C target.

On the one hand the United States has adopted such a retrogressive attitude, and on the other we are facing an increasingly dire situation. As far as Hong Kong or China is concerned, what has inhibited the Government from taking forward its work? Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, who has proposed this adjournment motion, asked a question on why the pace of implementation on the part of the Government had been so slow, such that he had to propose this adjournment motion to spur the Government to expedite its work. I think that the reason is very much clear. In such a place as Hong Kong, the Government, many Members or even members of the public will not deny the link between climate change and human activity, unlike the chief environmental adviser of the United States I mentioned just now.

However, in our city, the political power structure and the economic power structure highly overlap, meaning that those with economic power also enjoy disproportionate political power. For this reason, I do not very much agree to the remarks of Mr Charles Peter MOK just now, who said that the business sector also believe that the implementation of MEELS will benefit them, so its implementation is better than none. His remarks may reflect the thinking of certain progressive members of the business sector, but the reason why the implementation of a certain phase of MEELS takes several years or even 10 years is that most members of the business sector constantly have sought to exert pressure on the Government by various means in the process. Hong Kong does face such peculiar problems.

As regards whether we should support this adjournment motion, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's motive in proposing his motion does not conflict with my position. We are both like a cat on hot bricks. We both consider that climate change is an

issue of great urgency to address, and the Government should assume the greatest responsibility. That said, we need to make a choice. Should we follow Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's logic, adjourning the debate on the resolution, such that the Government will be given a greater impetus to come up with a better resolution for our endorsement? Or should we stick to my current position, engaging in the debate on the resolution while at the same time requesting the Government to take a more proactive attitude toward this issue?

Deputy President, as I said just now, the slow pace of the Government is not without reason. There is a structural reason for the slow pace of addressing issues of regulation on the part of the Government. For this reason, I can hardly imagine that even if we pass this adjournment motion, the Government will make great changes to its mentality or even approach, thus making a breakthrough in the situation where regulatory measures of the Government are subject to the strong clout of the business sector. For this reason, I will choose to "pocket it first" in this issue, but to "pocket it first" does not mean that the Government cannot be aggressive in other issues.

As I indicated in my speech on the resolution, we must adopt a holistic approach to climate change, carbon emission reduction or energy conservation. In fact, officials of the Environmental Protection Department or the Environment Bureau should be able to understand the holistic approach very much easily. In the case of air pollution, carbon dioxide, pollutants emitted by vehicles or other pollutants all cause smog and affect public health. As for which types of pollutants should be reduced, officials of the Environment Bureau well understand that when there is resistance to the reduction of certain types of pollutants, they will seek to reduce other types of pollutants. In the face of little resistance from groups with vested interest in Hong Kong, they will be able to identify a breach point and bring about holistic changes. All in all, we must adopt a holistic approach. When the SAR Government pursues the target of reducing carbon intensity in Hong Kong by 65% to 70% by 2030 compared with the 2005 level, has it drawn up any roadmap and timetable?

The Government will now implement the third phase of MEELS, but I hope that the Government will do more, including drawing reference to the European Union mentioned by me just now, increasing the number of energy efficiency categories, enhancing energy efficiency standards, introducing more stringent criteria for obtaining the Grade 1 energy label, and prohibiting the import and sale of high-energy-consuming products. I certainly hope that the Government will do so, but at the same time I would like to advise the Under

Secretary to adopt a measure which no one opposes and which will benefit the Hong Kong economy. Deputy President, the Government submits many funding proposals for public works projects to the Finance Committee each year, and officials explain that we need to undertake many infrastructure projects, so as to boost the Hong Kong economy—Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok happens to be present—for many construction workers are waiting for jobs. Hong Kong is most adept at promoting economic development through infrastructure development, and we understand very well how to walk this path. However, I would like to point out that infrastructure development means not only building roads or bridges, but Hong Kong has an area badly warrants urgent development, namely green infrastructure, Deputy President.

The Policy Address this year has a breakthrough point, namely the proposed announcement of the Feed-in Tariff of the two power companies in 2018, and the Government will start acquiring electricity generated from solar energy. A study released by The Hong Kong Polytechnic University early this year indicated that spots in Hong Kong that have potential for generating electricity through solar energy will be able to produce electricity that accounts for some 10% of the total electricity consumption in Hong Kong. By implementing the third phase of MEELS, we will be able to save some 150 million kWh of electricity each year, accounting for less than 0.5% of our annual electricity consumption of some 40 billion kWh.

We believe the third phase of MEELS is not the best, but we still agree to its implementation. That said, we hope the Government can at the same time demonstrate its boldness by proposing the allocation of tens of billions of dollars in the Policy Address and Budget next year, so that it will be able to assume a leading role in electricity generation through renewable energy, particularly solar energy. The Government is currently implementing a pilot scheme for two impounding reservoirs. When knowing that the scheme is feasible following the production of effects, it will expeditiously actualize the idea of green infrastructure. Not only does green infrastructure promote economic development and allow members of the business sector to participate in it, but it also creates employment opportunities. At the same time, in terms of replacing electricity generated by burning fossil fuels, electricity generation through renewable energy is much more effective than the implementation of MEELS. Deputy President, electricity that can be generated through renewable energy can account for 10% of the total electricity consumption in Hong Kong instead of 0.5%.

To put it simply, having considered so many factors, I cannot agree to this adjournment motion of Mr CHAN Chi-chuen. I hope that when implementing the third phase of MEELS, the Government can demonstrate its boldness, making members of the public see that rather than merely focusing on such a minor issue as saving 150 million kWh of electricity, it even rolls out initiatives in a bold and resolute manner for producing electricity that accounts for 10% of the total electricity consumption in Hong Kong. That way, it will be right for me to support this resolution for implementation of the third phase of MEELS.

I so submit. Thank you, Deputy President.

MR IP KIN-YUEN (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I speak in opposition to the motion moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen under RoP 40(1) to adjourn the debate on the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("the Amendment Order").

Deputy President, in introducing this proposed resolution, the Government seeks to amend Schedule 1 to the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the Ordinance") for the purpose of implementing the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") to include five types of products in it. A subcommittee was formed under the Legislation Council in the last session to consider this piece of subsidiary legislation and it raised no opposition to the amendments proposed by the Government. Although I am not a member of the Subcommittee, I support its decision and hope that this proposed resolution will be passed today so that the Administration can expeditiously table another amendment order before this Council for commencement of MEELS as early as possible.

Deputy President, as the Secretary said in his earlier speech, energy conservation is an important measure to mitigate the negative effects of climate change and MEELS under discussion today is precisely one of the energy conservation measures. Deputy President, I must point out that the reason I oppose the motion for adjournment moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen is that the threat of climate change is imminent. As a signatory of the Paris Agreement, Hong Kong is obliged to attain the emission reduction target set by this international agreement from different perspectives. As MEELS under discussion today is one of the policy initiatives that can help reduce emissions, I

therefore hope that the relevant resolution can be expeditiously passed so as to enable the Government to embark on the subsequent legislative amendment exercise.

Deputy President, I notice that the reason for Mr CHAN Chi-chuen moving this motion for adjournment is that there are inadequacies in the current MEELS, for example, the grading and the specification of details are not stringent, and the type of products covered is not broad either. Deputy President, while I subscribe to the criticisms made by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen of those issues, I understand that these types of schemes are imperfect and bound to carry deficiencies. I nonetheless think that despite the imperfection and inadequacies of MEELS, I remain not convinced that we should suspend the examination of the proposed resolution and the subsequent legislative amendment.

Deputy President, the reason for my opposition to the motion for adjournment moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen is that we should learn from mistakes. I say this not because I wish to hurl criticisms at Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, but merely to highlight that on 18 October, the Government also moved a motion to adjourn the debate on the Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill 2017 ("the Amendment Bill"). I think Members can still remember clearly and are aware that the scrutiny of the Amendment Bill was completed in the last session and it is now placed on the agenda of the Legislative Council meeting. However, since the examination of the Amendment Bill had yet to finish, it was deferred to this session. Because of the call of Chief Executive Carrie LAM for expeditious passage of the motion on the co-location arrangement, the Government has employed the tactic of moving a motion for adjournment at the expense of the Amendment Bill. In modern-day parlance, the Amendment Bill was "entrapped" for no reason and cannot "come out" for the time being. When will this Amendment Bill be tabled before this Council again and then "come out"? Will it be nipped in the bud? We surely do not want this to happen, but the outcome is still awaited. I am thus pretty worried that the same thing may happen to this proposed resolution on energy efficiency labelling, and that is, no one knows when it will be tabled before the Legislative Council again after the debate is adjourned, thereby causing delays to the implementation of the entire MEELS, dealing a serious blow to our emissions reduction efforts and, worse still, even causing a negative impact on the reputation of Hong Kong.

(THE PRESIDENT resumed the Chair)

President, I must point out that even if the resolution is passed today and the Administration enabled to take the next step, Hong Kong still lags far behind the international community in this task of emissions reduction. This is why I all the more have to oppose this motion moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen to adjourn the debate on the proposed resolution because if this motion for adjournment is passed, there will be an even bigger gap between Hong Kong and the international community in emissions reduction.

President, just as I pointed out in my speech yesterday, the two-week 23rd United Nations ("UN") Climate Change Conference ("COP 23") is being held in Bonn, Germany, which is the second conference of the signatories of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change following the endorsement of the Paris Agreement in 2015. COP 23 continues to focus on the formulation and negotiation of specific development guidelines in the light of the technology and provision of finance that help accelerate the emissions reduction projects of various signatories. Before the convening of COP 23, a number of academics already released the findings of academic studies and all came to the conclusion that as global warming continues to intensify, we are now left with a very tiny window and some people even estimate that there is only a 5% chance of preventing extreme weather caused by rising temperatures. Worse still, as we all know, President of the United States Donald TRUMP has announced his withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, which will definitely have an impact on the global crisis of climate change. In my opinion, Hong Kong should take forward the relevant work in any event. We must engage in discussions on the one hand, and decide on our way forward on the other. Or else, we will only make the entire situation even worse like TRUMP. Instead of holding up the entire process by adjourning the relevant debate, we should keep thinking as we move on.

President, I do not only oppose the motion for adjournment, but even consider it necessary to expedite the implementation of MEELS. Just as the Secretary said, the Government would, after the commencement of the third phase, make the first 18 months as a grace period for the trades to make preparations. President, it is now November 2017 and in the normal course, the Amendment Order should be tabled before this Council by the end of this month or early next month. And, adding to this the time required for scrutiny, I would

expect it to be passed before the December recess at the earliest. If things do not go on smoothly, it is possible that the Amendment Order will be passed only after Christmas and then comes into effect in 2018 at the earliest. Adding the grace period of 18 months to this, the actual date of implementation would be mid-2019, which is more than one year from now.

President, while the European Union ("EU") seeks to achieve an annual reduction of 175 000 tonnes of carbon emissions by 2020, the Government only aims to achieve a carbon reduction target of 105 000 tonnes in the third phase, which is less than the expectation of EU. However, a more critical problem is that this 105 000 tonnes is only the annual reduction target of carbon dioxide to be achieved following the commencement of the third phase. According to my computation as mentioned earlier on, our carbon emissions would only be reduced by about 50 000 tonnes by 2020, which is far from satisfactory. If the motion for adjournment moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen is passed and we unfortunately repeat the aforementioned mistakes previously made, and that is, it is still not known when the Amendment Bill will be tabled before the Legislative Council again, we are pretty worried that likewise, it is not known when the Amendment Order will be tabled before this Council again, resulting in further delay to the slow progress in taking forward the Amendment Order.

I therefore oppose the motion for adjournment on the one hand, and on the other hand hope that the Administration will, after the passage of the proposed resolution but before the Amendment Order is tabled before this Council for scrutiny, review if there is a need to adjust the grace period which is as long as 18 months. As a matter of fact, such a mechanism was adopted in 2009 and 2011 but it is now 2017 and approaching 2018, we are thus obliged to review if it is still suitable to use this mechanism adopted nearly 10 years ago. If it is so unfortunate that the majority of Honourable colleagues support the adjournment motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen today, I hope the Administration will consider shortening the 18-month grace period when the Amendment Order is tabled before this Council again.

President, another reason for my opposition to this adjournment motion is related to enforcement. According to section 7 of the Amendment Order (I quote): "If it is proved to the satisfaction of the Director [of Electrical and Mechanical Services] that before the commencement date, a contract has been entered into for the procurement of a new prescribed product that is to be supplied as part of, or ... the disposition of any specified premises, or that the new

prescribed product has been manufactured in or imported into Hong Kong, sections 4 and 5 of the Ordinance do not apply to the new prescribed product ..." (end of quote). To put it simply, a new prescribed product ordered or procured before the commencement date will not be covered by MEELS. At the same time, section 3 of the Ordinance also stipulates that MEELS does not cover second-hand products, which means that there may be a window period for some products.

President, I certainly do not think that the purpose of Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's attempt to defer the commencement of MEELS is to protect the interests of the suppliers of those five types of electrical appliances, but if the motion for adjournment is passed, it will really lead to this outcome. Is this the outcome Mr CHAN Chi-chuen or Members present at the meeting wish to achieve? Is it our intention to give the suppliers more time to sell their substandard products or transfer them to the second-hand markets for sale? President, the implementation of MEELS is indeed a very practical issue.

Members may have noticed that on 11 November (which was just a few days ago), a Mainland online shopping website launched a promotional activity and it had offered a golden opportunity for the shop operators to sell their substandard products. However, the Administration is completely helpless about this because such activities are not in contravention of the law, given that the relevant legislation has yet to come into force. But a more important issue is that such promotional activities will lead to overspending, as consumers are prone to purchase unnecessary items which will be discarded in the end and cause wastage on the one hand, but on the other hand, the objective of MEELS is to encourage the use of energy saving electrical appliances by consumers to reduce carbon emissions, thus the earlier MEELS is implemented, the better it is. Before the commencement of MEELS, there will still be substandard products available on the market and in use, which will have a negative effect on the environment. If shop operators seize the opportunity of the deferred introduction of the relevant legislation and dispose of their products by means of promotion drives, damage will inevitably be done to the legislation and initiatives that are due to come into effect to protect the environment.

President, in order for Hong Kong to expeditiously achieve the reduction target of carbon emissions, I will support any policy or bill that helps to realize this goal so long as it does not undermine the interests of members of the public, and I also hope that the relevant bill can be passed as early as possible.

President, I support the resolution proposed by the Government in relation to the Amendment Order and oppose the motion for adjournment proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen.

MR SHIU KA-FAI (in Cantonese): President, I was a member of the Subcommittee on Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017, participating in the entire scrutiny process of this piece of subsidiary legislation. Also, while the electrical appliance retailing sector is one of the major stakeholders in energy efficiency labelling of products, I am the very person who represents it. Therefore, I have profound understanding of the whole issue.

I have risen to speak in the hope of making the public know more clearly about what is going on. First, the Subcommittee comprised only six members and met just once on 13 June. The meeting lasted for merely 1 hour and 12 minutes, during which there was no substantive controversy and before long the scrutiny was completed. Given the composition and size of the Subcommittee and the number of meeting it had, the process of discussion and even the duration of the meeting on that day, all indicate that the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("Amendment Order") per se is not significantly controversial. Members all agreed that this piece of subsidiary legislation should be passed, so that the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") can be implemented as scheduled.

However, many Members suddenly came forth to express their views in these two days. Members from the non-establishment camp are particularly concerned about this Amendment Order. They are enthusiastic to speak with very extensive contents that often go beyond the scope of the subsidiary legislation, such that they even fetched so far as problems of global warming and greenhouse effect. Now this Council has even gone into an adjournment debate. In fact, to put it plainly, what else can I say except the non-establishment colleagues have harboured such an obvious intent to suddenly become so concerned about this piece of subsidiary legislation?

The non-establishment colleagues might refute that they always support environmental protection, so it is only normal for them to speak on energy efficiency labelling. I trust Honourable colleagues present in this Chamber, be

they pro-establishment or non-establishment, all support environmental protection. However, we must focus on the issue itself in reasoning instead of discussing some far-fetched issues that defy comprehension. Prattle without making concrete efforts will conversely keep wasting the resources of our planet. As we all take environmental protection seriously to request saving electricity and energy, why have we not thought of that talking volubly in the Chamber actually wastes much electricity as well?

I do not wish to see the Legislative Council keep wasting electricity for serving the political purposes of certain Members, so I am going to oppose this adjournment motion. If we are mindful of protecting the environment, we should pass the Amendment Order as scheduled. Moreover, as early as before the Subcommittee met in June, I had consulted many members of the electrical appliance retailing sector on the Amendment Order. Back then, members of the sector told me that they basically accepted the current amendment. Given the implementation of MEELS has long commenced in 2009 and the second phase of it has also been operating for some time, they thus considered there should not be much problem to launch the third phase now.

In fact, the third phase merely covers five additional types of products, namely televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, washing machines with rated washing capacity exceeding 7 kg but not exceeding 10 kg, and air conditioners with both heating and cooling functions that non-establishment colleagues kept mentioning earlier. To the sector, as most of the labels are provided by the agents, they in fact need only affix them to the products and that will not entail much extra work. They did raise a rather minor issue, however, which I also put forward to the Subcommittee back then, and that is, the possible leftover of adhesive from the labels on the surface of televisions that would affect the pleasant appearance of the products. However, this is not quite a big issue practically. Simply some cleaning will have it settled. After all, televisions are different from refrigerators or other electrical appliances, such that the label cannot be affixed to its sides. I reflected this to the Subcommittee back then. Nevertheless, such a simple issue ought not render the implementation of the third phase of MEELS impossible.

Besides, some Members kept criticizing the Government for being inadequate and slow with its environmental protection efforts. In the circumstances, why was an adjournment motion proposed all the same? We had better pass the Amendment Order as soon as possible, or else members of the public will find us self-contradictory. Therefore, I hope the Government will

continue its efforts. I know the government officials, including the Under Secretary, have been sitting here for such a long time. While definitely opposing this adjournment motion, I will support the original motion.

Thank you, President.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): President, I speak in opposition to the motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen to adjourn the debate. Speaking on this subject, I have deliberately taken off my jacket as I think we can raise the temperature of air conditioning in the Chamber slightly. After all, global warming is a significant problem facing all of us. It is also a major concern to be dealt with by the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance this time. Therefore, we should not take this resolution lightly and consider it unimportant in the mistaken belief that it is only about the energy efficiency labelling of certain electrical appliances. Why does the Government seek to extend the scope of energy efficiency labelling by proposing this resolution? Because we are all facing the significant problem of global warming.

In September this year, President XI Jinping expressly stated that all countries and the international community should work together to fight global warming. Of course, he did not publicly criticize the United States of breaking from the Paris Agreement ("the Agreement") but, as we all know, Donald TRUMP, the President of the United States, has repeatedly stated on public occasions that the United States will no longer observe the Agreement. I think the remark of President XI Jinping is extremely important as he highlighted the duty of all countries to observe the Agreement and the importance of joining hands to address global warming. China, being one of the major member states signing the Agreement, is therefore obliged to honour the Agreement.

Referring to the Agreement, I consider it really important as President XI has once and again stated that it is every country's duty to honour the Agreement without breaking from it. Hong Kong is therefore bound by the Agreement. The introduction of energy efficiency labelling is a step, though small, taken to honour the obligations. As President XI has said that we should all work together to tackle global warming, there is no doubt that Hong Kong must support our country. President XI has made it clear that China will stick to this direction.

What is the relationship between energy efficiency labelling and the Agreement? The goal of the Agreement is to limit the global temperature increase to 1.5°C. The relevant provision reads as follows: "Article 2. This Agreement, in enhancing the implementation of the Convention, including ..."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Dennis KWOK, you have strayed from the subject. You should speak on why you oppose the adjournment motion instead of discussing the content of the Paris Agreement.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): ... no, I am not off the topic. I am actually explaining why I oppose Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's motion. Given that the motion will delay Hong Kong in honouring its obligations under the Agreement, I must explain why the goals of the Agreement and the objectives of energy efficiency labelling complement each other. I do not think any Members speaking before me today have quoted the content of the Agreement, and I did not mention the Agreement in my keynote speech either. The Agreement stipulates that: "This Agreement, in enhancing the implementation of the Convention, including its objective, aims to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change, in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty, including by: holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, recognizing that this would significantly ..."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Dennis KWOK, please speak to the question.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): Yes, I am.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): The scope of the Paris Agreement, which you just mentioned, is too wide. Council is now discussing whether the debate on the proposed resolution on the Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme should be adjourned. Please speak to the question.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): President, I hope that you can understand ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): A number of Members have already spoken on the Paris Agreement. Please speak to the question.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): But few Members have mentioned its content and details ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Members who wish to discuss the content of the Agreement should leave it to the relevant panel discussion.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): Why should we leave it to the panel discussion?

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Because the subject of our current debate is very narrow in scope, i.e. whether this Council should adjourn the debate on the proposed resolution.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): That is right. I oppose ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): The proposed resolution is only about the five types of newly-added electrical appliances under the Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme. Please speak to this question.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): President, you must be aware that this motion, if passed, will have the effect of adjourning the debate on the proposed resolution. Hong Kong will then have to hold back a necessary measure of addressing global warming. We often talk about global vision. Hong Kong, as an economy which contributes to global warming, is obliged to honour the Agreement. I will not go into the details of the Agreement. All I wish is to raise some key points. One of the long-term goals of the Agreement is to ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Dennis KWOK, I have already reminded you that you should not stray from the subject.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): President, I have not.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Dennis KWOK, you have strayed from the subject. Please speak to the question.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): Fine. What is the objective of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS")? It is to require the affixation of energy labels to home appliances by manufacturers so as to inform consumers of the energy consumption of products like televisions and washing machines. Why is this arrangement necessary? Because energy labels can facilitate consumers in selecting energy efficient products and help address global warming by inducing manufacturers to scale down the production of energy inefficient home appliances. This possible change will eventually reduce the emissions of, among others, carbon, which is one of the long-term goals of the Agreement. Its long-term global goal is net zero emissions. The goal of the United Nations is to achieve zero emissions by 2070 and the relevant article in the Agreement is as follows: "Article 4. In order to achieve the long-term ..."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Dennis KWOK, if you continue to elaborate on the Agreement and stray away from the subject, I will have to ask you to stop speaking. Please speak to the question.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): President, I am now pointing out how energy efficiency labelling can help us achieve zero emissions, which is a very important goal of the Paris Agreement. All I am doing is just referring to the relevant article.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Dennis KWOK, Council is now debating whether the debate on the proposed resolution should be adjourned and this resolution is about the five types of newly-added electrical appliances under the Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme. Please speak to the question.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): Am I not speaking on how energy efficiency labelling helps attain the long-term goal? The goal is to achieve net zero emissions, which is one of the five key points in the Agreement. The provision on this key point is as follows: "Parties aim to reach global peaking of ..."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Dennis KWOK, this is my last warning. If you do not speak to the question and continue to stray from it, I must ask you to stop speaking. Mr Dennis KWOK, please speak to the question.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): President, if you do not allow me to speak on the content of the Agreement or to reiterate that President XI Jinping has repeated the need for us to honour the Agreement, I can then only say that if this motion, as moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, is passed, it will slow down the pace of Hong Kong's honouring the Agreement, indirectly hindering Hong Kong from achieving the long-term goal set out in the Agreement, i.e. net zero emissions.

In retrospect, we will find that the progress of implementation of the Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme is actually very slow. The Electrical and Mechanical Services Department introduced the Voluntary Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("VEELS") as early as in 1995. Yet, whenever the Government rolls out a scheme, most of these new initiatives are voluntary in nature as the Government is reluctant to make them mandatory or legislate for them. VEELS, which was not well-received, was proved to be ineffective. It was until 2009 that the Government launched MEELS as a three-phase scheme. The first phase covered three types of products, namely room air conditioners, refrigerating appliances and compact fluorescent lamps ("CFLs"). The scope was very small. Starting from November 2009 ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Dennis KWOK, in the Council's earlier debate on the proposed resolution, a number of Members and your goodself have already elaborated on the first and second phases of the Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme. You should speak to the current question, i.e. whether Council should adjourn the debate on the proposed resolution. If you continue to stray from the subject, I must ask you to stop speaking.

Mr Dennis KWOK, please continue.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): President, I did not mention this point in my previous speech ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Some other Members did ...

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): Am I barred from speaking on this point after other Members have done so?

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Yes. The Rules of Procedure prohibit Members from repeating the same points time and again.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): I do not think so. President, it is the first time I learn that I am not allowed to discuss something which has been elaborated by other Members.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): You have repeated ...

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): I have not repeated my viewpoints.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): You have repeated the viewpoints of other Members and the Rules of Procedure have clear stipulations on this.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): Members may discuss the same issue from different perspectives.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Dennis KWOK, you may not have listened to other Members carefully but I have been listening to them for a long time, from last night to the present moment. I now remind you that you should speak to the question without repeating yourself or elaborating on matters concerning the first and second phases of the Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): That is fine. If you do not allow me to refer to the first and second phases ... President, I totally disagree with your ruling but I am not going to engage you in an argument here.

In the discussion of energy efficiency labelling, pace is a key point. If this motion is passed, it will only drag the pace of MEELS. Why do I speak on the pace issue? Because MEELS has been at a standstill for years. I hope that the Government can step up its efforts and speed up the pace of MEELS. If the motion of Mr CHAN Chi-chuen is passed, the pace will be made slower.

Why should we expand the scope of electrical appliances covered by MEELS as soon as possible? Because we hope to give consumers of home appliances additional information on environmental protection as reference. If, in the course of purchase, consumers can learn from the energy labels that a particular product model, though with low energy consumption, performs as good as the same product of another brand, home appliance manufacturers may then be induced to minimize energy consumption of their products during research and development to demonstrate their green awareness. Consumers may then achieve sustainable consumer behaviour.

Why did I mention sustainable consumer behaviour? If consumers opt for energy efficient home appliances, the total energy consumption in Hong Kong will be reduced. Sustainable consumption will then become possible. I am not going to repeat this point.

Lastly, I wish to discuss why we should expand MEELS now. In the Policy Address of this year, it has been proposed that we should turn our city into a smart city and many of our homes into smart homes. This point has been discussed by Mr Charles Peter MOK for a few times. What is a "smart home"? To put it simply, when electrical appliances are not in use ... for example, when I am not in my room, the light will turn off automatically. It is a way to pursue energy efficiency. I hope that the Government can promote more smart home concepts so that energy efficiency of home appliances can be achieved in ways other than energy labels. The Government, apart from requiring traders to indicate the energy efficiency of home appliances in energy labels, should encourage members of the public to conserve energy in every aspect of their daily life, including consumption, in order to bring the idea of energy efficiency to every family.

When MEELS was first introduced, why did the Government include CFLs in the scheme? Its aim was to bring CFLs into households to increase their usage by way of promotion. However, this approach is rather backward. We must extend the concept of energy efficiency to cover other efficiency functions of home appliances. For example, electrical appliances should have automatic switches so that they will go off when left idle and turn on automatically when someone goes into the room. In fact, this switch function is popular among offices, including those of the Legislative Council. I hope that it will also be widely used in households.

