

OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Thursday, 12 April 2018

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 TOMMY CHEUNG YU-YAN, G.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.

THE HONOURABLE KWOK WAI-KEUNG, J.P.

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.

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.

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

THE HONOURABLE HO KAI-MING

THE HONOURABLE LAM CHEUK-TING

THE HONOURABLE HOLDEN CHOW HO-DING

THE HONOURABLE SHIU KA-FAI

THE HONOURABLE SHIU KA-CHUN

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

THE HONOURABLE YUNG HOI-YAN

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

DR THE HONOURABLE CHENG CHUNG-TAI

THE HONOURABLE KWONG CHUN-YU

THE HONOURABLE JEREMY TAM MAN-HO

THE HONOURABLE GARY FAN KWOK-WAI

THE HONOURABLE AU NOK-HIN

THE HONOURABLE VINCENT CHENG WING-SHUN, M.H.

THE HONOURABLE TONY TSE WAI-CHUEN, B.B.S.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

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

DR THE HONOURABLE KWOK KA-KI

THE HONOURABLE DENNIS KWOK WING-HANG

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

DR THE HONOURABLE PIERRE CHAN

THE HONOURABLE LAU KWOK-FAN, M.H.

PUBLIC OFFICERS ATTENDING:

MR TSE CHIN-WAN, B.B.S., J.P.
UNDER SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, AND
SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

THE HONOURABLE JOHN LEE KA-CHIU, S.B.S., P.D.S.M., J.P.
SECRETARY FOR SECURITY

CLERKS IN ATTENDANCE:

MS ANITA SIT, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

MISS FLORA TAI YIN-PING, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

MS DORA WAI, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

MEMBERS' MOTIONS

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Good morning. Debate on the motion with no legislative effect. This Council will now proceed with the motion debate on "Promoting the popularization of electric vehicles".

Members who wish to speak on the motion will please press the "Request to speak" button.

I now call upon Mr Frankie YICK to speak and move the motion.

PROMOTING THE POPULARIZATION OF ELECTRIC VEHICLES

MR FRANKIE YICK (in Cantonese): President, today I am very glad to have the chance to move the motion on "Promoting the popularization of electric vehicles" at long last. First of all, I must make it clear that I do not intend to market any particular type of environment-friendly vehicles. But we should keep abreast of the global trend, so I would say that electric vehicles ("EVs") are more advanced in development than other types of environment-friendly vehicles, and they are also more suited to the environment in Hong Kong. I hope that if there emerge any types of vehicles which are even more environment-friendly in the future, the Government can likewise roll out active policies to support and dovetail with their development, so as to further improve roadside air quality.

The threat posed by air pollution to the environment and human health is beyond any doubt. Statistics of the World Health Organization show that air pollution takes away as many as 7 million precious human lives every year. Human lives aside, air pollution also causes enormous economic losses. As measured by the Hedley Environmental Index of the University of Hong Kong, the total economic losses caused by air pollution in Hong Kong last month amounted to \$2.1 billion. Based on this figure, the total economic losses a year are estimated to be \$25.2 billion.

Emissions of fuel-engined vehicles have long been regarded as a source of air pollution. Hence, many European countries, such as Norway, the Netherlands, Germany, France and the United Kingdom, and even China in Asia, have announced that they will ban the sale of fuel-engined vehicles from 2025 onwards. Many vehicle manufacturers have also said that they will invest more

resources in the research and development of a new-generation of EVs with zero-emissions. It is thus obvious that the production of EVs is now the general development direction of the global automobile industry. In contrast, the Government's efforts to promote the popularization of EVs have not been strong enough.

As early as 1994, the First Registration Tax ("FRT") for EVs was already waived in Hong Kong. The Steering Committee on the Promotion of Electric Vehicles, chaired by the Financial Secretary, was subsequently established in 2009 with the objective of making Hong Kong one of the places in Asia that sees the most extensive use of EVs. The Committee also set down the target of attaining a rate of 30% for EVs and hybrid vehicles in the total number of private cars by 2020. But as at February this year, there were only some 11 000 EVs in Hong Kong, representing less than 2% of all registered vehicles in the territory, and falling far short of the government target.

To encourage car owners to purchase EVs, the Government offers FRT concessions and lower vehicle licence fees for EVs. But still, the use of EVs in Hong Kong has never become any major trend. The main reason is that the prices of EVs cannot meet market expectations, and there is a shortage of ancillary facilities. The desire of car owners to purchase of EVs is thus affected.

The Office of The Ombudsman has looked into the Government's planning and provision of ancillary facilities for electric private cars. The findings announced last year show that the shortage of charging facilities has impeded the extensive use of EVs in Hong Kong. As at late February 2018, there were totally 1 862 EV chargers in Hong Kong. Though these charging facilities are already spread across all the 18 districts in various buildings, shopping malls and hotels, there is still the problem of uneven distribution. What is more, only some 300 of them, or less than 2% of all charging facilities, are quick chargers. Car owners who use the rest of the charging facilities must spend several hours on charging their vehicles. In brief, the existing facilities are simply unable to cope with the needs of the 10 000 or so EVs in Hong Kong.

The shortage of charging facilities aside, parking spaces with charging facilities are often misused. For instance, there is a measure of giving priority to EVs in using the parking spaces with charging facilities at the Star Ferry Car Park in Central, but these spaces are very often occupied by fuel-engined vehicles. The Government says that since public charging facilities are only meant as a

kind of support, EV owners should perform daily charging at home or in the workplace. Some private buildings completed after April 2011 indeed provide parking spaces with charging facilities for EVs. But in the case of certain old housing estates, the retrofitting of charging facilities is not only expensive but also very difficult. Residential buildings in Hong Kong are regulated by provisions of the Buildings Ordinance, deeds of mutual covenant and tenancy agreements. If charging facilities are to be retrofitted to a building, approval must be sought from the owners' corporation. There was in fact a case in which the car owners concerned were required to take out additional third party insurance, conduct electricity load assessment and sign agreements with solicitor, but in the end, after one whole year, they still failed to get the approval of the owners' corporation.

The Government says that the major source of roadside air pollutants is commercial vehicles. But since commercial vehicles must operate longer hours and there are the constraints imposed by the local climate and relief, any electric commercial vehicles to be introduced must satisfy very stringent technical requirements. Hence, although the Government offers full FRT exemption and has set up the Pilot Green Transport Fund to subsidize the introduction of EVs by interested parties, the use of electric commercial vehicles has still remained largely at the trial stage. A few years ago, the taxi sector voluntarily launched a trial scheme involving the use of 48 electric taxis. But the trial eventually fell flat, as the electric taxis concerned could not cope with actual operating needs. Also, the 36 electric franchised buses purchased with full government subsidy are still on trial runs.

President, the Government has not put in place a satisfactory mechanism for the recycling or disposal of waste car batteries either. At present, there are about 800 000 vehicles throughout the territory. Given a battery lifespan of three to four years, there should be more than 200 000 batteries to be recycled or disposed of each year. However, when the Government replied to my question on 14 December 2016, it said that the waste car batteries recycled by qualified recyclers numbered only 50 000 or so a year, and the remaining 100 000 or so batteries might have been dumped in landfills without undergoing any proper treatment. If this is the case, the toxic substances in such batteries will cause enormous environmental damage. If the Government does not actively tackle the problem of waste car batteries now, it will only find this problem more difficult to solve when EVs come into wide use in the future.

Furthermore, the technical know-how of electric vehicle repairs is highly exclusive at present, with the result that vehicle repairs workshops in the community can only provide very limited repairs services. Vehicle owners are in effect forced to send their EVs back to the manufacturers for repairs and maintenance. This results in longer repairs time on the one hand, and higher repairs costs on the other. If the Government does not dovetail with the development trend of EVs and make it mandatory for EV suppliers to disclose the technical know-how and provide training to the people concerned in good time, car owners will only stay away from EVs due to the shortage of repairs services.

President, since the use of EVs with zero-emission is an inevitable trend and they can help mitigate the harm of air pollution, let me make some suggestions on promoting their popularity here.

First, to promote the popularization of EVs, the Government should comprehensively review the relevant policies. It should enhance the function of the Steering Committee on the Promotion of Electric Vehicles, and turn it into a central coordinating body with actual power to execute and oversee the measures of promoting EVs. The Committee's actual execution power should be enhanced, with the aim of enabling it to achieve various intermediate targets covering the number of EVs, the supply of charging facilities for EVs and the provision of repairs services for EVs.

Next, the Government must actively enhance the charging facilities for EVs, so as to dispel people's concern. The Government should quicken the pace of upgrading the existing standard and medium chargers to quick chargers. As the chargers for EVs produced in different countries adopt different standards, the authorities must explore how best to provide a greater number of multi-standard charging units.

As for widening the network of charging facilities, besides continuing with the installation of charging facilities in the car parks of existing government properties and public housing estates, the Government can learn from the Japanese experience of retrofitting charging facilities to petrol stations with adequate space. Besides, it can also study the German experience of modifying lamp posts to make them also serve as charging posts. We hear that the Environmental Protection Department is doing tests on outdoor chargers. If some roadside metered parking spaces can be provided with charging posts, the network of chargers can be expanded substantially.

To tackle the misuse of parking spaces with charging facilities, the authorities can conduct site inspections. If contraventions of rules are found or if complaints are received, the vehicles concerned should be impounded. And, in case a vehicle does not leave the parking space long after charging, the Government can consider the current practice of EV suppliers to impose fees and charges on non-compliant drivers, so as to eradicate parking space squatting.

Furthermore, the Government should review the Buildings Ordinance. At present, if an EV owner wants to retrofit a charger to an old building, he must follow the standard legal procedures of amending the deed of mutual covenant. The application procedures are complicated, requiring consultation with the management company and property owners, a system review, and the hiring of a contractor to conduct site investigations and write up a project proposal. And, the proposal must then be subject to vetting, amendment and approval by the owners' corporation at its meetings. All this will easily take several months. Hence, the authorities must streamline the relevant application procedures to enhance the efficiency of the vetting and approval process.

To dovetail with the development of EVs, the authorities already amended the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines in 2011, proposing that 30% of the private car parking spaces in newly completed buildings should be equipped with charging facilities. Since the use of EVs is an inevitable trend, they will only keep growing in number. The Government should make the provision of EV charging infrastructure facilities mandatory for all parking spaces in newly completed commercial/residential buildings, so as to avoid the difficulties in retrofitting charging facilities parking spaces when the available supply fails to meet the demand in the future.

The batteries of the first batch of EVs in Hong Kong will be due for decommissioning very soon. The Government should expeditiously formulate and implement a satisfactory recycling mechanism for EV batteries. Generally speaking, decommissioned batteries will still have up to 70% of their capacity, and they may have a lifespan of seven years if properly handled. Also, such batteries contain huge quantities of lithium, which can be processed and turned into new lithium batteries. So, their recycle value is quite high. If they are simply dumped in landfills instead of being recycled, huge waste of resources will result, and the environment will also suffer serious damage.

President, there is a lack of comprehensive EV-related courses in Hong Kong. Young people who are interested to join the occupation can hardly receive any quality training. I propose that the authorities should encourage tertiary institutions to offer courses of design, scientific research, and maintenance related to EVs, so as to nurture different types of talents for the EV industry, and in turn create favourable conditions for the promotion of EVs and the development of EV paraphernalia industries.

The popularization of electric commercial vehicles hinges on the Government's willingness to put in resources to subsidize the purchase of electric commercial vehicles and the installation of charging facilities. And, such success stories can easily be found in Europe, the United States and China. For instance, from 1 January this year, all new black taxis in the United Kingdom must be EVs. The Transport for London of the United Kingdom will spend £18 million on installing new fast-charging facilities which can fully charge a black electric taxi in just several minutes. Our neighbouring city Shenzhen also set up an EV support fund with RMB5 billion as early as three years ago, with the aim of helping to phase out the 4 500 fuel-engined taxis and promoting the development of electric taxis.

EV prices have remained uncompetitive so far, and this is a major reason why car owners do not want to buy EVs. Since the Government cancelled the full FRT exemption for electric private vehicles, the number of electric private cars registered for the first time has plummeted. But I support the Government's decision to cap the FRT exemption for electric private vehicles. If full exemption continues, car manufacturers will not voluntarily lower EV prices. As a matter of fact, some low-priced EVs have started to emerge in the market. With the popularization of EVs, their prices will certainly drop. The Liberal Party has also asked the Government to consider raising the \$97,500 ceiling in FRT exemption to induce more people to purchase EVs, but the Government prefers to maintain the current level.

To contain the number of vehicles, the Government has launched the "one-for-one replacement" scheme, under which the buyer of a new electric private car who scraps his old fuel-engined private car can enjoy an FRT concession of up to \$250,000. But his old car must be aged six years or above, and he must have owned it for at least three years. In response to criticisms that the conditions are too harsh, the Financial Secretary has publicly explained that the conditions are meant to prevent second-hand car speculation and misuse of

public money. I understand what the Financial Secretary means. But I think if we are to achieve greater effect in encouraging car owners to switch to EVs, the scheme should be further improved. I hope the Government can heed more public views and then make appropriate adjustment, so as to answer people's demands and attain the policy objective more quickly. President, I so submit.

Mr Frankie YICK moved the following motion: (Translation)

"That, since the global awareness of environmental protection has been rising and emission from fuel-engined vehicles is one of the main sources of air pollution, the governments of various countries, including China, Norway, Germany and the United Kingdom, have announced the prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles successively after 2025; meanwhile, the biggest vehicle manufacturer in the world has indicated that it will completely cease the production of fuel-engined vehicles in 2050, and various vehicle manufacturers have also indicated that they will inject more resources into the research and development of new-generation zero-emission electric vehicles ('EVs'), thus evident that the production of EVs has become the general direction of the development of the automobile industry worldwide; the SAR Government has waived the first registration tax for EVs for more than 20 years since 1994, but as at end of August 2017, the result has been unsatisfactory with only 11 033 EVs in Hong Kong, accounting for 1.3% of the total number of registered vehicles in the territory; to further promote the popularization of EVs, this Council urges the SAR Government to:

- (1) comprehensively review the policy on the promotion of EVs and set phased targets for such promotion;
- (2) amend the relevant provisions of the Buildings Ordinance to mandate the provision of charging facilities for charging EVs at all parking spaces in newly constructed commercial and residential buildings;
- (3) review the provision of ancillary facilities for charging EVs, including conducting a study on retrofitting the existing car parks in government properties and public housing estates, on-street parking spaces and public car parks with charging facilities for EVs;

- (4) in light of the successive replacement of batteries of registered EVs, formulate expeditiously a mechanism for the recycling and disposal of waste vehicle batteries, so as to prevent such batteries containing toxic substances from being dumped at landfills, causing serious perils to the environment and ecology; and
- (5) incentivize tertiary institutions to offer programmes on the design, scientific research, maintenance, etc. of EVs for nurturing talents for the EV industry, so as to assist Hong Kong in developing the industry of EVs or EV parts."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Mr Frankie YICK be passed.

Eight Members will move amendments to this motion. This Council will conduct a joint debate on the motion and the amendments.

I will call upon Members who move the amendments to speak in the following order: Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Ms Tanya CHAN and Dr Junius HO; but they may not move amendments at this stage.

MR KENNETH LEUNG (in Cantonese): President, I thank Mr Frankie YICK for moving this motion on "Promoting the popularization of electric vehicles", which will win the support from Members of all political parties and groups in this Council.

According to the statistics produced by the World Health Organization, exposure to outdoor air pollution is the direct cause of death of an average of 3 million people globally every year. As revealed in another statistical survey conducted by the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry of Japan, in the few decades from 1999 to 2035, global greenhouse gas emissions from different modes of transport will account for 22% of the total greenhouse gas emissions, and carbon dioxide emissions will increase by 1.75 times. This is one of the very astonishing figures we have. Under the Paris Agreement, the global temperature rise must be contained within a certain limit. Therefore, if we

cannot curb the growth in the number of fuel-engined vehicles in Hong Kong, and if we fail to replace fuel-engined vehicles completely with electric vehicles, disastrous effects will be caused to the planet Earth in such aspects as public health and its biodiversity.

If we look back into the past, we will notice that the SAR Government has actually started promoting the use of electric vehicles quite a number of years ago. In the 2009 Policy Address, a long term policy objective was announced by the then Chief Executive Donald TSANG to popularize electric vehicles, aiming to make Hong Kong one of the places in Asia where electric vehicles are most widely used. In the 2011 Policy Address, the SAR Government indicated that it would strive to increase the proportion of electric vehicles to 30% of the total number of registered private cars in Hong Kong by 2020. These are objectives set in previous policy addresses, and shall the relevant initiatives be shelved after a new term of Government has replaced the previous one? I do not think we should give them up simply because a new Government has been formed.

With regard to LEUNG Chun-ying's Government of the last term, it has also indicated in paragraph 152 of the 2014 Policy Address that the Government would purchase more electric vehicles, and the Chief Executive and the Principal Officials would take the lead in using them on a trial basis. This is a very simple objective, which aims only at requiring Principal Officials to use electric vehicles, but as revealed in a news report published last month, it seems that the Government's words are really not matched by its deeds. It is not a difficult thing for the Government to purchase electric vehicles, and it has been over four years since the announcement of the above measure, but we can only find the Secretary for the Environment WONG Kam-sing using an electric vehicle. We can easily find out what vehicles Principal Officials are using, since they are often required to attend meetings held in this Council or in other places.

The Government's policy on electric vehicles has been put in place for quite a number of years, and vigorous efforts have sometimes been made in taking the policy forward, but generally speaking, I think the Government has failed to formulate long-term objectives for the policy. First of all, what proportion does the Government want electric vehicles represent in the total number of registered vehicles in future? Secondly, has the Government formulated a longer term objective to replace fuel-engined vehicles completely or largely with electric vehicles? Certainly, given the current technology, it would

not be possible to replace certain fuel-engined heavy goods vehicles and large vehicles completely with electric ones for the time being, but reference should be made to practices adopted in other countries or places. Although a total ban on the use of fuel-engined vehicles has not been imposed, Norway has announced two years ago the prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles from 2025, and the same measure will be implemented in the Netherland and France in 2025 and 2040 respectively. Does the SAR Government have any vision for the future in this respect? If so, can a genuine timetable be prepared for this purpose? What the matter involves is a major policy and blueprint.

As for other policy details, there are a few points I would like to mention. Firstly, the first and foremost requirement for promoting the use of electric vehicles is to ensure adequate provision of charging and ancillary facilities by the Government for use by owners of electric vehicles. Under the general international trend, the global growth rate of public charging facilities for electric vehicles in 2016 alone is 72%. In contrast, according to a statistical survey conducted by the Office of The Ombudsman on the provision of parking spaces or charging facilities for electric vehicles, in the five-year period from 2011 to 2016, the number of public chargers for electric vehicles in Hong Kong has only increased from 872 to 1 518. It is a pity that the number of public chargers provided is very limited, and the growth rate in the five-year period was not even double. Among the public chargers provided, most are slow chargers while some are medium ones, and it will usually take eight hours to have an electric vehicle fully recharged with a slow charger.

According to the statistical figures relating to public charging facilities, the name used by the Government to identify slow chargers is "standard chargers", and there are now 915 standard chargers, 605 medium chargers and 326 quick chargers. I hope the Government will expeditiously raise the slow charging speed of standard chargers to medium and even quick level, and conduct a trial scheme on the provision of medium or quick chargers in metered parking spaces for use by vehicle owners. It is hoped that the Government will take early actions to put the above proposals into practice.

Secondly, with regard to the provision of charging facilities in buildings, I think we should all know that many old residential or commercial buildings are not provided with charging facilities for electric vehicles, but their occupiers are willing to install charging facilities at their own expense. In this connection, I first of all hope that the Government will provide them with more technical

support in this respect. Secondly, the Government should examine the possibility of providing certain incentives, such as the granting of loans, since these are what the Government can do within its capability. Thirdly, as the installation of charging facilities in domestic premises involves a lot of legal matters, and technical requirements under the Buildings Ordinance or deeds of mutual covenant have to be met, I hope the Government will set up a dedicated team to provide expeditious assistance to residents in handling such technical issues.

In the 2017 Budget, the Financial Secretary capped the first registration tax concession for electric vehicles at \$97,500, which was further relaxed subsequently, and the launching of a "one-for-one replacement" scheme has even been announced in the current year. However, how great the impact will this "one-for-one replacement" scheme have on the sale of electric vehicles remains unknown so far, and I hope further adjustments can be made by the Financial Secretary next year to the maximum amount of first registration tax concession for electric vehicles.

In addition, I hope a clear objective will be set by the Government for the proportion of electric vehicles among the total number of registered vehicles in Hong Kong, in order to set out a long-term planning vision in this regard. With the formulation of a clear percentage for this purpose, there will be a major blueprint for consumers or members of the public to follow. I also hope that an announcement will be made by the Government to inform the public whether it will propose a concrete date for the prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles, and if so, in which year will the measure be implemented?

MR CHARLES PETER MOK (in Cantonese): President, first of all, I thank Mr Frankie YICK for moving this motion. Although this debate has been delayed for half a year, the biggest problem is not the delay, but the lack of progress or improvement in the government policy, irrespective of the debate being held six months ago or six months later. We have given the Government six more months to work on this issue, but it has not done anything.

In regard to the development of electric vehicles ("EVs"), it has been discussed by the Legislative Council on different occasions. In these discussions, they all come to a main point, and that is, how serious is the Government in promoting EVs. With the technology getting more and more

mature, EVs will certainly replace the traditional fuel-engined vehicles. In July last year, Bloomberg New Energy Finance released a report on the automobile industry, and it predicted that in 2038, the number of EVs will surpass that of fuel-engined vehicles. It is also estimated in the report from UBS, an investment bank, that in 2025, among the vehicles sold in the whole world, one out of six vehicles will be EV, and 2025 is actually just a few years away.

Seven years ago or in 2011, the Hong Kong Government set a target for the popularization of EVs and highlighted that by 2020, 30% of private cars would be EVs or hybrid cars. At that time, this policy was rather forward looking. But at the end, nothing has been done. In 2015, the former Central Policy Unit released a study report which said that Hong Kong was the most suitable place in the whole world to use EVs. But to date, EVs only account for less than 2% of the private cars in Hong Kong. The policy of the Environment Bureau in promoting EVs absolutely needs a review.