My assistants often complain that I forget to turn off my desk lamp before leaving the office. My desk lamp does not have the function of automatic switching. If the concept of energy efficiency can be promoted more extensively by means of publicity and tied in with the newly-promoted ideas of smart city and smart home ... I wish to hear the suggestions of the Bureau in this respect and hope that it will take heed of the policy measures mentioned by Mr Charles Peter MOK and some other Members in the policy debate.

With only tens of seconds left, I am not going to repeat my views. All I wish to say is that we look forward to the expeditious expansion of MEELS and the attainment of its objective. We also hope that MEELS can help achieve the long-term goal of reducing emissions and the goals (*The buzzer sounded*) ... set out in the Agreement.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr KWOK, please stop speaking.

PROF JOSEPH LEE (in Cantonese): President, I have listened to the remarks made by some Members and also carefully to your ruling, so I will avoid repeating the views already expressed by other Members.

I am not a member of the Subcommittee on the subsidiary legislation but when I know that the subsidiary legislation will be passed by the Legislative Council, I think there should not be any major problems and there is no reason to oppose it. But Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has moved a motion on adjournment of debate for no reason and I find this rather odd.

I learnt from the remarks made by Members these two days that the Subcommittee had six members only, and if I have not got it wrong, only one meeting was held and members were pleased with it. According to the Government, the Voluntary Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme has been implemented since 1995 and the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") is about to be implemented. President, I will not repeat the details and Members can refer to the relevant speeches.

I understand from the remarks made by different Members that the target of so many measures introduced by the Government is to reduce emissions. I believe many Honourable colleagues including the pan-democrats (i.e. non-pro-establishment Members) and pro-establishment Members have indicated that they agree with the concepts and principles of emission reduction, zero emission and global warming and they also think that the target can be achieved.

Of course, I do not want us to become the fool in a certain powerful country in the West who refused to sign the Paris Agreement. We will not do so and we will not seek to "surpass the United Kingdom and catch up with the United States" in this connection but I find the remarks made by Honourable colleagues somewhat confusing. Now that desirable measures have been formulated, why did Mr CHAN Chi-chuen consider it necessary to adjourn the debate? I was really confused but things became clear when I continued to listen attentively. It transpires that the Subcommittee did not have any proper discussion on what should be covered in this phase other than focusing on discussing home appliances and some other issues. For example, the retail sector takes issue with the affixation of energy labels to televisions as the screens may be affected. However, the problem has been straightened out.

Once this adjournment motion is passed, is it necessary for the Government to re-examine whether the third phase of MEELS should cover all electrical appliances in continuous use? My computer, for example, will shut down around five minutes after it has been switched on and it will not waste too much electricity, so there is no need to affix an energy label. However, will it be better if energy labels are affixed to all home appliances in continuous use to remind users to reduce the use of electrical appliances that waste too much energy and switch to buying electrical appliances that are slightly cheaper after deducting the energy expenses, so as to slowly achieve the emission reduction targets? Yet, the Government has not covered such electrical appliances. Obviously, the

Subcommittee's discussion was not exhaustive and the emission reduction target is not comprehensive enough. I have reservations about this and there is no reason why I should support the resolution; thus, I would like to thank Mr CHAN Chi-chuen for reminding me not to support this proposal that is not thorough enough.

President, I would also like to say that the Secretary hopes that 150 million kWh of electricity can be saved in the third phase and 600 million kWh can be saved each year. I definitely welcome such ideal figures, so I do not wish to argue or discuss further, and I do not intend to repeat the Secretary's views. Even though I am not a businessman but only a teacher, I also know that businessmen or the management like to talk about KPI. How can the Government prove that 600 million kWh of electricity can be saved each year? This 600 million kWh of electricity is not a small amount and we should all be happy with zero emission. However, the Government has not given any details. Maybe, because I am not a member of the Subcommittee or I have not heard it well, yet, Appendix 2 as displayed on the screen has not stated how the Government will achieve the target. These are high-sounding targets, and the Government should not propose high-sounding targets, right?

If the debate is adjourned at this stage, the Government may later on propose some mechanisms or present concrete results so that the public will know which brand of televisions or electric water heaters for continuous use can save 600 million kWh of electricity each year and practically achieve the target. As the President said earlier, the subsidiary legislation can be referred to the Subcommittee again for further study. I will support it then and there is no need to adjourn the debate.

As some Honourable colleagues have mentioned earlier, the Subcommittee has discussed a number of issues but it has also omitted quite a number of issues. I was baffled when I heard that; if the adjournment motion is passed, will we become an accomplice of the Government in proposing the high-sounding targets? I basically have no idea how the Government will save 600 million kWh of electricity. But as the President knows, an interesting thing is that the Government has just abolished the tax concessions for electric vehicles. I am not trying to speak for electric vehicle owners and I do not own an electric vehicle either; I simply wonder how electric vehicles can help reduce emissions. I do not wish to repeat the contents of the Paris Agreement because my computer has shut down and I cannot read the relevant contents aloud and the President

may ask me to stop speaking if I do so. Nevertheless, the Government has not proposed any comprehensive emission reduction strategies. The Subcommittee has only discussed the third phase of MEELS and the Government has not made any substantive proposals. How can this put our minds at rest?

After the Government has made considerations or revisions, a subcommittee maybe set up again and more pro-establishment Members or non-pro-establishment Members may join it to become members. It may even hold public hearings, which are very common, to listen to different opinions and draw on collective wisdom instead of focusing on home appliances only.

President, there is another very important matter. I am a sector representative. I dare not say that hospitals are wasting electricity but they actually use a lot of electricity. Are energy efficiency labels affixed to the equipment used in hospitals? If the Government's response is that the relevant equipment will be included in the fourth phase, my opinion is that, as Mr Dennis KWOK has just reminded me, it might as well consider Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's proposal and adjourn this debate because the problem has remained unsolved for many years. The Government started to implement the Voluntary Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme in 1995 but it is only about to implement the third phase in 2017. In that case, the Bureau can reconsider and explain the arrangement for electrical appliances in continuous use such as home appliances, commercial appliances and hospital equipment, etc. The American Heart Association has just updated the blood pressure guideline and hospitals frequently use certain equipment to measure vital signs for a long period of time, should the Government consider how to reduce emissions? How much electricity is consumed by hospital equipment? I believe many doctors and nurses are green supporters and very much support environmental protection, and hospitals have the responsibility to do so. Will the Government include such proposals?

It is definitely a good thing for the Government's subsidiary legislation on the implementation of the third phase of MEELS to be passed by the Legislative Council. Can the target of saving 600 million kWh of electricity each year as suggested by the Secretary just now be achieved? But the Government does not intend to conduct any assessment. President, it is now 2017 and I am really concerned about when the Government's subsidiary legislation on the implementation of the fourth phase of MEELS will be submitted to the Legislative Council so that more types of appliances can be covered and that

Hong Kong can truly achieve emission reductions long term. I am not talking about zero emission and I just hope that the air quality in Hong Kong will be improved.

President, I think it is more appropriate for the debate to be adjourned now, so I will support the adjournment motion moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and I hope the Government can make more thorough considerations. I dare not say that the Subcommittee's discussion at that meeting was very comprehensive but it should be able to more comprehensively and appropriately make Hong Kong people realize—this is the responsibility of the Environmental Protection Department and the Environment Bureau—that home appliances, commercial appliances or home appliances and equipment used at hospitals can achieve the emission reduction targets through MEELS. As Mr Dennis KWOK has just said, choosing electrical appliances is consumer behaviour. In choosing equipment to purchase, hospitals will also choose equipment that are more stable and cheaper—not in terms of lower prices but in terms of saving more energy—so that patients can put their minds at rest when equipment for measuring vital signs is used and that the equipment will not cause serious pollution to the earth. This is a very important point and also the most important reason for my support for Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's adjournment motion.

As there is still a little speaking time left, I would like to talk about a political issue. We all understand that I am performing the sword dance like XIANG Zhuang in making this speech. Whether Members support or oppose it, those on our side will be described as trying to extend the discussion time while those on the other side are trying to shorten the discussion time by all means. However, some Members also want to extend the discussion time of certain bills on other occasions so that the bills will not be introduced into the Legislative Council. Then, we may have to wait until the end of this year or early the next for an opportunity to discuss the Rules of Procedure and the two sides will confront one another again at that time.

This is certainly a political issue but I wish to make the public clear about one point, that is, whether we resolve political issues by political means or solve the problems with bills by practical means, this piece of subsidiary legislation tabled for endorsement by the Legislative Council will obviously help reduce emissions. Can the tasks that we have just mentioned be fully accomplished? At least 10 Members have talked about the merits of MEELS last time but these

merits are not comprehensive enough. It seems that the Secretary is not present; I do not know if the representatives of the Bureau have considered what should be done. Of course, they have not considered that because we are just filibustering and the resolution will certainly be passed in the end. However, in implementing the fourth phase of MEELS, it is indeed necessary for the Bureau to explore whether it is necessary to affix energy labels to neglected or uncovered commercial equipment or electrical equipment in hospitals that is in continuous use so that users or retailers will know that they also play a part in reducing emissions. President, this is the most important point.

I believe I am the only one who supports Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's adjournment motion because it seems that nobody has expressed support for him. The adjournment motion will not be passed but I believe it has political significance as I just mentioned and it can practically cause the Government to stop, which is most important. Even though we are filibustering, we have presented some constructive views so that the authorities can think of other ways to reduce emissions after the resolution relating to the third phase of MEELS has been passed. After all, emission reduction is the responsibility of the Environment Bureau.

I have unknowingly spoken for 12 minutes and I can no longer prolong my speech. Now I defer to Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung. Thank you, President.

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): President, just now, I had listened to Mr CHAN Chi-chuen carefully when he gave views on why he supported adjourning the debate. As I did not want to quote him wrongly, I asked him for the script after listening to his speech. I cannot remember if he read out his script word by word. Yet, from his script, I see his explanation on why he proposes an adjournment motion, i.e. to force the Government to introduce for televisions a more precise and detailed energy label. In order to pressurize the Government, he resorted to proposing an adjournment motion. By doing so, he also wished to force the Government to include instantaneous electric water heaters in the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS"). I am not sure if this point was mentioned in his speech.

President, as far as I can recall, the focus of his entire script is on the issue of televisions. His major complaint is that the energy efficiency labelling requirements on televisions are far too general to be effective. This view

actually echoes the Consumer Council's criticism of the current practice under MEELS. According to the Consumer Council, general consumers are drawn to the neat energy labels but may not know from them the differences in annual electricity consumption among products. In contrast, annual electricity consumption is shown in the energy labels in the European Union ("EU"). Why can Hong Kong not introduce a more precise and detailed grading, with the relevant information presented in a clear and simple way to facilitate comprehension by consumers? The Government has not given us any detailed explanation in spite of the suggestion of the Consumer Council. In the view of the Consumer Council, it is best to follow the EU practice by dividing energy efficiency into seven grades. I made the same point in my previous speech at the last stage as I consider this approach more effective.

However, I do not think it is justified for Mr CHAN Chi-chuen to propose an adjournment motion on this simple ground. He should have given some more reasons to justify his request for adjournment. To me, it is more important for us to have more specific requirements under MEELS. As we all know, products with lower energy efficiency are usually less expensive, vice versa. Yet, this point does not seem to be a concern of the Government, which is satisfied with the introduction of MEELS to give information on energy efficiency and let consumers to choose a suitable product at their own right.

Yesterday, I asked a question: How long does it take for a consumer to recover his cost of buying an energy efficient product? Such information is not available in the energy labels and no one knows the time so taken. When we buy a more expensive product, we will expect savings in our electricity bill. But right now we do not know how many years it will take for the savings to offset the higher price paid for the product. In my speech yesterday, I said that a friend of mine who worked for the CLP Power Hong Kong Limited ("CLP") had told me that it would take at least 25 years to recover the cost of installing a solar power system after coming to my home for a relevant test at my request.

After the introduction of MEELS, if it takes more than 10 years for consumers to recover their costs of buying more pricey products, many of them will be deterred from doing so. It will also be impossible for the grass roots to opt for energy efficient products. It is a pity that the Government, instead of giving careful thought to the promotion of energy efficient products among consumers, simply seeks to place five types of products (including televisions,

storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, washing machines and room air conditioners with heating and cooling functions) under MEELS in the third phase with effect from next year (2018). It fails to help consumers select and purchase energy efficient products. Therefore, I think Mr CHAN Chi-chuen should present more justifications, for example, saying that the deficiencies in government promotion and support warrants consideration afresh.

Yesterday, I also stated that if more time is available, the Government should give consideration to many more aspects. It should not just casually say that a lot of effort has been made in including different products in the three phases of MEELS. If it fails to formulate a long-term plan for MEELS or consider its effectiveness, its implementation will just be a waste of resources because the relevant legislation, after introduction, cannot be amended easily and the Government may not be willing to consider taking complementary measures by that time. The Government, which claims that it wishes to first put the scheme into practice and conduct a review later, is just employing delaying tactics and wasting resources.

According to the Government, MEELS can help save 600 million units of electricity. However, it is easier said than done. What if this objective cannot be achieved? By that time, we can no longer hold the current-term Government accountable for the setback and the next-term Government will just continue the efforts. If it is the case, MEELS will be rendered meaningless. Why can the Government not develop a holistic plan before rolling out MEELS to make sure that the inclusion of the several types of products will be accepted by the public and can in effect bring forth energy efficiency? Will the Government consider subsidizing low-income families to buy energy efficient products? I think it is a good idea which merits consideration by the Government.

Moreover, in my speech yesterday, I spoke on issues to which the Government owes us a proper response. Should it pause for a while and think about the next course of action? Yesterday, a number of Honourable colleagues expressed concern over products other than the five types to be included in MEELS. Has the Government drawn up any blueprint and timetable to place other products under MEELS? We have seen none. President, MEELS has also failed to cover electrical products used by commercial institutions. How should the Government deal with this? Yesterday, I asked the Government whether the fourth and fifth phases of MEELS were upcoming. If the

Government has not yet come to a decision, it should think it over and inform us clearly of the way forward. Palliative measures, as well as minor improvement taken in a perfunctory manner by drawing reference to overseas experience, are far from sufficient. I hope that the Government will carry out its work in a solid manner to reduce carbon emissions instead of muddling through.

President, in my view, the most important issue here is that the Government seems to have failed to give a concrete response to the suggestion of the Consumer Council and this may render MEELS ineffective. I am not sure if it is the result of insufficient time for consideration or due to some other reasons. Nevertheless, why can the measures in Europe not be taken in Hong Kong? Why can we not learn from overseas by establishing a more precise grading system and specifying the energy consumption levels in the labels for the information of consumers? This is my second point.

Thirdly, the Government has not yet told us how it will enhance its publicity and education efforts. I consider these efforts very important. I cited my experience of buying an electrical product two years ago as an example yesterday. When I asked the salespersons about the energy efficiency of the products after noting their energy labels, they replied, "The energy efficiency of these products is more or less the same. The grade is too wide to tell whether a product is energy efficient." This situation causes confusion to consumers as they can neither tell from the price nor energy label the energy efficiency of a product. Eventually, they may not be able to buy energy efficient products, as said just now, to reduce carbon emissions. In view of this, will the Government spend some time to explain to us how its publicity and education efforts will enable the public to gain a clear understanding of the energy efficiency of products and help enhance the effectiveness of its policy? I hope the Government can give some thought to it.

Lastly, I think the Government should also give us a clear account of the progress of its supervisory effort. Does the energy efficiency of products match the description in the labels? If not, how will the Government deal with this problem? It has been the practice of the Government to take action only after receiving complaints from the public or conducting sampling checks. Will it consider conducting supervision at source instead of following up with the complaints from consumers after they have suffered losses? Will it be more desirable to do so? I hope the Government can spare some time thinking about

this suggestion and, later on, inform us of its plan. Meanwhile, it should propose complementary measures for MEELS and tell us in full how it will implement the scheme. Will it be a better option?

President, I indeed feel ambivalent. While the early enforcement of the amendment in question is not a bad thing for it can do good in some ways, I find lots of inadequacies in it. On the one hand, we wish to see the Government implement the relevant scheme as soon as possible; and on the other, we hope it can work out the complementary measures before implementing the scheme. That is why I hope the Government can spend some more time considering how it can better deal with the dilemma and address the queries and difficulties raised by me just now.

President, I am still thinking whether I should support the adjournment motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen. I will make my final decision after listening to the response of the Government. President, I so submit.

MR HOLDEN CHOW (in Cantonese): President, I speak in opposition to the motion proposing that the debate on the proposed resolution moved under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the Ordinance") be now adjourned. President, the Ordinance imposes a mandatory requirement that certain products are to be affixed with energy labels. In retrospect, the Government implemented the first phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") in 2009. It has been a long time since then but phase three is going to be implemented now in 2017. The purpose of the proposed resolution is to include in MEELS such electrical products as televisions, electric storage water heaters, induction cookers, washing machines, and so on.

President, as many Honourable colleagues have mentioned today, it has been almost a decade since 2009 but today in 2017 the Government is just planning to implement phase three of MEELS and only a few electrical products are covered. President, many would ask why the progress of MEELS has been so slow in almost a decade and why the Government cannot promote the environmental protection work in Hong Kong further to make the public realize that saving electricity can reduce the consumption of energy and protect our environment. Seeing that only phase three of MEELS is going to be

implemented after almost a decade with only very few products being mandated to display the energy label, everyone thinks the progress of MEELS has been too slow in implementation and there should be no more delay and MEELS should be taken forward as quickly as possible. Then why would a Member suddenly propose the adjournment motion?

President, one of the views I have heard is that by adjourning the debate, it is hoped that the Government will reflect deeply why the progress of MEELS has been so slow and since it is such a rare case that a new phase of the scheme is implemented, apart from the televisions, washing machines and induction cookers, more electric appliances should be covered and more complementary measures introduced to perfect the Ordinance. President, such a view is far too idealistic. In reality, if the implementation of MEELS has been rather smooth and there has been little obstruction, more than three phases should have been implemented in these close to 10 years, and there should have been more than a few types of electrical products covered.

President, I have also heard another view. Since the Government has taken such a long time to only implement phase three of MEELS now, if we adjourn the debate today, does it mean it will cause a significant change in the Government's mentality or the objective environment in a short time so that the Government would extend the scope of MEELS, covering all other electrical products than the televisions, induction cookers and washing machines? President, I find such a view totally unrealistic. I oppose the adjournment motion because I do not want to waste time; neither do I want to lose the opportunity for MEELS to go one step forward as a result of the sudden adjournment of the debate. I believe many people who care about the promotion of environmental protection do not wish to see the sudden adjournment of the debate on the proposed resolution today.

President, allow me to say this: the objective of the proposal of this adjournment motion is to stall the proceedings. I have recently found that some opposition Members may be fond of playing a game in this Chamber, which is, have someone playing the bad guy propose an adjournment motion for no reason and then some other opposition Members playing the good guy to say that the adjournment motion should not be proposed and they will oppose it. President, the objective effect will be an even longer extension of the debating time of the

Council, resulting in a filibustering effect. I wish to solemnly tell all members of the public that the purpose of those Members who have someone play the bad guy to propose an adjournment motion suddenly and then have others play the good guy to speak against the motion is to filibuster. Hence, I oppose the adjournment motion, such that the Legislative Council can endorse the proposed resolution as soon as possible.

President, I would like to take this opportunity to speak more. We can learn from the environmental protection measures from other countries. It is not unprecedented in other countries to mandatorily require the display of energy labels. For example, to meet the requirements, the Government of the United States must procure products whose materials are recyclable to a certain extent. If the Government can enforce such requirements, it will effectively promote market demand. Under free economy, when there is demand, there is supply. Without demand, it is hard to promote this kind of work. If the Government can take the lead to require that government departments must procure products that are recyclable to a certain extent, it will greatly stimulate the demand for such products. By the same token, if the implementation of MEELS aims at saving energy, and if the Government takes the lead to require that the products procured for government use must reach a certain degree of energy efficiency, it will stimulate the demand for such products.

President, I have expressed my views. We do not wish to see the debate on this proposed resolution adjourned. We hope that we can handle the Ordinance more effectively and go one step forward in promoting the work of environmental protection. President, I so submit.

MR CHAN HAK-KAN (in Cantonese): President, I speak in opposition to the adjournment motion whose obvious purpose is filibustering and wasting this Council's time, turning environmental protection policies into chips for political bargaining.

Having listened to Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's remarks, I think that he should be quite supportive of environmental protection and he also supports the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance. He said that the Government is not doing enough and should include all electrical

products in the scope of the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the Ordinance"). Since Mr CHAN is so concerned about these issues, I have checked if he has joined the Subcommittee. President, the Subcommittee has seven Members only including me and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen is not a member. If Mr CHAN cares about the energy efficiency of products, he should have joined the Subcommittee in the first place.

Secondly, if we think that the Government should do more, the Subcommittee should have held more discussions and called more meetings. However, the Subcommittee completed discussions in only one meeting. In other words, the Subcommittee has no objection to the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 and also finds it necessary to implement the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS"). Mr CHAN is a veteran Member, so if he considers that the Ordinance should cover more and different types of electrical products, he should not suddenly become environmentally-friendly and propose that more electrical products be covered by the Ordinance. On the contrary, he should have put forward his proposal back in 2009 or when this Council discussed the second phase of MEELS. Why did he not join the Subcommittee or put forward such a proposal when the first or second phase was discussed? Obviously, he simply wanted to filibuster and waste this Council's time as I just said.

President, I oppose this motion because the Members concerned do not really want to discuss the contents of the Ordinance and they do not really care about environmental protection; they are just requesting further discussion on the issue for the sake of filibustering. Some members of the public who are watching the live broadcast on television or webcast may not understand very clearly what an adjournment motion is. Put simply, if the adjournment motion is passed, all discussions held from yesterday to 3:00 pm today will go down the drain. This Council's time, public funds and energy will be wasted, and this runs counter to their claim that they care about energy efficiency.

When this Council discusses whether a bill should be passed, if there is a new situation or new development during the Second Reading or Third Reading stage and it has not been discussed before or there was no opportunity for discussion before, an adjournment motion moved by a Member can really give

this Council more time to reconsider matters or conduct consultations or hold public hearings again, and the Government will also have more time to give responses and make revisions. Nevertheless, we have finished discussing the Ordinance and the Government has already conducted consultations. The Government conducted consultations in September 2015 and stakeholders from different parties and groupings have already indicated support. I have heard the remarks made by many opposition Members in these two days and they have indicated that the resolution should be passed as soon as possible so that Hong Kong can do a better job in respect of energy-saving products and there can be a larger number of more environmentally-friendly appliances for consumers to choose.

Since the Ordinance is nothing new and it is now time to implement the third phase, why do we need to adjourn the debate and hold discussions afresh in the future? President, why have opposition Members proposed the adjournment of debate on a resolution on which the community has already reached a consensus and requested to start all over again? There is only one answer: they want to filibuster. Opposition Members often say that no livelihood issue is too trivial and they must fight for the public in every issue. But they will not let trivial livelihood issues slip by for the sake of filibustering and they are now playing with the proposal to affix energy labels to induction cookers and televisions, trying their best to delay proceedings.

If we want to stop filibustering by the opposition camp, we should let Mr CHAN Chi-chuen get what he wanted and pass the adjournment motion moved by him as soon as possible, such that the discussion time can be shortened and they cannot hijack the resolution for the sake of filibustering. Yet, we Members have a bottom line. We think that the resolution should be passed as soon as possible and I understand very well that the opposition camp will continue to hijack the resolution and continue to filibuster after moving the adjournment motion. I must say that I oppose Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's adjournment motion.

Lastly, President, I have a few words for Mr CHAN Chi-chuen or the opposition Members: "reduce waste at source and reduce superfluous remarks; cherish energy and no filibustering". Thank you, President.

MR WONG TING-KWONG (in Cantonese): President, you have had a hard time today, sitting here the whole day since morning, listening to the nonsense of the opposition camp, watching an ugly farce directed and performed by themselves. Today, it has been very strange, for no requests have been made for headcounts since morning. *(Some Members talked in their seats)* This is pretty good, right? They will request a headcount when they so wish, and they will not when they wish otherwise. They have employed such tactics. What has become of this Legislative Council? Is it up to the mark? What is meant by exploiting one's power to the fullest? This is it. What is meant by "hypocritical rhetoric"? This is it.

(Some Members talked aloud in their seats)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHIANG Lai-wan ...

(Several Members, including Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Ms Claudia MO, spoke aloud in their seats)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please keep quiet. Mr WONG Ting-kwong, please continue.

MR WONG TING-KWONG (in Cantonese): We actually need to expose them to the petty masses. What is meant by going to any length to one's end? As we can see, they are going to any length to their end, resorting to such extreme tactics as to invoke RoP 88(1) and 54(4) ...

(Ms Claudia MO talked aloud in her seat)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Claudia MO, please keep quiet.

Mr WONG Ting-kwong, please address your speech to the Chair.

MR WONG TING-KWONG (in Cantonese): President, she is interrupting me.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I have already given her a warning. If she engages in any disorderly behaviour again, I will order her to leave the Chamber.

MR WONG TING-KWONG (in Cantonese): Marvellous, President!

(Ms Claudia MO still talked in her seat)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Claudia MO, this is my last warning to you. If you continue to speak in your seat, I will regard it as disorderly behaviour and order you to leave the Chamber.

Mr WONG Ting-kwong, please continue.

MR WONG TING-KWONG (in Cantonese): President, thank you. All right. Today the opposition camp have been composed. They neither provoked the President nor crowded around. If the President asked them to leave the Chamber, they would apologize to the President with a grimacing face. Look! In this Chamber, they do no decent work. The petty masses in Hong Kong are spending public money on keeping this bunch of people. Do we not feel heartrending and indignant? We have been stalled and delayed by them here every day. All projects relating to the people's livelihood, infrastructure, etc. have been impeded by them.

I am the Chairman of the Subcommittee on this Order. We have handled the scrutiny of this Order in a most rational manner. Our views on this issue are unanimous. All of us support environmental protection work. We also consider that emission reduction and energy conservation should be taken forward gradually, and the relevant products should be handled properly one by one to facilitate the smooth operation of the industry and achieve the objective of reduction in waste and emission. However, today they suddenly invoked RoP 40(1) to propose a motion to adjourn the debate. This is quite intriguing. Someone came forward to act as the target while the others attacked him and opposed him together. What perverse behaviour in the Council! Nevertheless, this is also a novel trick. Hence, I would like everyone to see such shameless behaviour clearly. Thank you, President.

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

DR ELIZABETH QUAT (in Cantonese): President, I rise to speak against the motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen to adjourn the debate on the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the Ordinance"), because the adjournment motion is unnecessary. Moreover, the Member seeks merely to stage a filibuster as a delaying tactic and once again put politics over people's livelihood, thereby further delaying initiatives conducive to people's livelihood.