One of the major sources for the serious roadside air pollution in Hong Kong is private cars. While some foreign countries have already planned for the prohibition of sale of gasoline and diesel vehicles, how can Hong Kong be so laid-back and relaxed about it? Norway, the Netherlands, the United States, Germany, India, France, the United Kingdom and Taiwan have already announced the timetable for the total prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles. The above countries and places will gradually prohibit the sale of fuel-engined vehicles between 2025 and 2040. While others have started to reduce the prices of EVs and assist their societies in accelerating the use of EVs, Hong Kong is going against the tide. Last year, it abolished the tax concessions for EVs. Hong Kong was taking the lead originally, but is now lagging behind. Even Mainland China has already begun studying the timetable for the prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles. Among China, Hong Kong, Taiwan and Macao, although I am not very clear about the situation of Macao, it is very likely that Hong Kong is falling the farthest behind.

In February 2017, the Financial Secretary, Mr Paul CHAN, announced the abolition of all tax concessions for EVs. In April last year, the Government abolished the full waiver of first registration tax for EVs and instead capped their first registration tax concession at \$97,500. According to the figures of the Transport Department in 2017, for the first registration of EVs, the number dropped substantially. Compared with 2 078 vehicles from April to December 2016, during the same period in 2017, the figure has dropped to only a double-digit number of 99 vehicles. On the contrary, for the first registration of

fuel-engined vehicles, the number has conspicuously risen. The Government says it is worried that there will be more and more private cars running on the streets. But we have to understand that if the Government increases the tax payable by vehicle owners in the purchase of EVs, they will turn back to purchasing fuel-engined vehicles. I already mentioned this fact as early as last year, but the Government does not believe it. This outcome is now reflected in the figures. The policy is unable to suppress the overall growth of private cars. Instead, it has made the situation even worse, as the private cars that the drivers want to buy have switched back from EVs to fuel-engined vehicles, thus aggravating the air pollution problem due to more emissions from private cars plying on the streets. This is the problem that I raised as early as last year, but the Government is simply intransigent.

The prices and charging facilities of EVs have been the issues of our concern. We also think that if the policy of Hong Kong is not well implemented, Hong Kong's ability to keep abreast of the times and attain the zero-emission target in the future will be affected. Mr Kenneth LEUNG's amendment suggests setting a target proportion of EVs (including electric private cars and electric commercial vehicles) among registered vehicles in Hong Kong, while Mr HUI Chi-fung also suggests conducting a study on setting a target year for phasing out fuel-engined vehicles completely. I think the Government really has to set a target instead of procrastinating year after year, taking two steps forward and then three steps back, as this can never achieve the policy objective.

In the Budget this year, the "one-for-one replacement" Scheme is proposed. Since it is the replacement of one old car by a new EV, there should not be an increase in the number of vehicles on the streets. But as I read on, there are more and more restrictions. For example, the car owners are required to own the old cars for over three years. On the one hand, the Government says that it will promote the popularization of EVs, but on the other hand, the threshold is set at such a high level. To a car owner who is considering of buying a new car, since the money is in his pockets, with the same amount of money, he would rather buy a fuel-engined vehicle. Hence, the Government must keep an eye on the effectiveness of the scheme. The Government has just released a figure. After the announcement of the policy, 11 applications were received and, according to the authorities, were all approved as well. Eleven is a rather tiny figure. Compared with the sale of over 2 000 vehicles within eight to nine months in 2016, we can understand how small that figure is.

In fact, EVs are growing with popularity in Hong Kong in recent years, but the charging facilities concerned cannot catch up with the growth. In such a short period of five years, while the number of charging spaces for EVs has increased by 78%, the number of newly registered EVs has increased by more than 30 folds. On average, there is only one charging space to serve six EVs. According to the figures from the Environmental Protection Department, among the current 1 862 chargers, 701 are medium chargers and over 300 are quick chargers. In other words, nearly half of them are standard or slow chargers.

While the number of charging spaces, mostly equipped with slow chargers, is small, they are also often occupied by fuel-engined vehicles. The charging spaces are thus always unavailable, and the EV drivers are often seen to be waiting at the car parks. Since 2011, the Government has been granting gross floor area concessions to developers so as to encourage them to provide additional charging facilities in private car parks in new property developments. However, there is no mandatory requirement on the building management for power supply, rendering the facilities only for window dressing purpose. According to the explanation from the public officer, the facilities can provide service once they are technically ready. What a joke indeed. The technical guidance must move with the times.

Many countries have already turned their gas stations into charging stations, and have also started studying how charging facilities can be directly plugged to the sockets installed in street lamp posts. The Government must consider how to increase the number of chargers and charging speed so as to facilitate charging by EV owners. According to the Government, the chargers in public car parks are merely supporting facilities and it will not invest heavily in this area due to the low proportion of EVs. On the one hand, the Government says that it has to promote EVs, but on the other hand, there is a lack of supporting facilities. Is it schizophrenic? Not only is it schizophrenic, but it is also not practising what it preaches. As the policy backfires, the Government is even suspected of being tilted in favour of some gasoline vehicle dealers or oil companies.

Since the Government has to promote Hong Kong as a smart city, it should make the best use of its existing venues and planning. In addition to installing medium EV chargers to some upgraded public facilities, such as the new generation of roadside parking meters and smart lamp posts, more outdoor

charging stations should be provided. The policy is effective only when more car owners are willing to switch to EVs.

I recognize the various suggestions in Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok's amendment, which include supporting the industry to promote the study in this area. Mr CHAN Hak-kan's amendment suggests launching an official mobile application for EVs, but I hope that the Government will really open the data instead of launching official mobile applications. I will not oppose Mr CHAN's suggestion, but actually, opening of data is more important. Since no one downloads the applications written by the Government, it should not waste any money and time.

In sum, the Government must set a policy objective and consider how to at least double the number of electric private cars and commercial vehicles by 2030. It must have an objective and cannot muddle through the business with its present attitude.

President, I expect to have a common policy objective from the Environment Bureau, the Development Bureau, the Transport and Housing Bureau and even the Innovation and Technology Bureau in the promotion of EVs. If the policy of promoting EVs continues to be so confused and disordered with the buck passing among the departments concerned, and it is unfortunate that the buck finally falls onto the Environment Bureau, the target of zero-emission will not be achieved even by 2040.

Thank you, President.

IR DR LO WAI-KWOK (in Cantonese): President, the original motion moved by Mr Frankie YICK seeks to urge the Government to comprehensively review its policy and further promote the popularization of electric vehicles ("EVs"). I trust that the majority of Members agree to this. Therefore, the amendments proposed respectively by myself and Members belonging to different political parties are basically in line with the direction set in the original motion that they are only meant to supplement some of the specific policy initiatives proposed therein.

President, according to the Paris Agreement, all member parties are required to propose targets for voluntary reduction in emission of greenhouse gases which should be reviewed and updated every five years in order to curb the trend of global warming. EVs, having no tailpipe emissions, can help improve roadside air quality and so the Government has been proactively promoting the use of EVs in the past. It has also put in place concessionary measures for EVs regarding taxation and licence fees, in particular the first registration tax full waiver for EVs introduced since 1994. It is shown in the Administration paper submitted to the Panel on Environmental Affairs of this Council on 26 February this year that the number of registered EVs in Hong Kong was less than 100 as at the end of 2010, but it has increased to 10 856 as at the end of January 2018, of which 10 453 being electric private cars, accounting only for 1.7% of the total number of registered private cars. This means that there is still considerable room for promoting the use of EVs.

However, since the Government announced in the 2017-2018 Budget its decision of imposing a ceiling to cap the first registration tax concessions for electric private cars at \$97,500, the number of newly registered electric private cars, which used to grow persistently, has dropped significantly. The industry is rather disappointed.

President, this issue has been high on the agenda of the Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong ("BPA"). I have met with members of relevant sectors to listen to their demands and views. In BPA's 65 recommendations made to the Government on the Budget of this year, we have expressly urged the authorities to suitably adjust upward the cap on the first registration tax concession for electric private cars while granting first registration tax waiver to vehicle owners seeking to replace their old pre-Euro IV diesel commercial vehicles. In the meantime, I also proposed at the aforesaid meeting of the Panel on Environmental Affairs that the Government might consider the option of offering financial concessions for "one-for-one" replacement and raise the cap on first registration tax concession in a bid to encourage car owners to replace their fuel-engined private cars with EVs.

I am pleased to see that the SAR Government has taken on board our views and acted accordingly in that it announces in its latest budget that the provision of first registration tax concession capped at \$97,500 will continue, alongside the introduction of the "one-for-one replacement" scheme, under which eligible existing car owners who arrange to scrap and de-register their own eligible old

private cars and then first register a new electric private car to enjoy a higher first registration tax concession cap up to \$250,000. I believe these initiatives will be well-received by all quarters of society.

Yet, as I had emphasized when meeting with members of relevant sectors, we just cannot excessively rely on the Government's tax concessions for EVs in the long run. Instead, we should focus on Hong Kong's overall transport development strategy and complement with market needs as well as technological development in order to enhance the cost-effectiveness of EVs and other environment-friendly vehicles, so that consumers will find switching to EVs an attractive option.

At the current stage, EVs used in Hong Kong are still mainly electric private cars, which accounted for 96.3% of the total number of the 10 856 registered EVs mentioned above. Therefore, I think that the authorities should comprehensively review the development strategy for environment-friendly vehicles in Hong Kong and make timely adjustments to the policy on the promotion of EVs in response to changes in the market and technology. I trust that all quarters of society are in favour of development of green transport in Hong Kong. In fact, the first registration tax full waiver for electric commercial vehicles will continue. Meanwhile, the Government has allocated \$180 million for procurement of 36 single-deck electric buses by franchised bus companies for trial.

The Government established in March 2011 the \$300 million Pilot Green Transport Fund ("the Fund") and I had been a member of its steering committee. Of the 118 trials approved under the Fund, 56 involved electric commercial vehicles. Regrettably, only a limited number of models of electric commercial vehicles are available in Hong Kong for the time being, of which the performance is far from satisfactory in terms of carrying capacity and price competitiveness. With the improvements in EV technologies in future, the authorities should step up efforts to promote the use of commercial electric vehicles then.

President, the major obstacle currently facing the popularization of EVs in Hong Kong lies not in the levels of tax concessions but that the various supporting facilities have fallen behind development. For example, the current ratio of various types of charging facilities to EVs is 1:7, reflecting a serious shortage of such facilities. I opine that the authorities should examine the

relevant provisions of the Buildings Ordinance to propose that charging facilities for charging EVs must be provided at all parking spaces in newly constructed commercial and residential buildings.

You may have noticed that the wording of my amendment differs from that of the original motion moved by Mr Frankie YICK as well as that of the amendments proposed by Mr Kenneth LEUNG and Mr Charles Peter MOK. The three Members use the word "mandate", while I used "propose" instead because in my opinion, mandating installation of charging facilities in commercial and residential buildings is quite a complicated matter and can be rather controversial. Actually, the Government had taken a pragmatic approach in this regard by tightening the granting of concession on gross floor area for private car parks in new buildings from as early as April 2011 to encourage developers to provide the EV charging-enabling infrastructure. However, I will still respect it if the word "mandate" used by the above Members is approved by the Council today. After all, the Government steps up its efforts in addressing the problem of insufficient charging facilities is what really matters.

Besides, given that the EV charging facilities currently available for use in the market are mainly standard chargers, I think the authorities should procure those charging facilities that mainly provide medium and quick charging. It is because according to relevant information, the charging efficiency of different types of chargers varies greatly: the standard charging time required for charging of an ordinary EV by using standard, medium and quick chargers is about 25 hours, 10 hours and 1 hour respectively.

President, in the light that the Financial Secretary announced this year that he has generously earmarked an additional sum of over \$50 billion to further speed up the development of innovation and technology as well as scientific research, I consider it necessary that the authorities take corresponding actions to support the industry to develop EV batteries and explore the possibility of interoperability among chargers of various standards, so as to further facilitate the use of EVs. Actually, Hong Kong does have certain achievements on this front: With the funding provided to some organizations (e.g. the Hong Kong Productivity Council) under the Innovation and Technology Fund established by the Government, a significant milestone was achieved upon completion of the 50kW EV charger (quick charger) development. Moreover, the mobilized smart charger for EVs has also come into being. Such research and development outcome will be launched in the market after being commercialized. It takes

only 20 minutes for the battery of an electric private car to be 80% full using the aforesaid quick charger that provides 150 miles of range.

President, following the establishment of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Bay Area ("the Bay Area"), major cross-boundary transport infrastructure like the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge will be commissioned for use and the ideal of "one-hour quality living sphere" is gradually materializing. Hence, the SAR Government should provide support to both the relevant sectors at home and in the Bay Area for collaborative efforts in exploring the possibility of interoperability among chargers of various standards as a specific project to help enhance the Bay Area's infrastructure.

With these remarks, President, I hope Members will support my amendment.

MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, electric vehicles ("EVs") have turned increasingly popular. But what is the role of EVs? In my view, EVs are not purely a product of innovation and technology, let alone a gadget, a toy or a second vehicle for the rich. Rather, they should be a mode of transport which is affordable to car owners and the general public and also a mode of green transport for replacing conventional fuel-engined private cars. So, speaking of any discussion on an EV policy, it will certainly involve a tug-of-war among various stakeholders, such as fuel companies, automotive manufacturers, drivers and the general public. Nevertheless, we should put our emphasis on whom we should speak up for. We should speak up for clean energies and healthy air.

A review of 2017 shows that the total numbers of days with the Air Quality Health Index reaching the "High" and "Serious" levels as recorded at general and roadside air quality monitoring stations were respectively 44 and 55, registering a 70% and 77% increase over the corresponding figures of 26 days and 31 days in the previous year. We are now talking about roadside air quality. People are now facing an increasingly serious problem of inhaling exhaust gas when walking at the roadside in daily life. We certainly do not want to see more vehicles on roads as they will cause traffic congestion. We also understand that the Government's policy is to encourage people to adopt rail and walking instead of driving as the major means of transport. But the reality is that people are facing the problem of deteriorating air quality. I am not talking about the overall air quality. The overall air quality is certainly poor. The Environment Bureau has told us every time that they have done a lot to resolve the air quality problem,

such as imposing more stringent control on berthing vessels. But I am talking about roadside air quality. Improving roadside air quality can bring enormous benefits to people.

The major factor affecting roadside air quality is vehicles. The Government will certainly say that the authorities have also devoted treatment to commercial vehicles, such as requiring them to comply with the lower emission and more stringent standards laid down by the European Union, and also developing and trying out electric buses. These are also evident to the public. But from the objective reality, we can also see that the application of technologies on commercial vehicles (such as buses and lorries) is still not very popular worldwide, in marked contrast to private cars. What is the Hong Kong Government doing when the Governments of various countries are vigorously promoting the use of such technologies?

I am really disgruntled whenever we talk about the measures rolled out by the Hong Kong Government these days. In my view, the Government does not want to make any improvement and lacks any determination when implementing an EV policy. In the case of the previous Budget, for example, the Government was simply retrogressive, in the sense that it proposed to cap the first registration tax ("FRT") concession at \$97,500. The resulting figures are evident to all: The number of newly registered EVs has declined drastically, and the number of fuel-engined vehicles, especially diesel vehicles, has risen. Isn't it a retrogressive measure? How can it achieve the policy objective and the effect of promoting EVs? Has the Government ever come forward and explained to the public what has happened in the past year which has caused the wastage of time and also such a serious degree of retrogression?

Let us look at another common phenomenon. EV owners certainly know—I must declare interest: I am an EV owner who has driven an EV for one year—that they need to wait an hour for using a public fast charging facility and another half an hour or so for recharging their vehicles. This means that they have to spend almost two hours before leaving the venue. Will drivers continue to use EVs? A Member said just now that Secretary WONG Kam-shing was likewise an EV owner. I really want to ask him if he has any experience of queuing up to recharge his vehicle. He may not have this experience as his home is equipped with very good charging facilities. Will any people dare to buy EVs if they have to wait two hours in order to recharge their EVs outside their homes before leaving?

As for the policy objective, the Government has simply refused to take on board the proposal put forth by many Members on setting a target year for phasing out conventional fuel-engined vehicles. One example is the setting of a certain percentage for the number of conventional fuel-engined vehicles three or five years later. Let me stop talking about figures for the time being and discuss the direction, a matter of secondary importance. The Government's policy objective is perhaps to raise the overall proportion of EVs in conventional private cars. I once asked the Secretary about this objective at Panel meetings and also question sessions of Council meetings. But he refused to give any reply. In that case, why should the Government still say that it will promote the development of EVs in Hong Kong?

I have yet to recount another matter involving him. As discovered by the press, bogus charging facilities are installed at car parks of many newly-constructed buildings. While the Government requires property developers to install charging facilities, it has been found that the relevant facilities are not connected to any power source. Subsequently, I once asked the Secretary again how many developers had been granted gross floor area concessions for their shopping malls even though the relevant facilities were not connected to any power source. The Secretary was unable to answer my question, and he was even completely unable to give me any reply whatsoever on the figure concerned, as well as the numbers of parking spaces, shopping malls and locations. How can it possibly be regarded as a measure for promoting EVs?

The Democratic Party is relatively proactive. Our recommendations on the Policy Address also point out that we should achieve the comprehensive use of EVs in Hong Kong and the phasing out of conventional fuel-engined vehicles by 2030 as the target. Let us look at some countries around us. The United Kingdom and France intend to end the sale of diesel and fuel-engined vehicles by 2040, and Paris also plans to impose a total ban on diesel and fuel-engined vehicles by 2030. Just now, a Member described Norway—as Members all know—as the most proactive country in the world. It has laid down the target of zero emissions for all vehicles by 2025.

Let us look at Ontario in Canada. Over recent years, Ontario has striven to promote the use of EVs, and the result is quite good. They offer a concession ranging from HK\$30,000 to HK\$80,000 for new EVs below C\$75,000 (or

HK\$470,000). They also provide a subsidy capped at HK\$6,200 for installing charging stations at EV parking spaces in the workplace. Ontario has introduced many preferential measures. But why has Hong Kong failed to set a target year or introduce similar measures?

The Secretary often says that private cars are not their major target because pollution from private car emissions is not as serious as the pollution caused by commercial vehicles and vessels. For this reason, he says that emissions from vessels and commercial vehicles are rather the most urgent problem in dire need of a solution. But I have always raised one point, the point that we should not purely quantify the pollution problem in our discussion on a green mode of transport and the environmental policy. If people can join, see and benefit from the environmental policy on promoting the use of EVs, their mindset will change. This is good to changing Hong Kong people's awareness of using environmental and energy-saving modes of transport. Therefore, can we foster the development of electric private cars with greater efforts and determination while promoting the development of commercial vehicles?

For these reasons, we have raised some specific proposals, hoping that the Government can lay down a clear policy direction as the first step to encourage people to switch to EVs, so as to increase the proportion of EVs in registered vehicles, promote the general and popular use of EVs, and in turn make EVs price competitive with the same-class conventional fuel-engined vehicles. This is the only way to turn EVs into the first and mainstream option among people in the end.

Therefore, I have also put forth a specific proposal on increasing the FRT concession for purchasing EVs. I also welcome the Government's acceptance of the Democratic Party's view of introducing the one-for-one replacement concession. But this is still not enough. One urgent task at present is to increase the number of public charging stations. And, we propose to set the ratio of charging stations to EVs at 1:5 as the short-term target and immediately build at least 1 150 charging stations. So doing will require a dozen million dollars. Why does the Government want to save this expense?

President, as time is running out, I will end my speech here for the time being. I so submit.

MS YUNG HOI-YAN (in Cantonese): President, in the main, the policy of the SAR Government aims to promote the use of environment-friendly vehicles, including electric vehicles ("EVs"), as a means of helping to reduce roadside air pollution and improve air quality. According to the Background Study on the Promotion of EVs ("the Study") published by the Central Policy Unit in March 2015, Hong Kong is blessed with various unique advantages in promoting the use of EVs. Such advantages include short commuting journeys resulting from its small size, and the Mainland's vigorous development of the EV industry, which can provide strong logistic support for the development of EVs in Hong Kong. Hence, the Study says Hong Kong is the world's most suitable place for using EVs, especially in terms of electric public transport.

For reasons of environmental protection, emissions reduction and the building of a quality living environment, a step-by-step replacement of fuel-engined vehicles and diesel vehicles with EVs is by now an inevitable global trend. As pointed out by the Study, Hong Kong enjoys a number of unique advantages in promoting the use of EVs and is a suitable place for using EVs. Unfortunately, in recent years, the SAR Government's efforts to promote EVs have been criticized for lacking in vigour. The Government has neither deployed sufficient resources nor provided any support measures. Also, there is a shortage of EV charging facilities across the territory, and a Member has also mentioned the slow speed of chargers. All this has directly dampened car owners' desire to switch to EVs. Besides, we have been discussing the issue of first registration tax concessions for EVs these days. Previously, it was said that total exemption could be possible. But what we see now is instead a drastic reduction of the concession. Will all this directly dampen private car owners' desire to switch to EVs?

Hence, my amendment today contains three proposals. First, the Government should comprehensively review the policy on the promotion of EVs, so as to complement the development of the EV market and technologies, and to ensure fair competition in the market; second, it should conduct a study to amend the relevant provisions of the Buildings Ordinance to introduce additional incentives to encourage developers to provide charging facilities for charging EVs in newly constructed commercial and residential buildings; and third, it should review the mode of subsidization and effectiveness of the Pilot Green Transport Fund, with a view to expediting the promotion of the switch of public transport and commercial vehicles to EVs.

President, over the years, the SAR Government has sought to promote the use of EVs in Hong Kong mainly by offering first registration tax concessions for EVs, establishing the \$300 million Pilot Green Transport Fund and allocating \$180 million to franchised bus companies for the procurement of 36 single-decked electric buses. Can these measures achieve the intended goal and effectiveness?