President, the objective of this proposed resolution under the Ordinance is simply to include televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, washing machines, and so on, in the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS"). The Government has estimated that around 150 million kWh of electricity and carbon dioxide emissions of 100 000 tonnes can thus be saved per annum. President, I really do not understand why someone could have proposed to adjourn the debate on this resolution that is capable of contributing to environmental protection in Hong Kong as well as coping with global climate change. His sole purpose is to filibuster.

President, a number of Members who spoke before me, including those who spoke today and yesterday, have pointed out the acute problems caused by global climate change. Following the announcement by the United States President to withdraw from the Paris Agreement, it is all the more imperative for various countries and regions to enhance and expedite their environmental protection efforts. Frankly, if possible, we should speed up and take one more step. Members should actually feel very pleased that the Government is willing to improve its energy efficiency initiatives. Therefore, there is no reason for us to make any further procrastination. Instead, the relevant scheme should be implemented expeditiously.

The electrical appliances included in MEELS this time around are mostly those categorized as televisions, which are more sought-after in recent years. In a word, it is definitely better for this motion to be passed one hour earlier than later. It is a pity that Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has proposed this absolutely unnecessary adjournment motion and put up a collaborative show with the pan-democratic Members from the opposition camp to cheat the people. They

have also used this method recently to stage filibusters. If they can request headcounts, they will do so to procrastinate by all means. The public might find it strange that they have not requested headcounts should they wish to procrastinate. It is because they will strive to procrastinate this motion and then the next one. In a word, they will exhaust all means to procrastinate. But why do they have to procrastinate? It is because they intend to prevent us from proposing to amend the Rules of Procedure ("RoP"). President, their objective cannot be clearer. Hence, I have to speak and tell the general public what they are doing.

President, I have also taken note of the speeches delivered by many Members who are absent now but were here yesterday and today, including the pan-democratic Members from the opposition camp. I have not heard any Member oppose this resolution proposed by the Government. Moreover, the views expressed by quite many Members are most positive, and their speeches have been reported by quite many media today, too. For instance, Members from the Democratic Party considered that the mandatory energy efficiency labelling work should be taken forward expeditiously, and members of the public be encouraged to conserve energy and reduce emissions. These were the views expressed by Mr WU Chi-wai. Dr Fernando CHEUNG held that consumers should be informed of the energy efficiency of a wide range of electrical appliances for enhanced transparency, with a view to reducing carbon emissions and avoiding aggravating global warming.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan from our camp, the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong, revealed the intention of these Members just now by pointing out that only a few Members have joined the Subcommittee, and many of the pan-democratic Members who spoke today have never shown any concern about this subject. Today, however, they suddenly expressed concern about environmental protection products and kept saying that the legislation should stipulate that the electrical appliances must be energy efficient and capable of reducing emissions. President, the actual intention of these Members is to filibuster. In the opinion of Mr CHAN Hak-kan, should these Members really wish to see improvement in the environment, they should cut back on filibustering, and avoid burning the time of the Legislative Council continually and expending a large volume of electricity and air conditioning. So doing is actually conducive to enhancing energy efficiency, conserving energy and reducing emissions.

Some time ago, a number of pan-democratic Members from the opposition camp mentioned the significance of environmental protection in Hong Kong, the increasingly serious impacts of global climate change, the need for energy efficiency management in Hong Kong, and so on. However, for the sake of buying time for filibusters, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has proposed an adjournment motion. President, proposing motions for adjournment of debate and adjournment of the Council is the usual filibustering tactic adopted by these Members. Their sole purpose of proposing motions for adjournment of the debate is to speak for another 15 minutes. Once this motion comes to an end, they will propose adjournment motions one after another, so that they can speak for another 15 minutes again and again. Why do they propose motions to adjourn the debate on environmental protection measures supported by the general public and even themselves? Because they can continue to filibuster and procrastinate only through proposing adjournment debates. I believe the adjournment motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen will definitely not be passed because even they themselves might vote against it.

President, these Members have frequently employed these tactics recently. For instance, the motion moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick under RoP 88(1) met with opposition from pan-democratic Members from the opposition camp unanimously, even though Mr CHU is one of their members. Like putting up a collaborative show to cheat the people, a pan-democratic Member from the opposition camp will propose a procedural motion, and when the ensuing debate is over, the motion will be opposed by other pan-democratic Members from the opposition camp. The objective result is prolonging Members' speaking time and hence the time spent by the Legislative Council as a whole.

What is the point of triggering this debate? President, it is really meaningless to do so. The sole purpose of these Members is to keep procrastinating. For instance, we have just finished discussing the motion on the co-location arrangement. President, you pointed out yesterday that 26 hours in total were expended on this motion. However, the actual debate on the motion, the speaking time for public officers and the actual voting took up only 8.5 hours, 1.5 hours and half an hour respectively. Of the remaining 15.5 hours, five hours were spent on headcounts, and the remaining 10.5 hours on the debate on the adjournment motion. Members will please take a look. It turns out that this Council has spent 10.5 hours discussing and debating whether a debate should be adjourned. Later on, a Member requested that the press and members of the

public should leave the Chamber. As a result, this Council had to spend time on conducting another debate. Actually, the sole purpose of these tricks was to filibuster, too.

The word "dynastic" can be used to describe the filibusters staged in the Legislative Council in the last several years, with some Members resorting to every means conceivable, so to speak. According to media reports, 16 of the 407 hours of meeting conducted by the Legislative Council last year were spent on doing 95 headcounts. The situation faced by the Legislative Council of the last term was even worse, with the number of hours of meeting totalling 2 174. President, I wonder if you can remember the number of headcounts made. It turned out to be 1 478, meaning that 220 hours were wasted. President, all these were the filibustering tricks employed by Members. I hope the figures can be announced later on. As regards the number of hours spent on adjournment debates conducted at Council meetings last year—I do not have this figure for the time being—I think the number of hours spent on debating adjournment motions is equally alarming.

Actually, the pan-democratic Members from the opposition camp are trying to vent their anger by continually spending time on proposing motions for adjournment of the Council and adjournment of the debate or requesting headcounts. President, the reason for parliamentary assemblies to allow filibusters is to enable Members to make their voices about some specific subjects heard, especially topics related to the socially disadvantaged or issues afforded less audience. Some Members might consider their voices too weak, and so they make use of filibusters to give themselves more opportunities of speaking or arousing the attention of the community to the subjects. Many parliamentary assemblies allow Members to stage filibusters to a certain extent. Therefore, honestly, President, I have no intention to impose a complete ban on the acts of filibustering by Members in this Council.

Let us examine the filibusters staged by Members of this Council. They have spent 220 hours on requests for headcounts and proposing motions for adjournment of debate. Even the resolution proposed by the Government under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance today has now been used as a filibustering tool. In my opinion, the adjournment motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen is really inconceivable. He can be described as matchless and unrivalled.

President, when we learn that these Members would exploit the loopholes and make use of RoP 88(1) which has never been invoked, we would understand why Members of the pro-establishment camp consider it imperative to amend RoP. Our purpose of amending RoP is not to impose a complete ban on filibusters by Members in this Council. We just hope that, even if some Members wish to filibuster, they have to do so within a certain limit, so that this Council can operate effectively and be brought back to the right track.

The Legislative Council is now running idle, President. No matter how hard we try, how many matters we wish to discuss, and how many subjects related to economic development and improving people's livelihood we wish to discuss and hold rational debates, we have no chance to do so. This year, not even one Member's motion can be tabled before the Council for serious discussion due to the lack of time. All the time has been spent on headcounts, Members refusing to discuss the amendment of RoP as well as motions constantly proposed by Members for adjournment of the Council and adjournment of debates. President, how can this Council continue to operate? How can we as Legislative Council Members explain all this to the general public? Will this Council continue to operate in this manner in future?

President, I oppose this adjournment motion. Most importantly, my speech is meant to tell the general public that there is a group of pan-democratic Members from the opposition camp who have completely turned a deaf ear to Hong Kong economy and people's livelihood, rather than telling them what kind of situation we are facing. So long as these Members consider the motions proposed by the Government unpleasant to their ears, incapable of meeting their wishes, or associated with the country, they will oppose China in all circumstances and oppose for the sake of opposition by hook or by crook, such as proposing a motion for adjournment of the debate.

President, should we allow these Members to behave in this manner? President, should RoP be amended? The general public have formed the view that the Legislative Council today has become a disgrace. These Members may think that they represent public opinion and many people support their acts, but actually many Hong Kong people have expressed great disappointment over the present state of this Council. President, I hear many people say every day that the present state of the Legislative Council is intolerable. They also queried why we could not do anything and questioned if we would continue to tolerate the disruption caused by these Members to the Legislative Council, thereby impeding

the development of Hong Kong. As a result, even the Amendment Order made under the Ordinance has been delayed again and again. How much delay do these Members intend to cause? I do not know the answer, either. They might think that they are now taking full control of the Legislative Council. In other words, they have complete control over when the meeting will end, when the voting is to take place and when filibusters can be staged.

President, Hong Kong belongs not only to the pan-democratic Members from the opposition camp; it also belongs to all the people of Hong Kong. It belongs to this generation as well as the next. We hope Hong Kong can continue to develop. Economic development must be pursued before people's livelihood can be improved. Likewise, this Amendment Order must be passed before we can become global citizens and contribute to combating global climate change. Should these Members be allowed to behave in this manner, we as Members of the pro-establishment camp will have the responsibility and reasons to amend RoP. Even if they continue to filibuster, even if they are allowed to filibuster for several dozen more hours, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, we will eventually table the proposal of amending RoP before this Council. We believe we will have a strong popular mandate, and many members of the public will support us amending RoP to prevent these Members from using these methods to exploit the loopholes and impede the development of Hong Kong.

With these remarks, President, I oppose the adjournment motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen.

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

MS ALICE MAK (in Cantonese): President, there is this popular exclamation on the Internet, and it goes: "Gosh! I am so confused!", followed by an emoji which shows a person covering his face with his hands in confusion. It is really all very confusing, why? From members of the public who are watching the live broadcast of today's meeting to Honourable colleagues attending this meeting, everyone, I believe, is extremely confused. Since yesterday, colleagues have seemingly been discussing this resolution in respect of energy labels, as well as the environmental protection work of Hong Kong, with great sincerity. Some Members who had been discussing energy labels even went on to talk

about—despite your repeated reminders, President, that the discussion should focus on energy labels—such issues as motor vehicles, lamps and light pollution. They covered everything, telling anecdotes like stir-frying vegetables with sunglasses on. Just when everyone looks forward with eagerness, which is natural with Members talking about environmental protection with such sincerity, to the speedy passage of the resolution, they proposed a motion calling for adjournment of the debate instead. What is that supposed to mean? Is there no need for further discussions now? The purpose of the adjournment motion, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen explained, was to pressurize the Government into doing more. However, other Members of the opposition camp disagreed with halting the discussion.

In the midst of confusions, what actually are they doing here? I just wish to tell those members of the public who are watching the live broadcast of this meeting that the Legislative Council is embroiled in filibusters. Many people actually do not have a clue, thinking that filibustering means only requests for headcount. The truth is there are all sorts of filibustering tactics which do not necessarily involve requests for headcount. Let us take a look at the Chamber now, despite the fact that there are just a couple of people here, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, who is in his seat at the moment, does not request any headcount—he has his calculations, and naturally, and I will not impute motives to him. Clearly, there are more filibustering tactics than requests for headcount.

Among the many speeches made by Members of the opposition camp speaking before me, I am most impressed by Prof Joseph LEE's speech, which really deserves a "Like". He admitted that they were performing the sword dance like XIANG Zhuang as a cover to kill LIU Bang. In other words, their true motive is filibustering, which has nothing to do with adjourning the debate on the resolution. Prof LEE's frankness is truly admirable. So, I must now tell the people of Hong Kong what they are doing: exploiting the proceedings of the scrutiny of this resolution. After playing the roles of ambassadors and commissioners for environmental protection one after another, they are now playing the opposite roles in a "good cop, bad cop" scenario with one side proposing adjournment of the debate while the other demanding its continuation. I have always thought such tactic of "good cop, bad cop"—or one playing the villain while the other playing the hero, as Mr Holden CHOW put it in a more cultured analogy, while I would simply say "good cop, bad cop"—only works with my niece who is just over three years old, i.e. I don the mask of villain or

bad cop, since I am stern by nature, while another plays the good cop in order to teach her to behave. I have always thought such ruse works only on three-year-olds. It has never occurred to me that it could be applied to the meetings of the Legislative Council. Perhaps they think such ruse works with many people, not just kids aged a little over three.

Therefore, I wish to tell the people of Hong Kong that it is indeed necessary for us to oppose this adjournment motion. For they are using this motion to drag out the scrutiny of the resolution for the purpose of filibustering. Even though no requests for headcount have been made, it does not mean no stalling tactics are in play. In fact, we are in the middle of filibusters. That is why members of the public need to be told and to take a good look. From spouting high-sounding speeches on environmental protection to proposing the adjournment of debate, they are simply trying to drag out, as long as possible, the scrutiny of the resolution, making it impossible for this Council to discuss the subsequent issues that need to be dealt with under normal circumstances. As Dr Elizabeth QUAT pointed out, at the end of the day, they were doing all this probably to avoid the discussion on the changes to the Rules of Procedure ("RoP"). However, what our party, the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions, really wants to discuss is the new Government's stance on labour policy in the Member's motion of "conducting a comprehensive review of labour legislation to improve labour rights and interests" proposed by Mr HO Kai-ming. Delayed from 2016-2017 to the current legislative year, the motion has yet had the opportunity to be discussed while my script for the debate, prepared nearly half a year ago, still has no opportunity of delivery. We really wish to have a debate with the Government and to hear what the relevant Bureau Director has got to say about the expectation of the new Government in terms of labour policy, what are their plans for implementing it, how the issue of holidays will be handled, etc. Yet, we have no opportunities for such debate, all because they keep proposing motions to adjourn debates.

Let me reiterate once again, President, that I oppose this adjournment motion. For we hope that the proceedings will not be stalled anymore and be free from filibustering, which they are trying to maintain as long as possible. As Prof Joseph LEE said, they wished to drag out the proceedings, knowing full well of our wish to shorten it—he admitted as such just now—and have the proceedings free from stalling by them so that we can return as soon as possible to the proper discussion about issues of concern to the general public.

Over the last few weeks, they have been resorting to all sorts of ways and means, demanding, at one time, continuation of discussion in an attempt to have the three Readings of a bill completed in a one go, and the withdrawal of members of the press from the Chamber at another. Now, they are proposing adjournment of the debate on the resolution. All these moves are made for nothing other than filibustering. People however should see that stalling tactics come in so many forms. That is why we need to improve RoP in order to avoid a repeat of such filibustering attempts to drag out proceedings, which would affect the normal operation of this Council.

I must extend my deepest sympathy to the Under Secretary and my classmate sitting next to him. It is unfortunate that your resolution happened to be the target chosen by them for filibustering. Under normal circumstances, you will find yourself in this Chamber, listening to Members for their policy recommendations in respect of this resolution, or how legislation should be improved. Instead, you now have to listen to speeches made for the sake of filibustering which is a waste of everyone's time—why picked us among everybody else, is not that so? I hope the public can see what they are doing and realize the very true necessity of perfecting RoP. Otherwise, following this resolution on energy labels, who knows what agenda item will be targeted next, and we will never be able to move on to the discussions on other issues.

I speak, President, certainly to oppose this adjournment motion. There are in fact a lot of things I wish to say but dare not do so. For once I throw it out, they will defend themselves by saying that they are not alone in making speeches and stalling for time. So, instead of delivering a lengthy speech, I only wish to tell the public loud and clear that the Legislative Council has become the target of filibustering again, even though no requests for headcount have been made. The public should remain vigilant of the myriad tactics of filibustering and safeguard our legislature together with us.

I so submit, President.

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

MR LEUNG CHE-CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, first of all, let me make it clear that I will not stall on the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("the Amendment Order") by means of filibuster, just as the pan-democrats are doing now. But having listened to the remarks made by them yesterday and today, if I were a member of the general public, I would think that the Legislative Council has suddenly become crazy. It is because every one of them made remarks that were most pleasing to the ear, claiming support for the reduction of emission and environmental protection and while they kept making those remarks, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen outrageously proposed a motion on adjournment. I cannot agree to his abnormal behaviour.

Of course, he said that he proposed a motion on adjournment in the hope that the Government could do better. But as we all know, should this debate be adjourned, we do not know when there would be a chance for it to be tabled to the Legislative Council for discussion again in future. As we all know, this Amendment Order was proposed in May this year but it can be tabled to this Council for discussion only now, which goes to show how difficult it is to come to the present stage and yet, he still has to filibuster now, resulting in the overall environmental policy being greatly compromised. So, with regard to his motive of proposing this motion today, I have heard the analyses made many colleagues and while I will not hazard any guess, it is there for all to see, and I think these analyses are somewhat reasonable. Having said that, I will not make any guess, but I wish to put forward some of my views on the Amendment Order.

In fact, many Members had participated in the scrutiny of the Amendment Order but not Mr CHAN Chi-chuen. Therefore, if he has read only the papers, he may not know too well the specific details of the entire Amendment Order. But when the process has come to this stage now, he suddenly said that he does not know the details or the Government has not done its part properly, querying about whether there would be loopholes following the implementation of energy efficiency labelling in future and asking whether the Government could make some improvement. So, when he has proposed a motion on adjournment now, it gives people the feeling that while he did not participate in the Subcommittee, he also failed to present the salient points of the discussion of the Subcommittee. That he has proposed a motion on adjournment now is, President, most incomprehensible to us.

If the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance can be amended, we will be able to reduce energy consumption or achieve energy savings with a reduction of carbon dioxide emissions of 105 000 tonnes per annum, as clearly stated in the paper. Therefore, this is indeed a vitally important measure of environmental protection and even energy savings in Hong Kong at large. Certainly, as to the question of whether or not this target can really be achieved, the Government will have to submit a report to the Legislative Council on the environmental benefits concerned after the legislation is brought into effect in future and we can make further comments then, and that would be a different matter. But I think the Government has come up with this figure based on the studies and reports made by experts.

Certainly, there is currently regulation in law and a phased approach has been adopted. The first phase was launched in 2009 and improvement has been made to the situation. The second phase was implemented in 2011 with the scope being extended to washing machines. The current proposal covers even a greater variety of electrical appliances, including televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, and room air conditioners of reverse cycle type. The requirement of energy labels has made manufacturers attach importance to labelling and ensure compliance with the requirements of Hong Kong. Therefore, this will benefit members of the public (including myself) in using these electrical appliances because at least energy consumption can be reduced. So, this is very important and I believe no one in Hong Kong will oppose it, for such control is imposed on the manufacturers whereas we are only purchasers of these products. If this motion on adjournment of the debate proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen is passed, the public would not be able to use these good products, and this would do harm to me and to the people of Hong Kong. I, therefore, do not support the motion on adjournment proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen.

Just now Dr Elizabeth QUAT and Ms Alice MAK talked about his purpose in proposing a motion on adjournment and I think their remarks made sense because as we can see, in the history of filibusters in the Legislative Council, he is a valiant champion for filibusters after WONG Yuk-man and "Long Hair" as he invariably took the lead to request a headcount at any meeting in an attempt to filibuster. As he has made such a move now, I believe we would think that he should have such a motive. But it strikes me as strange because it should be their intention to filibuster on the motion relating to the co-location arrangement. Why do they suddenly continue to filibuster also on the motions coming after it?

Dr Elizabeth QUAT has aptly exposed their aim. What is it? It is to stop the pro-establishment camp from tabling to the Legislative Council the motion on amendment of the Rules of Procedure.

Judging from their position, I think this step taken by them gives no cause for criticism, but can they refrain from filibustering on the Amendment Order? They can filibuster on the motions that follow. For instance, five resolutions proposed to extend the amendment period will follow and they can start filibustering when it comes to their turn. Why do they have to filibuster now? I think they have got the timing wrong, giving the public the impression that the Legislative Council ... When I visited the district these days, members of the public all said that they found the Legislative Council in chaos as any issue can be subject to filibustering and even issues relating to the people's livelihood are no exception. Certainly, their accusations are directed not at us, but the filibustering Members. If things go on like this, the image of the Legislative Council as a whole would likewise be adversely affected. Recently I have read some poll results which show that in people's impression, the Legislative Council is a "rubbish Council", rather than the Legislative Council. This is not good to any Member of this Council.

Therefore, I think Mr CHAN Chi-chuen should change their approach. They should cut down on and even cease filibustering on livelihood issues, in order to serve the people and work for the people. I think this is a basic principle of Members of the Legislative Council.

President, I oppose the motion on adjournment moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen. I so submit.

MR CHAN HAN-PAN (in Cantonese): President, I find it utterly meaningless and an abuse of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") for Mr CHAN Chi-chuen to move a motion to adjourn the debate. He has abused RoP in the past by moving adjournment motions, of which Dr Elizabeth QUAT has cited many examples just now. The purpose of the adjournment motion is to suspend the debate on some controversial topics so that we can start afresh the discussion in another meeting, or to even shelve the matter and scrutinize the next motion in the queue. This Council has been debating yesterday and today this motion regarding energy efficiency labelling which is conducive to environmental protection and

supported by almost all Members who have spoken. I cannot find any reason other than filibustering for a Member to move that the debate on a motion without any controversy be adjourned.

Mr LEUNG Che-cheung said just now that the target of filibustering is the pro-establishment camp or its proposal to amend RoP aiming at preventing future abuses of RoP. But on second thought, that may not be the case. Since Donald TRUMP's withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, the whole world is talking about global warming. If we do not introduce any regulatory measure, I believe the speed of temperature rise will further accelerate. Hence, Donald TRUMP has become the culprit of global warming, and if he is the culprit, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen is his accomplice. Scientists have predicted that global temperature will rise by 4.2°C by 2100 if no emission limit is imposed; it will rise by 3.3°C by 2100 if the commitments in the Paris Agreement are fully implemented; and it will rise by 3.6°C if the United States withdraw from the Paris Agreement ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Han-pan, I have reminded Members to refrain from discussing the details of the Paris Agreement. Mr CHAN, please speak on the subject under debate.

MR CHAN HAN-PAN (in Cantonese): President, that is right. Hence, I think Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's adjournment motion is actually echoing Donald TRUMP.

Moreover, I believe his moving of the adjournment motion is an organized and premeditated action as I found that several Members seemed to have a script from which they read out in turn. For instance, the example of waking up cold because of strong air conditioning was cited at least three times by Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Andrew WAN and other Members. Therefore, I strongly suspect that Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's adjournment motion is a continuation of his filibustering action in the first half of the meeting. This motion allows the opposition camp to talk over and again three times about waking up cold because of strong air conditioning, then Mr CHAN Chi-chuen moved the adjournment motion, which they said they did not support as they would wake up cold because of strong air conditioning. From this they could repeat again and again which is really very confusing. Hence, we believe this adjournment motion is an organized and premeditated action intended to deliberately delay the proceedings of the Legislative Council.

In fact, before Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's proposing the adjournment motion, many Members already mentioned that the sea level in Fiji had been rising the fastest in the whole world in the past 20 years. If no limitation is imposed, the people of Fiji will lose their country which will turn into a water world.

I believe it was hard for Mr CHAN Chi-chuen to move this adjournment motion too because he would become the target of all Members of the pan-democratic and the opposition camps. But he claimed in his speech that he did not mind them voting against his motion. Why? Because he has conspired with the others to move this adjournment motion for an objective which is clear to everyone: to filibuster or to rise the temperature in coordination with Donald TRUMP as I have just said. We saw right through his objective.

Members of the opposition camp have talked so much for three weeks in a row during our discussion on the Express Rail Link last week, at the meetings in the previous week and the week before that. How many times did he move an adjournment motion since the beginning of this legislative session which started not so long ago? I wonder if he has actually kept track of it. Perhaps he is not sure about that himself.

The electors in New Territories East voted for Mr CHAN Chi-chuen in the Legislative Council election hoping that he would actually do something for society. But since he was elected, he has done nothing but moving adjournment motions. Today, he launched a filibuster even on this motion which is crucial to environmental efficiency. I believe he should be strongly censured.

Of course, by doing so he is making himself a sacrifice for his "brothers of the opposition camp". The motion moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick sitting immediately behind Mr CHAN that requested the media to leave the Chamber on the last occasion was also a sacrifice as the entire society might criticize him for that, while people may not have strong feelings towards Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's adjournment motion as he has moved that so many times. If the motion debate is successfully adjourned, what will happen? The motion will not be implemented. Then how will the world look at Hong Kong? Why has such a meaningful motion of energy efficiency labelling not be passed? Was it due to Hong Kong's lack of commitment to environmental protection? Hong Kong's global reputation will be damaged and may even be boycotted following the steps of Donald TRUMP.

In fact, except Syria and Nicaragua, the United States is the only country not participating in the Paris Agreement. By moving this adjournment motion, does Mr CHAN want Hong Kong to model on the United States, Nicaragua and Syria and be condemned by the world? Therefore, I think this adjournment motion is completely senseless and I hope Mr CHAN Chi-chuen can reflect upon himself whether filibustering is appropriate when it comes to such an important and environment-related matter. He is acting against humanity by stabbing the motion tabled to the Legislative Council after being scrutinized. He should never again say that he cares about environment protection because he has moved that the debate on the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance be adjourned. I hope that he will not put this halo on his head anymore. I understand that he is trying to obstruct certain matters by moving this adjournment motion. Nevertheless, he should not have proposed that an item to which nobody in the whole world would object be adjourned. Therefore, I think his motion is utterly senseless.

President, I oppose the adjournment motion moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen. I so submit.

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

MR HO KAI-MING (in Cantonese): President, I speak in opposition to the adjournment motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen. I believe all people or viewers who are watching the live television broadcast really want to see energy labels affixed to all electrical appliances to enable us to distinguish those more energy efficient from those not so. It is just because of technical issues or views of the industry that it has yet to be implemented. The general public expects more electrical appliances to carry energy labels soon.

However, the circumstance today has arisen definitely out of the filibustering staged by Honourable colleagues from the opposition camp. They may say they are not filibustering but just discussing environmental protection issues—discussing environmental protection issues from last night to this morning. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen will surely say that he proposed the adjournment motion only because he hopes the Government can withdraw the motion to allow more time for scrutiny in future so that more electrical appliances can have energy labels affixed to them, thereby bringing greater benefits to the people. I can only say it is hypocrisy.

When I was studying, teachers taught us to judge whether effects could be achieved for a certain matter by the means employed and determine whether it is worthwhile to achieve the objectives by particular means. Of course, Honourable colleagues from the opposition camp would say, as Members, their job, means and objectives are to deliver speeches. But I do not agree because Members or public officers should not speak merely for the sake of speaking but work for the well-being and welfare of the general public in Hong Kong. We surely play roles different from those of public officers: Members definitely take a certain position to strive for people's or supporters' interest, whereas public officers may assume a comprehensive role as mediators to formulate policies. We play our different roles respectively.