As shown by the statistics of the Transport Department, from the introduction of first registration tax concessions for EVs in 1994 to July 2017, totally 10 876 EVs were registered, accounting for 1.3% of all registered vehicles in Hong Kong. Of the registered EVs, 97% were electric private cars. The number of electric private cars in Hong Kong has soared over the past five to six years, increasing from merely 60 in January 2011 to 6 994 in 2016, or 7.3% of all private cars registered for the first time. Moreover, as at late 2016, about \$4.4 billion worth of first registration tax concessions had been granted to totally 7 212 EVs registered for the first time.

In the five financial years from 2012 to 2017, electric private cars registered for the first time and with a taxable value of over \$700,000 accounted for 73.1% of all electric private cars. This shows that most of the electric private cars benefiting from the first registration tax concessions are expensive ones. We can understand why this is the case, because we know that there are actually very few EV suppliers and even just a single source of supply. Also, the number of EV manufacturers is very small, so prices are rather high. But we still have to say that such a government measure is very much like encouraging people to buy expensive cars, because the money saved is directly proportional to vehicle prices.

In fact, there are already quite a few makes of EVs on the market. The more famous Tesla aside, there are Nissan, Renault, Volkswagen, etc. But government statistics show that in the five financial years from 2012 to 2017, the best-selling make was Tesla. In 2016-2017, various models of Tesla EVs accounted for 95.8% of the EVs registered for the first time. The second best-selling models were two BMW ones, with a sales total of 105 vehicles. But these two BMW models only accounted for 1.8% of the 5 839 EVs registered for the first time in the year. So, we can also see the problem of limited EV choices here.

Very few EV models are for sale in Hong Kong, so some people prefer buying EVs from overseas. And, some new EV models are in fact hybrid vehicles using both petrol and electricity. So, the choices available in the Hong Kong market are really very limited. I have said that Tesla has sold many EVs, but the average price of an entry-level Tesla EV model is actually as high as \$700,000 to \$800,000 on average. This is beyond the means of most car owners. Hence, we must think about how we can bring different makes and models of EVs at lower prices into the Hong Kong market and induce people to buy them, so as to truly promote the popularization of EVs in Hong Kong. I think this is the one problem that the Government should face up to and tackle.

The Budget this year continues to offer qualified car owners a first registration tax concession of up to \$97,500. And, it also proposes a new scheme called "one-for-one replacement". Under the scheme, a qualified car owner who buys a new electric private car and scraps his old car can enjoy a higher first registration tax concession of up to \$250,000. But many car owners have told me that they do not find the scheme appealing, because they must bear additional expenses, and this directly affects their desire to buy new EVs. I also doubt whether the "one-for-one replacement" scheme can really achieve the Government's desired result.

President, in many cases, environment-friendly and energy-saving facilities are bound to be more costly when they are first rolled out. If the Government does not take the initiative and itself introduce these facilities, then apart from exposing its powerlessness in promoting environmental protection, it will also fail to promote the popular use of any environment-friendly facilities. The use and development of EVs, for example, must depend heavily on government promotion and its provision of various support facilities.

As shown by the statistics of the Environmental Protection Department, the number of public EV charging facilities saw an increase from 872 in 2011 to 1 774 in late September 2017. This means that there was only a twofold increase in six years. But the ratio of EVs to charging facilities in Hong Kong is 1:0.17, which falls far behind the global average of 1:1.1.

The Office of The Ombudsman announced in September 2017 that it would launch a direct investigation to look at and study the Government's planning for providing ancillary facilities to electric private cars. The Government said in its 2009-2010 Policy Address that it would strive to make Hong Kong one of the

cities in Asia where EVs are most widely used. It later announced some specific objectives, including turning 30% of the private cars in Hong Kong into EVs by 2020, and installing charging facilities in 30% of the private car parking spaces in new buildings. But as we can now observe, the Government is definitely behind the target, not to say reaching the target. It is not even close.

The present situation shows that the Government has taken developers into consideration in its planning and arrangement for ancillary facilities to promote EVs. Such arrangement includes starting from April 2011, developers who provide EV charging facilities for the parking spaces in their development projects will be granted exemption on the floor area of the car parks. Of course, as we can see, the measure has been quite effective. Some 40 000 parking spaces with charging facilities installed for EVs are now available. We hold that this measure is quite appealing to property developers. But my amendment is against compulsorily requiring all newly constructed commercial and residential buildings to do this because I hold that this lacks flexibility, if introducing additional incentives to encourage developers to provide charging facilities can already effectively promote the popularization of EVs.

President, although EVs have considerably increased in number in recent years, electric private cars still account for less than 2% of the total number of private cars. I mention in my amendment the \$300 million Pilot Green Transport Fund set up in March 2011. I request the Government to review the effectiveness of the Pilot Green Transport Fund. I hope that this can truly expedite the promotion of the switch of public transport and commercial vehicles to EVs.

I support other Members' amendments, especially those which urge the Government to raise the cap on the first registration tax concession for EVs and other concessions.

President, I so submit.

MR CHAN HAK-KAN (in Cantonese): President, first, I thank Mr Frankie YICK for moving a motion about the policy on electric vehicles ("EVs"). I also thank the eight Members for moving various amendments that enrich and add more substance to the original motion. I want to disclose here that I am a user and a supporter of EVs. Why do I say that I am a supporter of EVs but not a

supporter of the policy on EVs? This is because the SAR Government's policy on EVs is really very backward. President, what is the reason for using EVs? The reason is very simple. We want to improve roadside air quality and reduce reliance on fossil fuels, and the latter is already a world trend.

In my opinion, we can tell the success or otherwise of a policy by looking at three things. First, the policy objective. Second, the policy content. And, third, its actual implementation in society. A number of Members have already mentioned that many places in the world have formulated their policy objectives on using EVs and timetables for banning the sale of fuel-engined vehicles. I have a clear table here. We can see that the Netherlands will ban the sale of fuel-engined vehicles starting from 2025. India will do so from 2030 onwards. And, the United Kingdom and France will follow suit starting from 2040. The sale of diesel vehicles will be banned even earlier; Paris, Mexico City, Madrid and Athens will implement the relevant measures in 2025. As for countries which are still studying the ban, Austria will do so in 2020; China in 2025; and Sweden, Germany and Belgium in 2030.

President, how come the SAR Government is not on the list? This is because the SAR Government's policy on EVs is simply not worth any mentioning at all. Even now, we are still talking about having 30% of all our vehicle being hybrid vehicles by 2020. That is why the Government simply does not dare to formulate any policy objectives at all. National governments are one thing, but even our neighbour, Shenzhen, has set the target of replacing all existing buses in the city with electric ones within this year. Our neighbouring city, Macao, has always been criticized for being slow in policy implementation, but the use of EVs is now one of the required conditions for the issue of taxi licences.

What policies is the Hong Kong Government implementing now? Let us not talk about this for the time being. Let me first examine why some 500 000 EVs could be sold in the Mainland in 2016. The need for attaining the above mentioned target aside, another reason was in fact the policy support provided for encouraging the use of EVs by Mainland people. What policy support has been given by the Mainland authorities to users of new energy vehicles? Subsidy is granted to purchasers of new EVs; owners of new energy vehicles can enjoy free parking for two hours; 10% of the total area has to be reserved in all new buildings for the installation of charging facilities for EVs; new energy vehicles will not be subject to the odd-even licence plate restriction on driving in the city.

Furthermore, priority will be given to issuing licences to government logistics vehicles, and no restrictions will be imposed on electric logistics vehicles delivering goods in cities. Therefore, policies are in place in the Mainland to encourage and facilitate more extensive use of public and private EVs as far as possible.

Have such policies been formulated in Hong Kong? We cannot deny that the SAR Government has set up the \$300 million Pilot Green Transport Fund ("PGTF") in 2011, and the Steering Committee on the Promotion of Electric Vehicles has also been established under the chairmanship of the Financial Secretary, but have one or two regular meetings been convened every year? What topics have been dealt with? This legislature knows completely nothing about it. The SAR Government has granted floor area concessions to developers for the installation of charging facilities in new buildings, but its generosity has been exploited, and there is actually no electricity supply in the charging facilities installed. PGTF has been in operation for seven years, and what effects have been achieved? I have asked Secretary WONG Kam-sing whether transport operators who have applied for subsidy from PGTF to test out EVs have switched to using EVs subsequently, but he replied that he had no data on the information in this regard, meaning that the answer is in the negative. It turns out that these transport operators will only purchase EVs when government subsidy is available, implying that the sum of \$300 million earmarked to set up PGTF is money dumped into the sea, and the Fund is not effective at all.

Furthermore, how many EVs do we have in the public transport sector at present? There is only one electric taxi and seven electric public light buses in the whole territory, and together with some 11 000 electric private cars as mentioned by some Members just now, the number of EVs only accounts for 1.3% of 840 000 registered vehicles in Hong Kong, and how can our policy on EVs be described as successful and even effective? Such figures are simply shameful.

It would also be necessary to point out that since the abolition of the tax concession measure for EVs, we have witnessed a significant drop in the growth rate of electric cars. However, this is contradictory to an observation made in a study report released by the former Central Policy Unit in 2015 to suggest that Hong Kong is the world's most suitable place for using EVs. A number of Members have already cited the findings contained in the report earlier, and I am not going to repeat once again here.

Let me present two sets of figures to further illustrate my points. We can see from this chart that before the abolition of the tax concession measure for EVs, a growth rate of 22% was recorded for electric cars during the period from April to September 2016, and this was the highest growth rate among various types of vehicles. We did have recorded growth in the numbers of fuel-engined vehicles and diesel vehicles over the corresponding period, but they have increased at a slower rate. However, upon the abolition of the tax concession measure for EVs, the growth rate of electric cars in the corresponding period (that is, from April to September) in 2017 has dropped to 0.2% only, but does it mean that the quantities of other vehicles have shown utterly no increase? Secretary, this is not the case because an increase of 25% was recorded in the number of diesel vehicles. Can the Government curb the growth in the number of vehicles by reducing tax concessions for EVs? As we can see from this chart, the new policy is a total mistake.

Let me provide you with another set of figures as follows: Only six successful transactions involving the sale of EVs were recorded in February 2018, but the relevant number recorded in February 2017 was 601, 100 times higher than that recorded in 2018. Yet, the number of diesel vehicles in the corresponding period has increased by 3 100 (that is, 20%). If it is the Secretary's objective to curb the growth of EVs, why does he choose to turn a blind eye to the growth of other types of vehicles? What are the reasons for doing so? Has this run contrary to the environmental policy of the Environment Bureau? President, I cannot help but wonder.

However, I do consider it unfair for us to criticize the Secretary for the Environment for such policy failures, because he also wishes to promote the use of EVs, but he is not at liberty to decide. The success or failure of the policy on EVs actually hinges on decisions of the Financial Secretary. The Government has now announced a "one-for-one replacement" scheme after listening to our views, but the threshold of the scheme is so high that only those who have owned a car for three years will be allowed to scrap a private car aged six to seven in order to enjoy higher tax concessions.

I understand that the Government is trying to prevent abuse of the scheme, but from the perspective of supporting environmental protection, if the launching of the "one-for-one replacement" scheme can really help to phase out more old vehicles, even though an applicant has chosen to purchase an old vehicle in the market and then replace it with an EV under the scheme, this can still serve the

purpose of reducing the number of old vehicles running on the road by one fuel-engined or diesel vehicle. This is what the Environment Bureau should do, and what is the point of adopting a very high threshold for the scheme? The Government has received only 11 applications since the announcement of the scheme, and it seems that the scheme has failed to attract potential buyers of both high-priced and lower-priced EVs. Hence, should the Government lower the threshold required, so that more people will be encouraged to go for EVs, thereby reducing roadside air pollution? This should be the Government's policy focus.

President, the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong supports all the amendments, and we also support the original motion moved by Mr Frankie YICK. I so submit.

MS TANYA CHAN (in Cantonese): President, this morning, we have already heard many Members, like Mr CHAN Hak-kan, express their disappointment, or even anger, on the present policy on electric vehicles ("EVs"). As the Chairman of the Panel on Environmental Affairs, I know many Members will be very angry whenever they discuss the subject of EVs. The policy used to be on the right track and managed to successfully encourage people to switch to EVs. But ever since the Government suddenly withdrew the first registration tax exemption for EVs and put a cap on the tax concession, statistically speaking, people who have switched to EVs have clearly plummeted in number, while fuel-engined vehicles have risen in number. As a result, the policy has failed to reduce vehicles on the road but made the air quality in Hong Kong worse.

Indeed, the index of major air pollutants at street level last year rose compared to that in the year before last. Major street-level air pollutants come from diesel commercial vehicles or buses, and we understand that the development technologies of electric commercial vehicles may not be fully applicable to the Hong Kong environment, but we have to know that 70% of the vehicles on the road are private cars. If we do not focus on a policy that can encourage people to switch to electric private cars, we are like an ostrich hiding its head in the sand. The Government ultimately has to face this problem. It cannot wait until electric commercial vehicles are suitable for introducing into the market before it starts its work.

Many Members mentioned just now the report released by the Central Policy Unit in 2015. It point out that Hong Kong is the most suitable place in the world to use EVs, because Hong Kong is a small place and can easily be covered by road journeys, but the Government lacks sound measures and assistance to comprehensively promote the EV policy. Norway is one of the most successful places in promoting EVs. In 2017, Norway already had over 140 000 electric private cars, which accounted for 5.1% of the private cars in the whole country and represented a 40% increase compared to 2016. In December 2017, the total sales of EVs and hybrid vehicles already surpassed the sales of fuel-engined vehicles, and accounted for 52% of the new vehicles sold. Norway plans to restrict all new car sold from 2025 onwards to be zero-emission EVs or low-emission hybrid vehicles.

Just now, many Members mentioned that many cities and countries in the world had already set a target for promoting EVs. The target of Los Angeles is to have 10% of its cars to be EVs by 2025; New York City targets at having 20% of its new cars sold to be EVs by 2025; Amsterdam also strives to achieve zero emission for all its transport sectors in the city by 2025; and many other overseas cities also pledge to ban fuel-engined vehicles from running in the most part of their cities by 2030, while some other cities, including Mainland cities, have also set a sales target for EVs.

In contrast to the targets above, as of January 2018, registered electric private cars ... Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok and I have a similar percentage ... accounts for 1.7% to 1.8% of all private cars and 1.3% of all vehicles in Hong Kong. Setting aside the figures in the first three months of 2017, newly registered electric private cars accounted for 0.3% of all newly registered private cars in Hong Kong. Why do I have to set aside the first three months of 2017? It is because we still had tax exemption at that time, but starting from April 2017, the Government set a cap on the first registration tax exemption for electric private cars.

Of course, Members have also settled the account with the Secretary, since the Secretary said in 2011 that EVs or hybrid vehicles would account for 30% of all private cars in Hong Kong by 2020. Compared with targets set by other countries or cities, this target seems rather aggressive, but at least the Government

did set a target at that time. President, now, we do not even have a target. It is impossible not to set a target. We all hold that the Government should set a target. President, Mr CHAN Hak-kan said just now that the Steering Committee on the Promotion of EVs was established long ago but the work of the Steering Committee stopped last year. However, after the Office of The Ombudsman pointed out the problem of EV parking spaces, the Steering Committee all of a sudden was informed to resume its work. So, it stopped its work in 30 June last year and resumed its work in October again.

In a radio programme where I was interviewed, the person sitting next to me was Mr WAN, a member of the Steering Committee on the Promotion of EVs. Mr WAN says that they mainly target at electric commercial vehicles. I find it strange, so I look up the terms of reference of the Steering Committee, but their terms of reference does not specifically say that they focus only on electric commercial vehicles, but just EVs. I do not understand why they suddenly switch their focus from EVs to electric commercial vehicles. Regarding how often the Steering Committee meets, as far as what I learn from Mr WAN, they meet once every half a year. It is really "frequent". Committees generally meet at least once every quarter, but I do not know why such an important committee only meets once every half a year.

The Legislative Council discussed the promotion of EVs in February again. The authorities say they will look into the feasibility of setting a target. It is indeed too late to start setting a target now. They really lag behind the situation and are outdated. The Government lacks a target on introducing electrification into the transport system of Hong Kong and also lacks a policy objective on supporting the development of EVs.

Let us come back to the government departments. Both Mr Charles Peter MOK and Mr Kenneth LEUNG commented just now that the Government appeared to be very aggressive before. But now, only the Secretary for the Environment drives an EV but not all other principal officials. Of the 512 vehicles newly procured by the Government last year, only 7 vehicles were EVs. It is woefully little.

In London, all new property developments are required to install charging facilities in one in every five parking spaces. In Hong Kong, however, we only

have similar proposals. But as many Members have said, many of these facilities in Hong Kong are fake. I hold that the guidelines must be renewed. The Government has already provided many concessions for developers. I thus cannot agree with Ms YUNG Hoi-yan's proposal. The developers have already grabbed all the concessions. They can have 30% of the floor area for installing charging facilities, but they have gone so far as to stint the electricity connection. I hold that this is caused by the Government's miscalculation. The developers have reaped all the advantages, but they do not connect electricity to the charging facilities. It ended up that the parking spaces could only be used by ordinary vehicles and cannot be used for charging EVs.

Hence, in retrospect of the impact of the policy on promoting electric private cars in the past three years, especially the changes in the first registration tax for EVs, the impacts of the policy were polarized. Two years before the withdrawal of the exemption of first registration tax for EVs, the number of newly registered EVs increased dramatically, but almost 95% of the EVs were expensive models and the total tax revenue exempted in the two years amounted to over \$4 billion. Ms YUNG Hoi-yan has mentioned this point just now. On the contrary, after capping the tax exemption at \$97,500, there is almost zero increase in the number of electric private cars. The result in the past three years shows that relying on economic incentives alone cannot arrive at the desired outcome of encouraging people to switch to electric private cars. One of the priority tasks of the Government is to formulate a policy on electricity charging network.

The Government says that EV owners should arrange charging facilities themselves at their living or working places, and public charging facilities are meant to be complimentary. But just look at the electricity connection of the facilities in their living places. As I said, the developers did not connect the charging facilities with electricity, and the Government seldom provides any support. As I said before, District Offices under the Home Affairs Bureau should provide assistance, since installing electricity chargers in residential estates often need to be discussed with Owners' Committee or other residents. If the Government can play a coordinating role, I believe the result will be better.

Many Members have mentioned that since capping the tax concession at \$97,500 and introducing the "one-for-one replacement" scheme, there have been only 11 applications in the first month. Although the Government has approved

all the applications, we had better wait and see the impact. We already pointed out earlier that the Government would seriously undermine the attractiveness of EVs if it capped the tax concession at \$97,500, and the statistics have fully reflected this point. But the Government has insisted pushing ahead the cap, and it even added the "one-for-one replacement" scheme this time. It is actually even more difficult now.

We hope that the Government would acknowledge the fact that EV technologies around the world are becoming more and more mature, and that it would expeditiously formulate a policy; otherwise, Hong Kong would only become an outlet for different countries to get rid of their fuel-engined vehicles. I hope the Government can thoroughly consider this subject and expeditiously formulate a policy objective. I so submit.

DR JUNIUS HO (in Cantonese): President, I thank Mr Frankie YICK for moving the motion on "Promoting the popularization of electric vehicles", as it is a highly urgent matter.

As we all know, in 2025, not only our mother country, but places in Europe like Norway will gradually prohibit the sale of fuel-engined vehicles. In 2050, large vehicle manufacturers will directly cease the production of fuel-engined vehicles. Under the circumstances, we have to catch up with this trend. Notwithstanding a small place, Hong Kong has a large population and should take a leading role. Instead of setting an example, we are now falling behind seriously. Why would it turn out like this? While we cannot catch up in terms of policy, we are also in lack of efficiency. And the Government's determination in promoting this policy is really disappointing.

Why would I say that? I will share with Members a few examples. In terms of road administration, it took 20 years to plan the construction of the Central Kowloon Route, and will take another decade to carry out the works. How long will this route be? Only 3 km to 4 km long. How much money will be spent? Nearly \$40 billion. Hong Kong, being squeezed with pressure from others, is just like a hen that will lay golden eggs. While Hong Kong is progressing at "turtle speed", it is actually paying an astronomical price, leaving a golden print for every step it has taken, and this picture is totally disproportionate.

Where is our enforcement capability? As I always mention, it has been more than three years since the Occupy Central movement, but the thousand-odd cases concerned have not yet been completely handled, and we are still condoning the wide discussion of "Hong Kong independence" by those toxic spreading activists. The Hong Kong Government says it is determined to reprimand them, but this is merely empty talk. If it thinks that they have breached the law, why does it not enforce the law?

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr Junius HO, please return to the topic of this debate.

DR JUNIUS HO (in Cantonese): I am now back to the topic under discussion. I only want to raise the question of efficiency as efficiency is the most important element. If there is only a policy but without any promotion, even the best strategy will turn out to be an armchair strategy, and what we need is action. The Government is sometimes too cautious and apprehensive in the formulation of a policy, but is not proactive enough in taking it forward.

The policy on the promotion of electric vehicles ("EVs") was first introduced as early as 1994, and the first registration tax for EVs had also been waived since then as an encouragement. But to date, there are only 11 000 EVs plying on the streets, accounting for 1.3% of the total number of vehicles—I trust the figures provided by Mr Frankie YICK—What does it explain? It explains that nothing has been done in these 20 years. The Government is taking the lip service as action. When the policy has to be implemented, there is no one to take neither action nor responsibility, and the Government keeps on paying lip service for this cause. This is really environmentally friendly, as there is merely empty talk. What does it rely on? It relies on a breath of air. The policy is taken forward only by air, right?

President, what is my message? We should definitely not backpedal. After reading the figures early last year, people made their own calculation and found it economical to use EVs. But the Budget then proposed to cap the tax concession, which I find highly inappropriate. Why do we not implement the

"one-for-one replacement" policy? It has already been implemented in Singapore for a very long time. We can see some clues in the Budget last year, for which I also commend the Financial Secretary. If a person wants to enjoy the concession or allowance, he has to replace his old car. But this is not enough after all. In my view, a better way is that apart from providing a full waiver, the car owner has to replace an old fuel-engined vehicle with a new EV. This is the best way and the biggest motivator. Is the Government bold enough to adopt this approach? Since there are already some signs, the Government should do it in one go, and this "one-for-one replacement" policy is desirable.