Nonetheless, Members and public officers alike, our main role is to serve the people and the common good of society at large. However, Members from the opposition camp will certainly say they are now serving the common good of the people, or would even proclaim that it is their rightful duty to speak for the entire planet Earth. Yet, I would like to say that if they wish to speak, they should not do so on this occasion because the Council conducts its business as per the established framework. I think people watching the live television broadcast now may not clearly understand that discussions on policy matters should be carried out in meetings of panels. For example, matters relating to this ordinance or the Paris Agreement should be discussed in meetings of the Panel on Environmental Affairs. After the major directions are set, discussions on the formulation and enactment of laws should be held in meetings of Bills Committees, not the Legislative Council.

The subcommittee formed to scrutinize the subsidiary legislation only held one meeting which lasted for a little more than an hour. Obviously, members all considered the Government's proposals correct and should be endorsed and implemented as soon as possible, so no major controversy had emerged. Therefore, only at the juncture when the proposed resolution is about to be put to the vote that the opposition camp forces the Government to do more; it is not a proper practice. I think viewers watching the live broadcast should understand that filibusters in the Council today are no longer the same as the kind of ferocious filibusters staged by WONG Yuk-man or "Hulk" in the last Legislative Council. We need to clearly understand that the Rules of Procedure is intended to give flexibility to Members, and it has become a loophole now being exploited by Honourable colleagues from the opposition camp to facilitate their filibusters so as to delay operation of the Council and Hong Kong society.

I was pondering if there is a more accurate adjective to describe the opposition camp because "hypocritical" may not be correct. Having pondered over it for a long time, I finally found a network neologism on the Internet to describe them. I believe many people have heard the term "green tea bitch". Now there is a new "bitch" to aptly describe them—"Holy Mother bitch". Such an adjective is indeed blasphemous to the Holy Mother, whom I highly respect. But it is a very fitting adjective to describe them. I now try to read out the online explanation: "'Holy Mother bitch', a network neologism. 'Holy Mother' is obviously a commendatory term whereas 'bitch' is derogatory. The two terms combined are used in the derogatory sense, referring to people who are kind on the surface but dark underneath, i.e. hypocrites. Simply put, a 'Holy Mother bitch' is a bitch pretending to be the Holy Mother. A 'Holy Mother bitch', to exhibit her holy motherly image, expresses love and support for criminals and even the underprivileged engaging in violence and terrorism. Her act is a good deed on the surface but a disservice to others in reality."

The Council has a whole host of work to deal with. Most work should be assigned to different committees, but such "Holy Mother bitches" have to demand discussions on everything or legislation, etc. to be carried out in the meetings of the Legislative Council. In this case, the entire Council can cease operation. For example, before the end of the last Legislative Council session, I was finally allocated a slot for debates to propose a Member's motion on labour legislation, which was originally scheduled to be moved in early July, exactly when Chief Executive Carrie LAM had just assumed office. I thought the timing was perfect as I could take the opportunity of proposing the motion to remind the Chief Executive of the aspirations of 3 million workers from the labour sector over the years. As the freest capitalist society, labour welfare in Hong Kong is genuinely inadequate compared to other European or Western countries ...

(Mr CHU Hoi-dick raised his hand)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr HO Kai-ming, please pause for a while.

Mr CHU Hoi-dick, what is your point?

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): I hope Mr HO Kai-ming can clarify the Chinese character of "婊" ("bitch") in "聖母婊" ("Holy Mother bitch").

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick asked Mr HO Kai-ming to clarify the Chinese character of "婊" ("bitch") in "聖母婊" ("Holy Mother bitch"). Mr HO Kai-ming, you can choose whether to clarify or not.

MR HO KAI-MING (in Cantonese): President, I think I would leave this question to colleagues who are in charge of the official record of proceedings to give him an answer. If Mr CHU Hoi-dick does not understand it, he can search for the meanings of this term on the Internet. I reckon such a term is in wide circulation on the Internet.

We discussed labour issues to alert the new Chief Executive in early July to the aspiration held by many people for improvement of working conditions and did not want her to listen only to the business sector or tilt her consideration to the business sector. Such was the original intent of our proposing the motion at the time. However, originally the motion could be proposed in July, but it had been repeatedly delayed and could not be proposed even at the end of the last session. More than a month has passed since the commencement of the new session and it is still uncertain when the motion can be moved for Members' discussion in the foreseeable future. It appears that the motion cannot be proposed until 2018. Why do I have such an estimation? Precisely because of the opposition camp's filibuster. Now they even filibuster by advancing various specious arguments or discussing legitimate issues at the wrong time. We hope people who are watching the live television broadcast can note that currently the Rules of Procedure can only guard against honourable men but not mean and selfish characters or mobsters. We truly hope to amend the Rules of Procedure as soon as possible.

Therefore, President, I oppose the adjournment motion and hope to scrutinize the proposed resolution as soon as possible. I so submit. Thank you, President.

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

IR DR LO WAI-KWOK (in Cantonese): President, I originally did not plan to speak on the agenda item relating to the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance and the motion on adjournment under discussion now. It is

because if we truly care about environmental protection in Hong Kong and hope that more improvement can be made in energy conservation and emission reduction, what we should do is to pass the resolution proposed by the Government expeditiously.

Much to our regret, the operation of the Legislative Council today seems to be really abnormal. President, I will not impute motives to other Members, and as you, President, always remind us of the impropriety of imputing motives to other colleagues, I will only talk about the practical results. In fact, basically there is no controversy surrounding the discussion on this motion tabled by the Government in relation to energy labells now, and the discussion could have been completed in no time. But what is actually happening now is that it has been continually delayed, and there can be no reckoning for how many hours it has been delayed so far. This is the practical result.

Another practical result is that this is most non-environmentally friendly behaviour. President, as we conduct meetings here in this Chamber, a great many resources have to be consumed, including air conditioning, lighting, and so on. All these require the consumption of energy and will directly or indirectly lead to carbon emission. For this reason, I hope that filibustering would no longer continue in this Chamber. Here, let me exhort the filibustering colleagues to stop, for their behaviour does not only consume the important manpower resources and various resources of the Legislative Council, but it is also most non-environmentally friendly behaviour.

President, as I said just now, I will not impute motives to Members. But in the later part of his speech on the adjournment motion earlier, Dr Joseph LEE sweetly pointed out the purpose of this motion on adjournment. In the early part of his speech, he spoke at great length on energy efficiency and the product labelling system but in the last paragraph Dr Joseph LEE said straightforwardly that in the final analysis, this motion is meant to prolong the meeting. Even though I did not hazard a guess, the non-establishment Members admitted brazenly that this is downright a filibuster. President, such filibustering is heart-rending to me. But with regard to this adjournment motion before us now, I cannot but speak against it vehemently. Even though I was not prepared to speak, I have to say something now.

President, I am a member of the Subcommittee on Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 and a meeting was held in the first half of the year. During the meeting, there was

entirely no dispute from members of the Subcommittee on the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("the Amendment Order"). As a matter of fact, the Amendment Order seeks to further extend the scope of the energy efficiency labelling scheme and earlier on, colleagues have recounted the history of the development of this scheme and the various phases of development since the scheme was implemented. The phase that we are talking about now is the third phase, under which the scope of the scheme will be extended to electrical appliances that we always come across in our daily life. Therefore, it very much merits our support.

While you, President, have reminded us not to make excessive repetitions on the work in the first two phases, I still wish to state on behalf of the industries with which we have come into contact that they had staunchly supported the implementation of the scheme in the first and second phases. The electrical appliances covered in each phase were determined after detailed planning and thorough consideration because the status and amount of energy consumption of electrical products vary for various technical reasons. At present, Europe as well as places around the world all attach importance to energy conservation and emission reduction and place great emphasis on "eco-design" in product design. Besides, the promotion of energy efficiency labelling hinges on good timing and favourable geographical and social conditions because Hong Kong is not the place of production of these electrical appliances and we are basically a city of consumption.

Under the phase that we are talking about now, the authorities proposed the incorporation of several new types of electrical appliances into the scheme, including televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, room air conditioners of reverse cycle type (i.e. with heating and cooling functions), and washing machines. Washing machines are already covered in the previous phase but the proposed phase extends the coverage to washing machines with rated washing capacity exceeding 7 kg but not exceeding 10 kg. It is a matter of course for the Government to put forward these proposals. Since the first and second phases of the scheme have started to gain popular support and the industries are also supportive of their implementation, it only stands to reason for the authorities to extend the scheme further.

Throughout the process, I have heard of some problems. I do not know if these problems were brought up in a bid to cause delays or if they practically exist but here, I wish to argue strongly against them, in order to highlight the

reasons why I oppose the motion on adjournment. For example, a Member questioned why it is necessary to draw up a number of grades rather than having only the grade of highest energy efficiency and then disallowing purchases of electrical appliances that are not categorized into this grade. I think this view is absolutely unrealistic and utterly inappropriate because the energy consumption or energy efficiency of the products is subject to the actual conditions, and it is not the case that their energy savings can be determined according to Members' subjective wish. I trust that consumers understand this point very well because even electrical appliances of the same type may have different functions. This is a free market, and we need to have different products to provide choices for consumers.

Certainly, we hope that products of the same type but with different functions can achieve as much energy savings as possible and so, there is reason for the current grading system to exist. In terms of statistics, and take window-type air conditioners as an example, there is energy saving of 11% for Grade 1 over Grade 3 and 25% over Grade 5. Therefore, it is reasonable to set out the grading levels. In this connection, when colleagues criticized even the grading system in their speeches, I think they only intended to burn time because this arrangement had been clearly accounted for upon implementation of the system in the first two phases.

Moreover, some colleagues considered it necessary to adjourn the debate, so as to enable the Environment Bureau to further consider the need to cover all the remaining types of electrical appliances. President, this view is grossly illogical. It was necessary to implement the scheme in two phases previously because the electrical appliances covered in each phase had to be tested in order to ascertain their energy consumption status and in the process, a lot of technical considerations were involved and it was also necessary to conduct studies with the industries and rely on the complementary efforts of all sides. In fact, the grading system was devised through a very complex process and so, Members should not take the view that since five new types of electrical appliances can be added this time around, they can demand the coverage of all the remaining types of electrical appliances, thinking that this is a simple task to complete. In fact, regarding the five types of electrical appliances covered in the third phase mentioned by me earlier on, the relevant government departments have carried out plenty of concrete and detailed work before arriving at these ultimate proposals.

Furthermore, this issue was also explored in the previous discussions of the relevant Panel or the Subcommittee. The third phase of the scheme, if implemented, will have the practical result of covering close to 70% of electricity consumption, which is a very high percentage and this is stated in the records of meetings of the Legislative Council. Therefore, if Members consider that the debate should be adjourned for the Government to consider extending the coverage to all electrical appliances, it is merely empty talk. In fact, it should not be difficult for Members to look up the past records of meetings which stated that "the Administration advised that the coverage of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme after implementation of the third phase, which would account for about 70% of the annual electricity consumption in the residential sector, compared favourably to those of other advance[d] economies." President, this is what I mean by 70% of electricity consumption that I said just now.

Certainly, we can make the Government take steps to handle the remaining 30% but it is not going to be an easy task. Given a large variety of electrical appliances with insignificant overall consumption rates, the formulation of a method for measuring the status of energy consumption alone would require enormous social resources and therefore, priorities have to be set in this respect. However, if a motion on adjournment is proposed on the ground that the Government has yet covered all electrical appliances, I think this is a waste of the time of the Legislative Council and besides, I do not see any actual benefit in doing so. In fact, the rationale is simple and what is more, the relevant panel and the Subcommittee have discussed the related issues before and there are also records filed on this.

President, in the 20th century, the technology of human beings has doubtlessly advanced by leaps and bounds but at the same time, our energy consumption and emissions have recorded astonishing growth, growth that we do not wish to see. Some members of the industries have conducted an analysis and pointed out that since the Industrial Revolution in 1775, whenever human technology made a major breakthrough and ushered in a new stage, greater carbon emission would invariably follow, and compared to the Earth's relatively stable carbon emission over the years, the growth has been multiplying. Now, as we have already entered an information age, our energy consumption in daily life and work is astonishing.

Since the Government can really resolve to implement the energy labelling scheme and has successfully promoted it and secured the support of the industries, and as the scheme is to be propelled to the third phase today, we should indeed throw great weight behind it. If Members still see it as their duty to waste the time of the Legislative Council by proposing pointless motions, just as the non-establishment colleagues gave a perfect demonstration of how to exploit the loopholes or gaps in the Rules of Procedure by invoking RoP 54(4) and 88(1), as well as RoP 40(1) being invoked today, it would indeed be most heart-rending, for they are exactly wasting the time of the Legislative Council, wasting our energy and creating unnecessary emission (*The buzzer sounded*) ... Thank you, President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, please stop speaking.

Does any other Member wish to speak?

MR JEFFREY LAM (in Cantonese): President, I rise to speak in opposition to the motion moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen on adjourning the debate.

President, we suddenly heard certain Members express a keen interests in energy labels. What is their motive? President, as you have already reminded Members not to impute motives to them, I will not make any conjecture. Anyway, Members know it only too well, and people can see it very clearly. But all along, I have failed to understand their arguments. Do the opposition Members support or oppose environmental protection? As they appeared to be very much concerned about our climate and environment in their speeches and said that they wanted to reduce energy consumption, why do they filibuster so often? Why should they refuse to endorse the passage of this resolution? They have spoken for quite some time. But I honestly fail to understand their points.

During the period from last night to this morning, several friends of mine engaged in the recycling business and the sale of electrical appliances rang and asked me what those Members were doing. Initially, I did not intend to speak. But I have to speak up for my friends. All the arguments advanced by the opposition Members are self-contradictory. In the future, we should provide people with records of their speeches, so that they can see for themselves clearly. At present, Hong Kong can hardly implement the relevant environmental initiatives precisely because those Members intend to adjourn the present debate.

President, the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") is nothing new, and the authorities are now prepared to implement its third phase. People and the relevant trades have become accustomed to the affixation of labels to electrical appliances. Before introducing the piece of subsidiary legislation, the Government already conducted public consultations and held discussions at panel meetings. The public and the trades have already presented their views and made proper preparations. When purchasing electrical appliances, people are certainly glad to see the relevant labels as they can know the energy consumption of a product from such a label. Besides, they utterly do not need any time for adaptation because the implementation of MEELS already began quite some time ago. Let me reiterate that the authorities have already planned to commence the third phase of MEELS.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen from the opposition camp moved the motion on adjourning the debate for the main purpose of obstructing the implementation of a policy favourable to energy conservation. Other opposition Members who have claimed to attach huge importance to environmental protection should have all the more reason to expeditiously vote down this motion on adjourning the present debate. Nevertheless, they are not doing so. The early voting down of this motion can save much time. However, why did they exhaust their 15-minute speaking time and keep repeating the same arguments over and over again in their speeches? Why did they want to have 10 Members repeat the same viewpoint over and over again? Obviously, instead of showing concern about people's interests, the opposition Members merely wish to delay the progress of our meeting by exploiting this issue concerning environmental protection with a shameless face.

President, we often hear the principles of environmental protection. But the hardest part is always action. For instance, the topic under discussion is obviously crystal clear, and Members have already thoroughly discussed their stances and viewpoints. But at this meeting, they refuse to properly discharge their duties and keep talking about and repeating over and over again those matters which stray seriously away from the subject. Such an ineffective way of deliberating a policy will certainly delay our proceedings and waste much of our resources. Is it not true to say that this runs counter to "waste reduction at source"? I believe if a private company discusses matters in such an ineffective way, its owner will likewise find this unacceptable. The very presence of these Members here already causes damage to our climate and environment even if we

use electrical appliances with "Grade 1" energy labels. But there are bound to be places in this world where certain people will abuse their freedom of speech and waste the resources of Mother Earth.

President, MEELS has been implemented for many years and operated smoothly without any controversy. Even sellers and manufacturers of electrical appliances who have been most affected likewise render it their support. In fact, energy saving is a selling point of an electrical appliance. Manufacturers have striven to enhance the energy efficiency of their products as a means of showcasing their brands' technologies. These days, when choosing electrical appliances such as refrigerators and dehumidifiers, people very often only choose between those with level-one or level-two energy efficiency grading. Some shop owners even refuse to procure relatively less expensive products with lower energy efficiency. I appreciate the fact that we cannot compare all types of electrical appliances this way because of the differences in their functions, technologies and specifications, and users' habits may also affect their energy consumption. Besides, laboratory tests on the energy efficiency of products based on their distinctive functions may likewise yield different results. If the standard is overly stringent, a minor error is already likely to affect the energy efficiency grading of a product.

President, on the other hand, MEELS is expected and likely to be extended to other types of electrical appliances. My concern is that apart from energy labels, Hong Kong will soon implement a levy scheme for "four categories of electrical equipment and one category of computer products" to require sellers to affix labels to such products as well. Containing much information, the relevant labels must also be clearly visible. But some people feel concerned that the labels may be too large. For example, several labels must also be affixed to the back of a mobile phone. In this regard, I think that in the future, the Bureau concerned can consider the idea of adopting a standardized approach and designing a label which can meet the requirements of these two schemes. That way, manufacturers and sellers can be spared the need of affixing several labels to a product and avoid affecting its appearance.

President, the goal of moving towards green living cannot be accomplished in just one step. In a bid to delay our proceedings, the opposition Members have exploited the present topic to discuss irrelevant matters ranging from global warming to the Paris Agreement. They have also taken the opportunity to criticize various environmental initiatives of the Government. If they want to do

nitpicking, they can definitely find something to criticize. However, it is actually unreasonable of them to squeeze climate problems worldwide into our discussion on this straightforward scheme called MEELS and refuse to endorse the passage of the resolution if those problems cannot be solved.

I wish to ask these troublemaker Members to stop wasting their breath and time. They should instead do something to reduce energy consumption and facilitate the effective conduct of our meeting. People must also see clearly how the opposition Members have even sought to create trouble and obstruct the progress of our meeting with a scoundrelly tactic while disregarding people's livelihood and refusing to accord people's interests the top priority.

President, I so submit.

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

MR LUK CHUNG-HUNG (in Cantonese): President, there is this trending Cantonese idiom on the Internet which says, to the effect, that one speaks his mind only at the divine moment. This is how the opposition camp has behaved with respect to the amendment of the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance over the last two days, which is actually sort of filibustering. In fact, why do they have to filibuster? As many Members and colleagues have said, the energy efficiency labelling of electrical products had been discussed in the Panel on Environmental Affairs and also in the Subcommittee on the subsidiary legislation. Certainly, there was actually not the slightest controversy over these amendments which are only some details and technical in nature and so, there is actually nothing for Members to argue over; nor are these amendments considered major policy changes. Hence there is no reason to spend so much time and effort discussing them. There are a lot of issues pending our discussion in this Council, including government motions and Members' motions, and the labour sector also proposed a motion on labour rights and protection in the last legislative session which is still in the queue now because of "serious congestion" in the Legislative Council.

Having listened to the speeches of a number of opposition Members, it seems that none of them dare admit honestly that they are filibustering on this resolution. I think if they have the guts to do it, they should have the guts to

admit it, so that all the people of Hong Kong can see if their filibustering is justified or not. With regard to their previous filibustering actions, many people have described them as crazy, that they sought to achieve their aims by hook or by crook, and that they created such a big mess and stepped over the line. They took advantage of Rules 88(1) and 54(4) of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP"), and through the abuse of RoP, they threw this Council into chaos and confusion, and they have already been severely criticized by the public. This is why they do not admit filibustering and have become surreptitious, rather than acting in an open and above-board manner. This is indeed most pathetic.

With regard to energy efficiency, what I wish to say is, actually we place emphasis on efficiency in how we conduct ourselves and how we go about things because God is fair, for He gives all the people and society the same measure of time. The more right things that society and the people do in the same given time, the more advanced society will be and hence, the well-being of the people can be promoted. Speaking of efficiency, we have in place energy efficiency labelling for electrical appliances whereby a product consuming less electricity has higher energy efficiency, which is very good, and the product can be classified as Grade 1, so as to enable the public to be more environmentally-friendly and reduce their electricity consumption.

I wish to make a point and that is, probably it may be necessary to set up an efficiency labelling system in the entire government structure one day, President. While some government departments may bear labels representing very high efficiency, such as the Fire Services Department, for the public have spoken highly of it and when the public called 999 in the event of emergency, the firemen will immediately set off for fire-fighting and rescue operations with unequalled efficiency, but regrettably, President, if efficiency labelling is really introduced in government departments and also in the executive, legislature, and the Judiciary, the Legislative Council may probably be classified as Grade 5, President, or even "5++", because its efficiency is extremely low indeed.

Let me first make it clear that having low efficiency and being slow are two different issues. There are things that really should be done slowly and discussed in detail. When something is wrong, criticisms are warranted to urge the Government to make improvement, in order for monitoring to be exercised effectively. It is necessary to discuss certain issues in greater detail, instead of simply closing our eyes and putting up our hands to endorse them, and this is normal. But President, what is happening now is different. There is no

controversy at all over this issue and no one ever raised any objection in the previous discussion, so why does this Council still have to spend so much time discussing it? This is downright slow and inefficient, and there is just no efficiency to speak of. Should there be efficiency labelling for this Council, we are set to be classified as "5++", for we are but very slow. Therefore, it is really ironic to discuss this issue. After much discussion and when they run out of things to say, they are bound to move motions on adjournment. When the public have seen all this, how can they not feel anxious about this Council and how can they not feel anxious about the future of Hong Kong?

President, I am very straightforward with my words. We in the pro-establishment camp have worked very hard to take forward the amendment of RoP because we hope to save this machine of the Legislative Council. This machine has really been paralysed to the extent that its efficiency cannot be lower and so, we have to fix the bugs or the defects plaguing it. It is like an electrical appliance with problems in its programming and we have to fix it. This is why we in the pro-establishment have proposed amendments to RoP. The opposition have certainly done their utmost to put up resistance because they take filibuster as their inherent quality, they take filibuster as their duty, and they take filibuster as their political goal and political tool. They do not want us to amend RoP to enable this Council to become more efficient and to do more for the people. They do not want this to happen and they very much wish to drag down this Council, in the hope that this Council will continue to be trapped, hence making it impossible for the amendments to RoP to be tabled.

Actually I am really frank with my tongue. We think that we must clearly tell the public the facts. We should not be hypocritical. We bare our bosoms and have never concealed our intention. Our intention is to amend RoP, and with regard to the unreasonable provisions in RoP, such as RoP 88(1) whereby a Member may without notice move anytime a motion to drive away the press and the public from the Chamber, we propose that such a motion can be moved only with the consent of the President. This can reduce abuse and improve efficiency. President, I have not strayed from the question.

Therefore, I strongly object to this adjournment motion today. It is entirely a means to filibuster and most ironically, it strip this Council of all its efficiency. Such being the case, I will vote against this adjournment motion later. I also hope that this resolution relating to the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance can be put to the vote and the relevant amendments be

passed as soon as possible, so that energy efficiency labels will be affixed to electrical products to encourage the public to use more often electrical appliances with high energy efficiency. In the meantime, it is also necessary to restore the efficiency expected of this Council, and only this is the right thing to do.

Thank you, President. I shall stop here.

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

DR CHIANG LAI-WAN (in Cantonese): President, I rise to speak against the motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen under Rule 40(1) of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP"), i.e. the motion "That the debate on the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling Of Products) Ordinance be now adjourned".

As we all know, the opposition camp uses filibustering as their tactic to delay legislation, bills or motions which they do not wish to endorse. Everyone knows it. Regarding the things they do not support, they do not wish the relevant motions to be passed. I believe we all understand this, right? However, this time their filibustering is rather strange, since the proposed resolution we have been discussing these two days seeks the approval of the Legislative Council for the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017, which amends the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the Ordinance") for the purpose of implementing the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS").

Yesterday, many Members of the opposition camp fully used their 15-minute speaking time to express their views on the Ordinance. Many of them expressed support, considering that the Ordinance needs amendment, and five types of products should be incorporated into MEELS. However, today they suddenly said they wished to adjourn the debate. What the heck does it mean? Since they support the amendment, it is actually not right to filibuster. They want to steal the limelight and speak as much as they can to buy time. Fine. We just let them stall for a while, right? The proposed resolution could have been passed this morning, but then they said they wished to adjourn the debate. This is in fact quite dangerous. At that time I was very angry. I really wonder what is wrong with Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's mind. Why did he do

so? What does such adjournment mean? Now let me explain to those people who do not know what adjournment means. If we adjourn the debate, that means we do not support this piece of legislation. So we stop it, cease to adopt it and wish to scrap it.

As we all know, recently, the international community is convening a conference on environmental protection to discuss the issue of climate change, concerned about whether our next generation can still live in a healthy Earth. Yet at this juncture, they said they wished to adjourn the debate. That is why I came back to ask the other Members of the opposition camp why they proposed this adjournment motion. What on earth are they doing? Whatever tricks they usually play, we just ignore them and let them do so. However, we all know that environmental protection is vitally important to the environment in Hong Kong and to our next generation. Why did he mess around with this matter? I am angry with him. I am really very angry. He has indeed gone too far. "Slow Beat", OK?

There may be a lot of things in which he is slower than other people, but he cannot be so slow as to adjourn this resolution, right? Perhaps he is different from the ordinary people in many aspects, but he cannot mess with our environment and environmental protection in Hong Kong, can he? I have made enquiries with the other Members. They said Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, that means "Slow Beat", proposed the adjournment motion of his own accord. It had nothing to do with them. How would it have nothing to do with them? I asked them why "Slow Beat" would propose the adjournment motion of his own accord. Certainly, "Slow Beat" should later explain why he did so, or whether he was supported by the other Members of the opposition camp. He must give an account of it to all the people of Hong Kong. May I ask him not to find any excuse. For example, he does not like the following two or three pieces of legislation, so he uses this motion to obstruct the passage of such legislation. He cannot act in such a way. As we all know, in the past, they impeded other items by filibustering, such as the civil service pay adjustment and funding for the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme. They have filibustered over many issues, causing late payment to members of the public. But never mind. Even if it is one, two or even three months late, retrospective payments will ultimately be made to members of the public. However, environmental protection brooks no delay. Why do they have to filibuster? Right?

(THE PRESIDENT'S DEPUTY, MS STARRY LEE, took the Chair)

Come to think about it. Just now many Members of the pro-democracy camp and opposition camp spoke in support of discussing this resolution today. Mr Jeremy TAM of the Civic Party has also indicated that he does not support this adjournment motion because he feels worried, too. He thought he was simply proposing it as a joke, and so long as Members of the pro-establishment camp are present, the adjournment motion will not be passed. However, we have got to know what the consequences will be if he messes up this matter and inadvertently turns such make-believe into reality. If that happens, the implementation of the relevant legislation will be delayed. The sooner we implement the third phase of MEELS, the sooner the objective of energy conservation and emission reduction can be achieved. Consumers can also make some savings. Hence, why did he still propose the adjournment motion for purposes of filibustering?

Deputy President, today I have attended the seminar at which Mr LI Fei, the Chairman of the Basic Law Committee, was the speaker. Mr LI Fei spoke a lot on subjects ranging from the present economic development of the country, the current global ranking of its GDP (i.e. Gross Domestic Product), total trade value, to per capital GDP. He even elaborated on the Constitution versus the Basic Law, the role and mission of Hong Kong, etc. What I appreciated most was his closing remarks. He said he expected the people of Hong Kong to think it over. Now the country is proactively further developing its international strength, with a view to establishing a firm foothold among the world powers and taking the lead in technological development in the world. He very much hoped that at this juncture, we could think about what we could do for the Chinese nation, and what we could do for upholding the interests of the country and the people.

Filibustering and proposing adjournment motions are very negative behaviour. Are they constructive? No. Is it true that he does not want the amendment to the Ordinance passed? No. In that case, why did he propose the adjournment motion? For what? "Slow Beat" is younger than me. I just wish to admonish him earnestly that whatever we do now, we should give priority to the greater good, the interest and future of Hong Kong, and the overall interest of the country. We should do solid work. Therefore, Deputy President, I hope Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, who proposed the adjournment motion, will clearly reflect on his action when he gives his reply later on.

Of course, he will definitely say that he has got reasons for anything he does. But is it right to do so? Certainly, he will also hold that by filibustering, the discussion about the upcoming items can be deferred for a few weeks, but he should know that it is pointless to do so. Even if these items can be delayed, they will be discussed at the end of the day. Moreover, such an act will only keep deferring many livelihood issues to July, August or September until the end of the session. However, if it is an important livelihood issue, the pro-establishment camp will absolutely stand firm. Frankly, I will attend meetings to discuss it even if I cannot take leave. I will definitely do so because this is precisely a Member's duty. Hence, if he considers anything else unfavourable to the people's livelihood, he can by all means act in his own way. But if this matter is conducive to the people's livelihood, beneficial to the global climate and good for the next generation and everyone, he should not mess around with it. I hope he can come to his senses.

Deputy President, there is one more point. Will Members please look at the membership list of the Subcommittee on Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017. Only three pan-democratic Members have joined the Subcommittee. Yet these two days they talked about the need to expand the scope, hold discussions afresh, etc. If they are really so concerned about environmental protection, they should have joined the Subcommittee long ago and made greater contribution to the work of the Subcommittee, right? Hence, I hope the opposition camp will stop filibustering, since they did not attend the meetings. Sometimes I really find it regrettable. The public money is used to keep a bunch of Members who did not attend meetings, filibustered, and frequently want to sabotage the Government's administration. It is indeed a waste of public money. For this reason, Deputy President, I oppose the adjournment motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen.

I so submit.

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

MR STEVEN HO (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I support the proposed resolution moved under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance, but oppose the adjournment motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen. I would also like to respond to the speech delivered by Dr CHIANG Lai-wan because she

mentioned just now that she would attend meetings even if she could not take leave. I believe all Hong Kong people would like to have more holidays, or else the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions would not have campaigned for more holidays, labour holidays, and so on. However, I hope the meetings held in the Legislative Council can be conducted in a more efficient manner—as Mr LUK Chung-hung said just now—the Legislative Council is indeed wasting time, but I am not referring to my present speech.

During my visits to the district, I would sometimes chat with the elderly people who were playing chess in the gardens, so that I could understand public sentiments better. One of the elderly chess players I met said, "Hong Kong society has everything and Hong Kong people cherish a lot of things, such as animal welfare and the environment. But they are wasting time." I recall that when Mr CHAN Kin-por chatted with me when I newly joined this Council, he told me the Legislative Council was really wasting a lot of time. He said he would not repeat the remarks made by others when he attended his usual board meetings—Mr CHAN is a businessman. However, the ecology of the Legislative Council meetings was very different. He had to repeat the remarks made by other Members in order to demonstrate his support. Why did dozens of Members have to repeat the same remarks again and again, thus wasting time by dozens of times? This is indeed the reality the Legislative Council has to face now.

Specifically, it is not that Members do not cherish time; it is just that they cherish time in a different manner. For instance—Members might consider my remark offensive, but actually there is nothing derogatory—many men and women like purchasing skincare products. Some of them might even spend a major part of their savings on purchasing these products in order to prolong their youth. However, they are wasting their time in other ways. Why did the Member propose an adjournment motion rather than spending time more efficiently?

Besides meeting the mentioned elderly chess player during my district visit, I would also chat with kaifongs in Hong Kong-style cafes. I once came across a kaifong who knew little about what was going on in the Legislative Council. When he asked me what was going on in the Legislative Council lately, I told him a Member had proposed an adjournment motion. He said he wished to raise his middle finger, too. I said the motion was proposed by the opposition, not me. He then asked me if the opposition had principles in doing

things. In order to explain to him the meaning of "adjournment", I wrote the word "adjournment" in Chinese (中止) and explained that it meant "putting on hold". He then asked, "Does it mean that the meeting was aborted?" I replied, "Yes. If some Members intend to do something else, they will propose a motion for adjournment of the debate without doing anything. For instance, debates on raising the amount of 'fruit grant'—though this proposal has yet to be tabled before this Council—pay increases for civil servants, energy efficiency labelling currently under discussion, and so on, will be put on hold immediately to allow Members to procrastinate. However, even if Legislative Council Members resort to filibustering, members of the public will not find this problematic. Anyway, their lifestyle of 'horse racing and dancing' and visiting Hong Kong-style cafes for set A, B or C can remain as usual."

Let us take a look at the community facilities currently available. In an event held in Lei Tung Estate, Ap Lei Chau, I said to the participants, "Why do we have the Mass Transit Railway directly linked with Lei Tung Estate now? Why is the water quality of the typhoon shelters better than before? Thanks to the funding approvals given by the previous Legislative Council, we can see these results now. Should filibusters continue to be staged in the Legislative Council for the coming decade, we will become frogs boiled in lukewarm water. Ten years from now, Members will definitely be questioned by the public why such a terrible decision was made in 2017 or even as early as 2012 to allow certain Legislative Council Members to filibuster, thereby knocking the situation out of hand." The participants considered that I was right and requested me to stop the adjournment of debates held in this Council. I told them there was nothing I could do as there were too many loopholes in the Rules of Procedure ("RoP"). When they asked me why no filibuster took place in the Legislative Council in the past, I replied, "Members of the Legislative Council in the past were all gentlemen, but now they are mostly rascals. RoP can only regulate gentlemen, not villains. Villains are fond of abusing RoP. I cannot do anything about it." Actually, the Police could not but carry out their duties when the unlawful Occupy Central occurred in 2014 and a riot broke out in the early hours of the first day of the Lunar New Year two years later—I had better stop talking about this incident because the case is sub judice. Everyone was calculating the bottom line of the law and exploiting the grey areas to aggravate social conflicts.

I told the kaifongs we had already exerted our very best. Although the Legislative Council might still be unable to plug the loopholes by amending RoP in the future, we would still make our best effort. Though I was not sure if we

could make it, at least we would not breach the pledges made to the public during the election. Sometimes, there is nothing Members can do about issues concerning people's livelihood. Depending on the Government's willingness to propose relevant motions, Members can only vote in favour of their passage. Hence, I hope Hong Kong society—I have spent five minutes making a long statement to help the public understand that certain Legislative Council Members have indeed adopted a belligerent attitude. I wish to make it clear that I definitely do not wish to see continued filibustering in this Council.

My refusal to support the motion on adjournment of debate on the proposed resolution under the Ordinance has something to do with my stance. To a certain extent, I am willing to support ideological changes, especially motions concerning environmental protection. Certainly, if the implementation of certain specific measures will affect the trade, I hope other solutions will be available or a "several-step approach" can be adopted, which I think is reasonable. The direction of this resolution concerning energy labels is simply to encourage the public through labelling to reduce consumption of electricity and the impacts on the environment. I certainly welcome the implementation of the labelling scheme.

When it comes to environmental protection, I identify with it mainly because an incident that occurred in 2015 has had a very strong impact on me. As a result of the deaths of tens of thousands of fish in Yim Tin Tsai, New Territories East, the fishermen affected were almost completely wiped out. Today, I do not mean to criticize the Government for its poor policy on resumption of operations or its request for the fishermen to carry out clearance at their own cost. While only a small amount of compensation of \$10,000 was granted to encourage the fishermen to make efforts in resuming operations, they had to spend \$50,000 on carrying out clearance work. I have no intention to discuss this matter today, but when I asked the Government why such a large quantity of fish had died, it replied that the climate was to blame, for the exceedingly high water temperature might lead to the proliferation of *Karenia mikimotoi*, thus causing toxification and oxygen depletion, but these problems could hardly be resolved. What can the Government do to address these climate problems? This was why I requested the Government at that time to formulate a plan to protect against natural disasters. Nevertheless, we cannot count on the Government alone to protect the environment; all the people in Hong Kong must change their living habits instead.

Although I live in Yuen Long, I often take public transport to commute to the Legislative Council lately, especially so when I know that I have to combat filibusters in the Council. However, if I have to visit several places on one trip, I will drive my own car in order to save time. Taking public transport has two merits: Firstly, as I mentioned just now, we have to change our living habits in order to protect the environment better by reducing carbon emissions and petrol consumption. I did not think clearly before buying a hybrid vehicle running on a combination of petrol and electricity by paying an additional \$100,000 or so. Owing to the abolition of tax concessions by the Government at that time, I did not buy an electric vehicle as it was even more expensive and unaffordable to me.

As I mentioned a moment ago, my second reason is to save time so I can take the opportunity to visit the district to listen to the views expressed by the public. This explains why I said I heard the elderly man talking to himself while playing chess, as well as the comments made by the man sitting opposite me while I was having fried rice vermicelli with pork chops and tomatoes. Initially he did not know who I was but when he had learnt that I am a Legislative Council Member, he started talking about the Legislative Council in which filibusters were being staged. When he mentioned the adjournment of the debate, he said he wished to raise his middle finger. I therefore earnestly hope that this Council will pass this resolution expeditiously instead of heeding the proposal put forward by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen for adjournment of the debate. When proposing his adjournment motion, Mr CHAN even cited an interesting reason, that is, the adjournment of the debate can enable the Government to quicken its pace. I do remember he expressed his hope that the Government could withdraw the motion and revise it quickly for "one-step accomplishment". The implementation of a policy should be like the implementation of a specific proposal in a gradual and orderly manner. Sometimes, "one-step accomplishment" might become the most time-consuming process.

From a broader perspective, it is also stated clearly in the Basic Law that democratization should be achieved in a gradual and orderly manner rather than in one step. Let us take a look at the Philippines or other countries, or even the third-world countries which are frequently subject to the intervention of the United States. "Red revolutions" or separation may occur at any time in these places. I hope Members will comply with the provisions of the Basic Law. For Hong Kong to maintain stability and prosperity, universal suffrage should be implemented in a gradual and orderly manner. Why is the Basic Law written in this way? It is so written to enable everyone to come to terms with the transition

slowly. It similarly applies to the environmental protection policy. We have taken note of the 19th National Congress of the Communist Party of China convened earlier and examined the speech delivered by President XI in his report. There are several paragraphs devoted to the progress made by China since 1949, which I recommend Members to take a look. In 1949, China was led by the thinking of MAO Zedong and our country was very weak and poor. As such, in the run-up to 1956, the State appealed to Chinese people to stand up. Between 1956 and 1978, that is the period prior to China's reform and opening, the State hoped the people to become rich. In the aftermath of China's reform and opening, China has indeed become rich, despite a serious disparity between the rich and the poor. For these reasons, we should all the more become more powerful to solve the problem of balance.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Steven HO, please focus on the question under debate today.

MR STEVEN HO (in Cantonese): Let us take a look at what is happening in Hong Kong now. What problems will the Government encounter in implementing its environmental protection initiatives? For instance, some environmental protection problems related to recycling bins occurred some time ago. My parents actually relied on collecting cartons to raise me, so I have a good understanding of green recycling and feel strongly about the green policy introduced by the Environment Bureau. I am most unhappy about the questions about Hong Kong's recycling policy and the landfill problems that occurred a couple of years ago. I was also told that some recycled end-of-life batteries were dumped at landfills, possibly resulting in contamination of the sea by battery electrolyte. I hope the Government can address this problem squarely.

As I mentioned earlier, Chinese people have already stood on their feet and become rich and powerful. What does the present-day Hong Kong need? Hong Kong people must be aware of the problems, realizing we have to stand united and let go of something. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, I do not mean to impute any motive to you. Nevertheless, the public can see clearly from the motion moved by you this time around as well as your behaviour and performance over the past several weeks that you are actually filibustering. I hope we can let go some of our prejudices and political views to allow passage of the proposed resolution moved under the Ordinance, the green policy to take a step forward

and the proposal to be tabled before the Legislative Council afresh for review. If the motion cannot be passed today due to filibustering, we will see something like what happened last year. The relevant legislation was submitted to the House Committee in June last year and then to the Legislative Council in July when Mr CHAN Chi-chuen had no comments to make. The legislation is now tabled before the Legislative Council again but Mr CHAN has proposed an adjournment motion and demanded that government officials go back and start everything afresh. Does that mean the Government has to wait one more year? Does it mean that Members will not be happy unless large quantities of fish are found dead in Yim Tin Tsai again? Should that happen, the Government will again put the blame on the climate instead of admitting its reluctance to do anything. I do not wish to give the Government an excuse to put the blame on your filibuster. Actually, I am lending you a helping hand. I hope fellow citizens, including Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's supporters, can persuade him to enable the smooth passage of some livelihood-related policies. Please note that I am not requesting Mr CHAN to stop the discussions.

I so submit. Thank you, Deputy President.

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): No other Member wishes to speak. Secretary for the Environment, do you wish to speak?

SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (in Cantonese): Deputy President, the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("the Amendment Order") is an outcome of detailed studies and extensive consultation, having been carefully considered by the relevant subcommittee of the Legislative Council and for which preparation has been made by the industry. The inclusion of more products in the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS"), raising the grading standard of energy efficiency for certain products or altering the existing method of grading requires technical considerations, examination of various factors, consultation with all stakeholders and time for the industries to make preparations. It

requires a process which cannot be completed in a short time as many problems along the way will have to be solved. Since, even with the debate adjourned, the Government will not be able to put forth another amendment order with different content in a short period of time, the adjournment will achieve nothing but delaying the implementation of MEELS, thus sending the wrong message to society and the international community.

I understand that, with the development of technology and experience accumulated by other countries, MEELS may offer room for continuous improvement. The Government will review MEELS from time to time. For instance, the grading standards of air conditioners, refrigerating appliances and washing machines were raised following the review conducted in 2014, resulting in an additional energy saving of around 300 million kWh per annum and a reduction of carbon dioxide emissions of 210 000 tonnes.

Some Members are concerned about whether or not the Government has a comprehensive plan in place for energy conservation and carbon reduction. As a matter of fact, regarding energy conservation, the Government promulgated the "Energy Saving Plan for Hong Kong's Built Environment 2015~2025+" in 2015 which, apart from including a range of measures to promote energy conservation on different fronts, sets a target of reducing Hong Kong's energy intensity by 40% by 2025 compared with the 2005 level. As for combatting climate change and reducing carbon emission, the Government set up an interdepartmental committee chaired by the Chief Secretary for Administration in 2016 to supervise and coordinate the action of all bureaux and departments. In the "Hong Kong's Climate Action Plan 2030+" report released in January 2017, the committee set a target of reducing Hong Kong's carbon intensity by 65% to 70% by 2030 from the 2005 levels. So, we do have a comprehensive plan in place.

Moreover, the Government will continue to set itself as an example. The 2015 Policy Address sets a target of achieving a 5% saving in electricity for government buildings in the five years between 2015-2016 and 2019-2020 based on the levels of 2013-2014. We also earmarked at least \$500 million to facilitate the implementation of energy saving measures by the relevant bureaux and departments. In respect of procurement, the Government also has the relevant policy in place. At present, the number of items on the government procurement list with green specifications is expanded to 150 items of over 20 product and service categories, which include products requiring the Grade 1 energy label.

As regards enforcement of MEELS, the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department ("EMSD") inspected, as at the end of April this year, nearly 5 500 stores, of which 98% were compliant with the requirements. The Department served 59 prohibition notices against non-compliant cases, with six suppliers having been prosecuted and convicted.

In view of the rapid growth of online shopping in recent years, EMSD began conducting regular inspections of local shopping sites this year and will follow up and take action upon detection of breaches. EMSD will not slacken in respect of enforcement.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen is very much concerned also about the energy efficiency standards of televisions. The proposed revised standards for televisions are in fact roughly on par with those of the European Union, in which the proposed Grade 1 is equivalent to the European Union's current highest standard of A++. That said, Members can rest assured that the Government will continue to draw reference from technological developments, overseas experience, international standards, potential energy savings, views of the industries and stakeholders, etc. and conduct reviews from time to time with a view to including more products in MEELS, raising the energy efficiency grading standards of products and exploring whether or not there is room for enhancement of the labelling arrangement.

With these remarks, Deputy President, I hope Members can support the expeditious passage of the Amendment Order.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, do you wish to reply?

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I thank every one of the Members who have spoken on the motion that the debate on the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 be now adjourned proposed by me today. I think this occasion has seen a record number of Members speaking on a motion moved under Rule 40(1) of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP"). I wish to thank the 13 pro-establishment Members who have spoken. While they may have slightly strayed from the question talking about whether this debate is intended as a filibuster or the possible

amendments to RoP, the President or the Deputy President has permitted them to continue their speeches. Nevertheless, I consider it a good thing because we are preferably given sufficient time to discuss these issues in the Council. In respect of the arguments advanced by the pro-establishment Members today, I must spend a little time responding to them. For example, according to several pro-establishment Members, given that the Subcommittee on this piece of subsidiary legislation has seven members only and its meeting lasted for just a bit more than an hour, it should mean that they have no dispute over the amendment, questioning why Members have not spoken enthusiastically until the Council meeting today. Most pro-establishment Members share this view, but I wish to point out that it is incorrect. I nonetheless think that Prof Joseph LEE has raised a very good point, pointing out that the reason is precisely negligence on someone's part at that time. Some Members questioned why we have gone so far as to spend some 10 hours on it today while only six or seven Members joined the Subcommittee and had it discussed for just a bit more than an hour back then. They questioned why we, not having joined the Subcommittee, spoke enthusiastically at the Council meeting today and even proposed some procedural motions, asserting that we were up to something bad, filibustering and stirring up troubles. Along this line of thinking, in the future, we will have to join all the subcommittees and speak enthusiastically at their meetings so as to have a rightful cause to further speak enthusiastically on bills introduced into the Council following their scrutiny.

By then, they may again question why the bills have to be discussed again at being tabled before the Council if they have been discussed in the committees for 18 months, just like the Copyright Ordinance. If Members speak in accordance with RoP with the permission of the President, I will not criticize them. For example, at a meeting of the Bills Committee concerning the trade ban and embargo on ivory, Mr CHAN Han-pan and Mr SHIU Ka-fai were said to be filibustering, as a result of which the bill has yet to be introduced into the Council for discussion. Nevertheless, I will not put it this way. Since they talked sense with the permission of the Chairman and the Government also gave a response, things should proceed.

As to the effective operation of a parliamentary assembly, Members from the pro-establishment camp or the constructive camp, as you people call it, the pro-democracy camp or the opposition camp, the Government and the President all have a part to play. We cannot say that Members who speak enthusiastically are wasting the time of the Council, as stated by Members from the Liberal Party

earlier on. Democracy amounts to inefficiency and a waste of time: elections are not cost-effective either, particularly direct elections, for which the publicity campaigns will result in a huge waste of resources. What makes things cost-effective? Appointment and functional constituencies are cost-effective. What makes a meeting cost-effective? Allowing someone to have the final say is cost-effective. Convening one meeting annually is cost-effective, just like the practice of the National People's Congress. Is that the way things should be? Certainly not.

If Members blow things out of proportions, saying that the act of speaking enthusiastically is not cost-effective and that it will waste the resources of the earth, some people may also consider that your existence on the earth has already wasted the resources of the earth. We should not go to that extreme, should we? When I request a headcount, they criticize me. Now I do not request a headcount, and they also criticize me. What do they want? This morning, I was worried that they would all go listen to LI Fei's talk. For fear that a headcount would result in our meeting being adjourned due to a lack of quorum, which would render us unable to proceed to the discussion about the subject, we did not request a headcount. Once the meeting is adjourned due to a lack of quorum, they will say that I have wasted the resources of the Council. While it does not happen now, they also make the same claim. Can they tell me what they want? They are really hard to please.

Deputy President, coming back to this motion, I did make my position clear from the outset, but maybe most pro-establishment Members did not pay attention to it. The Government has nonetheless listened to me carefully, so the Secretary has not strongly criticized me. The Government and I are more the same than different. I have never questioned the importance of energy efficiency labelling. We support its general direction, and I also expressed my support for it when I spoke for the first time. Nevertheless, such initiatives by the Government alone are not enough, and something more can be done. In terms of education, offering incentives, improving the legal system and expanding the coverage of energy efficiency labelling, the authorities must go the extra mile. Even though the Government has been working late and slowly or little, no one question it. For this reason, I must press the authorities to speed up its work and do more. They said that I could not press the Government to speed up its work using such an approach, but I am not going to argue with them over this. While I said that I wished to press the authorities to do more, they again claimed that my attempt would turn out to be a failure. While I may agree with their argument that my

approach is ineffective, I have already pointed out earlier in my speech when moving the motion under RoP 40(1) that my point of departure is to take this opportunity to exert pressure on the Government. Even if this motion is negated, our discussion, including the speeches made by the 13 pro-establishment Members, has lasted for a few more hours, which may also serve to exert pressure on the Government.

The Secretary has frankly admitted just now that even if the subsidiary legislation in question has to be returned as a result of the passage of the adjournment motion moved under RoP 40(1), he will not be able to submit a new proposal in a few months. Nevertheless, the Secretary has to offer a reply. What we ask him to do is actually nothing new. We are only asking for more elaborate grades for energy labels, which may even cover such peripheral products as set-top boxes and computer screens. The Secretary also needs to tell Members how long it will take. The authorities cannot turn a deaf ear to my opinion, which they consider valueless due to the allegation of ill motive against me made by the pro-establishment camp.

Deputy President, I reiterate that most of the speeches made by all Members, including those on the original motion after handling the "co-location" motion yesterday, and those on the adjournment motion today, are valuable, allowing the Government to have access to more opinions. Certainly, the Government will say that our approach cannot get things worked out, and we understand it. In fact, be it the pro-establishment or the pro-democracy camp, we can only manage to achieve those things that the Government originally intended and wished to do. Seeing that Members have striven to achieve it, the authorities do not mind proceeding with it one day ahead of schedule, and this is what we "manage to achieve". For things that the authorities are reluctant to do, even if we spend half our life pressing the Government to take them forward, we will not succeed.

Earlier on, a Member from the pro-establishment camp was very angry. Almost in tears, she accused "Slow Beat" of being a "deadly waster" who destroyed the Earth. It sounds like I am the one who causes the Earth to explode. As I have caused Members a several-hour delay, or even a several-month delay once the motion is passed, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan shot me a resentful look. Then why does she not give the Government a fierce glare? The Government has even delayed it for nine years. I understand that some Honourable colleagues from the pro-democracy camp disagree with this motion

proposed by me, but some have rendered it their support, which is hard to come by. I do not mind becoming a target of attack, a "good cop" or a "bad cop". I am also not disturbed by any allegation of filibustering of me because the public will judge whether I am filibustering, and filibustering is not necessarily wrong.

Lastly, instead of dwelling on this any further, I just wish to tell Members from both the pro-democracy and the pro-establishment camps that occasionally, government bills or motions may be imperfect—Members will certainly think that no bill is perfect—or even fraught with defects, flaws and loopholes, falling far short of or failing to live up to our ideal. Paternity leave is one such example. The Government is reluctant to extend it from three days to five days. Most pro-democracy Members, no matter whether they vote in the affirmative in tears or just wish to "pocket it first", will support such legislation as long as their passage will not cause any harm or serious side effects. Nevertheless, by proposing the adjournment motion, I hope to give pro-democracy Members more time and room to spur the Government, and in fact, the pro-establishment camp also helped with this earlier on. I hope this half-day meaningful debate today will facilitate the Government in taking forward its initiatives in the fourth phase in relation to the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance in the future. Today, no matter whether Members are going to vote for or against it or abstain on it, I will not feel displeased. For Members' earlier condemnation of me, I will just brush it off my shoulder.

I so submit.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Before I put the question on this adjournment motion, I wish to remind Members that in accordance with RoP 40(2) and (3), if the motion is agreed to, the debate shall stand adjourned; if the motion is negated, this Council shall continue to debate the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance.

I now put the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen under RoP 40(1) that the debate be now adjourned be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan rose to claim a division.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for five minutes.

(While the division bell was ringing, THE PRESIDENT resumed the Chair)

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

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung and Prof Joseph LEE voted for the motion.

Mr James TO, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Dr Pierre CHAN and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted against the motion.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Ms Claudia MO and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen voted for the motion.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr WU Chi-wai, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Helena WONG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr HUI Chi-fung and Mr Jeremy TAM voted against the motion.

Dr CHENG Chung-tai abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present, 2 were in favour of the motion and 15 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 20 were present, 2 were in favour of the motion, 17 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 motion was negatived.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): We now continue the debate on the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance.

IR DR LO WAI-KWOK (in Cantonese): President, as already stated in my speech made in opposition to the adjournment motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen earlier, I initially did not intend to speak on the proposed resolution. However, on the one hand, I had to get it off my chest just now because the adjournment motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen is utterly unreasonable and nothing but a waste of the Council's time and continued misuse of the Council's resources, which are extremely environmentally unfriendly. On the other hand, I have heard many untruthful representations, misunderstandings of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme or unfounded statements. As a representative of the engineering sector, I feel obliged to speak.

President, I believe we all agree that climate change is an important common issue facing mankind in the 21st century. Many scientists are of the view that climate change is a result of over consumption of resources and massive use of fossil fuel by mankind. In the last century, the rapid advancement in technology brought about many breakthroughs as well as consumption of energy, especially fossil fuel, on an even larger scale.

(THE PRESIDENT'S DEPUTY, MS STARRY LEE, took the Chair)

In my speech made in opposition to Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's adjournment motion, I mentioned that, comparing the technological breakthroughs made by mankind to our consumption of energy and carbon emissions in the last two centuries, the conclusion is that it seems the more advanced our technology is, the higher the consumption of energy. Therefore, we cannot but take actions against climate change now and devote more efforts to energy conservation and emission reduction.

The graph I am now holding graphically illustrates the arguments presented by me. From the outset of the Industrial Revolution at the end of the 18th century, as technological breakthroughs emerged in each period which prompted mankind to enter a new era, carbon emissions have been increasing accordingly. This graph shows the trend of carbon emissions in a number of periods respectively: since the Industrial Revolution to the use of steam engines and the emergence of rail in the 19th century—of course, today we talk about high speed rail, on which trains are propelled not by steam as they were at the beginning—and then entered the era of electricity, which gave birth to heavy industries; followed by the era of mass production characterized by the heavy use of gasoline and manufacturing of motor vehicles in large numbers; and now we are in the so-called era of information and communication. Mobile phones are our company at work and in daily life. In this graph, the X-axis on the bottom represents these several eras and the Y-axis represents the resulting carbon emissions; the two axes together form the graph.