As I also mention, on the roads, apart from private cars, what are the frequent users? They are taxis, buses and goods vehicles. Under the circumstances, is it feasible for the Government to actively promote the use of EVs under the taxi policy? Mr CHAN Hak-kan told us earlier that there are only a few electric taxis. Why? It is because the taxi trade is operating on a shift basis. When charging is slow and there are insufficient charging stations, do taxi drivers need to wait for a few hours before they can change shifts? This is not practical.

We have to listen to others' opinions and understand their work and challenges of trade before working out some solutions. The most important thing is to work out some solutions, and one advantage of Hong Kong people is our bright minds. What do we need to do? Is the proposal of "one licence for two taxis" feasible? A taxi licence holder will be provided with taxi A and taxi B. Taxi A will be used for the first shift. At the end of the shift, it will be parked to the depot, while taxi B will be used for the next shift. This will render the shifting convenient and efficient. What about using EVs of Tesla? An EV of Tesla costs \$1 million-odd after taxation. With a tax waiver, it will only cost some \$700,000, and the cost of two EVs will only be \$1 million-odd, while a taxi licence already costs over \$6 million. In order to improve Hong Kong's living environment and promote the policy, are we willing to consider this proposal? Is the proposal of "one licence for two taxis" feasible? It is feasible. If this proposal can be implemented, the public will be very delighted and they will be glad to take it forward. Although the existing market is not very large and there may not be enough incentives for the manufacturers, I think in the long run, in

terms of design, we can catch up with the aid of technology. We should voice out our opinions. Over the past 20 years, we should have voiced out our views.

Therefore, I propose an amendment in the hope of achieving two goals. Firstly, I urge manufacturers to embark on the design and production of vehicles with replaceable batteries for use of the taxi trade in Hong Kong. This will facilitate battery replacement during taxi shifting. But before this new type of vehicles can be designed and produced, the proposal of "one licence for two taxis" can be allowed to be implemented. This proposal is desirable. Although it is not incorporated in my amendment, I also want to bring it out since I am already standing here to speak.

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

I think my other suggestion is highly important. With more and more EVs, how should we dispose of waste batteries in the future? Together with the representatives of the Environment Bureau, we attended the opening ceremony of WEEE • PARK last month. WEEE • PARK is a facility for the treatment of waste electrical and electronic equipment, but we also have to make a projection on the amount of waste batteries. I know there is a related policy, but we should estimate whether we have the capability and space to deal with a staggering number of waste batteries when hundreds of thousands of vehicles will need to have their batteries replaced in the future. These things have to be planned ahead as armchair strategy is not what we need.

Deputy President, finally, I have to say that no matter how nice a plan is, it is only a plan written on paper after all, but an action, no matter how imperfect it is, is still a kind of action. Action speaks louder than words. The Government should listen more to public opinions and address the people's pressing needs. This is the most important point.

I hereby reiterate that I support Mr Frankie YICK's motion. Thank you, Deputy President.

SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (in Cantonese): Deputy President, first, I want to thank Mr Frankie YICK for moving this motion and the eight other Members for speaking on their respective amendments. The motion debate today gives Members and me a good chance to thoroughly discuss the policies and measures on promoting electric vehicles ("EVs"), thus assisting the Government in considering how to enhance the policies concerned.

As mentioned in Mr YICK's motion, promoting the popularization of EVs has become one of the major directions of environmental protection policies in the world, and Hong Kong is no exception. To begin with, let me describe the Government's major policies on promoting the use of EVs.

The main policy consideration behind the popularization of EVs is the improvement of roadside air quality. At present, commercial vehicles, including goods vehicles, buses, public light buses and taxis, are the major sources of roadside air pollution. The respirable suspended particulates and nitrogen oxides emitted by them make up about 95% of all vehicle emissions in Hong Kong. Therefore, commercial vehicles have been the Government's focus in respect of improving roadside air quality. To reduce vehicle emissions, we have put in place different measures in recent years, including various schemes featuring both incentives and regulatory control. We will phase out the 82 000 or so pre-Euro IV diesel commercial vehicles before the end of 2019. The Government has also been offering full subsidy to franchised bus companies to retrofit their buses with emission reduction devices, so as to enhance their emission performance. Besides, the emission standard for newly registered vehicles has also been tightened step by step. We have thus noticed a remarkable improvement in roadside air quality. Over the last five years, roadside concentrations of major air pollutants which include respirable suspended particulates and nitrogen dioxide have seen a 30% reduction, showing the effectiveness of our long-standing policies.

EVs have no tailpipe emissions and they can efficiently convert power grid electricity into energy efficiently. The use of electric commercial vehicles in place of conventional commercial vehicles can significantly improve air quality. Therefore, promoting the use of electric commercial vehicles is a focus of the Government's promotion on EVs.

The Government has launched a number of measures to promote the use of electric commercial vehicles, including a full exemption of first registration tax ("FRT") for electric commercial vehicles. Since 2010, the capital expenditure incurred in the purchase of environment-friendly vehicles, EVs included, by business enterprises is fully deductible from the profits tax in the year of purchase concerned. The Government also set up the \$300 million Pilot Green Transport Fund in March 2011 to encourage the public transport sector, goods vehicle operators and non-profit making organizations to conduct trials on green and innovative technology, including electric commercial vehicles. The Fund has approved 118 trials, 81 of which are on electric commercial vehicles, and they cover a wide variety of vehicles such as taxis, public light buses, single-decked buses and goods vehicles, involving a total of \$131 million. Apart from assessing funding applications, the Steering Committee of the Pilot Green Transport Fund also monitors the effectiveness of the trial projects and advises the Government on encouraging the transport sector to conduct tests on EVs.

Furthermore, the Government has also allocated \$180 million to fully subsidize franchised bus companies to acquire 36 single-decked buses to conduct test runs on a number of routes. Twenty-six of these single-decked buses are now undergoing test runs and the remaining electric buses will provide services successively at a later stage.

On electric private vehicles, it has been the Government's long-standing policy to encourage people to use public transport. However, if people find it necessary to buy private cars, we encourage them to purchase EVs as far as possible. The major support measures provided by the Government include the provision of financial incentives such as tax relief and concession in annual vehicle licence fees, on top of promoting the setting up and enhancement of charging network for electric private vehicles.

Owing to the Government's incentive measures, the remarkable technological advancement in electric private vehicles in recent years, and the closing price gap between electric private cars and conventional private cars, the number of electric private cars in Hong Kong rose significantly from fewer than 100 by the end of 2010 to 10 997 by the end of March 2017. After capping the FRT concession for electric private cars at \$97,500 in the financial year of

2017-2018, the Government has been closely monitoring the latest development. Taking into consideration the technological development of EVs, the market environment, road and traffic conditions and opinions of the stakeholders, the Government on the one hand believes that the total number of private vehicles has to be curbed to avoid traffic congestion and worsening of roadside air pollution. On the other hand, it hopes to encourage car owners to choose EVs as far as possible when making a purchase of private vehicles. Therefore, apart from continuing to provide an FRT concession capped at \$97,500 during the period from 28 February 2018 to 31 March 2021, the Government will at the same time introduce a "one-for-one replacement" scheme. Qualified existing car owners can enjoy a higher FRT concession of up to \$250,000, provided that purchases of new electric private vehicles are made alongside the scrapping of their eligible old private vehicles. The Government believes that the new "one-for-one replacement" scheme provides a greater financial incentive for qualified existing private vehicle owners to switch to purchase electric private vehicles when replacing their existing private vehicles.

Regarding the charging of electric private vehicles, the Environment Bureau has pointed out repeatedly in its responses to Members' questions that it has been the Government's long-standing policy direction to ask car owners to arrange daily charging of their electric private vehicles at home, in the workplace or at other appropriate venues, including the charging facilities installed by electric private vehicles suppliers. Local public charging facilities which allow EVs to top up their batteries in their journeys in times of occasional needs are supplementary in nature and certainly cannot replace those facilities for daily charging. When acquiring electric private vehicles, car owners should duly consider the daily charging arrangement for their vehicles instead of relying on public charging facilities to meet their daily charging needs. Under this policy direction, the Government accords priority to promoting and encouraging private residential buildings to install charging facilities when it formulates planning for the development of charging facilities for electric private vehicles.

In view of the rapid changes in the use of EVs, the Environment Bureau is now working with the relevant government bureaux and departments to review the various policies and measures regarding the promotion of EVs. These include looking into the enhancement of public charging network and facilities

for EVs provided in public car parks, exploring ways to encourage private and commercial buildings to install EV charging facilities in their car parks, reviewing the technological and planning guidance relevant to the installation of charging facilities for EVs in newly completed buildings and so on, so as to dovetail with the use of EVs.

On determining the proportion of EVs, the target and timetable for phasing out fuel-engined vehicles, given that Hong Kong is a free market, the Government's policy on promoting the popularization of EVs is implemented with incentive measures and measures that facilitate market development. To mitigate tailpipe emissions and climate change, the development of clean energy vehicles has become a global trend. Of course, we also hope to replace fuel-engined vehicles with clean energy vehicles, including EVs, as soon as possible. As a matter of fact, the Government's policy has always been to expeditiously replace heavily polluting vehicles with clean alternatives where practicable. For instance, upon completing the trial of LPG taxis in 1998, the Government took forward the replacement of all the 18 000 diesel taxis with low emission LPG taxis within a few years, with the provision of incentives, construction of LPG filling stations and amendments to legislation. It is thus evident that given the technological feasibility, the Government is highly determined and will adopt measures to phase out heavily polluting vehicles expeditiously, so as to fulfil the aim of improving air quality.

Yet, we have to understand that the situation of Hong Kong is different from that of some other countries such as France and the United States. With the absence of local automobile industry, all vehicles we use in Hong Kong are imported. Therefore, when considering the phasing out of vehicles solely using petrol or diesel, we have to study the provision and development of clean energy vehicles, such as EVs, in foreign countries and in the Mainland, on top of the arrangement of auxiliary facilities in Hong Kong.

We are now gathering relevant information in this regard, including the specific plans and measures of individual countries which have formulated timetable or target for a total ban on the sale of vehicles solely using petrol or diesel vehicles, in addition to the latest development in the production of clean energy vehicles in the automobile industry. The information gathered will be

used to analyse the future supply of clean energy vehicles suitable for Hong Kong and their conditions of use, so as to consider the next policy step forward.

Deputy President, the Government will continue to draw reference from EV development in various areas, listen to different opinions and monitor policy effectiveness, so as to review and enhance the policy on popularizing EVs in a timely manner. I will continue heeding Members' comments on the motion and its amendments, before providing a consolidated and detailed response to them. Thank you, Deputy President.

MR KENNETH LAU (in Cantonese): Deputy President, today's motion is "Promoting the popularization of electric vehicles. First, I declare that I am an electric vehicle ("EV") owner. Even though I am not an EV owner, I will still speak to support the motion moved by Mr Frankie YICK.

Although eight Members have moved amendments to the motion, all of them agree on the major principle of the motion, namely that the Government must promote the popularization of EVs, with more concrete proposals put forward. Therefore, I support all the amendments.

Deputy President, I believe that the Government agrees with the motion to a certain extent. Otherwise, the Budget would not have announced a "one-for-one replacement" scheme for EV buyers to enjoy tax concessions. However, is money the only incentive to promote the popularization of EVs?

At the Council meeting held on 7 February, Mr Charles Peter MOK and I raised oral and written questions respectively, asking whether charging facilities would be incorporated in multi-functional smart lampposts for EVs. In the past, there were also Members raising questions to the Government about the charging arrangements for EVs.

Today's motion and amendments have voiced quite a lot of opinions regarding charging facilities, which show that sufficient and reliable charging facilities are crucial for promoting the popularization of EVs.

Unfortunately, the public charging facilities for EVs in Hong Kong are seriously inadequate. On the face of it, there are 1 846 public charging facilities, but 915 of them are standard charging stations, which can only add a dozen kilometres of range in an hour of charging. Such efficiency is far from satisfactory. When Member asked the Government when it will install or upgrade the standard chargers, it said: "public charging facilities are merely supplementary in nature ... They do not serve as daily charging facilities", and: "Potential buyers of e-PCs [electric private cars] should fully consider the daily charging arrangements required and should not rely on public charging facilities for daily charging of their e-PCs. The Government also sees insufficient justifications for spending large amount of public money to provide e-PC owners with public charging facilities ..." In other words, EV owners have to solve the problem on their own.

However, in reality not everyone can access charging facilities at their workplaces. Even if charging facilities are available, their number is limited. It is impossible for ordinary "wage earners" to closely monitor the availability of charging facilities. With insufficient parking spaces, there is a shortage of parking spaces in many temporary car parks, which even do not have CCTV installed, let alone charging facilities for EVs. Some EV owners have their own parking space, but the electric networks in their housing estates belong to the owners' corporations. It is therefore not easy at all for them to apply for installation of private EV charging facilities.

Apart from the private car market, has the Government considered the situation of commercial vehicles such as goods vehicles? At present, most commercial vehicles are parked at the roadside or in some temporary car parks. Even if goods vehicles can be propelled solely by electric power in the future, they probably do not have the opportunity to park in car parks with charging facilities. And I also do not believe that those temporary car parks would install charging facilities to help the Government promote the popularization of EVs.

Deputy President, since commercial vehicles do not have the opportunity to park in car parks with charging facilities, and that 95% of air pollutants come from commercial vehicles, public charging facilities are, to a large extent, not for electric private cars but for paving the way for electrification of commercial vehicles, as well as creating a favourable environment and an incentive for the popularization of EVs. However, the current situation hardly provides adequate

incentives for ordinary fuel vehicles owners to switch to EVs, not to mention to promote the adoption of EVs.

Although the development of EVs is restricted by battery and charging technologies, EVs are indeed a dominant trend. With the advancement of technology, there is no telling that when there will be a breakthrough in battery and charging technologies. Perhaps in just a few years or months, a 5 to 10 minutes charge time can enable EVs travel dozens of kilometres, thus popularizing the use of electric private cars and commercial vehicles.

However, if the policies on EVs maintain the status quo—charging facilities remain inadequate, and the Government keeps holding a market-driven principle for the development of EVs and standing aside with folded arms—EVs will never be popular in Hong Kong. It is because an EV that cannot be charged is no different from a heap of scrap iron.

Deputy President, the Government must not be short-sighted. It will be too late for the Government to install charging facilities in every lamppost and parking space only after the maturity of EV technologies. The popularization of EVs will only become a laughing stock in the end.

With these remarks, Deputy President, I support the original motion and all the amendments.

MR YIU SI-WING (in Cantonese): Deputy President, global warming is a common concern of countries all over the world. The Paris Agreement was signed in 2015 with an aim to reduce carbon dioxide emission with joint effort of the international community. Among the signatories, many developed countries have implemented policies to promote EVs in order to achieve the goal of emission reduction. China has also planned that by 2025, 20% (close to 7 million) of new vehicles put up for sale must be new energy vehicles. South Korea even plans to impose a complete ban on the sale of diesel vehicles. With a view to encouraging consumers to switch to EVs, many countries have formulated various policies for replacement of old and high-pollution vehicles, including giving tax concessions to car owners and allowance to EV manufacturers.

The SAR Government proposed in its 2009 Policy Address the strategy of promoting the use of EVs, in the hope that Hong Kong will become a place where EVs are widely used. In the Budget for the same year, the Government announced that it would examine the feasibility of providing re-charging facilities in government multi-storey car parks and explore ways of encouraging the business sector to set up such facilities. In May 2011, the Government amended the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, stating its longer term target is that as far as private cars are concerned, 30% are EVs or hybrid by 2020, and EV standard charging facilities should be provided, where appropriate, in at least 30% of car parking spaces for private car in new car parks.

The implementation of the above policies, however, is not satisfactory over the years. According to the statistics of the Environmental Protection Department and the Transport Department, as at September 2017, the number of registered electric private cars was only 11 000, accounting for only 1.8% of registered private cars; and the number of EV charging facilities is only 1 774, representing an increase of merely 100% over the past six years. Given the current progress, we can tell that it is impossible to achieve the goals set by the Government. The Government's determination in implementing these policies is thus called into question.

In order to encourage citizens to use EVs, the Government should first dispel their worries by providing more incentives and implementing those measures in a well-planned manner. For example, one of the major reasons hindering the development of EVs, which is also most concerned by people, is the shortage of charging stations. The Government should undertake to install, within a target time frame, sufficient medium or quick charging stations in government buildings, suitable facilities and subsidized private housing estates across 18 districts.

Besides, the maintenance skills of EVs are not yet popular, which is another reason holding back the development of EVs. Currently, maintenance services for EVs are not available in ordinary repair shops. EV owners have to send their vehicles to the manufacturers for repair in case of breakdown by paying a higher maintenance cost, which may turn potential EV buyers away. I suggest the Government introduce courses on the structure and maintenance of EVs through the Vocational Training Council and include them in the Reimbursable Course List under the Continuing Education Fund. At the same time, grants should be provided to the relevant courses subsidized by the

University Grants Committee. These measures not only create a new way out for graduates but also help in-service technicians adapt to product transformation, thus nurturing more talents to drive the development of the EV industry chain.

Actually, the authorities concerned understand most of our proposals well, and know how to solve those problems. I think the problem lies in the Government's lack of determination. The Secretary for the Environment has just mentioned that the Government would leave the matter to the market. However, problems that left to the market in fact cannot be solved by the market itself; they must be faced and solved by the Government with determination and more resources allocated. The Government must get rid of the obsession of Government-business collusion and should not fear that these policies would affect the public's impression on the Government or be considered collusion with the business sector. It should also not be afraid of trouble, thinking that adding new facilities will need coordination of many departments, and lobbying may be needed if those departments fail to cooperate. I believe that the Government can only succeed with such an attitude. The problems relating to the EV development can only be solved with a proactive attitude.

With these remarks, Deputy President, I support the original motion and all the amendments.

MR MA FUNG-KWOK (in Cantonese): I thank Mr Frankie YICK for moving this motion today so that we can have a discussion on this topic. Deputy President, promoting the popularization of electric vehicles ("EVs") is a global trend. Out of the concern on environmental protection, various places in the world usually encourage the use of EVs by citizens through measures like offering tax concessions and subsidies in the purchase of EVs. In recent years, these countries even further set a timetable for the prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles. Norway is the first country to carry out the policy, while the Netherlands, Germany, the United Kingdom, France and Taiwan, our neighbouring country, will also carry out a total prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles from 2025 to 2040. The Central Government has also conducted a study on this topic, and its target is to implement the prohibition of sale policy 15 to 20 years later. Many large-scale branded manufacturers have also planned to gradually cease the production of fuel-engined vehicles.

In the case of Hong Kong, as early as the 1990s, we encouraged people to switch to EVs through tax measures. In the Hong Kong's Climate Change Strategy and Action Agenda in 2008, we incorporated the target concerning 30% of private cars in use being EVs or hybrid cars by 2020. It was also mentioned in the 2014 Policy Address that the Government would continue to purchase more EVs, while the Chief Executive and principle officials would take the lead in using them. However, behind these targets and slogans, has the Government tried its best to achieve the targets? We can say that the answer is in the negative and is also extremely disappointing.

First of all, in the new "Hong Kong's Climate Action Plan 2030+" report, the target concerning 30% of private cars in use being EVs or hybrid cars has been removed. After the announcement of the policy on the purchase of more EVs, the proportion of EVs among government vehicles has surprisingly decreased instead of increased. It dropped from 4.8% in 2015 to 2.1% in 2017. Among the Chief Executive and principle officials, only one person is using an EV. It is really difficult for us to believe in the determination of the authorities in promoting the popularization of EVs.

Besides, the authorities' policy to attract people to switch to EVs by means of tax measures is rather erratic. Firstly, the policy is regressive. The Administration does not encourage the supply of more EVs but punishes those who succeed in switching to EVs, as it has abolished the full waiver of first registration tax for electric private cars and instead capped their first registration tax concession at \$97,500. As a result, there is a sudden drop in the number of EVs purchased. The "one-for-one replacement" scheme introduced in the Budget this year only applies to vehicles not less than six years old which are possessed by the owners for not less than three years. This threshold is being criticized as too high and stringent. I believe that it can hardly attract vehicle owners to replace their existing private cars with EVs.

In fact, in order to be successful in promoting the use of EVs by vehicle owners, financial incentive is not the main factor. The key factor is the provision of good supporting facilities, especially charging facilities for EVs. According to the information from the Environmental Protection Department, there are currently 1 862 charging stations in the whole territory. As there are over 10 000 registered EVs in Hong Kong, on average, each EV can only make use of 0.2 charging station. Besides, these charging stations are mostly scattered

over the Hong Kong Island and Kowloon, while there are only 330 stations in the New Territories. There are two other problems. Among the charging stations, part of them are located in government car parks which are not open for public use round the clock. And only about one third of charging stations can provide fast charging service. Under the circumstances when it is difficult to locate the charging stations and also time consuming to charge the vehicles, there is less incentive for drivers to use EVs.

Excluding the charging stations rentable by the public, in private car parks, the development of charging stations for EVs is only at its initial stage. Although it is suggested in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines that in new housing developments, 30% of private car parking spaces should be equipped with charging facilities, to the existing buildings, the Government actually does not have any policy to require installation of additional charging stations in private car parks of, for example, commercial buildings, shopping malls or private housing estates. In order to attract more people and tenants, the owners of shopping malls and commercial buildings are more willing to install more charging facilities with their own money. But there is no such incentive for private housing estates. In the past, it has been reported at times that some owners' corporations and management companies declined owners' request to install chargers for reasons of fire risk derived from overloading of electricity in housing estates or even without any reasons.

In supporting the popularization of EVs, the Government should not shy away from its responsibility. First of all, it has to put forward a specific, holistic and sustainable policy on the development of EVs. For instance, it has to change its mindset that public charging facilities are only supportive in nature. On the contrary, it has to keep on increasing the amount of public charging facilities, like installing charging devices to parking meters. It should also find ways to encourage gradual enhancement of the charging speed of the existing charging stations so as to enhance efficiency. At the same time, it can launch some targeted measures, such as providing allowances, to encourage and assist private car parks, especially in private housing estates, in installing more charging facilities. It can also consider turning the proposal concerning 30% of private car parking spaces in new housing developments being equipped with charging facilities into a mandatory measure. In addition, the Government cannot neglect such work as studying and exploring the technology concerned. It should, for example, study and promote the use of mobile charging devices, reduce the space

occupied by charging facilities and their cost, and take the lead in launching mobile application to share the real-time information on the location, number and availability of rentable charging-equipped parking spaces across the territory in order to enhance transparency and facilitate EV owners.