In fact, before the Industrial Revolution, the content of carbon dioxide in the entire atmosphere of the Earth, that is carbon emissions created naturally, was relatively stable. However, the so-called geometric growth started after the Industrial Revolution. In Hong Kong which is a modernized city, we enjoy all

sorts of convenience brought by its status of an international metropolis and a free port, and electricity is readily accessible. In this way, we often disregard the fact that if we do nothing today, at the close of this century, fossil fuel contained on the Earth may completely deplete. And it affects not our generation, but the next generation, the next of the next generation and the next of the next of the next generation will have to suffer the consequences.

Therefore, the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") is a benevolent policy of the Government. Nevertheless, the implementation of MEELS is hard-earned for it encompasses the efforts made by many professionals, not just environmentalists, but many other professionals, such as mechanical engineers. Having measured the energy consumption levels of a product, they set different grading standards which will be compiled into clear labels so that consumers can base their selection of products on them. MEELS embodies the great efforts of many different professionals, especially engineers.

Here I wish to commend the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department and the Environment Protection Department for their hard work done in this respect over the years. Of course, Hong Kong is a consumer city. Among the many types of electrical appliances we have mentioned, of course some of them may be designed by Hong Kong companies but the factories manufacturing them are not located in Hong Kong, and also many of them are imported.

Hence, the implementation of MEELS requires the support of the industry—not only the local industry, but also the peripheral regions, especially those manufacturing products for export to Hong Kong. Fortunately, energy conservation and emission reduction seem to have become a worldwide common goal now. In this course, there are definitely twists and turns and it will not always be plain sailing. Some participating countries can even take different stances on the issue under different leaderships. Some Honourable colleagues have expressed such concerns in their speeches made on this topic in these two days. I will not spend any more time on such discussion.

However, as regards implementation of MEELS, we have been lucky to have secured the collaboration of all parties. Therefore, the first and second phases have yielded fruitful results, among which the most important one is public education. When MEELS was introduced initially, people might not

understand the meanings of the labels. But I think now energy efficiency is definitely one of the factors consumers will consider when purchasing electrical appliances.

In my speech made earlier in opposition to Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's adjournment motion, I briefly explained the reasons for the energy labels in Hong Kong being classified into Grades 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Because the same electrical appliance can come with different functions and designs, so do their energy consumption levels; it is impossible to put them all in one category. Therefore, for the sake of pragmatism, MEELS classifies products into different grades according to their energy efficiency performance for consumers' selection. Smart consumers certainly will select the most energy efficient electrical products while considering whether their functions suit their own needs.

Deputy President, as a member of the Subcommittee on Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 which operated in the first half of this year, I have a good understanding of the discussion and members' concerns expressed at the time. Actually during the discussion, there was not much controversy. Surely some members asked questions but they were not difficult to answer. For example, can MEELS be made expeditiously to cover all electrical products sold in the market in Hong Kong? It is indeed impossible to reach the goal in one leap and aim at full implementation of MEELS immediately. Even the third phase which is under discussion now does not cover all electrical products. However, after the third phase is implemented, MEELS will cover electrical products in use in Hong Kong and the energy consumption of which makes up 70% of the territory-wide consumption. Therefore, the coverage is fairly extensive.

When the first phase was implemented in November 2009, it only covered products which were the so-called main appliances mostly used by people in daily life, including air conditioners (only cooling capacity is regulated), refrigerating appliances and compact fluorescent lamps. The second phase, which was fully implemented in September 2010, extended the scope to cover washing machines and dehumidifiers, but the rated washing capacity of washing machines included in MEELS must not exceed 7 kg because technical problems regarding energy consumption of bigger washing machines required more time to handle. For the third phase, the Government has not worked behind closed doors. The Government targets to cover more types of electrical appliances in the third phase, including televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, room air conditioners of reverse cycle type (with heating and cooling

functions) and bigger washing machines (with rated washing capacity exceeding 7 kg but not exceeding 10 kg). It means that the third phase will complement the second phase by extending the scope of MEELS to cover electrical appliances not covered in the second phase.

Why did I say the Government has not worked behind closed doors? Because it has conducted public consultations and considered the views collected and many factors, such as overseas practices. As I have explained, since Hong Kong is a consumer city, not the main city where these electrical products are manufactured, the Government needs to draw reference from overseas practices, specific product designs and energy consumption levels, as well as the availability of testing standards and testing laboratories. Therefore, it is a complicated process. As the third phase, which is expected to be implemented soon, all at once includes the five types of electrical appliances in MEELS, the first to the third phases combined will then cover electrical products accounting for 70% of the electricity consumption in Hong Kong. Therefore, the proper implementation of MEELS will benefit energy conservation and emission reduction in Hong Kong enormously. Household energy consumption can thus be directly reduced. As we can imagine, power plants will have lower emissions due to a reduced demand for electricity. Deputy President, of course we are also carrying out another task, that is, continuously tightening the emission standards of power plants, which calls for concerted efforts.

Therefore, as a member of the Subcommittee as well as a representative of the engineering sector, I have a profound understanding of how heavy the workload involved was and am happy to see the successful implementation of the first and second phases, which have won support from the industry and the people. I can say that energy efficiency has become an important factor for consumers when they purchase electrical appliances as it helps them select the more energy efficient ones. For these reasons, I am absolutely in favour of the proposed resolution put forward by the Government. In fact, we do not think otherwise because energy conservation and emission reduction are our responsibilities. I also hope that, in keeping with the principle of energy conservation and emission reduction, we do not casually filibuster in the Legislative Council to waste the time and important resources of the Council, as well as the air conditioning and lighting of the Legislative Council Complex. Here I thank once again the parties from various sectors who have worked tirelessly for MEELS, including the relevant industries and government departments (*The buzzer sounded*) ...

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, your speaking time is up. Please stop speaking.

IR DR LO WAI-KWOK (in Cantonese): I so submit.

MR HOLDEN CHOW (in Cantonese): Deputy President, we are discussing the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the Ordinance") today. As I mentioned in my previous speech, the Government already launched the first phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") back in 2009, and it has proceeded to its third phase in 2017 to expand its coverage to additional electrical appliances, including televisions, electric storage water heaters, and washing machines. Deputy President, in our previous discussion, I heard many Members say that the Ordinance was good and could foster the extensive application of energy labels. But some Members also wondered if the authorities should do better and perfect the Ordinance. Today, I have also heard some Members say that if the authorities can perfect the Ordinance this time around, it will be able to fully cover all electronic products or those which consume electricity in our daily life, in addition to the several types of products including televisions, induction cookers, washing machines, and electric storage water heaters. They consider that this is rather the most effective way of taking forward MEELS and encouraging people to reduce energy and power consumption.

Deputy President, the first feeling we have upon hearing such remarks is that they may have a point there. It has taken Hong Kong almost 10 years from 2009 to 2017 to launch three phases. Upon counting, we can see that only a handful—only some 10 or eight types—of electrical products are included. Some people have therefore argued that in that case, the amendment exercise this time around should be more comprehensive and set a higher target, so as to make better amendments to the Ordinance. Deputy President, this thought is really idealistic. Sometimes, if we set overly high targets in actual practice, we may not always be able to achieve the desired result due to objective constraints.

Deputy President, I have listened attentively to Members' speeches today. They have hit the nail on the head. Why have the authorities only been able to launch three phases of MEELS in almost a decade's time from 2009 to 2017? There are bound to be difficulties and problems, and the trades and product manufacturers may hold dissenting views. How do the authorities strike a

balance between heeding the industry views and implementing MEELS? This requires some time and efforts. Deputy President, Members may propose that a higher target be set, so as to take forward the relevant tasks more effectively. I wish to cite an example to illustrate that sometimes, things can never be perfect in reality due to objective constraints.

Deputy President, I decided to begin my discussion with the Kyoto Protocol signed in 1998. In 1998, the United States Government led by Bill CLINTON signed the Kyoto Protocol. But after the BUSH Administration commenced operation following its inauguration in 2000, President George BUSH said that as he did not agree to the Kyoto Protocol, he decided that he would not comply with the targets therein. What were his grounds? At the time, BUSH said that around 80% of the countries or regions were not required to comply with the Kyoto Protocol, and this would cause economic damage to the United States in the end. Simply put, he thought that it was unfair to the United States.

Deputy President, if Members read the relevant news reports, they would know that the United States economy comprised various interlocking segments. The BUSH Administration was also well aware of this. In gist, he was utterly unable to meet the relevant targets. If he insisted on meeting the relevant emission reduction targets, the business sector and local communities of the United States might rebound very strongly. As everybody knows, BUSH came from the Republican Party. And Members may have some knowledge about the history of the Republican Party. All along, the Republican Party in the United States has tilted towards the business sector and paid more heed to its views. Therefore, the BUSH Administration said somewhat decisively that it was unable to comply with the targets in the Kyoto Protocol anymore. His decision drew criticisms from various parts of the world. The reason was that the United States as a superpower had no reason to be absent from the global task of reducing emissions and protecting the environment. But the BUSH Administration was realistic. As he knew that he could not meet the targets, he decided to cease its participation.

Deputy President, I am not saying that the BUSH Administration made a correct decision. I have cited this example to illustrate that we also need to consider the objective reality sometimes. Deputy President, let me cite another example to explain that if our target is too high or idealistic, we may fail to achieve it in the end.

Deputy President, in 2011, three countries decided to cease compliance with the new targets in the Kyoto Protocol, namely Canada, Japan and Russia. Let me talk about some background here. The Canadian Government gives people an impression as a staunch champion for environmental requirements. Deputy President, since Canada had all along given people the impression that it was willing to commit resources to environmental protection and take actions, you may wonder why it would decide to cease compliance with the targets in the Kyoto Protocol in 2011 after upholding it for many years. Deputy President, the HARPER Administration likewise gave the same explanation at the time, claiming that they had also found it impossible to comply with the targets in the Kyoto Protocol. For example, one initial target set by the Kyoto Protocol was to reduce carbon emissions by 6% before 2012 compared to the level in 1990. Deputy President, it was the initial target set by them. But in the course of actual practice, they nonetheless found it unattainable. Members may wish to know the result, and people watching our live television broadcast should listen to me really very carefully. Statistics of the Canadian Government found that its carbon emission level in 2009 were 17% much higher than that of 1990.

Deputy President, what does this mean? It was alright for them to refuse to sign the Kyoto Protocol. But having signed this international agreement and undertaken to achieve the relevant targets, they would naturally face immense pressure of being fined or penalized for failing to achieve them. In the end, the Canadian Government said "Sorry" openly in 2011 because it was unable to meet the new targets in the Kyoto Protocol.

Deputy President, if Members have listened attentively to the examples cited by me just now, they will understand that they serve to explain one point, the point that if we wish to make everything perfect with a perfectionist mindset and set overly high targets, we may be unable to achieve them in the objective reality. What will be the result in the end? We may end up failing to achieve our target despite our desire to do so and even facing possible penalties, as in the case of the Canadian Government.

Deputy President, in this circumstance, I find it necessary to give a reply concerning the Ordinance. Opposition Members or pro-establishment Members are all aware that Hong Kong needs to do a better job in environmental protection by promoting energy conservation and emission reduction, implementing energy labels, and so on. But if Members wish to perfect the Ordinance in just one step to cover all electronic products, they will actually fail to achieve anything given the objective constraints. If our discussion on this resolution had really been

adjourned due to the passage of the adjournment motion moved by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, the result would have been even more inconceivable. The reason is that the Government will have to conduct from scratch all the various tasks it has already undertaken, and we will lose our initial opportunity of moving a possible step forward.

Deputy President, my speech up to this point may lead Members to conjure up Hong Kong's constitutional reform as the situation is just the same. Some people always say that we must set a certain target. But they nonetheless do not realize that we must also take account of the objective reality. If one side merely wishes to take a step forward whereas the other side raises objection as it hopes to accomplish its target in just one step, no success can be achieved in the end, and both sides will only end up marking time. This will do no good to both sides.

Deputy President, I pointed out in my speech in the previous session that MEELS had also stimulated a thought in me. How should the Government drive the demand for the relevant products? Deputy President, apart from adopting the simple approach of introducing MEELS, we must also educate people in the market, such that they are willing to buy those energy-saving products with energy labels (meaning those meeting the standard). This is the only way for our commercial society to operate.

Deputy President, let me give an example. Members all know that since a long time ago, many recycled products (such as paper) have met with the absence of a market in Hong Kong, and many waste materials have been shipped to the Mainland after recycling. I cannot but ask why Hong Kong seems to be unable to attain any success despite the Government having made efforts to promote recycling for years. One reason is that people's demand for products made from recycled materials is not keen in the market.

Deputy President, how can the Government create demand? Let me give an example. The United States Government adopts the approach of formulating guidelines and targets, requiring government departments to ascertain in the procurement process if a product is made from recycled materials and to procure such products in order to fulfil the requirement. From this, we can see that as long as the Government can take the lead to set similar targets—Deputy President, I mean stringent targets—and require various departments to enforce them, the market demand for such products can be increased. When there is demand, economic activities will naturally take place in the community. If there

is no demand, nobody will be willing to invest in the production of energy-saving products or products made from recycled materials, because they cannot make any profits without any market demand.

Deputy President, if the Government can set similar targets and, with various complementary measures ... I do not mean that I hope the Government can immediately set the rigid requirement that all private organizations must do so. Instead, I hope certain organizations (such as the Government) can take the lead and do so in the procurement process, so as to drive demand. Whether speaking of energy-efficient products or products made from recycled materials, business opportunities will naturally arise as long as there is market demand, and this in turn will be conducive to driving environmental protection. A comprehensive environmental policy should rather be one which can generate demand that will in turn drive the market as a means of materializing green ideas.

Finally, Deputy President, I wish to take this opportunity to urge the Government to take the lead in setting a standard and undertaking guiding work, so as to create demand for the relevant products, particularly energy-efficient products. The Government can drive market demand only if it can create demand and procure such products. This can in turn generate economic activities.

Deputy President, I so submit.

MR WILSON OR (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I find it most regrettable that Honourable colleagues of the opposition camp are employing their usual tricks of filibustering during the discussion on livelihood issues, completely ignoring the well-being of Hong Kong people. They are obsessed with filibustering.

Deputy President, Hong Kong society understands that further regulation of energy efficiency labelling can help consumers reduce their expenditure on electricity consumption which is particularly important to low-income households. Every cent saved can help improve their financial situation. For Hong Kong society as a whole, further refinement of the energy efficiency labelling is also beneficial to the environment and future development of Hong Kong. This is a good policy in the right direction in the interest of people's livelihood and society.

Unfortunately, Members of the opposition camp keep using different methods to filibuster. I really do not understand why Members of the opposition camp are delaying the item when they always claim that they represent the interests of Hong Kong people. Their filibustering, whatever the circumstances may be, is paralysing the operation of the entire society. Energy efficiency labelling involves the interests of the people and the future development of Hong Kong. I hold that it must absolutely not be delayed any further.

In recent years, due to filibustering in the Legislative Council, taxpayers' money was wasted and many construction projects and items concerning people's livelihood were delayed. Are delays and filibustering actually what Hong Kong people want to see? Do Hong Kong people eventually have to bear the consequences and foot the bill? This proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance should have been passed smoothly so that the Government can move one step forward in doing a proper job in this regard. This is about the interests of all Hong Kong people, so I hope the opposition camp will come back onto the right track and stop filibustering.

Hong Kong's overall energy efficiency labelling policy has become a hot topic of discussion in society in the past few years. It is believed that this initiative can bring the efforts at environmental protection in Hong Kong to the next level. For instance, the level of greenhouse gas emission in Hong Kong reached its historic peak in the 1990s, while it is now at 17%. According to the data from the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, the electricity consumption per capita in Hong Kong is 5 600 kWh, lower than the United States (approximately 12 000 kWh), Canada (approximately 16 000 kWh), Japan (approximately 7 600 kWh) and Singapore (approximately 7 400 kWh). This shows that the initiative of energy efficiency labelling can give Hong Kong another edge and convey a message to the world that Hong Kong is prepared to make contribution towards energy conservation and emission reduction. More importantly, consumers' financial burden can be relieved by choosing appliances which are more energy efficient according to the energy labels.

When I visited the local districts, people often asked me, "Mr OR, why does it take so long for such a simple energy efficiency labelling policy to process? Is it because the Government is reluctant to do so, or is it because Members do not let the Government do so?" As I often said, if a policy is beneficial to Hong Kong, we definitely will render it total and absolute support. Therefore, I believe energy efficiency labelling should be implemented as soon as

possible so as to arouse the awareness of the general public of energy conservation and emission reduction and relieve their household financial burden. Of course I understand that some Members do not know or do not care what are energy labels because they are not aware that low-income households must calculate every cent carefully under the pressure of electricity bills. In any event, on livelihood-related issues they stage a filibuster; on non-livelihood-related issues they also stage a filibuster, all the while totally ignoring the quality of living of the people. They claim that filibustering in the Council is for the benefit of the people. I find this statement absolutely ridiculous.

Deputy President, as far as I understand it, there was little controversy over the policy on energy efficiency labelling. The proposal is for the benefit of the overall development of Hong Kong. Members of the opposition camp did not aim at showing their enthusiasm on the issue, but rather, at achieving their political goals through filibustering. We must make people watching the live broadcast on television realize this. We must also implement energy efficiency labelling expeditiously in order to solve global warming and energy efficiency issues that we are facing right now. We do not claim to be environmentalists, but we know that we will give up many opportunities of development if we do not move forward.

Deputy President, the passage of this resolution on energy efficiency labelling will be enormously helpful to environment protection. As a member of Hong Kong, we must protect our environment not only for our own generation but also for the next generation. The five additional electrical appliances covered by the energy efficiency labelling scheme are indispensable to our daily life. Basically every household has them and uses them frequently. Without an energy efficiency labelling policy, we will be unable to efficiently control greenhouse gases emission, and thus, the long-term harms caused to the environment in Hong Kong will be unimaginable.

For the benefit of this generation and the next, I think it is reasonable and necessary to include these five types of electrical products in the third phase of Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme. I hope Members of the opposition camp will stop wasting time on undue procrastination. This type of procrastination actions is indeed wasting a lot of resources of the Council. Energy is wasted on lighting and air conditioning due to filibustering. Deputy President, I must stress that everyone should look ahead in order to do a good job

of environmental protection. I must also stress that the efforts at energy conservation and emission reduction do not yield instant results. Rather, the policy must be continuously explored and refined through implementation. How can the policy be refined if it is not given the chance of being implemented?

I believe repeated delays to the energy efficiency labelling policy are neither conducive to the development of Hong Kong nor to the promotion of environmental protection. Hence, I hope this resolution will be passed expeditiously so as to improve people's quality of living and the environment.

Deputy President, countless Hong Kong households make their choices based on the energy labels when buying electrical home appliances. Many people told me that they definitely looked at the energy labels first when purchasing televisions, washing machines and water heaters. The electricity consumption of these appliances can be staggering. The passage of this resolution and the introduction of energy labels can help grass-roots households, in particular, save on their electricity bills. Economizing here and there is already helpful to the grass roots who live in poor conditions or those who can barely make ends meet. Should this policy fail to pass, I believe they will have to bear expensive electricity bills, which is the last thing we would wish to see.

Deputy President, I would also like to take this opportunity to remind the Administration that even if a certain policy has been passed by the Legislative Council, more often than not, a more vigorous effort at publicity needs to be made by the Administration. I saw much room for improvement in the publicity work on various environmental issues in the past. I expect government officials to reach out more to the local communities in introducing new policies to the public. Government officials often neglect the local administration advisory body, that is, the District Councils of which I am also a member. I just talked to a fellow District Council member on the phone who asked me whether various Policy Bureaux had promoted the energy efficiency labelling scheme which has been under discussion for such a long time in local communities. I answered them: yes, but not enough. Hence, I would like to take this opportunity to ask the Government to make better use of the edge of local administration. We have the chance to debate the subject in the Legislative Council, but should we take a few steps more also in the District Councils instead of only attending certain committee meetings thereof? I urge government officials to reach out to the front line of local administration, that is, Area Committees, mutual aid committees and owners' corporations, who are actually their partners with whom

they should work together on the publicity. Friends in owners' corporations, mutual aid committees and District Council members are most willing to relay the message to the public on their effective platforms in order to let people know that this is a good policy and teach them how to choose electrical appliances.

I am confident that the public will fully support a policy if publicity efforts are in place and down-to-earth. Besides, I often stress that government officials, Members and those who are engaged in community service should keep these words in mind: more gathering for less misunderstanding; more communication for better success. I believe this is important. If we often lack communication, people will think that the Government is doing a disservice despite its good intentions and Members of the opposition camp will be given the excuse.

Deputy President, since everyone is making a concerted effort to do a good job of this, I believe we should give it our full support. I hope this resolution can be passed expeditiously without delay. Hence, I hereby urge Members of the opposition camp to refrain from playing their filibustering tricks. I urge them to do more solid work for Hong Kong people, especially for those who elected us as Legislative Council Members. This is what we should be aware of as elected representatives. Unfortunately, Members of the opposition camp are not in the Chamber now. But in any case, I hope that we all think what people think and address people's pressing needs.

Deputy President, I support the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance and the expeditious passage of this resolution. I so submit.

MR MARTIN LIAO (in Cantonese): Deputy President, the Secretary for the Environment proposed this resolution on the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 to amend a Schedule to the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Cap. 598) for implementing the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") and this, I support. I also hope that the this phase of MEELS can be implemented as soon as possible, so as to incorporate into MEELS five additional types of products which include televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, washing machines and room air conditioners of reverse cycle type. The authorities estimated that an additional annual energy saving of around 150 million kWh can be achieved for Hong Kong. The amount of energy saved, which accounts for a quarter of the total

energy saving of MEELS and is equivalent to an annual reduction of carbon dioxide emission of around 105 000 tonnes, will be conducive to alleviating the global climate change.

MEELS will also bring new opportunities to the industrial and commercial sectors and through market force, positive incentives can be provided to stimulate the industries to, with the application of innovative technologies, design and manufacture products that are more energy efficient, thereby enhancing their competitiveness in the market and at the same time, facilitating the adoption of green practices by consumers at large in their living. In short, this will be helpful to Hong Kong's development in the direction of green economy.

Deputy President, perhaps some people may hold that affixing energy labels to products to inform consumers of the energy efficiency of the products can achieve only an insignificant result, or they may think that compared with the several tens of billion tonnes of carbon emission produced globally every year, the amount of emission to be reduced is but negligible. But it is precisely when these small effects of policy measures are added up that there can be collective behavioural changes made by members of the community. Only when they can save energy and reduce carbon emission in every small aspect of their living will there be hope to achieve for the Earth the target of keeping the global temperature increase to within 2°C, thereby preventing the human race and the natural ecology from coming to an irrevocable turning point.

Deputy President, what is worthy of concern is that despite the wide consensus long reached in the international community and the conclusion of various international agreements pledging to make concerted efforts to combat climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, it is regrettable that the results have been far from optimistic. According to the latest report of the United Nations Environment Programme, the pledges for emission reduction made under the Paris Agreement are only a third of what is required to pre-empt the worst impacts of climate change, and stakeholders have to take greater strides in concert to ensure that the emission reduction targets of the Paris Agreement will be achieved. Meanwhile, the President of the United States has, amidst international condemnation, announced the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement which is expected to take effect in around 2020. Although the United States deputation still attended the Conference of the Parties under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change held in Bonn recently

and some states and cities in the United States enjoy a certain degree of autonomy over their climate policy and their actions to combat climate change will not be stalled by the policy of the Federal Government, these uncertainties nevertheless still give cause for concern.

Deputy President, extreme weather events brought forth by climate change have already caused immense frustration to various places worldwide. For example, there have been more instances of super typhoon, super rainstorm, and so on, and Hong Kong is no exception. Among the affected places, the island countries that are the first to bear the brunt have long let out a wail to the international community. For instance, the Maldives hope to save themselves by purchasing islands, and Fiji also appealed for unity in the world at the climate meeting in Bonn. Being a member of the village earth, Hongkongers should spare no effort to make every possible bit of contribution to energy conservation and emission reduction.

Deputy President, I so submit.

DR ELIZABETH QUAT (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I speak in support of the proposed resolution put forth by the Government under section 54 of the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance. Climate change and global warming are the most pressing problems faced by the human race as a whole, and it may be regarded as the hardest to tackle. We often ask whether it is too late to talk about energy conservation and emission reduction today.

In fact, we human race have wasted a lot of time on disputes. I recall that around two decades ago, many scientists around the world were discussing issues of global warming and climate change, stating that the problems were posing serious threats to the human race and the Earth as a whole. However, conspiracies about the issues were widely circulated at that time. I remember that many scholars had denied the validity of those climate change concerns and criticized them as mere conspiracies, while some considered them alarmist talk raised by certain countries to promote their products or package their countries. Yet, in the past 20 years, the issues have been proved by a lot of evidence found in scientific researches. Certainly, there are cycles of global climate change, and the earth has undergone a number of ice ages. However, in the past few decades, the rise in global temperature was closely related to the habits of mankind. The habits of human beings in daily life, as well as our mode of

consumption, have driven up global temperature at an extremely rapid pace. Today, very few people will deny the problem of climate change and global warming. Yet, the new President of the United States of America is an exception. He dares renounce these problems and go against the world as a whole, thinking it is unnecessary to address climate change and global warming. Such remarks have caused an uproar and are really inconceivable.

Hong Kong, as a cosmopolitan city, is facing a serious problem of carbon footprint and ecological footprint. Our ecological footprint includes our daily activities in meeting our basic needs and the power consumption of buildings, companies, enterprises, the Government and the Legislative Council, and so on. As a global citizen, Hong Kong is obliged to minimize its carbon footprint by all means. The Paris Agreement has laid down the significant target of keeping the global average temperature from rising 2°C (compared to the temperature of pre-industrial revolution period). With the exception of the United States which has announced its withdrawal, all governments of countries which have signed the Agreement agree with the proposals put forth by this dedicated committee on climate change in its assessment report, according to which the total carbon dioxide emission should be reduced by 72% by 2050 globally. In respect of the Paris Agreement, the Hong Kong Government has much to do.

As for the resolution relating to energy labels under discussion today, it is the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS"), and we must render it our support. Back then, when the first phase of MEELS was introduced in 2008, only three types of products were included, namely, air conditioners, refrigerating appliances, compact fluorescent lamps. By 2009, the second phase was introduced to include washing machines and dehumidifiers. As for the inclusion of the new products this time around, it will definitely be conducive to the reduction of total greenhouse gas emissions. We all know that as the number of people using these energy efficient appliances increases, we may achieve significant energy saving, thereby reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases by power plants and of air pollutants. To the public, these labels offer genuine choices to them. Hence, we strongly support it.