Deputy President, it is a global trend to promote using clean energy vehicles and reduce pollution. I hope that when the Administration is vigorously promoting the smart city policy, it can quicken its pace in improving the policies concerned, so that 20 years later, Hong Kong will not become one of the few backward cities which still purchase traditional fuel-engined vehicles, or even degenerate into a museum of running fuel-engined vehicles. While the whole world is adopting decisive and determined measures, the Secretary just said that the SAR Government is still adopting incentive measures. This kind of backward thinking is really highly disappointing to me.

With these remarks, I support the motion and all the amendments today. Thank you, Deputy President.

MR JEFFREY LAM (in Cantonese): Deputy President, electric vehicles ("EVs") have become a major development trend of the automobile industry worldwide. Many countries in the world, including Germany and the United Kingdom, have announced the start of banning the sale of fuel-engined vehicles. It is foreseeable that EVs will gradually replace petrol-fuelled vehicles and diesel-fuelled vehicles. Of course, promoting the popularization of EVs cannot be done within nights. As Mr Frankie YICK says, we need phased targets, and these targets need to be coupled with a series of long-term and sustainable policies from the Government, and these policies or measures definitely should not change frequently and capriciously.

In fact, EVs are a kind of transport that does not have tailpipe emissions. It can positively help relieve street-level air pollution. According to a study report on the promotion of EVs conducted by the former Central Policy Unit in 2015, battery EVs are propelled by batteries and do not require petrol combustion. So, they almost have no roadside emission and are very suitable for use in densely-populated cities, especially Hong Kong.

Deputy President, the Government must provide more incentives to promote the development of EVs, so as to encourage consumers to choose EVs. The Government and the industry must also step up cooperation, properly take forward research and development ("R&D") and training, so that EV technologies can become increasingly matured.

(THE PRESIDENT resumed the Chair)

First of all, the Government should expeditiously set a specific target, including the proportion of EVs in registered vehicles and a target year for phasing out fuel-engined vehicles, in order to catch up with and stay close to the world trend. After setting a target, there must be a long-term plan. Although the public agree with promoting EVs, consumers are more sensitive to the price of the vehicle. If there is not an obvious difference in the price, consumers may not actively switch to EVs. The Budget this year has a list of measures to encourage consumers to buy or switch to EVs, including waiving in full the first registration tax ("FRT") for electric commercial vehicles, providing an FRT concession for electric private cars of up to \$97,500 and introducing an "one-for-one replacement" scheme. I support all these measures. However, I also hope that the Government can be consistent with these measures, and strengthen other supporting policies as well, such as charging facilities and talent training.

President, besides, a major obstacle to the popularization of electric private cars is insufficient charging facilities. Although some government open-air car parks are installed with charging facilities, when EVs become popularized, how will the Government deal with all the EV drivers who fight for the parking spaces with charging facilities? Will people occupy the parking spaces for a long time and refuse to leave? This will undermine the parking needs of other drivers and create traffic congestion. Public car parks are now getting less in number and parking spaces with charging facilities for EV drivers are even less. In this connection, I hold that the Government can complement the development of the Hong Kong Smart City Blueprint and make suitable planning of public spaces for charging of EVs, and review relevant provisions of the Buildings Ordinance to mandate the provision of charging facilities at the parking spaces of all newly constructed commercial and residential buildings.

Of course, to effectively lower roadside emissions, apart from encouraging the public to switch to electric private cars, we must also secure the support of the industry to switch to electric commercial vehicles. Actually, commercial vehicle emissions account for 95% of air pollution from vehicle emissions. Since the ratio is so high, I hope the Government can expeditiously address the worries of the industry in switching to EVs, such as immature technologies, a high initial investment and lacking operational data for reference, so as to work on the long-term development of EVs.

Commercial vehicles have a high driving mileage and are affected by weather and topography. Despite having the Pilot Green Transport Fund, the present technologies cannot provide a battery performance that can satisfy our needs. The reason is that the electric light bus under testing with the support of the Fund can only drive for about 180 km after two hours of battery charging. This is far below the average daily mileage of a public light bus. So, at this stage, EVs are not suitable for use by transport industries that have a high driving mileage. I hope the Government can spend more effort and resources on how to solve this problem in the long run, including supporting the R&D of local EVs and developing the maintenance and repair industry.

President, our policy has to be forward-looking. When EVs become common in the future, the number of retired batteries from EVs will increase. We will need a system to collect and handle these old batteries and a large number of supporting technicians. Hence, I hope the Government can communicate more with the business sector and formulate an effective strategy, and also set up apprenticeship programmes in the Vocational Training Council, so as to cope with the fast-changing usage level of EVs in the future.

In fact, if Hong Kong can successfully promote the popularization of EVs, it can improve our air quality and also facilitate the diversification of local industries. The business sector can train local and overseas talents to actively participate in the development of the electric automobile industry. It can also complement the development of new-energy vehicle industries in the Mainland and help these Mainland EV industries to go global.

All in all, I hold that the Government needs a set of sustainable supporting policies to meet the future usage of EVs. Do not blindly listen to what other people say. The policy must be appropriate and be able to tie in with the development of the whole society, such as strengthening (*The buzzer sounded*) ... supporting facilities and talent training ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Jeffrey LAM, please stop.

MR JEFFREY LAM (in Cantonese): Thank you, President.

MR WILSON OR (in Cantonese): President, I would first of all like to thank Mr Frankie YICK for moving this motion. The global awareness of environmental protection has been rising, and a number of countries and vehicle manufacturers have announced the prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles as well as the complete cessation of the production of fuel-engined vehicles in the next 30 years. I think the research and development of new-generation zero-emission electric vehicles ("EVs") will become the general direction of the development of the automobile industry worldwide. Regrettably, the SAR Government has been advancing at tortoise speed in this respect. In my opinion, the Government should further promote the popularization of EVs, so as to reduce roadside emission and improve air quality.

President, the levels of respirable suspended particulates and nitrogen dioxide at the roadside in Hong Kong have been exceeding the Air Quality Objectives over the years, and motor vehicles, especially diesel vehicles, are the main sources of these pollutants at street level in Hong Kong. According to the Livability Ranking announced by the Economist Intelligence Unit for the current year, Hong Kong's ranking has again gone down two places, and serious air pollution is one of the factors for the drop of our ranking. The SAR Government has all along been working vigorously to mitigate the problem of air pollution over the past many years, and in order to have the problem resolved, the Government should strengthen its actions on the promotion of the use of EVs.

The Government has in fact striven to encourage the use of EVs, and measures have been implemented as early as in 1994 to waive the first registration tax for EVs. Although such measures have been put in place for over 20 years, I consider that they have failed to achieve satisfactory results. As at end of August 2017, there were only 11 033 EVs in Hong Kong, accounting for 1.3% of the total number of registered vehicles in the territory. In the Budget announced last year, the SAR Government has even abolished the full waiver of first registration tax for electric private cars and capped the tax concession amount at \$97,500. Together with the inadequacy of charging facilities, I think

these are two major factors impeding the pace of promoting the popularization of EVs in Hong Kong.

In fact, the SAR Government has already formulated objectives for the popularization of EVs in 2011, but no effect has so far been achieved. The first objective set by the Government is to increase the proportion of EVs or hybrid vehicles to 30% of registered private cars by 2020; while the second objective is to provide charging facilities for EVs in 30% of private car parking spaces in newly constructed buildings. With less than three years left before 2020, it seems that it is most unlikely that the Government will be able to achieve these two major targets.

With regard to the popularization of EVs, the Government has suddenly reduced and capped the tax concession amount for electric private cars at \$97,500. Under such a new arrangement, the costs for purchasing EVs will undoubtedly increase substantially, thus providing a strong disincentive for potential buyers. According to information provided by the Transport Department, the number of EVs at present accounts for less than 2% of the total number of registered vehicles, and there is a huge gap between this figure and the target proportion set by the Government. In this connection, the Government has explained that it is more concerned about the growth in the total number of vehicles (especially private cars) in Hong Kong, and measures have to be formulated accordingly to improve the situation. Does it necessarily mean that the Government has to shelve all measures to promote the popularization of EVs? I do not consider such an attitude adequate for the Government to meet the targets constantly put forward by the relevant Policy Bureau to popularize EVs, and neither can it help the Government genuinely address the aspiration for curbing the growth in the number of private cars. President, many people have relayed to me that they do not want to see that the Government is, as the saying goes, "invincible in its words but powerless in its actions".

Yet, this can be fully reflected in the Government's provision of charging facilities. According to figures from the Environmental Protection Department, the number of chargers has increased from 872 in 2011 to 1 774 in 2017, but there are now some 10 000 EVs in the whole territory, meaning that each charger is used to serve the needs of about six EVs on average. How can this help to popularize EVs? It can thus be seen that the Government has not endeavoured to provide more charging facilities for EVs over the past many years, and this has always been a problem bothering owners of electric cars.

Furthermore, the speed of charging facilities for EVs is classified into three categories, namely, standard, medium and fast chargers, and it takes 24 to 40 hours to fully recharge an electric car with a standard charger. How can this provide a greater incentive to attract more people to go for electric cars? The problems of inadequate parking spaces for EVs or their occupation by non-electric cars have also attracted a lot of public criticisms. President, all these have made me worry that the policy on the popularization of EVs will only be put to an end without a known cause.

In addition, I hope the Government will understand that we do not mean to oppose for the sake of opposition, but very much wish to see that corresponding support measures can be put in place by the Government. In this connection, we would like to make the following proposals for consideration by the Government: It is hoped that the Government can offer financial incentives to car owners so that they will be attracted to switch to using EVs. Possible measures include exploring the feasibility of increasing the first registration tax concession amount for electric private cars; offering an ex gratia payment to car owners who replace their fuel-engined vehicles with EVs; and lower the threshold required under the "one-for-one replacement" scheme. Consideration can also be given by the Government to providing metered parking spaces installed with charging facilities, "roadside charging stations" and "street light charging points", and all these measures can bring convenience to owners of EVs.

President, as I have always pointed out, the Government should no longer advance at tortoise speed in this respect, and apart from taking the lead to implement the necessary measures, it should also examine ways to address the problems of slow charging speed, inadequate EV parking spaces or their occupation by non-electric cars. The Government should seize the opportunity of the development of a smart city and endeavour to undertake its work in this regard properly, lest the target of popularizing EVs will become nothing more than a mere slogan.

Finally, I hope the Government will listen to our views, because many people have asked me to reflect to the Government that with regard to the popularization of EVs, it should put its words into actions. The Government should avoid committing the mistake of "starting well but finishing poorly", thus rendering the relevant policy a nondescript.

Thank you, President.

MR TONY TSE (in Cantonese): President, as we all know, many places in the world are now actively promoting environmental protection, and as mentioned by Mr YICK, a timetable has been drawn up for the prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles in different places all over the world. Hong Kong has been promoting the use of electric vehicles ("EVs") for over 20 years, but the number of EVs at present only accounts for 1.3% of the total number of registered vehicles, and our performance in this respect is barely passable.

In its reply to a question raised by a Member in this Council at the beginning of this year, the Government stated that it was collating information on the timetables or targets set in overseas places for a total ban on the sale of private cars solely using petrol or diesel, and would explore the situation in Hong Kong before making a decision on the feasibility of setting local timetables or targets for the same purpose. I agree that there is in fact no ground for blame if the Government really wishes to conduct a thorough study, but at the present stage, it should not give further consideration to the desirability of setting timetables or targets in this respect, and should put its words into actions to draw up the same, otherwise people will only have the impression that the Government makes no decision after discussion and takes no action after a decision is made.

The Government displayed great vision 20 years ago and decided to promote the use of EVs. As early as in the 1980s and 1990s, studies on the use of EVs have already started in Hong Kong by Prof CHAN Ching-chuen, who is named the "Father of Asian Electric Vehicles", and the relevant technologies have been adopted in places like European and American countries as well as China.

In 2015, the former Central Policy Unit released a study report and pointed out that Hong Kong was the world's most suitable place for using EVs, especially in terms of electric public transport. The wider use of EVs, if successfully promoted, would be conducive to the effective improvement of air quality in Hong Kong. In view of the development of Mainland's new energy vehicle industry, this would help the EV industry of the Mainland "go global" and facilitate the diversification of Hong Kong's industries. In the long run, such a move might help Hong Kong establish its leading position in promoting EVs for improving air quality of the city.

With so many advantages, actions should in fact be taken to implement the relevant initiatives, but as at end of February 2018, there were only some 11 100 EVs in Hong Kong, and as compared to the global number of 3.2 million EVs,

there is still a very long way to go for Hong Kong to establish its world-leading position in promoting EVs.

Hong Kong is a city with narrow and crowded roads, and instead of introducing electric private cars of a larger size from Europe, I consider it more appropriate to invest resources in researching and developing small and medium electric private cars and electric public transport which can suit the local situation, and promoting their use in Hong Kong. Efforts should also be made to develop rechargeable EV batteries and examine how we should dispose of waste batteries. Therefore, I have reservation about the proposal of granting tax concessions across the board, including the waiving of first registration tax with no upper limit on the tax amount exempted, because this may encourage more people to purchase private cars, thereby rendering local traffic even more congested and benefiting car dealers indirectly.

Apart from research and development efforts, the provision of ancillary facilities is equally important in promoting the use of EVs. Committed efforts have been made in European and American countries and Japan to retrofit different places with charging facilities, in order to build a charging network with comprehensive coverage. I support Mr YICK's proposal to amend the relevant provisions of the Buildings Ordinance to mandate the provision of charging facilities at all parking spaces in newly constructed commercial and residential buildings. However, what is even more worth reviewing by the Government is that under the existing policy, quite a number of carparks are built underground, and the practice is not environmentally friendly. On the one hand, this involves excavation works and disposal of wastes during the construction stage, while on the other hand, measures have to be taken at a later stage to address problems concerning ventilation, lighting and air circulation in underground carparks completed. I consider it more environmentally friendly if carparks are not built underground.

The Government has repeatedly emphasized that judging from the daily mileage of vehicles in Hong Kong, charging facilities provided in domestic premises or offices should be adequate to cope with the demand of EVs, and there is no need to rely on additional electricity supplied by public charging facilities. However, the Government has neglected the fact that there is now a serious shortage of charging facilities in domestic premises and offices. Plans to install additional charging facilities are often faced with the problems of fragmented ownership and occupation of public places, thus making it very difficult to lay

electrical wirings as required. Moreover, the current design standards for car parking spaces may have also rendered it more difficult to install such facilities. It is therefore necessary for the Government to provide more public charging facilities and expand the charging network.

If the Government is really determined to promote the use of EVs, it has to build a charging network comparable to the current network of fuelling stations for non-electric cars. There are now charging network plans of a considerable scale for EVs in Europe, with five super charging stations under construction at the end of last year. At the same time, according to some charging services operators, there are plans to provide more than 300 charging stations in Europe in the future. In order to tie in with the energy policy implemented in Taiwan, the biggest fossil fuel company in Taiwan, CPC Corporation, will convert existing fuelling stations to green energy stations. In addition, it will also consider joining hands with manufacturers of EVs to conduct researches on and develop its own brand of rechargeable batteries, so as to facilitate a smooth transition of its 2 000 vehicle fuelling stations.

If we want to build Hong Kong into a smart city, we should be far-sighted and think outside the box. The authorities have often expressed concern that if charging facilities are provided at roadside parking spaces, these spaces may be permanently occupied by drivers of EVs for recharging their vehicles, thus failing to cater for the parking demand of other motorists, and causing traffic congestion in nearby areas as long queues of EVs may appear to wait for their turn to use the charging facilities. Hence, the Government is reluctant to develop charging facilities at roadside parking spaces.

The problem can actually be resolved completely with the use of the latest technology. As fast chargers are now available to fully recharge EVs in only 30 to 40 minutes, the Government should not try to find excuses, and should take immediate actions to put the plan into practice.

The use of EVs is a major trend in the future. Instead of making no decision after discussion and taking no action after a decision is made, the Government should put in more efforts to promote their popularization.

President, I so submit.

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): President, I first wish to thank Mr Frankie YICK for bringing up the issue of electric vehicles ("EVs") today.

The Government has recently set two targets for EVs' popularization: First, by 2020, 30% of all private cars should be EVs or hybrid vehicles; and second, 30% of the parking spaces for private cars in a newly-constructed building should be equipped with the relevant facilities. But how is the current situation? As at January 2018, only 10 000, or less than 2%, of the 550 000 private cars in Hong Kong were powered by electricity. Besides, there were 1 862 charging stations in Hong Kong, and this figure merely accounted for 0.3% of the total number of parking spaces in Hong Kong. These two figures totally lag behind the original standards or targets laid down by the Government. I wonder how the Government can make up for the shortfall before 2020.

One fatal reason is the capping of EVs' taxation concession at \$97,500 in the Budget of last year. Before the introduction of this taxation measure, the number of new EV registrations ranged between 160 and 200 on average every month. But after this measure took effect, the number of registrations recorded merely stood at a single digit, and the figure for the whole year was extremely small.

The Budget recently delivered rolls out the "one-for-one replacement" scheme ("the Scheme"). If a car owner replaces his old car with an EV, he can enjoy a first registration tax ("FRT") concession of \$250,000. Let me talk about the concept of the Scheme. Hong Kong's FRT is computed on a progressive basis. The tax rate for the first \$150,000 of the taxable value of a motor vehicle is 40%, the tax rate for the next \$150,000 is 75%, and the tax rate for the next \$200,000 is 100%. If computation is done on the basis of the \$250,000 tax concession, an EV below \$377,500 is tax-free. In other words, suppose you want to buy an EV, its tax-inclusive price would be \$530,000 after deducting the \$97,500 tax concession before. But under the Scheme, it will be totally tax-free, and the tax-inclusive price is merely \$377,500.

First, why should the authorities draw the line at the price level of \$400,000? I must explain that EVs can be categorized into two types. The first type of EVs is for daily uses, and the second type is those high-end supercars or super EVs. With this distinction, am I right to say that EVs below \$377,500 are regarded as EVs for daily uses, as reflected by the concession amount set by

the Government? If the line is drawn at this price level, an overwhelming majority of the cars for sale at present can meet the criteria. So, I have no dispute with this amount of \$250,000.

However, this has given rise to one question. A car must be six years of age or above in order to meet the criteria under the Scheme. Members can come to imagine this. A car owner must use his car until it becomes virtually worthless (for example, its value has dropped to a dozen thousand dollars or a few thousand dollars) before he can join the Scheme. If a car costing \$400,000 at the very beginning has been used for seven years, it may still be worth some \$200,000. In that case, how will the car owner have the drive to replace it with an EV? For this reason, the Government only received 11 applications in the first month after rolling out the Scheme. Before the introduction of the relevant tax concession, some 100 new EVs were registered a month. But the figure has dropped to merely 11 lately. Even if things turn for the better in the future, the authorities will still be unable to restore the figure to its previous state.

Another reason for hindering EVs' development is definitely parking spaces. At present, there is one charging station for every six EVs. But in the Netherlands, there is one charging station for every 1.8 EVs. Besides, the Government even needs to set up more fast charging stations. Half of the existing 1 862 government charging stations are only equipped with standard charging facilities, or what we call "slow charging" facilities. It will take 25 hours to fully recharge an EV's battery.

Furthermore, I hope the Government can grasp the opportunity presented by the replacement of all parking meters. The Transport Department is now planning to replace all parking meters in the territory. I urge the Government to equip new parking meters with charging facilities. That way, 18 000 parking spaces with charging functions can be provided. Certainly, the Government must provide support measures. It must not only install additional charging facilities but also ensure that the power grid is able to support such a mammoth task. But I urge the Government to consider the idea of conducting these two tasks simultaneously rather than separately when replacing parking meters. Besides, in some countries (such as Canada), their local Governments will provide charging facilities in cooperation with fuel stations. Hong Kong can consider this idea.

I must say that as a long-standing policy, the Government will exempt private developers from land premium payment in return for providing EV parking spaces in their car parks. But they are merely equipped with bogus charging facilities, in the sense that they are not connected to any power source. The reason is that the basic conditions only include the provision of switchboards, distribution boards, cabling, conduits and trunking. The Government has not required that the charging facilities must be connected to a power source or open to the public. All this is due to administrative problems. I hope the Government can resolve them as soon as possible, or else it will be impossible to tie in with social development or meet people's demand.

As I said just now, the popularization of EVs is a broad trend which is inevitable. Various places in the world have already set a timetable for banning the sale of fuel-engined vehicles. For example, Norway and the Netherlands will ban the sale of fuel-engined vehicles by 2025; the United States and India will ban their sale by 2030; and in France, the United Kingdom and Taiwan, the sale of such vehicles will be prohibited in 2040. But in the case of Hong Kong, no blueprint has been formulated, and people do not know when such a ban will be implemented. Here, I urge the Government to stop its empty talks.

The Government is duty-bound to promote EVs with vigorous efforts. And, the Government should not forget that automobile manufacturers are actually developing in this direction. One of the four major automobile manufacturers in Japan has already indicated clearly that it will no longer develop any new engines for private cars. This shows that it is a broad trend which is inevitable. I hope the Government can seriously consider my earlier viewpoints.

Thank you, President.

MR SHIU KA-FAI (in Cantonese): President, I first wish to thank Mr Frankie YICK for proposing the motion on "Promoting the popularization of electric vehicles" today. His earlier speech was very comprehensive, and it commands my strong approval. While I am the representative of the wholesale and retail sector, I also represent the automobile sector. Since this sector hopes that I can put forth their expectations for them, I will give a short speech and discuss the relevant respects.

I believe many Hong Kong people will support this motion in order to improve Hong Kong's air quality and protect people's health. But I wish to tell the Government that before implementing any policies, the Government must communicate fully with the relevant trades, so as to ascertain the actual feasibility of policies.