However, Deputy President, we have to consider whether it is adequate to merely show support. Hence, I would like to take this opportunity today to point out that we have lots to do. Many people know that I have been promoting the development of smart city in the past two years. The Chief Executives of the

previous term and the current term have included the development and promotion of Hong Kong as a smart city in their policy addresses. The incumbent Chief Executive has stated unequivocally in the latest Policy Address that the authorities will push ahead with smart city development. Deputy President, smart environment is a key component of a smart city. Some time ago, on behalf of the Smart City Consortium and the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong ("DAB"), I have submitted some proposals to the Government. We are obliged to do so.

To our understanding, at present, electricity generation is the main source of carbon emission in Hong Kong, which accounts for 68% of local greenhouse gas emissions. Among the various types of electricity users, the power consumption of commercial and domestic users on air conditioners was the highest. Hence, the development of green building technology, the enhancement of air-conditioning efficiency and the reduction of total power consumption should be accorded top priority in reducing the total carbon emission of Hong Kong. In this connection, the BEAM Plus, a set of international criteria for green construction, is adopted for government buildings and newly completed buildings with a view to reducing the power consumption of buildings. However, issues concerning the power consumption and green performance of old buildings have basically been left not addressed. Even for government buildings, the new criteria for energy conservation and emission reduction are applicable to newly completed ones only. As for old government buildings, I notice that the Government has not made any proactive effort at implementing improvement measures. According to the statistics of the Buildings Department, over 85% of the buildings in Hong Kong are over 10 years of age. These buildings will only achieve energy saving if renovation and conversion are carried out. In this connection, what are the plans of the Government? What has it done and what will it do? Deputy President, we have neither heard nor seen any action taken.

The authorities are now promoting scientific research and innovation technology. With the establishment of the Innovation and Technology Bureau, we hope the Government will make rigorous effort at promoting the development of green technology. In fact, some local companies of Hong Kong have developed some award-winning technical solutions, such as the Smart AirCon which helps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions of old buildings. If enterprises can install the Internet of Things, they will reduce the power consumption and greenhouse gas emission during the peak hours.

Moreover, in the discussion on smart city, we often say that full community participation is a must. We hope to find out the current condition of greenhouse gas emission in Hong Kong, including the emission of residential flats, commercial organizations and individuals. Yet, in Hong Kong, only total figures but not detailed data in this aspect are available. Deputy President, we may feel happy about the total figures, yet we should not be too excited. We know that the total greenhouse gas emissions of Hong Kong in 2015 had dropped to the lowest level since 1990. It means that we are making progress and we are not at a standstill. It also means that the Government has done something instead of leaving the issue not addressed. Moreover, the total carbon emission has dropped by 7.5%, whereas the per capita carbon emission has dropped by 8%, returning to the level in 2004. In other words, we are working on it. MEELS, which the Government introduced some time ago, definitely has a part to play. The Government should implement such good schemes as soon as possible, and it should work harder on it.

Yet when it comes to meeting the requirements under the Paris Agreement, there is still a long way to go for Hong Kong. Hence, we propose adopting the smart city approach to involve the community as a whole. If the Government will introduce schemes in cooperation with technology industries and universities through the introduction of smart sensor products in collaboration with the business and industrial sectors and the relevant organizations, people may carry the devices on their bodies or place them at home, and then we may know the carbon emission by person, by household and by office. The present problem is the unavailability of relevant data, and this prevents us from setting a benchmark, for we can only decide the carbon emission of individuals and households with reference to such a benchmark. Our performance in this aspect is less than desirable. Hence, I think we should adopt the smart city thinking and technology to enhance our performance.

(THE PRESIDENT resumed the Chair)

I started promoting green ICT (information and communications technology) some years ago. The number of data centres adopting green technology is increasing in Hong Kong. Yet, is that enough? I think it is inadequate, for a great number of data centres in Hong Kong are still using the conventional approach with high power consumption. Members will understand

that once they enter these centres, for the temperature inside is comparable to that of a refrigerator. For new data centres, air conditioning is optional. Yet, has the Government introduced measures to incentivize enterprises to use this type of green data centres? There is none presently.

Why is the carbon emission of Hong Kong so high? It is mainly because Hong Kong relies heavily on coal-fired power generation. It is true that the use of natural gas for power generation is increasing and the situation has improved slightly. Yet, the problem of carbon pollution persists. In Hong Kong, the development of renewable energy resources is extremely slow. The Government has expressed only recently that it will consider laying down some indices or installing solar photovoltaic panels at reservoirs. Will it be adequate? While other overseas cities and countries have been exerting their level best to implement waste-to-energy conversion, yet in Hong Kong, the first facility for waste-to-energy—waste incinerator—has not yet been constructed and it can be achieved only many years later. Recently, we have just addressed the issue of selling landfill gas to the power companies, and the progress is really slow.

As for the Energy Utilization Index ("EUI") of buildings, only some of the government buildings have set the target, but not the others. Regarding the buildings in Hong Kong, should the authorities not introduce some measures to encourage energy conservation or make energy saving a mandatory requirement? The work in this aspect is far from satisfactory.

President, some time ago, I visited Austria to inspect the new energy saving approach adopted in the buildings there. In a small region, solar photovoltaic panels are installed to taller buildings on a full scale, and those buildings are comparable to a generator in the region supplying electricity to other shorter buildings, and the need for electricity storage is also dispensed with. The building concerned does not consume energy and will supply electricity to the surrounding buildings. Have we done anything in this aspect?

In 2006, Secretary Wong Kam-sing said, "I think electric vehicles best suit the small environment of Hong Kong and may be conducive to energy saving and emission reduction in Hong Kong." However, today, the Government has cut the tax concessions for electric vehicles. Do the authorities really want to encourage the use of electric vehicles?

President, the most important concern is whether the ecological footprint of the community and Hong Kong as a whole is developing in the direction of achieving sustainable consumption. If members of the public are asked whether or not they support environmental protection, nine out of 10 will answer in the affirmative. We often meet with students and visitors visiting the Legislative Council Complex. When we ask them whether or not they support environmental protection during our chat, they will all raise their hands. Yet, when they are asked if they will turn off the lights when they go out, they will answer in the negative. And when they are asked if they have reduced electricity consumption, the answer is also in the negative. Even if they are asked whether or not they have heeded the advice of "Big Waster" to avoid wasting food, they will also say "no". Hence, the public are mostly supporting environmental protection with words than actions. How should we incentivize all members of the public to conserve energy and reduce emission, as well as reducing their carbon footprint and ecological footprint in daily life? This is a big topic and I think the Government should have done more.

If all citizens will save energy and reduce emission and if they can practise sustainable consumption, I trust that it will definitely be more effective than the mere enactment of legislation, and it will be better for both the earth and Hong Kong. Hence, President, I hope that with the passage of the resolution today, the Government will do more.

Thank you, President. I so submit.

MR CHEUNG KWOK-KWAN (in Cantonese): President, today I rise to speak in support of the proposed resolution moved under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance, which can be deemed closely related to environmental protection. As I can see, the purpose of this proposed resolution today cannot be clearer. It is to implement the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") for electrical products in Hong Kong.

Coming to the third phase, that means Hong Kong did not just make a start. Before this, Hong Kong society has already carried out two phases of work in this aspect. In the third phase, we wish to extend the scope of application of the label. Why should we do so? To what scope will MEELS be extended this time? Having checked the documents, I know that the scope of MEELS will be

extended to new models of televisions, enhanced storage type electric water heaters, new induction cookers, room air conditioners of reverse cycle type with heating and cooling functions, and washing machines with rated washing capacity exceeding 7 kg but not exceeding 10 kg.

In my view, President, extending the ambit of the Ordinance to the products mentioned by me just now at this stage is actually timely and worthy of Hongkongers' support. As I said just now, environmental protection is indeed a very important issue in society now. In the past, we might think that environmental protection had nothing to do with us. However, if we have noticed the climate change in recent years, we would realize that planet Earth has been changing without our being aware of it. Needless to talk about such faraway places as America or Africa. Even in such a stable place like Hong Kong, we found that typhoons had hit Hong Kong more frequently in recent years, and each time the hit was fiercer than before. This is precisely a sign of global climate change which makes Hongkongers realize that the problem of climate change has appeared in Hong Kong, affecting our generation and the next.

Hongkongers in our generation are all very much concerned about their children. In terms of academic performance, we are anxious whether they can be admitted to a good school, and we will find many different extra-curricular activities for them to join. We often worry that they are not well-fed. What we mean by not being well-fed is different from the past. In the past, our parents would worry whether we had taken any meal and got enough food, whereas the Hongkongers of this generation would worry whether the foods eaten by their children have enough nutrition and variety. Take fruits as an example. In the past, we were already very happy if we got apples and oranges, but now I often see parents (including me) buy finer fruits, such as those produced in Japan or America, to ensure better health of their children. Certainly, being parents, we care much about the clothing, food, housing and transport of our children. But if we really care about them, we should also be concerned about their living environment in the future. For this reason, environmental protection is not merely a subject close to home. It is also a pressing issue affecting the future and closely related to the next generation.

Let us recap the history of Hong Kong. Hong Kong started as a fishing port, then developed its industries and has now become an international financial city. Looking at Hong Kong's economic condition today, we know that we no

longer rely on the industries. Hence, it is actually not in industries that Hongkongers consumed the greatest amount of electricity. If Hong Kong is not an industrial city, how can we save electricity and do something for the planet? In fact, we can exactly do so in our everyday life. In the course of our everyday life, we will use a lot of electricity on clothing, food, housing and transport. For example, when we have hot pot meals, we use induction cookers. In our living places, almost every household has air conditioners. In the past, there were window-type air conditioners. Later, there were split-type air conditioners. Then in recent years, room air conditioners with both cooling and heating functions covered in this amendment exercise of the Ordinance have gained increasing popularity.

Such changes have precisely told us that many electrical products are involved in our clothing, food, housing and transport. This situation and the past cannot be mentioned in the same breath. President, when I was a child, every year I would return to my home town to spend the Lunar New Year with my grandmother, since she lived alone on the Mainland while I lived in Hong Kong. The annual return to the Mainland to spend the Lunar New Year was a most unusual experience for me because my home place was not a city. It was a village. I still remember how I spent the Lunar New Year on the Mainland. In the morning, I would draw water from the well in front of an extensive piece of farmland with many cattle and sheep. At night, a particularly deep impression still vivid in my mind now is the absence of products which needed power supply in the house. There was no television, induction cooker or electric water heater in the entire house. The only exception was an electric light bulb oozing a dim yellow light in the sitting room.

My past experience on the Mainland told me that the community might not consume much electricity in the past. However, following the economic take-off, the living standard of every household has improved. In fact, the current consumption of electricity by each household warrants our attention. Certainly, President, I am not a fundamentalist in environmental protection. Here I am not advocating Hongkongers to live like primitive people and give up all the electrical products. This is impossible. President, as in the case of this Legislative Council, I have noticed that every Honourable colleague would dine with his mobile phone in hand. Living in Hong Kong, we need to keep using electrical products. This is not the situation in the Council alone. In ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, please focus on the present proposed resolution relating to energy efficiency labelling.

MR CHEUNG KWOK-KWAN (in Cantonese): I see your point, President. I wish to point out how pervasive electrical products are nowadays. Hence, if MEELS can cover more electrical products this time, it is quite worthy of our support.

Certainly, in this amendment exercise, we cannot ask the Government to achieve everything at one go and make MEELS cover all the electrical products in Hong Kong. This is impossible, but the Government can take it forward progressively in tandem with the development in Hong Kong. As far as the Ordinance is concerned, many electrical products have gained popularity in Hong Kong in recent years, and the use of these products has become increasingly extensive, including room air conditioners of reverse cycle type with heating and cooling functions and induction cookers mentioned by me just now. When we were young, we seldom had the chance to use these electrical appliances, but now every household has such appliances. In particular, winter is around the corner. If we wish to have hot pot meals at home, we will purchase an induction cooker. For this reason, the Government's current extension of the scope of MEELS to electrical products used by an increasing number of people, in my opinion, is rather worthy of support. It can also make Hongkongers understand that everyone can contribute his share of effort to environmental protection.

President, apart from affixing the labels so that it will be easier for Hongkongers to identify which electrical products are worthy of support, I also hope that the Government will attach importance to publicity work. Just now some Honourable colleagues also mentioned this point, because we may put in place the best labels to cover all electrical products in the future, but President, please think about this. Suppose you or I pick up this label but cannot decipher the information it contains or do not pay much attention to the labels, what purpose can this label serve then? For this reason, I hope that apart from progressively extending the scope of MEELS, the Government will also attach importance to education so that Hongkongers will know how to read the contents of the labels during their purchases of electrical products. It should also provide consumers with the best information through the labels, thereby enabling them to identify which products consume the least electricity. Such an act can not only help us save money on electricity bills but also help the planet and reduce environmental pollution. This is very important.

If the proposed resolution is passed today, I hope the Special Administrative Region ("SAR") Government can educate Hongkongers through different social media in the future. I also hope the relevant authorities can brief different councils, including District Councils and the Legislative Council, more on how to use the labels because frankly, I actually do not have a deep understanding of them. I also expect the Policy Bureau to explain to Members in detail how to read the contents of the labels so that we can teach our supporters within our circle about it, and consequently, more Hongkongers will know how to use the information on the labels.

President, we can see from past examples that this is not infeasible. The levy on plastic bags is a case in point. Back then, when the levy on plastic bags was not yet introduced into Hong Kong, if we were asked whether such an approach could make the people of Hong Kong use fewer plastic bags in shopping, we would find it inconceivable. However, since the levy on plastic bags was launched, I have asked many friends about it. All of them consider that Hongkongers seem to have attached great importance to this matter overnight. Now when we go shopping, we will automatically bring our own bags. Sometimes I am really amazed. For example, when my wife and I go to a supermarket to do some shopping after meals, she can always fish out a shopping bag from nowhere. It is evident that so long as we can pass the message to Hongkongers, they will be willing to contribute their share of effort to Hong Kong and to the planet. Most importantly, the Government needs to convey the useful information to Hongkongers. This is vitally important to our next generation.

Hong Kong is part of the country. I am not discussing overall jurisdiction here today. Neither am I discussing the "high degree of autonomy". Hong Kong is definitely part of the country. It is part of the planet, too. Hence, I believe, and I am also confident, that sharing a common goal, so long as the SAR Government continues to update MEELS in a timely manner, Hongkongers will pitch in together and use the information on the labels during their purchases of electrical products, contributing their share of effort to Hong Kong and to the planet. I hope that not only our previous generation and this one but also the next can have a beautiful home in Hong Kong and on this planet. President, I so submit.

MR JEFFREY LAM (in Cantonese): President, the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("the Amendment Order"), was in fact submitted to the Legislative Council in May this year, and it has been scrutinized by the relevant subcommittee. There is actually little controversy over the Amendment Order, as many Honourable colleagues said before, and we all hold that it is going in the right direction. Environmental protection and energy conservation are issues that enjoy the support of not just Members, but the great majority public of Hong Kong. Electrical appliances, as everyone knows, make our life and work convenient. As it is unavoidable for us to use all kinds of electrical appliances, energy efficiency labels can help every member of the public to make the right choice, by factoring in electricity consumption and energy consumption in particular, when shopping for an electrical appliance.

Electric storage water heaters and induction cookers are among a number of electrical appliances to be included in the scope of regulation, with which I agree. However, as we all know, the electricity consumption level of televisions, at no more than 200 watts per hour even for 60 inch-plus models, is not high. Even if a television is on throughout the day, the electricity consumed will not be excessive. As a matter of fact, there are more high-power household electrical appliances. What is high power? I shall explain it shortly. First, I think the Government, in conducting a review of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") in future, should first consider high-power electrical appliances such as hair dryers and heaters. To perform their respective functions, hair dryers and heaters rely on electricity to generate heat and their electricity consumption levels cannot be lowered through technology, unlike the case where electricity can be saved by replacing traditional street lamps with LED ones. Hence, in implementing the fourth phase of MEELS the Government should, for example, consider more different products without confining itself to household electrical appliances only. On the whole, all electrical appliances, be it used at home, in offices or anywhere else, should be considered.

Aside from energy conservation, the Government should take safety, which is of the utmost importance, into serious consideration. Some people are really muddle-headed in using electrical appliances, plugging several electrical appliances to the same extension unit. If those appliances happen to be high-power, watts used per hour could reach thousands in total, which could lead

to problems—ranging from tripping of the circuit breaker at best to a fire at worst—that should not be overlooked. I am speaking from my personal experience. I remember that when I was a child, there was an air conditioner in my room. One day, it tripped the circuit breaker with a bang and the cover of the air conditioner caught fire in seconds. Fortunately, I happened to be standing right next to it at the time and managed to put out the flame with a pillow. If the curtains caught fire too, the whole place could be set ablaze, which would be unthinkable. For this reason, the Government should give consideration to the issue of safety in particular.

With the advancement of technology, President, there is, as everyone can see, an increasing number of household electrical appliances. You too, President, love to go shopping for electrical appliances and I have learnt quite a few things from you. Should all electrical appliances be included in MEELS? Some say this would increase costs. Others say it would add to the work of manufacturers, retailers or importers, which could affect the progress of shipments. For instead of simply affixing labels to products, each product has to be tested and the result obtained before a label can be affixed to it. Speaking of labels, they are often beautifully designed these days. I have a friend who has a whole wall in his home decorated, one by one, with these energy labels, which is really creative. Hence, energy labels can indeed become a platform for young people or creative minds to bring their creativity into play.

Energy labels aside, President, I think there are some members of the public whose knowledge about electricity and mechanics is inadequate but they tamper with electrical appliances all the same just by heeding the advice of someone here and there. Can the Government do something about it? Can we incorporate the relevant content into the curriculum of physics for secondary schools so that students can learn some electrical knowledge? By putting what they have learnt to practical use, students can be greatly benefited in their future life and the way they use electrical appliances.

Meanwhile, I think the Government should exert itself more on education and publicity, doing more and doing better on different areas. Just take a look at the students these days. Some of them are rote learners, while others participate in all sorts of extra-curricular activities after school. It would be a good thing, I believe, if knowledge beneficial to their life and work in future could be included in the curriculum.

The relevant handbook published by the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department, which I have taken a look, has not—correct me if I am wrong—been updated for years. It needs a refresh. The handbook points out something that people should know and advises them to ask questions about things they do not know, which is not desirable. It would be beneficial to society and the public, I think, by updating the guideline with new knowledge. If people can figure out, for example, the voltage and functions of electrical products, knowing such things as whether or not a newly bought electrical appliance can be plugged into a certain socket and the maximum load of each socket—which are all safety guidelines, they can calculate the electricity consumption and thus the monthly electricity cost of an electrical appliance. There are electrical appliances in the market that are cheaply priced but consume a lot of electricity, which are no real bargain when the monthly electricity bills running up to hundreds of dollars are taken into account. Such information, if provided, can help people choose their products. If the Government can make such knowledge pervasive, as opposed to relying solely on energy efficiency labels to promote energy conservation, I think people will have a better idea about their electricity bills.

President, I once came across a product which, once plugged into a wall socket on the one end and connected to an electrical appliance on the other, can display information on the product's functions and electricity consumption. The authorities can assess whether or not this kind of products is worth promoting—product safety, certainly, is very important. If they are effective, I believe people can learn about the functions and electricity consumption of an electrical appliance and thus make an informed assessment of the product.

Let us now talk about manufacturers, as every electrical appliance is produced by a manufacturer after all. When the idea of energy efficiency labelling was first mooted, members of the industry shook their heads with apprehension, worried that sales would be hit if their products were found to be inferior to those of their competitors in terms of energy efficiency, and thus felt tremendous pressure. In the Policy Address this year, the Chief Executive stated clearly that the Government would vigorously promote innovation and technology. Manufacturers as well as members of the business sector, who are indeed very shrewd, have made a head start by hiring university graduates as well as professionals of new and high technologies and putting a lot of efforts into energy conservation. That is why we can see nowadays that many electrical appliances are not only priced at very inexpensive rates but far more powerful in

terms of functions, as well as tiny and space-saving, as compared with the older models. In this connection, energy efficiency labelling, I think, can indirectly promote education in Hong Kong and facilitate the development of high technology. How can the Government do more in this area? I think the relevant government departments should enhance communication among themselves and see how they can cooperate in respect of innovation and technology and facilitate manufacturers of electronic products or electrical appliances in doing more in energy conservation.

Speaking of electrical appliances, some of them are even bigger, though not for household use. The plastics injection molding machines manufactured by the company operated by Dr CHIANG Lai-wan's family, for example, consume a lot of electricity. I have no idea whether or not energy efficiency labels are required for these injection machines. In short, as electrical appliances come in great variety, we should expand substantially the scope of regulation, instead of just focusing on the several types of products to be brought under regulation. I hope that more young people as well as more traditional industries—electrical appliance manufacturing is in fact a traditional industry of Hong Kong—can produce more products in Hong Kong as a result of investments in scientific research. I also hope that scientific research can contribute more to Hong Kong and in turn facilitate the proper implementation of MEELS.

President, The Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong and I support the Government's scheme of energy efficiency labelling and we wish to thank the Government for its sympathy shown to the industry which needs time to adapt. As I mentioned just now, when the legislation for the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance was first proposed by the Government, the industry was really scared, worried that the quality of their products would be questioned due to test results and their companies go under as business vanished. However, after the implementation of MEELS, as I said before, they saw it in a positive light and began hiring more young people, university graduates and scientific research professionals, in a bid to develop high-technology products. Some manufacturers succeeded in winning more business as a result. It is therefore necessary for the Government to do a good job of education at the initial stage of a scheme. In the event of new measures to be introduced in future, the Environmental Protection Department should do more to reach out to and explain matters to the manufacturers. I am absolutely certain that, with the Government serving as their guiding light, they will not be afraid and be able to thrive.

Moreover, I hope the Government can implement MEELS smoothly. As I mentioned just now, the Government submitted the proposal, which we are examining at the moment, to the Legislative Council in May. I am also aware that the Government had consulted the industry as well as the public and the public consultation lasting three months has garnered positive responses. I hope more products can be included, one by one, in MEELS. Most importantly, allowances should be made for all of us to adapt to the new environment. So long as the Government can keep listening to the aspirations of the industry and make gradual efforts in energy conservation and emission reduction, Hong Kong should be able to comply with the emission reduction targets and become a cleaner and greener city.

I so submit, President.

MR LEUNG CHE-CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, I support examination of the proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the Ordinance") today. As we all know, the Government's emission reduction or energy conservation initiatives in Hong Kong are implemented in phases. As mentioned in my previous speech, the Government's energy conservation initiatives are implemented in three phases: The first phase commenced in 2009 with some electrical appliances brought under labelling control; the second phase commenced in 2011 and the scope of electrical products was expanded to include washing machines, and so on; and the third phase is to commence in 2017 and the labelling requirements will be enhanced to cover five additional types of electrical products, namely televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, air conditioners of reverse cycle type and washing machines.

Can the Government enhance its performance in emission reduction or energy conservation by expanding the scope of mandatory labelling to cover these types of products? According to the information provided by the Government, an annual reduction of carbon dioxide emission of approximately 105 000 tonnes can be achieved. This figure sounds really good. Should this motion be passed, at least the environment can be improved and I will definitely render it my full support. We also know that the greenhouse effect caused by carbon emission has had a profound impact on global climate, temperature and even food and water sources. I believe Members will share my views. The exceptional hot weather in Hong Kong this year is believed to be linked with excessive emission of greenhouse gases, too.

If we take a look at the figures, we will find that temperatures in Tuen Mun, Tin Shui Wai and Yuen Long in New Territories West could reach 38°C to 39°C. Various diseases caused by hot weather, such as heat exhaustion and heat stroke, as well as chronic diseases such as heart and respiratory diseases, are deteriorating. The problems with contagious diseases, such as malaria, dengue fever and Japanese Encephalitis, have become even more acute. The two Japanese Encephalitis cases that occurred in Tin Shui Wai were similarly caused by the weather and humidity, which will easily lead to the breeding of mosquitoes and hence push up the figures. As such, greenhouse gases emission has produced significant effects.

Both children and adults know that the greenhouse effect has an impact on the safety of the planet. But what can be done to ameliorate the situation? The situation cannot be improved easily by sole reliance on the public to adopt a more proactive attitude towards emission reduction. I think it is more worthwhile for the Government to introduce legislation to regulate the situation, with a view to reducing emission reduction figures to an ideal level. Someone has asked this question: How much effort has been made in Hong Kong on this front? Although we saw a drop in greenhouse gases emission in late 1990 in Hong Kong, it rose again in 2000. Actually, this phenomenon is no longer considered to be unusual because quite many people tend to adjust the temperature of their air conditioners downwards. I have some friends from the Mainland. Since they seldom turn on their air conditioners on the Mainland, they find air conditioning in Hong Kong so low that they feel like stepping into a refrigerator—I have caught a cold too—and people can easily catch a cold as a result. Air conditioning in the malls in Hong Kong is so low that the room temperature is usually maintained at around 20°C only. The fact that the development of business was particularly robust in Hong Kong in 2000 may have contributed to the increase in carbon emissions.

In 2014, carbon emission even surged by a staggering 35% to a historic high of 45 million tonnes. As a result, the Government adopted a multi-pronged approach with the focus placed on the electricity industry for the purpose of emission reduction. As such, as we pointed out some time ago, the Government began to regulate electrical appliances in 2009 by requiring electrical products to be affixed labels with a view to reducing carbon emission. Hence, the situation has seen improvement since then. Now the Government has set a target of reducing carbon emission by the year of 2030 to 26% of the emission level in 2005. I support and commend the setting of such a goal, as a target should at least be set for the Government to do a better job.

It is indeed imperative for the Government to legislate for regulation of gas emission control. Due to the absence of regulation in the past, we have seen fluctuations of gas emissions, with the emission figures rising steadily. We are indeed quite worried. In a three-month consultation conducted in the second quarter last year, the Government proposed to include televisions, storage type electric water heaters, induction cookers, room air conditioners of reverse cycle type and washing machines (with rated washing capacity exceeding 7 kg but not exceeding 10 kg), as I mentioned just now, in the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS"), as well as reducing the annual residential electricity consumption by 15%. Certainly, we think that these initiatives are good. However, the temperature of air conditioning in the mega malls I mentioned a while ago is still very low. Despite the Government's intention to expand MEELS, I wonder if regulatory efforts can be stepped up to make Hong Kong's carbon emission fall gradually in tandem with the inclusion of these five types of electrical appliances in the scope of regulation.

I have recently been given to understand that the Government intends to collaborate with the New Territories Heung Yee Kuk to retrofit the village houses in some of their villages with photovoltaic panels to connect this energy-saving system for power transmission. It is really good news if this can be achieved. Tai O residents have also collaborated with some voluntary agencies and non-governmental organizations ("NGOs") to install photovoltaic panels to cover the roofs of their houses completely. During my visit to Tai O, the residents told me that \$1,000 to \$2,000 in tariff could actually be saved per annum. This shows that the greenhouse gases emission generated by electrical products powered by electricity supplied by the power companies for households have really seen improvement.