Last year, the Government introduced amendments to require that newly-registered diesel private cars must comply with the LEV III exhaust emission standard laid down by California. Automobile associations in the trade do not have any objection in principle, only that they thought the transition period initially designated by the authorities was not long enough. Fortunately, after consultation, the Government took on board the views of the trade and delayed its implementation by three months in the end, so as to enable the trade to make necessary arrangements. Therefore, I believe communication with the trade is a very important segment.

At present, the Government caps the first registration tax ("FRT") concession for electric vehicles ("EVs") at \$97,500, in marked contrast to the previous total exemption. Hong Kong people in general and the trade think that there is no problem. As Mr Frankie YICK said, apart from the Government's provision of support measures, affordable pricing is also necessary for EVs' popularization. If the Government only offers particular support for expensive EVs of certain types, the result may be that not many people will be willing to use EVs, just as Ms YUNG Hoi-yan asserted. Therefore, if the Government can concentrate its resources on assisting EVs in the middle and low price range, I believe Hong Kong people will render support and echo with the Government.

The Government rolls out the "one-for-one replacement" scheme ("the Scheme") in the Budget of this year. If a car owner possesses an old car aged six years above for at least three years, he may deregister and scrap the old car and enjoy the FRT concession capped at \$250,000 when purchasing an EV. The trade thinks that this is agreeable and acceptable. Statistics show that there are around 210 000 private cars aged 10 years above in Hong Kong, and this figure accounts for nearly 40% of the total. I believe the Government's provision of subsidies for people to deregister and scrap their old cars will become an incentive driving people to replace their cars with EVs.

But I wish to bring up one point. Some people have told me that as a requirement under the Scheme, the car owner must have held a valid vehicle licence for his old car for a consecutive year. I do not remember whether it is one year or longer. Some people have asked whether the time frame for holding a vehicle licence can be changed from a consecutive year to, maybe, nine months. The reason is that some people may keep several old cars idle at home. They may not hold any licence for all the cars for a consecutive year because they do not drive them very often. Perhaps, they only drive one of them for half a year. For this reason, they have only renewed the vehicle licence with a validity of six or nine months all along. If they are required to comply with the Government's requirement of holding a vehicle licence for a consecutive year, they may be unable to deregister and scrap their old cars and can only leave them idle instead. I hope the Bureau can pay attention to the time frame for holding a vehicle licence because this was a view put forth by some people at a previous press conference.

I also want to bring up another point. Apart from all-electric vehicles, there are also hybrid vehicles in Hong Kong or various places of the world. Some of them are driven by a combination of petrol and electric power with remarkable environmental efficiency. While they may not be 100% the same as EVs, their environmental performance is better than conventional fuel-engined vehicles. The Government fully supports EVs' development these days. But hybrid vehicles have likewise contributed to environmental protection. Will the Government consider the idea of offering subsidies? The trade thinks that this is fairer.

Lastly, I wish to talk about Mr HUI Chi-fung's amendment. To put it simply, one of his proposals is that he hopes the Government can set a target or a target year for the total elimination of fuel-engined vehicles. I wish to say that Hong Kong is devoid of any automobile manufacturer. And, as Members all know, large automobile manufacturing plants can be found only in a few countries. Those who want to become car owners around the world actually must follow their direction. I certainly know that the promotion of EVs has become a major trend these days. However, have all automobile manufacturers already decided on the time of ceasing the production of fuel-engined vehicles? I do not believe they have. If Hong Kong hastens to enact legislation for a deadline today, and if certain automobile manufacturers fail to meet the target by then, no motor vehicles will be delivered to Hong Kong in the end.

On this point, I think the authorities must pay attention when setting a deadline and observe the trend of the whole world for a few more years. When automobile manufacturers worldwide have set a specific deadline for ceasing the production of fuel-engined vehicles, there is simply no need for Hong Kong to enact any legislation as fuel-engined vehicles will no longer be available for sale. I wish to remind the Bureau, the department and the Government to note this particular point.

President, I so submit.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): President, emissions from fuel-engined vehicles are the major source of air pollution. Therefore, promoting the popularization of electric vehicles ("EVs") is a major trend worldwide, and we have no reason to raise objection. This time around, Mr Frankie YICK proposes a motion debate for Members to put their heads together and raise some suggestions.

Frankly speaking, I am still unable to sort out one question. So today, I wish to seek Members' enlightenment. I always wonder how effectively we can help to reduce emissions after taking so many measures. Let me first talk about the Government's financial incentive of providing subsidies to EV owners with public money as a means of encouraging owners of petrol or diesel vehicles to switch to EVs. Recently, the Government rolled out many financial incentives concerning EVs' prices, including an increase of the first registration tax ("FRT") concession.

In theory, if financial incentives are not enough, the Government may offer more, such as a cash handout of a few thousand dollars for each EV owner every year. Some may question if this is tantamount to robbing the poor to help the rich, or car owners. But the Government has introduced an even more absurd policy to share the fruits of development with people. Can this financial initiative be more absurd than rates concession? The latter measure is actually one of returning wealth to wealthy people and robbing the poor to help the rich. Owners with more properties can enjoy a greater amount of rates concession. This is indeed very absurd! A cash handout for EV owners every year can at least help to reduce emissions and in turn do good to the air quality. This will

also benefit our health indirectly. So, they had rather offer subsidies to car owners instead of property owners. Members can think this way.

One point in Mr Kenneth LAU's earlier speech is very agreeable to me. As he pointed out, EVs are simply crap if recharging is inconvenient or simply impossible. Even the FRT concession or a cash handout of a few thousand dollars for car owners every year may not be able to induce them to switch to EVs. Today, it looks like many Members want to force the Government to set a target, a rigid target or a specific proportion, saying that after setting a rigid target, the Government may proceed to conduct studies on formulating policies as support, and it is the only way to achieve success.

In gist, this proposal concerns the question of whether the Government should encourage or force people to switch to EVs. The simplest way is to close down all fuel stations. If refuelling becomes more inconvenient than recharging one day, people may switch to EVs. Or, if the difference between fuel prices and recharging fees keeps widening, they may consider the idea of switching to EVs. All this can be discussed. But after so much effort, how many proposals can be implemented with effectiveness? I am really doubtful.

Actually, I also agree with the Government's assertion that the culprit of vehicular emissions is commercial vehicles. While private cars outnumber commercial vehicles, commercial vehicles travel on roads for long hours every day. Perhaps, Members are unable to tell which of the various amendments today is the most agreeable to me. The amendment proposed by Ms YUNG Hoi-yan is the most agreeable to me. Ms YUNG Hoi-yan proposes to expedite "the promotion of the switch of public transport and commercial vehicles to EVs". I think this should rather be the major objective.

I can think of a way to increase the number of EVs and resolve the difficulty faced by the Government: While it must contain the overall number of private cars to avoid the deterioration of traffic congestion and roadside air quality, it must also encourage car owners to choose EVs. But Mr Frankie YICK will not agree to this proposal, the proposal of promoting carpooling schemes, or encouraging the provision of Uber-like services.

Whether a person wants to buy a car depends very much on travel convenience. In Hong Kong, keeping a car and finding a parking space are very difficult. If a person can receive pick-up services at once simply by pressing a button, he will not buy any car. Certainly, whether such services charge any fee is another matter. If a carpooling service provider finds that the fuel cost of using electricity is lower than that of using diesel, he will certainly switch to EVs. Therefore, the Government should explore and encourage carpooling programmes as a means of reducing the number of private cars owned by individuals. If private cars are used as commercial vehicles, a service fee should be charged.

Lastly, I wish to point out that many Members have expressed support for all amendments. But do Members realize that the various amendments are actually different from one another, to speak less of being contradictory? For example, I also hope that Mr Frankie YICK can clarify point (2) in his motion. He proposes to "amend the relevant provisions of the Buildings Ordinance to mandate the provision of charging facilities for charging EVs at all parking spaces in newly constructed commercial and residential buildings". And Ms YUNG Hoi-yan instead proposes to "introduce additional incentives to encourage developers" to do so.

Many Members agree to one point today. The Government provides gross floor area concessions for new private buildings to encourage property developers to equip their private car parks with charging facilities for EVs. But in the end, it is found that only some conduits and power cables have been installed, and the relevant facilities are not connected to any power source. This has certainly aroused our objection. The reason is that they have been granted gross floor area concessions, so they should provide facilities with charging functions.

I wonder if Mr Frankie YICK's proposal is targeted at such cases or seeks to amend the Buildings Ordinance to require the provision of charging facilities at the car parks of all commercial and residential buildings. In point (2) of his motion, he uses the word "mandate" instead of "encourage". Why is he so harsh to private developers? Ms YUNG Hoi-yan's amendment proposal is different. So, Members should consider if they will support both amendments.

Point (3) of Mr Frankie YICK's motion is devoid of any proposal on the mandatory provision of charging facilities in the car parks of government properties and public housing. This is the case with government properties. The Member has no reason to tilt in favour of the Government and refrain from mandating the Government's provision of charging facilities in his proposal. This is in marked contrast to his proposal on the mandatory provision of charging facilities in private commercial and residential buildings. Actually, we should first require the Government to provide charging facilities and take the lead. Then, we may proceed to encourage the business sector and people to provide charging facilities and switch to EVs respectively. If we really require people to switch to EVs, we must close down all fuel stations. Certainly, the Government should also mandate the installation of charging facilities in all buildings. This is rather a drastic move and a major policy change.

I so submit.

MR CHAN KIN-POR (in Cantonese): The Government started to promote vigorously the use of electric vehicles ("EVs") by members of the public in about 2009 and many measures were being introduced. The issue was also being strongly debated at the Legislative Council then. Very regrettably, Hong Kong only has 11 000 EVs till now which accounted for 1% of the total number of vehicles in Hong Kong, it is really disappointing.

The development of EVs is not satisfactory as there are still many issues that cannot be properly resolved, particularly the issue of charging facilities. At present, newly completed buildings are required to install charging facilities in the parking spaces in car parks in order for all to be granted exemption for inclusion as gross floor area. More than 40 000 parking spaces with charging facilities had been approved in the past seven years. Definitely, it may be more directly effective if the original proposal of amending the legislation to make it mandatory for all parking spaces in new buildings to be provided with adequate charging facilities was adopted. Actually, the most annoying issue now is that old buildings will face a lot of problems including legal, financial and technical ones if they are required to install charging facilities, thus making it unachievable for many of the buildings.

I am the Chairman of the Owners' Committee ("OC") of a large housing estate on the Hong Kong Island. Our estate has 3 000 parking spaces. We

have been bothered by the issue of installing charging facilities for years and just examining the feasible options took over two years, which included the pricing and legal issues generated by letting private parking spaces using public power supply system. The processes are quite complicated. I can share with you on this. Several years ago, since many of the residents requested to install charging facilities in the parking spaces, the OC began to look into it. It was originally thought to be very simple. Upon understanding the issue, we find that the existing power supply capacity is limited, if it is not upgraded, each car park can only install about 20-odd charging facilities. It basically fails to cope with the needs. However, if more facilities are to be installed, the overall power supply facilities will have to be upgraded.

However, upgrading the overall power supply facilities is never simple. Our housing estate has four phases of multi-storey residential flats and each stage of the project will cost more than \$1 million while the electrical cords will have to be further connected so that the charging facilities can be installed upon completing the project. In view of the "user pays" principle, the owners will have to pay a sum of several ten thousand dollars for installing the charging facilities in addition to considering the legal and technical issues, the related works has therefore been repeatedly delayed. Fortunately, the electricity company offers consultancy services on charging recently and puts forth new plans allowing the owners of parking spaces to apply to the consultant firm directly and all the works will be undertaken by the consultant firm. The owners will be responsible for their own fees, the OC will only need to monitor without directly getting involved, so a lot of problems are avoided.

As a matter of fact, though we are a relatively large housing estate, moreover, the owners are willing to pay for their own installation costs while the OC and the management company are also working with drive, we have to spare substantial time and effort to resolve the problems. If for those smaller or old housing estates, or those Incorporated Owners of buildings which simply do not want to take care of it, it is believed that the introduction of charging facilities will surely be more difficult. Therefore, I think that if the Government wants to popularize EVs, it should help the buildings in the first place to resolve the issues of installing charging facilities and provide more assistance, or even provide financial incentives directly in order to expedite the progress of installing charging facilities for existing buildings. I believe when these problems are resolved, EVs can really be popularized.

On the other hand, some problems will inevitably be generated when we promote the popularization of EVs, the Government should promptly propose solutions to avoid creating new social problems. The most basic one is the disposal problem for waste batteries. As the batteries for EVs have to be replaced after using for several years, the popularization will inevitably lead to the presence of huge amount of discarded batteries that were being replaced. These batteries contain heavy toxins that will harm the environment but the Government still fails to come up with good disposal policies. Hence, the Government has to put forth battery recovery and disposal policies, for example, requiring the manufacturers to propose comprehensive improvement measure so that the popularization and use of EVs can be realized.

The other problem is the issue of abandoned old vehicles. If EVs are successfully popularized, a large number of vehicle owners may switch to use EVs within a few years, i.e. a large amount of old fuel-consuming vehicles will be replaced. No matter these vehicles will be diverted to the second hand market or be abandoned, a lot of problems may arise. The Government should evaluate the situation first and propose solutions beforehand. We must work out proper complementary policies, otherwise, even if EVs can be successfully popularized, the environment of Hong Kong will unavoidably be victimized.

I so submit.

DR ELIZABETH QUAT (in Cantonese): President, first of all, I thank Mr Frankie YICK for proposing this motion debate today, so that we can gather here and focus on finding a strategy for promoting the popularization of electric vehicles ("EVs") in Hong Kong. Why did the Government put forward the promotion of EVs 20 years ago? If we trace back to our original intention, the initial reason why we need to promote EVs in Hong Kong, it all originated from the serious air pollution in Hong Kong and also the problem of global warming and climate change. As an advanced city, Hong Kong also wishes to play a part in emission reduction and energy conservation, so as to slow down global warming. Hence, as early as 20 years ago, the Government started to launch policies to promote EVs. However, 20 years have gone, and we do not see any major progress in this regard.

In fact, in retrospect, the Government's attitude over the years wavered. Sometimes, it appeared to be very determined in the promotion, but then its determination did not follow through. After pressing the policy ahead a little, the Government then said that the policy had met with great difficulties, and we eventually stopped seeing any sign of the policy. We are thus of the view that the Government did not match its words with its deeds. It had no policy, no target, no blueprint and no plan to promote EVs. When we criticized the Government, it launched a few measures in return. For example, in response to our view that the policy would benefit a certain EV company, it abolished the tax concession altogether; and in response to our comment that the abolition was a disservice since without a tax concession people would choose not to buy EVs, it re-launched the concession to attract people to buy EVs. Is this wavering attitude conducive to addressing the air pollution problem in Hong Kong and achieving the target of energy conservation and emission reduction that we wish to achieve?

In fact, many of the present policies are contradictory and fail to achieve what they should achieve. As many Members have mentioned today, places around the world are launching EV policies, but Hong Kong seems unwilling to make a step forward. While other countries, including our own country and other European governments, have announced their targets of phasing out or banning the sale of fuel-engined vehicles by or after 2025, the Hong Kong Government still has not set any target. Every time when we urged the Secretary to set a target for Hong Kong, he said the target might not be feasible or other governments might not have any detailed plans for their targets. We understand that we may not be able to fully achieve our target, but if we do not even set a target or lay down a plan, we will lose our direction and make no progress.

Many people in Hong Kong, including friends around me, want to switch to EVs and replace their fuel-engined vehicles. But they have two issues: first, EVs are too expensive; and second, charging facilities are inadequate. So, if the Government can address these two issues, I believe many people are willing to give up their fuel-engined vehicles and switch to EVs. Most world-renowned vehicle manufacturers have announced their plans of stopping or reducing the production of fuel-engined vehicles and focusing their full effort on developing EVs. If Hong Kong fails to lay down a good foundation, it will become a

history museum. If anyone wishes to see the cities which still have fuel-engined vehicles, they should come to Hong Kong in 20 years' time. Hence, if the Government can solve these two issues, I believe Hong Kong can make a big step forward.

Regarding the expensive price, not too many people have bought an EV, not even when the first registration tax was still exempted in full by the Government, and the present number of EVs only accounts for 1.3% of the total number of vehicles. The main reason is inadequate charging facilities. So, even if there is a tax concession, and even if people want very much to opt for EVs, if the problem of electricity charging is not solved, they cannot do so. Hence, the Government has announced in this Budget to provide economic incentives again. We certainly welcome the proposal because economic incentives are appealing, despite not very adequate, and I hope the Government can provide more economic incentives. Second, I hope the policy would not be too complicated. The public find the present requirements of six years and three years too complicated. This will reduce the appeal of the policy. Hence, the Government should think about how to simplify the policy and provide more incentives. But the biggest problem remains the charging facilities.

President, just now, many Members mentioned that it is very difficult to find charging facilities on the street. Public car parks also lack adequate parking spaces with charging facilities. Many people are of the view that if there are charging facilities near their residence, the problem can be solved. If the facilities can provide high speed or medium speed charging, more people can then use the charging facilities.

Some Members question the number of parking spaces with charging facilities can be provided in a housing estate. This is a big problem. First, EV owners must get pass the hurdle of Owners' Corporations ("OCs"). Some OCs are not very cooperative. They may not want to install charging facilities for the buildings. Many housing estates have postponed installing charging facilities until now when EVs become a major trend, and this has forced OCs to start to approve these works projects. However, in some cases, housing estates which manage to have 10-odd parking spaces installed with charging facilities and have car owners who are willing to pay a few ten thousand dollars for the installation run into problems of insufficient power supply.

Hence, if the Government truly wishes to promote the development of EVs, it must have a comprehensive policy to properly prepare for the present and the future, such as finding ways to assist housing estates in providing adequate parking spaces with charging facilities, to fund and assist the research and development of local vehicles, to providing clean energy for charging EVs, to handle the recycling of retired batteries, etc. We need a comprehensive policy before we can have a chance to promote the development of EVs, reduce the air pollution problems in Hong Kong and in turn contribute to the combat against global warming, energy conservation and emission reduction. So, the Government should match its words with its deeds. I hope that after listening to our views today, it will truly support the development of EVs.

President, I speak in support of the original motion and all the amendments.

MR WU CHI-WAI (in Cantonese): President, I would like to thank Mr Frankie YICK for moving the motion debate on "Promoting the popularization of electric vehicles".

Many colleagues spoke pinpointing on the issue of inadequate charging facilities for electric vehicles ("EVs") at present, I agree that this is an important reason for the failure of popularization of EVs in Hong Kong but I think that the pockets of vehicle owners are most honest. The current prices for EVs are relatively exorbitant, buying a fuel-consuming vehicle costs \$80,000 to \$100,000 only while an EV cost at least \$300,000. Hence, expensive price is the reason which is most influential to the popularization of EVs instead.

With the advent of times, the popularization of EVs is a global trend. In fact, many countries begin to make the popularization of EVs a national policy, for instance, certain European countries have decided to stop the production of fuel-consuming vehicles in 2030. Under such a background, we need to consider that the failure for EVs to become popularized is due to their exorbitant prices. If cost effectiveness is to be achieved, in principle, there should not be so many supplementary facilities being installed to prevent them from lying idle or even having those very precious parking spaces in car parks from being occupied.

Nevertheless, even if this line of thinking is correct and we ignore the parking spaces in car parks of existing buildings, what about the new buildings? For the issue of so-called getting ready adequate charging facilities, can the developers get in return the various GFA concessions in respect of building constructions by simply placing charging facilities there or will the developers be required to provide adequate supplementary facilities? What should the related supplementary facilities include? "Ready" should not just mean placing something there as a pretence with the power source connected only when the owners need to use the charging facilities in the parking spaces. Instead, the power supply should actually be put in place to make "readiness" really exist.

Saying so sounds silly, we need to get prepared for the future now. In reality, however, Hong Kong has never planned for the future. What can we do when the day really comes? For example, we mention the inadequacy of parking spaces with charging facilities, the problem will be more serious in the future. Let us think about it, the new buildings are not ready and the old ones have not made adequate preparation, what will be the result?

In the future when the prices of EVs have dropped to \$100,000 each, many members of the public will be willing to switch to EVs as tax is no longer an issue. The prices are so low that the public will naturally want to switch. However, even if the public want to switch, it will not be possible as the existing parking spaces will not be equipped with facilities adapted for EVs until then. That is where the issue lies. Nevertheless, has the government ever considered such future situation and moved on to make proper preparations and planning now?

Not to talk about things which are so distant, can the government tell me whether there are sufficient power sources and voltage to install additional charging facilities for EVs in the parking spaces of car parks of the Hong Kong Housing Authority or the Government? If it is not permissible, what can we do in the future? By then, drivers of EVs may have to look for parking spaces everywhere, some Apps may worth a lot as they can help them find parking spaces with charging facilities, that is the crux of the issue.

I support the promotion of EVs, firstly, as EVs can help to improve the air quality. In fact, we also hope that with the development of the city, we could gradually control or even enhance the air quality. We can control the air pollution emission of power plants but we cannot control the fuel consuming

vehicles out there. I have argued with the Government for a long time, the number of vehicles rises from around 400 000 in 2003 to 600 000 nowadays, it has raised by almost 50%, the rate of increase is quite exaggerated.

Has the Government ever given serious thought to what extent will these 200 000 additional vehicles cause to the aggravation in air pollution? The Government has neither made any calculation, nor has it exercised any control or given any consideration to the fact that there will be better way of manufacturing in the future with the trend of development for EVs which will reduce the production cost of EVs and bring about an increase in demand. The Government did nothing and then responded at a "snail's pace" in tackling the imminent problems today.

The Government only mentions the positive figures, saying that at present there are over 1 000 parking spaces with charging facilities which are able to cope with the 20 000 to 30 000 EVs. Of course we can handle it as the EVs actually using the parking spaces with charging facilities are not that substantial, however, we are not talking about the current situation. The current situation occurs solely because the technology is immature, we are absolutely certain that the problem of exorbitant prices caused by immature technology will be addressed through downward adjustment in prices with gradual improvement in technology. I do not know when it will come, it may be in one year, two years or three years but I am sure that with rapid progress in technology, if the Government still sit there doing nothing, when the prices drop someday in the future and the drivers are still unable to opt EVs, that will be the responsibility of the Government.

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

Therefore, I hope that the Secretary would consider the issue from a broader perspective when he responded later rather than focusing on the point that the charging facilities today are adequate to cope with the current demand. Sorry that the demand for EVs today is being restricted due to very exorbitant prices, the second-hand ones are still very expensive even after tax deduction. Thank you, Deputy President.

MS CLAUDIA MO (in Cantonese): In promoting the popularization of electric vehicles ("EVs"), the Government only displayed half of its sincerity. It told the Hong Kong citizens on one hand that EVs were good stuff which would reduce emission and provided financial incentives. On the other hand, it stated that the public charging facilities for EVs were supplementary in nature. That inevitably causes our concern.

We talk about wise city now, why not considering the construction of fee collection charging stations dedicated for EVs in the future? Talking about the levying of fees, whenever the Government talks about the matter of environmental protection, it will always say "user-pay", so no wonder private housing estates have to give serious thought to whether charging facilities are to be installed within the housing estates because large housing estates may have several tens to several hundreds of vehicles which required charging. As it involves the sharing of electricity, the electricity charges have to be split among all households which include those who own no EVs. That is unfair. Can the Government tell them who should pay the related electricity charges? The Government can look into how it can be handled together with the power companies. We understand why many incorporated owners are unwilling to install charging facilities currently. Why should households without EVs pay for the charging fees for EVs? This point is arguable since just as the Government said, it should be paid by the users. However, the Government said that the private charging facilities have nothing to do with the it, the EV owners have to take care of it themselves while public charging facilities are supplementary in nature. If you own an EV, then I wish you good luck.

EVs have become a global trend but the Government still maintains the mentality of "keeping up with the Joneses", that is, as a wise city, when it is proposed by others, we also have to put it into practice, but it is carried out "half-way", particularly the so called financial incentives, this means nothing to me ... Just now we were told that an EV cost \$400,000. This is too extravagant. We talk about buying a car but not a branded handbag or a pleasure boat—of course, expensive vehicle also symbolizes position and status but to more people, it is a mode of transport, particularly when I live in Tuen Mun and work in Central, I really hope that I can have a car as a means for commuting.

The Government said that the cost of buying a vehicle is \$400,000—even if the Government provides financial incentives, I still feel uneasy. However, the most important consideration for the public is whether they can charge their

EVs upon returning home at night. If EV owners can do the charging within their own housing estates or buildings, I think many are willing to buy it. Can the Government assist in arranging vehicle owners to install charging stations in places where they live? The existing charging stations fall into the fast and slow types, most of them provide charging for an hour but the vehicle can only travel for 10 km after charging. The Government should no longer scare us as this will cause people to lose their confidence. To require the EV owners to take care of the charging issue on their own will only deter the people.

I own an old car, it is a small Japanese car which reaches its 7th year now. It really conforms to the Government's "one-for-one replacement" scheme but I am still puzzled as the Government requires me to de-register my small old car which I am reluctant to part with. Although the Government said that it was conservation, it is not reasonable to ask me to turn the small car which still functions very well into a heap of scrap iron. My old car is well maintained with examination being carried out each year, I use my car with care. The Government said we have to protect the environment, then why should the car be turned into scrap iron? I think contradiction exists therein.

We noticed that the Government did not take the lead to promote the use of EVs. We now discuss about promoting the popularization of EVs but we did not say it is confined to private vehicles only. Many people mentioned that the emissions from commercial vehicles accounted for the majority emissions from vehicles. Why did the Government not take the lead in promoting the popularization of commercial EVs? Frankly speaking, has the Government ever compiled statistics on government vehicles with registration plates bearing the prefix of "AM", and how many of them are EVs? I doubt the number is minimal. Has the Government led by example?

Moreover, Mr Frankie YICK suggested in his motion that the Government should make it mandatory for newly completed buildings to install charging facilities for EVs, I have reservation on it. I do not know whether the newly completed buildings he mentioned covered the newly completed buildings by the Government. However, the parking spaces in Hong Kong are in acute shortage at present. If some of the parking spaces are required to be used exclusively by EVs for charging ... a phenomenon occurred in the existing public car parks, we can go to the Yau Ma Tei Multi-Storey Car Park to have a look, we will find that an entire row of parking spaces with charging facilities for EVs is vacant while other conventional parking spaces are under-supply. The Government further

said that it hoped that by 2020 (that is in less than two years), 30% of the vehicles in Hong Kong would be EVs. Definitely, this was just paying lip service as basically it is impossible to achieve. The current practice for the Government to divide parking spaces into conventional and EV ones is extremely unfair for many vehicle owners, I have reservation on it.

MR KWOK WAI-KEUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I speak in support of the motion. First, I would like to thank Mr Frankie YICK for moving this motion.

Members may ask why we have to promote the use of electric vehicles ("EVs"). I think there are two reasons for this. First, the use of EVs has become a global trend. Even a large-scale vehicle manufacturer focusing on fuel-engined vehicles now tells us in advance that it will basically cease the production of this vehicle type in 2050 and shift its business focus to the production of EVs. You will surely question if this is merely a marketing move of the vehicle manufacturer to promote its EV models under development. But I think its business decision is sensible. We all know that the use of EVs is a global trend, not a wild guess made through crystal gazing. Norway in Europe, for example, will ban the sale of fuel-engined vehicles in 2025 while only EVs can be put into the market in India in 2030. The United Kingdom and France will also join the fuel-engined vehicle ban in 2040. In this context, I wonder if the Government should also make the necessary preparation as soon as possible to keep pace with the global trend, instead of waiting until the last minute. This is point one.

Second, there is an urgent need for us to improve the air quality. It appears that the Government only has its eye on the emission reduction targets set in an agreement signed between the Hong Kong and Guangdong Governments in 2012. About a year ago, the Government proposed to reduce the tax concession for EVs to some \$90,000 from a full tax waiver. When I asked why the Government had to make such a cut, it replied that the incentive of a full waiver to improve the air quality no longer existed as Hong Kong has basically met its emission reduction targets. I find this explanation very disappointing. Achieving the targets does not necessarily mean making the best effort. Actually, there is no such thing as the best, just better, right?

We all know that promoting the use of EVs can help reduce roadside waste emissions. The road surface does not cover a large area, but we have to note that most residential buildings in the urban areas are located near roadside, so urban dwellers are exposed to roadside air when they open their windows. In this sense, further improvement of roadside air quality will definitely help improve the living environment and the quality of life of residents. Hence, it is desirable to expeditiously promote the popularization of EVs and work more in the related area.

Deputy President, I would like to raise one more point. Apart from promoting the use of EVs, the formulation of polices to contain the overall number of vehicles is also crucial to improve the air quality in a comprehensive manner. Quite a number of Members have already pointed out that the number of licensed vehicles have increased from 680 000 in 2013 to as many as 770 000 at the beginning of this year. The number of vehicles on the road have thus increased by 100 000 in five years. Hence, the problem of roadside emissions will further aggravate if the Government is still reluctant to speed up promoting the popularization of EVs.

Improvement in air quality can not only enable us to breathe fresher air and live more comfortably, but it can also relieve our medical burden and reduce the economic loss. It is because the poor air quality will bring about adverse effects. In 2016, for example, air pollution caused a total of 1 686 premature deaths and as much as 2.65 million attendances of medical consultation for illnesses caused by air pollution. It also cost us \$2,100.6 million in direct economic loss, making an average daily loss of \$5.92 million. Hence, the Government has to face this problem and tackle it as soon as possible.

On tax incentives, the Government has introduced a new "one-for-one replacement" scheme in its new Budget. While the first registration tax ("FRT") for electric private cars ("e-PC") will continue to be waived up to the current level of \$97,000, the Government runs the new Scheme to allow PC owners who are willing to arrange to scrap their old PCs and then first register a new e-PC to enjoy a higher FRT concession of up to \$250,000. Although the coverage of the new Scheme is still far from comprehensive, it shows the Government's readiness to make improvement. Time will tell if the new measure is effective.

Colleagues have also discussed the ancillary charging facilities, which I am not going to repeat here. But I think it is crucial to provide sufficient and fast charging facilities for EVs to cater to the needs of car owners.

I would also like to talk about the repair technology for EVs. We can well imagine that EV owners would need to wait for a long time for vehicle repair services if the increase in the use of EVs does not come with an adequate number of vehicle mechanics for EVs. Hence, I think in tandem with the increase in the charging facilities as part of its efforts to promote the use of EVs, the Government should also strengthen the training of talents in this particular field, so that EV owners would not need to wait for a long time for the EV repair services.

To conclude, I hope that in its efforts to promote the use of EVs, the Government could provide economic incentives, contain the overall number of vehicles, improve the ancillary charging facilities, and expeditiously strengthen the training of vehicle mechanics for EVs, so as to pave the way for the promotion of the popularization of EVs in a comprehensive manner.

I so submit. Thank you, Deputy President.

MR HOLDEN CHOW (in Cantonese): Deputy President, the Government indicated that it would promote the popularization of electric vehicles ("EVs"), but over a period of time in the past, we have discovered a lot of inadequacies in Government policies as well as government measures in this regard.

For example, some time ago, in order to promote the popularization of EVs, the Government provided a rather considerable tax concession to encourage the public to switch to EVs some time ago. After that, there was an obvious increase in the sales volume of EVs in the local market. Unfortunately, the Government changed its policies about a year ago and cancelled the tax concession. In view of the heavy tax burden, the sales of EVs in the local market ceased to grow. Although the Government proposes a certain amount of tax concession in this year's budget, as Mr CHAN Hak-kan says for many times, the public still consider this year's tax concession a far cry from the previous tax concession arrangement. After all, the measure is not a strong incentive at all.

Deputy President, as a lot of Members have pointed out earlier, the use of EVs has become a global trend. Even our mother country is actively manufacturing and promoting the use of EVs. According to a report from the Internet, the overall usage rate of EVs in China has surpassed the United States for the first time in 2016. And in the same year, the production volume of EVs accounted for 43% of the world's total production volume. That is to say, no matter the promotion of the use or the manufacturing of EVs, China is in a leading position as other countries are lagging behind. For this reason, I hope Members understand that, as a part of China, Hong Kong should follow the irresistible trend. It is because China has already set out a crystal clear philosophy that Hong Kong should promote the popularization of EVs jointly with China, thus the Government should take the unshirkable responsibility by making some positive responses.

Furthermore, Mr Frankie YICK has mentioned in his motion this time around the need to increase charging facilities for EVs, and a number of Members have touched upon that issue just now. Deputy President, if we take a look at that, we will find that there are not too many charging facilities in public places or private buildings in Hong Kong. For that reason, the Government should consider to mandate the provision of charging facilities for charging EVs at all parking spaces in newly constructed buildings, so as to facilitate the popularization of EVs.

What is the impact of a lack of charging facilities on the promotion of EVs? It is simple, for the public who are still considering if they should opt for EVs, they will anticipate that charging facilities for EVs could be found in most places, and only that will give a big push to the sales of EVs. If people cannot find any charging facilities for EVs, then EVs are virtually useless even many people have purchased EVs. If that is the case, it is really difficult for me to believe that we can promote the popularization of EVs.

Deputy President, I wish to thank Mr Frankie YICK for proposing today's motion, and I hope the Government can seriously consider and implement the proposals put forward by Mr YICK, especially in examining seriously the provision of ancillary facilities, in particular the charging facilities, because that is the only solution to facilitate the popularization of EVs in the long run.

I so submit. Thank you, Deputy President.

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, with so many pedestrians and vehicles in Hong Kong, the city faces a very serious problem of roadside air pollution. Carbon emission from private cars ("PCs") is one of the major culprits of air pollution. As of January 2018, the number of registered vehicles in Hong Kong rose to 830 000, an increase of 30% over the past 10 years. PCs had the biggest share and also the largest percentage growth, recording a 47% growth or an increase of 200 000 over the past 10 years. Yet, with nearly 580 000 registered PCs in Hong Kong, only 10 000 or so are powered by electricity. The share is a pittance.

To effectively reduce carbon emissions, we have to first deal with road vehicles. One of the feasible directions is to encourage car owners to switch to the more environmental-friendly electric vehicles ("EVs"), so as to reduce the number of fuel-engined PCs. Actually, in a recent survey conducted by the Public Opinion Programme of the University of Hong Kong, over 80% of the 804 interviewees said they supported the popularization of electric PCs ("e-PCs").

There are many reasons leading to the unpopularity of EVs. One of them, as many Members have also pointed out, is the seriously lacking of ancillary facilities for charging EVs. There is only one public charging station for every five e-PCs on average, and most of the stations are only installed with low or medium chargers. A full charging will thus take as long as six to eight hours. Besides, the charging stations are not evenly distributed. Of some 1 800 charging stations in Hong Kong, most are located in Kowloon and on Hong Kong Island, with only a few in the New Territories. The charging facilities are mostly available at private car parks in large-scale shopping centres and commercial buildings. Given that installation of ancillary facilities for charging EVs is costly, I do not think the policy of the popularization of EVs is feasible without incentive measures.

As of the end of 2017, a meagre 7% of public parking spaces in government buildings or housing estates were installed with public chargers, most of which being low chargers of very low charging efficiency. If the Government does not have the determination to tackle the problem associated with the charging facilities for EVs, the tax reduction alone can hardly attract owners to switch to EVs.

I went to the United Kingdom last year. There were charging facilities for EVs everywhere, providing very convenient 24-hour charging services. If the Government does not provide more charging facilities for EVs but rather use tax

reduction to tempt owners to switch to EVs, this is just a superficial way of showing its accountability, and is not at all helpful.

Besides, I also call on the Government to explore ways to make the electricity generation process more environmental-friendly. Deputy President, we all know that EVs are powered by electricity and thus consume electric energy. We also know that coal fuels electricity generation, but burning coal emits large amounts of carbon dioxide. At present, carbon dioxide emitted in electricity generation accounts for two-thirds of the overall carbon emissions. This situation is alarming. According to the information of the Environmental Protection Department, coal-fired electricity generation accounts for half of the total electricity generation locally, and is the major cause of air pollution. Although power plants are more energy-efficient and have fewer emissions when compared with internal combustion engines of vehicles, for the sake of environmental protection, I think it is advisable for us to work from the energy supply to increase power generation by renewable energy. This is a step towards achieving the target of reducing carbon emissions and making EVs more environmental-friendly. Actually, renewable energy power generation has become increasingly popular. The promotion of renewable energy and EVs are complementary to each other.

But the reality is less than 0.1% of the energy in the fuel mix for electricity generation was renewable energy over the past 10 years, way lower than the share of 30% in Asia. Last year, the Government joined hands with the two power companies to introduce the feed-in tariff scheme to encourage the development of renewable energy power generation installations by members of the public. Under the policy, the two power companies will connect such installations with the public power grids, and purchase the electricity so generated. Regrettably, many people are discouraged by the extremely high costs for the installation of solar power generation systems.

I have also approached the CLP Power Hong Kong Limited to explore the feasibility of installing a solar power generation system on my rooftop. While saying the installation is feasible, CLP also expects that it will take 20 years for me to recover the cost. I am really unsure if I can continue to live after 20 years. Hence, the plan to engage the public in the generation of renewable energy is difficult to implement and will be infeasible without support from the Government.

Deputy President, before I stop, I would like to point out a more important issue. Apart from the need to deal with the energy side, it is more important for us to tackle the overall transport planning as the air pollution and traffic congestion problems cannot be resolved by the use of EVs alone. The root of the problem lies in the overall transport planning, such as the undesirable road usage. Many overseas cities have introduced policies to encourage the public to ride bicycles or take public transport in place of driving cars. Hence, the Government should adopt a multi-pronged approach in implementing its emission reduction policies, including studying the designation of dedicated cycle lanes or pursuing a bicycle-friendly policy, to encourage more people to commute by bicycles. *(The buzzer sounded)*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, your speaking time is up.

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

MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): Deputy President, just now, many Members' speeches inextricably linked to one theme, and that is different places around the world now strive to adopt different policies to lower greenhouse gas emissions, and the policy of electric vehicles ("EVs") can relieve roadside emissions and also strengthen Hong Kong in the combat against global warming.

If we admit that EVs can help relieve roadside emissions, we should then focus our discussion of EVs on the seriously inadequate charging facilities. In his response just now, the Secretary lists a series of work the Government has done in the past. It mentions the \$300 million Pilot Green Transport Fund ("the Fund") set up by the Government in March 2011. The Fund encourages public transport sectors to try out green innovative transport technologies, including electric commercial vehicles; and the Fund already approved 118 trials, including 81 electric commercial vehicles encompassing a variety of vehicle types, including taxis and light buses.

However, the Secretary should be aware that the electric taxis launched under the Fund are a bitter experience. As far as I know, the electric taxis are entering a cold winter. If I remember correctly, it has been reported earlier that there are only a few electric taxis left in Hong Kong, and I wonder if they are still

in operation now. Why? Inadequate charging facilities, difficulties in finding parking spaces for charging the taxis and the unaddressed problem of old batteries all play a part. The Government only mentions that the Fund has done a lot of work in the past, and indeed the Fund may be one of the measures, but the Government fails to lay down a long-term plan that is tailored to the development of EVs in Hong Kong.

In recent years, many governments and vehicle manufacturers in other cities and countries have formulated measures to prepare for the EV era. As mentioned by Members just now, Norway will put a complete ban on the sale of fuel-engined vehicles in 2025; India set the target on 2030, while France and the United Kingdom set it on 2040. For the manufacturers, Volvo announced that it would gradually phase out traditional internal combustion engines, and from 2019 onwards, that is next year, it would only launch electric or hybrid models.

In Hong Kong, our EV policy is divided into three areas: providing more incentives for people and commercial enterprises to purchase EVs, making charging facilities more common and comprehensively implementing a producer responsibility scheme. But are these measures adequate? In fact, the Government has not even accomplished the provision of charging facilities. Deputy President, this is really ironic. I just mentioned the pathetic destiny of the electric taxis. Taxi drivers have to make a living, but there are not enough relevant measures and facilities for them. I am only talking about charging their taxis, but it is not that easy for them to do so. The distribution of charging facilities in Hong Kong varies greatly. The New Territories has the least number of charging facilities. Most of them are located in Kowloon and Hong Kong Island. The Government indeed needs to spend greater effort in the promotion so as to get it done.

If I remember correctly, in a Mainland city called Taiyuan, with the all-out effort of the City Government in promoting EVs, there are now over 8 000 EVs in the city. Coming back to Hong Kong, now we have some 10 000 EVs registered, though far greater than the 500-odd EVs in 2013, the present number of EVs is still minimal compared to more than 500 000 vehicles in Hong Kong. While other places are actively preparing for the coming EV era and have put in place forward-looking policy objectives, Hong Kong is still making petty changes.

The Government is not without solid work done. It implemented a first registration tax ("FRT") exemption for EVs, in order to encourage people to purchase EVs instead of fuel-engined vehicles with a taxation incentive. This is an important step in reducing roadside air pollution. However, we should note that the Government later substantially cut the tax concession for EVs, citing the narrowing price difference between EVs and traditional vehicles, the worsening traffic congestion and the rapidly increasing number of vehicles as the reasons. However, the Government changed its policy again this year and proposed to launch a "one-for-one replacement" scheme as a tax concession for EVs. It is evident that the Government does not know the direction it wants to pursue. It does not even have a target. Does it really want to actively promote EVs? But then, it said there were too many vehicles and withdrew the measure in the next moment. And after some time, it launched a new measure again. The public do not know which course to pursue.

Hence, many people have voiced out to the Government, asking it to raise the cap on the FRT concession for EVs or provide other economic concessions, so as to make EVs affordable to the general public and enable EVs to remain competitive with their corresponding fuel-engined models. This is the only way to achieve the ultimate target of the Government's policy, and that is to comprehensively replace fuel-engined vehicles with EVs. The target sounds very distant, but as I pointed out just now, other cities and countries are now working hard on this task, but today we are still discussing some policies that lead us to nowhere.

Members please note that of the 181 petrol filling stations in Hong Kong, tender exercises will be conducted on the sites of 28 petrol filling stations this year. The Government should seize this opportunity to lay down conditions and concessions in the tender documents, requiring mandatory provision of high speed charging facilities ... it must be high speed ... for charging EVs.

We hold that the Government should take the lead and provide charging facilities in government properties, car parks of public housing estates, roadside parking spaces and public car parks. This task should at least start from government car parks. If charging facilities are installed in every car park, this will be able to meet the need of a large number of EVs. Actually, I notice just now that the Government is not against all these. It echoes that promoting EVs is one of the strategies to improve roadside air quality. The Government also points out that 95% of vehicle emission comes from lorries, buses, light buses and

taxis, and they are the main source of roadside air pollution. It agrees that promoting EVs can improve this situation. So, the Government should not make any more empty talk (*The buzzer sounded*) ... and it should take actions. Here, we look forward to ...

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr KWONG Chun-yu, your speaking time is up. Please stop.

MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): ... more solid policies from the Government. I so submit.

MR MICHAEL TIEN (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I have prepared a very short script for my speech, and should be able to finish in 30 seconds if I read fast. However, I consider it necessary to express my views on the subject, because the issue can be described as "a concept stock". As suggested by many Members, everyone supports the use of electric vehicles, and I believe no one will object that. However, three crucial factors are involved, namely the technology of electric vehicles, such as their travelling range; the provision of ancillary facilities, such as chargers; and the selling prices of electric vehicles, including taxation arrangements.

I support all the social support measures proposed in the original motion and its amendments provided that they are proved practicable. However, we all understand that it is always easier said than done, and the time needed for putting the ideas into practice remains unknown. Taxation arrangements should be the most direct, efficient and effective way for the Government to address the issue.