Nevertheless, it is a pity that the Government has merely allowed some NGOs to make some attempts without taking it seriously and formulating any policies. Such being the case, how can the Government combine zero emission electricity with electricity generating carbon emissions for the sake of reducing carbon emission? It appears that the Government is still pondering.

According to the grandiose plans formulated by the State, a goal for carbon dioxide emission has been set following the signing of the Paris Agreement, and carbon emission is expected to be reduced by 40% to 45% in 2030. In my opinion, the pace of the State appears to be faster than that of Hong Kong, as the

goal of sustainable green development has already been set by the 18th National People's Congress. The electricity consumption of some major cities on the Mainland, especially some industrial sites where electricity consumption of factories is very high, is not lower than that of Hong Kong, but the State is very committed to reducing electricity consumption, thereby lowering carbon dioxide emission. Hence, even if Hong Kong does not follow the State closely, at least a long-term goal should be set on this front. To set a target for Hong Kong's total emissions in 2030 and another one for 2050, Hong Kong must be far-sighted and have a goal. Certainly, I have confidence in the Environmental Protection Department because of the effort made by the Environment Bureau on this front in the past. In particular, since taking office as Secretary for the Environment, Mr WONG Kam-sing has been promoting environmental protection vigorously. I believe he can definitely enable Hong Kong to stride towards a new landmark.

Nevertheless, we must consider the current sources of emission of greenhouse gases and carbon dioxide in Hong Kong, that is, the two major power companies in Hong Kong, and examine if their emissions meet the requirements of achieving the goal? For instance, approximately half of the fuels used at present are coal and fuel gas. Will the Government carry out further reform by reducing the carbon dioxide emission of fuels? This is a very important factor, too. At present, 20% of the fuel used is nuclear electricity, but we cannot increase the consumption of nuclear electricity because some people find it ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, please focus on the proposed resolution concerning energy efficiency labelling.

MR LEUNG CHE-CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, I am talking about the relationship between carbon emission and labelling. I think labelling has a major impact on fuels. If power stations as a source can reduce their emissions, then the so-called labelling effect can be achieved. So long as the emission level reaches a certain level, there will be no need for it to be lowered further.

The energy efficiency labelling proposed in this motion is certainly beneficial to the public because the electrical products made by manufacturers must meet the Government's requirements, that is, reduce electricity consumption when using the products. Can the Government step up its effort at encouraging

more people to lower their electricity consumption such as lowering their electricity tariff from \$500 a month at present to \$400 a month? Will the Government provide incentives or discuss with the power companies on the offer of incentives to encourage the public to tie in with the emission reduction effort made by the Government? Doing so might turn out to be even more effective than the current approach of enacting legislation to regulate manufacturers or even mandate the public to purchase certain electrical appliances.

Furthermore, I have to remind the Secretary that, besides purchasing electrical appliances in major shops in shopping malls, the public sometimes might choose to purchase electrical products on the Mainland. Do these products comply with Hong Kong's labelling requirements? If not, how will the authorities concerned enforce the law? Upon the commencement of the legislation, I believe improvement efforts must be made properly by the Government in future.

With these remarks, I will support the passage of this motion. Thank you, President.

MS ALICE MAK (in Cantonese): President, I speak in support of the passage of the proposed resolution.

I believe we all know the importance of energy conservation and emission reduction and clearly understand the effects of extreme climate change on the earth. Weather changes in recent years have brought great hardships to many workers who work outdoors under extreme weather conditions, whether they are in the construction industry or the shipbuilding industry. Therefore, we support the passage of the proposed resolution so that hopefully these measures to conserve energy and reduce emissions can speedily improve the multi-faceted problems we are facing due to climate change.

In fact, among some work injury cases handled by us, there has been a rising trend of workers suffering from heat stroke when working outdoors in recent years. But heat stroke is not included in the scope of compensation for work injuries. For this reason, it is also what the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions has been striving for: a good working environment for workers even amid climate change.

At the same time, we also support the Amendment Order to extend the labelling scheme to cover several other types of electrical appliances. However, apart from implementing the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS"), the Government also needs to tackle the issue from its procurement measures and, with its contractors, take the lead to implement a green procurement policy to source products with Grade 1 energy labels.

We hope that MEELS is not just about affixing labels. We hope that the Government can devote more efforts to this end, including supporting the green industry, providing training for maintenance workers and setting up a qualification framework for accreditation. For example, broken products can be repaired instead of being randomly disposed of because we all know that people may not clearly understand a new energy label when it is first introduced. Possibly they will replace the electrical appliances, eventually creating some other waste. We should study how to enhance the energy efficiency of such replaced products or how they can be properly disposed of. I believe the Government has to carry out a detailed study.

Moreover, we need to educate the people. Public education is very important because as labels are affixed to these products, how can we ensure that people know how to distinguish them? Moreover, when people decide on purchasing certain products, they should also be educated to consider from a long-term perspective, that is, how much in electricity tariff they can save in future, instead of just looking at the prices of the products. We hope members of the business sector, such as Mr Jeffrey LAM, will not set the prices of products of Grade 1 energy efficiency at a higher level or set the prices of products of other grades lower because of the newly introduced energy labels, causing people to only consider prices when selecting products of which grades to purchase and eventually purchasing the cheaper ones.

Therefore, the Government needs to promote public education to tell people that it is not just a label or a product. People should adopt a long-term perspective to consider that, in terms of monetary gain, a lot of electricity tariff can be saved. I even think that after the enactment of the Amendment Order, that is, after the implementation of the new phase of MEELS, the Government should make corresponding arrangements to compile some conversion tables list the monthly amount of electricity tariff saved with using products of Grade 1 energy efficiency and using those of Grade 2 energy efficiency. People can then understand that small expenses do add up and will not choose less energy efficient products in order to save a few hundred dollars in purchase price.

For this reason, I think the Government needs to step up efforts at promotion and education, instead of relying only on television advertisements it routinely produces for publicity. A more essential task is probably to make young people and children aware of the importance of energy conservation and emission reduction from a young age because, after all, MEELS applies to household electrical appliances. However, energy conservation and emission reduction are about living habits as a whole—not just choosing from five grades when purchasing air conditioners, but living habits as a whole. Therefore, we hope the Government will, to accomplish the tasks in this respect, not only rely on enactment of legislation but at the same time carry out public education so as to help people cultivate a living habit of energy conservation and emission reduction.

We know that after the third phase of MEELS is implemented, we can save 150 million kilowatt-hour of energy per year, equivalent to a reduction in emission of 105 000 tonnes of carbon dioxide per year, making some contribution to the climate of the earth. However, as I have just said, it is not enough. Our goal is not only to make people know how to decide on purchases of electrical appliances, but more importantly to cultivate a living habit of carbon reduction and a lifestyle of low-carbon living, which is a long-term approach. We also hope that the Government will continue to promote greater development and expansion of the green industries.

With these remarks, President, I support the passage of the proposed resolution.

MR CHAN CHUN-YING (in Cantonese): President, I speak in support of the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("the Amendment Order"). We always say that we hope to promote a low-carbon life or a way of life that gradually relies less on petroleum, thereby reducing carbon dioxide emission and ameliorating the problem of global warming. It is necessary for us to explore how our lifestyle in everyday living, including such aspects as clothing, food, housing and transport, can be linked with the crises associated with global warming and the limited oil resources, and by practising low-carbon living, we can cope with the environmental challenges that we face now.

President, I would like to provide some statistics. According to the initial assessment of the World Meteorological Organization, last year (2016) is probably the warmest year on record globally. Satellite observations show that given unusually high temperature and sea surface temperature, the Arctic sea ice cap was below average throughout the year and even hit a record low in the seven months up to November 2016. Such extreme climate has caused many different incidents to occur worldwide last year, including the heat waves in Africa, Southeast Asia and the Middle East; disastrous hill fires in Canada and Tasmania; cold fronts in Southern China and Eastern United States; droughts in Southern Africa, Northern South America, Central America, the Caribbean region, Vietnam, some parts of India, Indonesia, the Philippines, various islands of the tropical Western Pacific, Ethiopia and Eastern Australia, and so on. As there is indeed too much information, I will not go through it one by one here.

Apart from the impact on the climate, the fact that the problem of suicide in the world population is also related to the climate warrants our concern, too. According to the statistics compiled by the World Health Organization, close to 800 000 people on earth commit suicide every year and the suicides of some people have to do with the temperature. The University of California in the United States published this year a research report on an in-depth analysis of the causes of high suicide rates. An in-depth study was carried out in some regions in India, and the findings pointed out that the statistics of the suicide rates published in India from 1967 to 2013 are closely linked to agricultural yields and climate data. Another important finding of the researchers was that given the lack of measures adopted by India to reduce the impact brought about by climate change, it is estimated that climate change has caused over 59 000 people to commit suicide in the last three decades.

In fact, the assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change also pointed out that climate change has a major negative effect on global agricultural yields and as the climate continues to warm globally, it is believed that agricultural yields would be hard hit if no adaptation measure is adopted.

In this connection, President, to enhance the awareness of the people of Hong Kong of energy conservation and environmental protection and to encourage them to choose more energy efficient products, the Government has since 2008 implemented the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") through the enactment of the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the Ordinance"). Under this scheme, all products

supplied in Hong Kong are required to be affixed an energy efficiency label for consumer information. This is a very good beginning. The first phase was implemented in 2009 and the second in 2011. Now that MEELS has come to its third phase, I believe it can further spur the public awareness of energy conservation and environmental protection.

Having said that, I have noticed that during its scrutiny of the Amendment Order, the Subcommittee put forward some views that very much worth the Government's attention. The first is about whether the Ordinance is applicable to second-hand products. This is quite a thorny issue, for we cannot stipulate that the public can purchase only new products. The second view concerns products purchased online, and the third concerns products carried by members of the public into the territory, as mentioned by Mr LEUNG Che-cheung earlier. It is more difficult to control these products than first-hand products. I hope that in the course of enforcement, the Government will seriously look into how the relevant provisions can be improved.

President, today a number of colleagues in the Legislative Council have made a diversity of valuable suggestions in respect of the Amendment Order, further providing a clear direction for how improvements should be made in the implementation of the third phase of MEELS. Although it seems that the energy saving to be achieved will be only 150 million kWh and carbon dioxide emission will be reduced by 105 000 tonnes, we have, after all, made some efforts for the protection of the global environment.

I know that the Government, when making preparations for the third phase of MEELS, conducted a public consultation exercise, and I also understand that it consulted views jointly with the working group comprising representatives of trade associations. However, I hope that during the grace period, the Government can continue to closely liaise with the industry and duly carry out publicity and also public education mentioned by Ms Alice MAK earlier, so that all consumers and shop operators will know the new types of prescribed products. I also understand that after the enactment of the Amendment Order, the Government will table another order to comprehensively set out some details. I hope that Members can then provide more input on these details for the further perfection of the Ordinance.

With these remarks, President, I support this Amendment Order.

DR CHIANG LAI-WAN (in Cantonese): President, I rise to speak in support of the passage of the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017. I believe Members all know that the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change has been in session in Germany these days. Many climatology experts have already warned the whole world that global warming will get increasingly serious. We all know that there are the North and South Poles on Earth, and the two polar regions comprise ice caps. At present, progressive melting of the ice cap at the North Pole has already begun to take place. The ice caps in the two regions have all along functioned as air conditioners at the upper and lower poles of Earth. When the two air conditioners begin operation, they will generate cool air in winter as normal if our entire Earth rotates without any problems. However, the air conditioner at the North Pole has failed to function normally now. Members should know the reason—the ice cap at the North Pole has begun to melt. In that case, suppose the ice cap has melted down completely one day and only the air conditioner at the South Pole remains, it will be utterly unable to adjust the climate of the world properly. By that time, the phenomenon of global warming will gradually set in. Everybody living on Earth is responsible for this phenomenon and is absolutely duty-bound to take actions. So, I strongly support the idea of further tightening and enhancing the regulation of energy labels in Hong Kong this time around.

Speaking of energy labels, I believe people may wonder what energy labels are all about. Let me talk about them very briefly. When buying electrical appliances, be they refrigerators or washing machines, people may notice that a label is affixed to an electrical appliance. It is certainly not as large as the one I have in hand, and the real label is smaller in size. People can see five grades on the label, and it clearly explains that "Grade 1" means the product has the best energy efficiency performance and is most helpful to saving their money. Suppose a product is classified as "Grade 5" which is indicated in red on the label, whether to buy it or not is really a matter of personal choice as its energy efficiency performance is certainly not quite so satisfactory.

Besides, the label also provides people with much information for comparison. For instance, even if people see that two products of the same type are classified as "Grade 1", they can still find information on the annual energy consumption of the two products as highlighted in the lower part of their respective labels. This can help people make a further comparison. For example, a certain product may consume less energy a year—maybe 1 106 kWh

only. The annual energy consumption of another product is nonetheless 1 200 kWh, slightly higher than that of the first product. This can help people choose those products that are good to the Earth environment and save some money in their wallets. This is very important.

I understand that the amendment exercise this time around is very important. Apart from expanding the types of products covered by the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme, the Government will also tighten the grading criteria. So, I believe that should the relevant amendments come into force in the future, we may not be able to see so many "Grade 1" products as we do now. Actually, there is one problem at present, the problem that when buying electrical appliances, people are at a loss as to how they should make a choice upon seeing that many products are classified as "Grade 1". I believe that as the authorities gradually tighten the relevant Ordinance, there will be fewer and fewer "Grade 1" products. This is absolutely a good thing, too.

That said, I wish to raise two points here today. First, I hope the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") can consider one proposal. When buying electrical appliances, people can certainly choose any "Grade 1" products themselves. But as far as I know, many newly built housing units are offered for sale with complimentary electrical appliances. In that case, will the Government require property developers to offer "Grade 1" electrical appliances? Can property developers offer complimentary electrical appliances classified as "Grade 3" for the sake of reducing costs? Here, I urge the Government to encourage property developers more often to offer "Grade 1" complimentary electrical appliances which are most helpful to saving energy and money and have the highest environmental efficiency.

Besides, I also wish to point out that what we have been talking about more often these days is mainly the residential aspect. But statistics show that places with the highest energy consumption at present are actually industrial and commercial buildings. Now, roughly over 60% of our energy consumption is for commercial purposes. In that case, how should we target at this respect and take forward the work of energy conservation? The reason is that residential energy consumption merely stands at some 41 000 terajoule, or merely some 20% of the total energy consumption. It is actually commercial buildings which have recorded the highest energy consumption, and I believe the energy consumption of air conditioners is the highest among all appliances. So, insofar as the environmental protection policy is concerned, I hope EPD can require all

commercial buildings to be fitted with equipment (such as air conditioners, electrical appliances and lighting devices) which have been proved by the Government's scientific research and tests to have the highest energy efficiency and classified as "Grade 1" on energy labels in the future. This is rather the way of contributing real efforts to protecting the environment of Hong Kong and Mother Earth. Thank you, President. I so submit.

MR ABRAHAM SHEK: President, in view of the profound principle of environmental protection, the current proposed resolution under the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance does not leave much room for controversy. This certainly is consistent with the carbon reduction target and the energy saving plan promulgated by the Government to reduce carbon intensity by 65% to 70% and energy intensity by 40%. The reason why I am speaking is I support and affirm this belief. I have listened to all these speeches, particularly the pro-establishment Members' speeches. They have spoken very well on the subject of energy efficiency, and I have actually learnt a lesson to be more aware of what energy saving should be. That is the reason, as a non-energy-aware person, I have learnt much, and at the instruction of my Chairman, I have to speak and affirm this belief.

The Secretary for the Environment has given notice to move a motion under section 54 of the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance at the Legislative Council meeting on 24 May 2017. The motion seeks the approval of the Legislative Council on the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("the Amendment Order") for the purpose of implementing the third phase of the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme. The Amendment Order seeks to add three products, namely televisions, storage type electric water heaters and induction cookers, new prescribed products, to Part 1 of Schedule 1 to Cap. 598 as prescribed. There is no question about it. In fact, by the end of today, we will pass this resolution. But the question is: Have we been very successful in the first and second phases? How successfully have the education programmes been implemented for Hong Kong people to take note of what is being legislated?

The importance is not in legislation. The importance of legislation is to encourage people to apply those concepts in their daily life and also the industries to do so. This is the whole meaning of today's exercise of passing this resolution. And then another aspect of today's debate is we have seen from the opposition side, particularly our Honourable colleague Mr CHAN when he

moved the motion to adjourn the debate—we have seen actual energy wastage in today's debate. Think of the amount of energy that we have wasted. Six other members of the Public Accounts Committee and I scrutinize the Government's performance under the concept of value for money. If we apply the same principle to today's debate, such action by the opposition should be condemned.

President, what is efficiency? Efficiency is defined as the ability to produce something with the minimum amount of effort and have the same good result. We have wasted a whole day to achieve the same result. So we have actually consumed a necessary wastage of energy. What is energy efficiency? Energy efficiency is the process of reducing energy consumption of infrastructure, facilities, buildings, machines, devices, products, services, business activities and transport. This is what energy efficiency is all about. It affects every aspect of our lives. The benefit of energy efficiency is: it can reduce costs, improve competition in our industries, reduce environmental impact and reduce the greenhouse effect. Energy efficiency is the goal to reduce, as I said earlier, the amount of energy to provide products and services. That is why we need to legislate for the three products today to make society more aware of the issue. And this is the whole aspect of today's resolution. It is very simple. But I do not see why we have to debate so long. I have listened to the debate in the last three hours. The pro-establishment Members have tried to right the wrong of negative filibustering, in that at least we are talking something to bring to the awareness of the people of Hong Kong that energy efficiency is important. Not only in terms of resources, energy efficiency must also apply to mental, emotional and every aspect. We need not waste energy, emotion or time to achieve something like this resolution.

President, I know that we are all tired after a long, long debate since nine o'clock. I do not intend to talk further except to leave the time to the Secretary for the Environment to sum up the whole day's work that we have actually put in, including the time that the opposition Members have spent on filibustering.

Thank you.

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): If not, I now call upon the Secretary for the Environment to reply. Then, the debate will come to a close.

SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (in Cantonese): President, I thank the Chairman, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, and members of the Subcommittee on Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017, as well as all Members for their valuable views. To tackle climate change, the Chief Executive set a new target of carbon reduction in the Policy Address presented in January 2017 to reduce carbon intensity by 65% to 70% compared with the 2005 level by 2030. Energy conservation is an important measure to alleviate the negative impacts of climate change. The Government issued the "Energy Saving Plan for Hong Kong's Built Environment 2015~2025+" in 2015, which sets the target of reducing the 2005 level of energy intensity by 40% by 2025. Participation of both the Government and people is crucial to achieving the target.

To raise people's awareness of selecting energy saving products, the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department ("EMSD") introduced the Voluntary Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme in 1995. The Scheme aims to inform consumers of the energy efficiency performance of products, thereby promoting energy conservation and encouraging product suppliers to offer more energy efficient products to meet consumers' needs.

To further promote energy conservation, the Government introduced the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme ("MEELS") for specified energy-using products. Energy-using products will be included in MEELS in phases.

Under MEELS, energy labels are required to be shown on the prescribed products for supply in Hong Kong to inform consumers of their energy efficiency performance. Moreover, importers or local manufacturers of products covered by MEELS have to submit information of product models to EMSD and be assigned reference numbers before supplying the products to the Hong Kong market.

In addition, through revision of the Code of Practice on Energy Labelling of Products, the energy efficiency grading standards for air conditioners, refrigerating appliances and washing machines have been enhanced. The

revised Code of Practice on Energy Labelling of Products was gazetted on 31 October 2014 and became fully effective on 25 November 2015.

MEELS brings considerable benefits to both the economy and environment. After the full implementation of the first and second phases of MEELS, 175 million units of electricity can be saved every year. In terms of environmental benefits, emissions of carbon dioxide can be reduced by 122 500 tonnes every year.

Also, with the full adoption of the enhanced energy efficiency grading standards for air conditioners, refrigerating appliances and washing machines, it is estimated that approximately 300 million units of electricity can be saved each year. In terms of environmental benefits, emissions of carbon dioxide can be reduced by 210 000 tonnes every year. After the implementation of the third phase, 150 million units of electricity can be saved each year. The three phases of MEELS combined can conserve about 600 million units of electricity.

Sustainability evaluation indicates that MEELS produces positive effects to energy conservation, reduction in emissions of carbon dioxide and improvement of air quality. The Scheme is also conducive to slowing down the growth of energy consumption, better adhering to the sustainability principle of optimization of natural resources.

The implementation of the first and second phases of MEELS was generally smooth. To ensure the energy efficiency performance of product models claimed by local manufacturers and importers tallies with their actual performance, when applying for reference numbers for products, manufacturers and importers must submit test reports issued by accredited laboratories. EMSD will conduct regular inspections of retail shops to monitor compliance with the statutory requirements of submission of information and attachment of labels stipulated in the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance ("the Ordinance"). EMSD will also select samples of products from the market and commission independent laboratories to conduct monitoring tests to check whether the actual energy efficiency performance of the products conforms with the information contained on the energy labels. If the listed model is found not conforming with the requirements, its reference number will be removed from the record of listed models and it will be banned on the market. We will also announce to the public the non-compliant types of products.

Moreover, EMSD will follow up on complaints relating to prescribed products and take legal action against offenders where appropriate. We will hold regular liaison meetings with the industry to exchange views and experience on regulatory matters so as to strengthen law enforcement by the Department and urge the industry to comply with the statutory requirements. Since MEELS came into force, the Government has organized a series of publicity activities to promote MEELS to the industry and the public. We will continue to conduct publicity events for the third phase of MEELS.

As regards law enforcement, as at 30 April 2017, EMSD has inspected 5 491 shops, with over 98% of them found compliant with the requirements of MEELS. Regarding the irregularities, the Department has issued 59 prohibition notices, most of which were related to non-listed models or no label being affixed while two were related to incorrect information on the energy labels. Moreover, six suppliers were prosecuted and convicted.

The Government conducted preliminary studies in 2011 and 2014 to ascertain that the first and second phases of MEELS had achieved the desired results. Moreover, as the replacement cycle of prescribed products is near completion, the Government will conduct a comprehensive review of the effectiveness of the first and second phases of MEELS in 2017-2018 to ascertain the actual amount of energy saved and whether the Scheme has changed the consumption behaviour of consumers. Depending on the review results and development of testing standards, the Government will explore the way forward of MEELS.

As regards whether the Government has any plan to include other products in MEELS, the Government strives to use products of high energy efficiency in place of the ones with low efficiency and keep abreast of the application of the latest energy conservation technology in products commonly used in daily life, as well as promoting high energy efficiency products to the public. In considering the inclusion of products in MEELS, we take into account many factors, including overseas experience, international testing standards, testing laboratories, energy consumption, energy saving potential and stakeholders' views. The scope of the third phase of MEELS will be extended to cover cooking and water heating appliances. The Government will consider continuing to expand the scope in respect of these two aspects to include, for example, rice cookers, microwave ovens and other cooking and water heating appliances.

Meanwhile, given the changes in the market of lighting devices and the rapid development and growing prevalence of LED lights in recent years, the Government will also study the feasibility of inclusion of LED lights in MEELS.

A Member asked why MEELS does not cover products for commercial use. The existing Building Energy Code formulated under the Buildings Energy Efficiency Ordinance sets out the energy efficiency design standards for four types of major building services installations, covering air-conditioning facilities, electrical installations, lighting devices, and lifts and escalators. As the electricity consumption of these four types of installations accounts for about 80% of the total consumption of commercial and office buildings, enhancement of energy efficiency of these four types of installations will help reduce the overall electricity consumption of commercial buildings.

Moreover, the existing Voluntary Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme covers products and office equipment which fall outside the regulatory scope of the Ordinance, such as computers, hot/cold bottled water dispensers, LCD monitors, photocopiers, fax machines, multifunction devices and printers.

Members have mentioned the importance they attach to publicity. The Government has organized many publicity activities to promote MEELS to the public and the industry. These activities include announcing the introduction of the Scheme on government websites, issuing letters to inform and remind importers and retailers of the implementation of the Scheme, distributing promotional pamphlets and posters to the industry and the public, publishing articles in periodicals, as well as holding promotional events in exhibitions and schools. Moreover, every year we organize a seminar for the industry to brief relevant suppliers of the statutory requirements. We have paid visits to retailers, done publicity on television and radio stations, distributed pamphlets and posters in various public housing estates and District Offices of the Home Affairs Department, set up a dedicated website, placed bus body and tram body advertisements, etc. We will strive to explore more publicity channels to strengthen promotion of MEELS to the public and the industry.

To collect views from stakeholders, a three-month consultation exercise was conducted on the industry and stakeholders, including trade associations, importers, testing laboratories, professional bodies, government departments, universities and public organizations, from mid-March 2015 to end of June 2015. We also consulted the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Subcommittee in

March and November 2015 and the Legislative Council Panel on Environment in January 2016, as well as setting up a task force with involvement of various trade associations and the Consumer Council to draw up the details of implementation of the third phase of MEELS. The industry was consulted on the proposed amendments to the code and transitional arrangements from December 2016 to February 2017.

As regards the transitional arrangements for MEELS, after the amendment of the Ordinance, in the preparatory stage of the third phase, manufactures and importers have to arrange for their products to be tested and submit information. We propose a 18-month grace period after the passage of the Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Products) Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2017 ("Amendment Order"), consistent with the practices employed in implementing the first and second phases of MEELS. Importers or local manufacturers of televisions, storage type water heaters, induction cookers and washing machines (with rated washing capacity from 7 to 10 kg) can apply to EMSD for energy labels during the grace period and affix them to the products after being assigned reference numbers. For room air conditioners of the reverse cycle type, in the grace period, the products should carry energy labels of the cooling only type or the reverse cycle type. Importers or local manufacturers can provide information on the energy performance of the products' heating function to EMSD within the grace period. After EMSD has amended the record of listed models, labels on the products can be replaced with those of the reverse cycle type. At the end of the grace period, all products supplied on the market must comply with the requirements of submission of information and specifications of labels stipulated in the Ordinance.

After the Legislative Council has passed the Amendment Order, the Government will introduce another order for negative vetting to provide for the energy label requirements and other details for such products.

I have also taken note of Members' questions about whether the two power plants can implement more energy saving measures. Through the new scheme of control agreements, we have requested the two power companies to set up funds for promoting energy conservation among the public.

With these remarks, President, I hope all Members will pass the Amendment Order. Thank you, President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by the Secretary for the Environment be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for five minutes.

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

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Mr James TO, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mrs Regina IP, Ms Claudia MO, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Helena WONG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr POON Siu-ping, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr HUI Chi-fung and Mr LUK Chung-hung voted for the motion.

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

THE PRESIDENT announced that there were 37 Members present, 36 were in favour of the motion. Since the question was agreed by a majority of the Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was passed.

NEXT MEETING

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now adjourn the meeting until 11:00 am on Wednesday 22 November 2017.

Adjourned accordingly at 7:53 pm.