I have reservation about Mr Kenneth LEUNG's proposal to restore the full waiver of first registration tax for electric private cars. A lot of people do not agree with the Government's initiative to levy tax again on electric vehicles, but it is not totally unreasonable to do so. The most desired objective we wish to achieve is that while increasing the proportion of electric vehicles, there is a reduction in the total number of registered vehicles. In other words, instead of growing at an ever increasing rate, I hope the number of registered vehicles in Hong Kong will remain stable or even record a slight drop. However, as far as the composition of vehicles is concerned, I wish to witness an increasing number of electric vehicles but a decreasing proportion of fuel-engined vehicles. The

only way to achieve this objective is to introduce a drastic increase in tax for fuel-engined vehicles, but this is politically not feasible.

The Government has announced the launching of a "one-for-one replacement" scheme this year, but frankly speaking, it sounds very complicated. I cannot predict what side effects the scheme may cause, and I hope it will not lead to such a consequence. Nevertheless, I reckon that the Administration will need to conduct a review of the scheme very soon after its implementation.

Hence, I am now exploring the feasibility of a tax measure, which I wonder if the Government would like to consider. In order not to upset the overall supply and demand of private cars with particularly low selling prices of a certain type of vehicles, thus inducing a considerable number of people who originally have no intention of purchasing vehicles to do so, which in turn will increase the number of vehicles on road; and in order to encourage people who have a genuine need to purchase vehicles to consider buying electric vehicles as far as possible, the most direct approach is to make upward adjustments of tax rates with reference to the selling prices of vehicles. Nevertheless, a lower rate can be levied on each tax bracket for electric vehicles, such as 50% or a certain percentage of that applied to the corresponding tax bracket for fuel-engined vehicles. Alternatively, with no tax levied on the lowest tax bracket for all types of vehicles, higher rates can be applied to higher tax brackets for fuel-engined vehicles, so that electric vehicles will always be subject to lower tax rates as compared to those levied on fuel-engined vehicles. As a result, buyers of vehicles will still be required to pay a considerable amount of money in general, but if this is inevitable, they will agree that the selling prices of electric vehicles are more competitive, and there is hence a greater chance that they will consider purchasing electric vehicles. In making a decision to purchase electric vehicles, buyers should of course consider also the provision of ancillary facilities, such as chargers.

I believe that in order to strike a balance and give us the picture which I would very much like to have, more generous discounts have to be offered, and there should be marked increases in the rates levied on various tax brackets for fuel-engined vehicles. I intuitively think that this is a relatively rational approach worth considering by the Government, because a full waiver of tax will not be granted to any particular type of vehicles.

I am sorry that a few minutes more have been used to deliver this four-minute speech. Thank you, Deputy President.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Deputy President, the electric vehicles ("EVs") are actually similar to the "curb" measures we discussed yesterday. We have referred the "curb" measures as "chicken ribs" because the measures appear to be increasingly irrelevant to genuinely resolving the housing problems. EVs share the same problem. This motion, moved by Mr Frankie YICK, has met with no opposition. Members have unanimously expressed their support, in a way like hanging decorations on a Christmas tree. But is the motion really relevant to our two targeted objectives of reducing carbon emissions and air pollution? I doubt about this.

Deputy President, first, I wonder if the strong promotion of electric private cars ("e-PCs") could really help reduce carbon emissions. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung has actually raised an important point in his speech that the effectiveness of EVs in reducing the overall carbon emissions depends on the energy sources, the proportion of the fuels or the fuel mix for electricity generation.

A Brussels university study I have seen on the Internet says EVs powered by renewable energy can reduce six times more of carbon emissions than petrol vehicles over the operation life of the vehicles. However, the overall carbon reduction of EVs will be greatly compromised if they are otherwise powered by fossil fuel. According to the study, the emission reduction of a fossil-fuelled EV is just slightly higher than that of a diesel vehicle. Well, it may also be possible that the fossil-fuelled EV emits more carbon dioxide than the diesel one.

Regarding the policy direction of carbon reduction, the SAR Government now says it will start with the energy mix and will increase the share of natural gas in the fuel mix. It seems that the Government has made some progress in this respect. However, we are still very far away from the use of renewable energy for electricity generation. The proportion is 80% in Germany, so the country is in the position to talk about the popularization of EVs. Deputy President, in the case of Hong Kong, only 0.1% of our electricity is generated by renewable energy. The SAR Government says it sees a potential to increase the share of renewable energy in the fuel mix to 3% or 4% by 2030. Yet, whether this can work out is still doubtful. Hence, while EV drivers may feel good in respect of carbon reduction, the effectiveness of the overall carbon reduction actually lies in the Government's policies on renewable energy.

Second, as many colleagues have also mentioned, if we wish to debate on the popularization of EVs to ask the Government to work more on the reduction of air pollution, we have to be in focus. The focus should be put on the use of EVs by commercial vehicles and public transport operators. Some colleagues have talked about Norway, saying that the country is very advanced and EVs are popular there. Yet, as the sales of EVs goes up, the proportion of the public taking public transport decreases correspondently. Another study I have seen online says the usage of public transport in Norway has thus dropped drastically by 80%. I am not sure if this figure is believable. Perhaps, the significant decrease is due to the small population of the country.

In other words, if we do not explore ways to curb the overall number of private cars, we may lose more than we gain. Actually, if we really wish to promote the use of EVs to reduce air pollution, we should promote the use of EVs by commercial vehicles and public transport operators. Hence, in respect of the focus of the promotion work, I concur with the amendments moved by Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Dr Junius HO regarding their proposals on public transport and taxis.

Third, Deputy President, I am against all amendments proposing the continued provision of tax concessions for EVs. The reason is simple. There is room for the Government to proactively promote alternative modes of transport, such as commuting by bicycles or taking public transport which some colleagues have just mentioned. I do not have a driving licence, so I have to take public transport or commute by bicycles. But I cannot find any government tax incentives to encourage me to do so. Instead, the Government mainly provides incentives to tempt people who afford to buy private cars to go for EVs. The Government thinks the switch to EVs would reduce carbon emissions and resolve the overall air pollution problem. But I think these proposals are simply out of focus, which cannot actively promote the wider use of bicycles and public transport as alternative transport modes.

I still have to think if I should vote for Mr Frankie YICK's original motion. Thank you, Deputy President.

DR CHENG CHUNG-TAI (in Cantonese): Deputy President, in respect of this motion debate, I cannot choose but abstain from voting for both the original motion and its amendments.

First, regarding the debate on the use of electric vehicles ("EVs") or promoting the popularization of EVs, I think the focus of our discussion should be on the reliance of public transport which is ultimately the most environmental-friendly, effective, and efficient mode of transport. Mr CHU Hoi-dick has already devoted most of his speech on this area.

Before I explain what I think about this, including some thoughts on the transport planning, I will first point out the problem associated with the popularization of EVs. In this morning's debate, Members have mostly put their emphasis on the taxation or the economic strategy. Actually, I am not concerned about the economic strategy irrespective of whether the direction of the discussion focuses on the tax reduction or the first registration tax. With the development or sales of EVs fully relying on importation, I do not think it is necessary, nor do I find it reasonable, for the local Government to provide tax concessions in the name of the promotion of environmental protection to subsidize overseas enterprises to do businesses in Hong Kong.

Instead, the Government should invest in the development of EVs or hybrid vehicles locally. Actually, Hong Kong has a long history in the development of EVs. The first home-grown EV, mycar, was developed by The Hong Kong Polytechnic University ("PolyU") in 2009. John TSANG was still the Financial Secretary that time while the Secretary for Innovation and Technology Nicholas YANG was with PolyU as its Vice President or holding similar senior position. The launch of mycar once reverberated around the city. Mycar won its popularity as it was the first locally developed EV which achieved a breakthrough globally in the battery charging efficiency and was awarded a European accreditation. Regrettably, despite the strong team of research and development talents, the infrastructure investment, as well as the research and development technology of the mycar project, the Government's indifference to the development of scientific research, environmental protection, and the quality-of-life planning in the past few years, has led to a drain of talents and infrastructure. The local development of EVs was thus scrapped in 2015.

Despite the fact that Hong Kong has its home-grown EVs, today's discussion focuses only on the introduction of tax concessions to facilitate some popular EV brands, such as Tesla, e-Golf, to enter into the local market. If the Government wishes to promote the use of EVs, why does it not promote the use of the locally developed brand? Why does the Secretary for Innovation and

Technology Nicholas YANG, formally Vice President of PolyU, not attend today's meeting?

Deputy President, do you not understand that it is fair for me to say so? The popularization of EVs is related to the Innovation and Technology Bureau, the quality of life, and the transport research and development. Hence, I do not understand why officials attending this meeting are the Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury or other related officials. Furthermore, the main reason for the unpopularity of EVs is its inconvenience. It is inconvenient for EV drivers to park their cars, to charge batteries, and to repair ... I heard some Members who are EV users say the EV repair service is readily available. Yet, it is still inconvenient in the sense that we will have to wait for the service from overseas manufacturers ... and Tesla is facing operational difficulties in the United States. Let me come back to the topic. Hong Kong indeed has its own developed EV. But the PolyU-developed mycar, covering with a layer of dust, has been parked unnoticed at a dark corner. This is in contrast to its debut in 2009 with a fanfare of publicity, when mycar was driven around the PolyU campus, attracting Bureau Directors to take pictures with it. Today, mycar is not even mentioned by Members in this relevant discussion.

The focuses of today's motion are on the tax concessions, the importation of overseas EV brands to popularize EVs in Hong Kong, and so on. Yet, as I have pointed out at the very beginning, it is totally unjustified for the Hong Kong Government to introduce any tax concessions or any other incentives to bring in commercial products from overseas to the Hong Kong market in order to implement the so-called EV popularization.

It is very likely that some Members will not agree with my argument. They may question the rationale for not using overseas EVs which are of good quality. I have to reiterate that the PolyU-developed EV has already been awarded a European accreditation, with the fastest battery charging technology in the year of 2009 or 2010. However, in less than 10 years' time, we have lagged behind in the EV technology.

As I have said at the beginning of my speech, my position on popularization of EVs is that if we really care about the environment and are keen to improve our life quality in a cost effective manner, the top choice is the use of public transport. However, once I bring up the topic of public transport, I think Hong Kong people will naturally point the finger at the Government, MTR,

buses, light buses, taxis for the problematic transport planning. The root of the problem is monopoly, the monopoly on public transport services.

Furthermore, has the Hong Kong Government ever reflected on its outdated road planning? Hong Kong has been adopting circular roundabouts with three or even four entries and exists for 20 to 30 years, but this aged design is bound to cause traffic congestion. Why does the Government not make reference to the relevant technology in the Netherlands in Europe, or even in Eastern European countries to replace the circular roundabout design? The new design concept has been adopted by the Beijing city for many years, since the Beijing Olympic Games. But in Hong Kong, no progress has been made in our transport planning. Hence, Deputy President, my position is very simple: the focus of the debate on the popularization of EVs should rather be on the cultural and ideological breakthrough than economic considerations. Thank you.

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): If not, Mr Frankie YICK, you may now speak on the amendments. The time limit is five minutes.

MR FRANKIE YICK (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I think I still have 1 minute 16 seconds to give responses, and another 5 minutes to reply.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Frankie YICK, you still have time to reply later.

MR FRANKIE YICK (in Cantonese): First of all, I thank 28 Members for speaking on this subject today. They have provided some inputs to the Government. I have absolutely no intention of denying the Government's efforts

in improving roadside air quality over the past years, including its work on the liquefied petroleum gas taxis, replacement of old diesel vehicle, diesel vehicle ban, as well as raising the emission control for imported vehicles. Yet, as far as the promotion of electric vehicles ("EVs") is concerned, we can hear that Members obviously consider the Government's measures on promoting EVs are still inadequate.

I have proposed in the original motion that the Government should mandate the provision of charging facilities for EVs at all parking spaces in new buildings. Members' responses to the mandatory measure are mixed. I have to stress here that up to now, not all new buildings are installed with charging facilities despite the Government's implementation of the so-called facilitating measures. Why? There are of course reasons for not doing so. This also explains why I have proposed to mandate the full installation of charging facilities. Also, the compulsory installation and the facilitating measures are not mutually exclusive. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen has asked why government facilities are not included in the proposed mandatory measure. I really ... Actually, there is no need to do so because the Government should already act this way ...

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Frankie YICK, I have to remind you that in your five-minute speaking time, you should devote to giving views on amendments proposed by Members. You still have time to reply to the speeches of the Secretary and Members later.

MR FRANKIE YICK (in Cantonese): All right. I thank Deputy President for reminding me of this. A total of eight Members have moved amendments to this motion. The amendments mostly seek to provide more specific views and do not contradict the original motion. I would like to give a brief response to some amendments as follows.

Mr Kenneth LEUNG's amendment proposes to amend the relevant provisions of the Buildings Ordinance to mandate the provision of charging facilities only at a specified percentage of parking spaces. As I have explained, the full installation of charging facilities is not achievable despite the setting of a

percentage target and the availability of facilitating measures. I have proposed to mandate the full installation of charging facilities because as Mr CHAN Kin-por has pointed out, it will be hard to retrofit parking spaces with electricity facilities when it is found out later that the power supply capacity is insufficient.

On waste vehicle batteries, Mr Kenneth LEUNG seeks to narrow the scope of my proposal to only deal with EVs. I find the proposed coverage incomprehensive. As I have pointed out at the beginning of the speech, it is now time for us to deal with waste vehicle batteries. We will aggravate the situation if we leave it until EVs have got problems with that.

Regarding the restoration of full waiver of first registration tax ("FRT") for electric private cars, I have heard a number of Members echoing my views that it is not necessary to restore the full waiver, though a correspondent increase in the concession is acceptable to incentivize members of the public to go for EVs. It is because the subject under debate is the popularization of EVs. But as some Members have said, even with full tax waiver, the best-selling EV brands are still selling at prices of as high as \$700,000 to \$800,000. How can we popularize the use of EVs? Hence, the lowering of the FRT ceiling can force EV suppliers to bring in some cheaper or new EV models to Hong Kong. I paid a visit to Germany several months ago, during which I was told that a new four-seat EV model, pricing at €16,000, would be put into the market in the second half of the year. The price would be HK\$160,000. Taking into account of the delivery cost and the profits of sellers, the selling price of this new EV would definitely enjoy the full FRT waiver at the current ceiling of \$97,500.

Mr HUI Chi-fung's amendment proposes the setting of a target year for phasing out fuel-engined vehicles completely. I absolutely have reservation about this proposal. As many Members have said, governments of overseas countries have set targets for the prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles only, and there is no ban on their use. There is a huge difference between the two. I also suspect the use ban might contravene and contradict Article 6 of the Basic Law that "The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region shall protect the right of private ownership of property in accordance with law".

I hereby thank the 28 Members once again for giving different views on the motion today. I hope that the Government would heed the opinions and put forward new directions, policies, and measures on EVs as soon as possible to enable the expeditious popularization of EVs in Hong Kong. Thank you, Deputy President.

SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I would like to thank Mr Frankie YICK once again for moving this motion. I am very glad to hear all Members spoken on this subject expressing full support to the promotion of electric vehicles ("EVs") and giving valuable views on various aspects of the implementation of the policy. Just now, some Members have asked about the use of EVs in the Government. As at 31 December 2017, there were 254 EVs in the Government fleet.

Today, quite a number of Members have called on the Government to conduct a study on setting a target year for phasing out fuel-engined vehicles completely, and to set phased targets for the promotion of EVs.

As I have said in the opening remark, the development of clean energy vehicles ("CEVs") has become a global trend. It is also the Government's long-term objective to replace fuel-engined vehicles with CEVs, such as EVs, to improve air quality. We have launched a number of EV promotion initiatives, and this demonstrates our determination to work towards this objective. However, as Hong Kong fully relies on exported vehicles, we will have to carefully examine the supply and the technological development of EVs in the Mainland and overseas countries in considering the complete phasing out of vehicles using petrol or diesel. We are collating relevant information to explore the availability of CEVs suitable for use in Hong Kong and their conditions of use, for considering our next step.

Today, some Members have referred to a government target it set earlier of 30% of private cars in Hong Kong being EVs and hybrid vehicles. Actually, the Government has already clarified this issue in its reply to a Legislative Council question on 20 April 2016. This target was once mentioned in the Public

Consultation on Hong Kong's Climate Change Strategy and Action Agenda released in September 2010 in the description of a hypothetical scenario. Under the scenario where 30% of PCs were EVs and hybrid vehicles or other vehicles with similar performance in 2020, the Government saw the need to encourage new developments to provide more EV charging-enabling parking spaces and more charging facilities at their car parks to cater to the future increase in the number of EVs. The Government thus amended Chapter 8 of the Hong Kong Planning Standard and Guidelines ("HKPSG") in May 2011 to incorporated into HKPSG additional guidelines on "Electric Vehicle Charging Facilities", requiring new developments concerned to install EV charging-enabling facilities for all car parking spaces and provide EV charging facilities, where appropriate, in at least 30% of car parking spaces for PC. The description of a "target" in HKPSG is simply made on the basis of the above hypothetical scenario. The Government has not set any target on individual type of vehicles.

On electric commercial vehicles ("e-CVs"), the effectiveness of our policies in promoting the use of e-CVs depends very much on the maturity of e-CV technologies, their prices and suitability for use in Hong Kong, including their ability to suit the modus operandi of local transport sectors. At present, the Pilot Green Transport Fund ("PGTF") fully subsidizes the price premium between e-CVs and the conventional fuel-engined CVs. As e-CVs generally have better fuel economy which are able to save 30% to 90% in fuel costs when compared with conventional CVs according to the tests conducted by PGTF, there are sufficient incentives for the transport trade to try EVs under PGTF. PGTF has already approved trials on 81 e-CVs, covering various types of vehicles including taxis, light buses, single-deck buses and goods vehicles. However, e-CVs are yet to become popular, mainly because e-CV technologies are still developing and cannot fully meet the operational needs of local CVs.

Results of the trials under PGTF have reflected that high production cost, limited service life, long charging time and low energy density of EV batteries are the key constraints for e-CVs. The hilly terrain and the need to provide air-conditioning during summer in Hong Kong require batteries of e-CVs to deliver a higher driving range. Therefore, the driving range and charging time of most e-CVs currently available in the local market are yet to completely cope

with the requirements of the local transport sectors. As a result, all electric taxis on trial under PGTF eventually gave up their taxis registration to register as PCs.

Nevertheless, results of the PGTF trials have revealed that electric light goods vehicles ("e-LGVs") are more likely to be practicable for operators who require relatively lower daily mileage and payload. Looking ahead, we will explore ways to promote the use of e-LGVs and keep in view the development of e-CV technologies. We will also encourage the transport sectors to make use of PGTF to try out other green innovative transport technologies, including some locally developed products.

On the promotion of the use of electric buses, the Government is fully subsidizing the franchised bus companies to purchase 36 single-deck electric buses and their charging facilities for trial on a number of routes after securing relevant funding approval from the Legislative Council. The Government will explore how to promote the wider use of single-deck electric buses by the franchised bus companies, subject to the satisfactory trial results as well as the affordability of the franchised bus companies and passengers. As for the double-deck electric buses, there are very few models available in the international arena. Furthermore, their passenger carrying capacity and operational efficiency still fail to fulfil the local operational needs of franchised buses which include long daily service hours, high peak passenger loadings, the need to tackle hilly terrain as well as intense air-conditioning capability being required in hot and humid summer. We will keep in view the development in other places and introduce suitable models for local trial in due course.

Regarding the promotion of electric private cars ("e-PCs"), quite a number of Members have expressed views on the arrangements of first registration tax ("FRT") concessions for EVs. Among other things, they have called for relaxation of the eligibility criteria of the "one-for-one replacement" scheme ("the Scheme") for old PCs, and raising the FRT concession cap for e-PCs.

On top of the FRT concession, the Financial Secretary announces in this year's Budget the new Scheme after striking a balance among various factors and considering the views of some Members and the public. This new initiative

seeks to encourage car owners to go for EVs as far as possible when replacing their old PCs while control the growth of PCs to prevent aggravating traffic congestion and roadside air pollution. Under the Scheme, eligible car owners who buy a new EV and arrange to scrap an eligible old PC they own can enjoy a higher FRT concession of up to \$250,000. The Government believes that the new Scheme will give eligible PC owners a greater incentive to go for EVs when they replace their old PCs.

Some Members are unhappy with the high threshold of the Scheme, under which the old PC must have been first registered in Hong Kong for six years or more, the car owner must have been the registered owner of the old PC for three years or more without interruption, and the old PC must have been licensed for at least 20 months within the 24 months immediately before its deregistration.

I appreciate Members' concern and understand that a lower threshold would enable more vehicles to meet the criteria and more owners to switch to EVs. However, I have to point out that the Scheme is to provide incentive to existing PC owners to go for EVs when they need to replace their old PC, on the premise that such replacements would not increase the overall number of PCs. For environmental reasons, we do not encourage premature scrapping of old PCs for the sake of switching to EVs.

Under the Scheme, the old PC must have been first registered in Hong Kong for six years or more, the car owner must have been the registered owner of the old PC for three years or more, and the old PC must have been licensed for at least 20 months within the 24 months immediately before its de-registration. The threshold is to prevent a surge in the import of old vehicles following the launch of the Scheme and to stop people from taking profit from the Scheme by accumulating old vehicles in the local second-hand market. The restriction also seeks to prevent people who do not own a PC from buying one in the market in order to join the Scheme.

In fact, the eligibility criteria for the Scheme are not at all high. According to the information of the Transport Department ("TD"), as at 9 March 2018, about 170 000 PCs met the two criteria that the vehicles "must have been first registered for six years or more" and "owned by the owner for three years or

more without interruption". TD anticipates that by the time the Scheme ends on 31 March 2021, the number of PCs meeting the above two criteria will increase to about 430 000, which is about three-quarters of the total number of registered PCs. Even if we lower the eligibility criterion on the old PC ownership period from three years to one year, the total number of PCs meeting the two criteria would remain unchanged at 430 000 by the time the Scheme ends on 31 March 2021. The only difference is some owners would meet the eligibility criterion on the vehicle ownership period earlier and thus replace their cars earlier. However, as I have said just now, the objective of the Scheme is to provide incentive to existing PC owners on the premise that the vehicle replacement would not increase the overall number of PCs. For environmental reasons, we do not encourage premature scrapping of old PCs for the sake of switching to EVs.

The Scheme provides a FRT concession of up to \$250,000, which will give EVs with a taxable value of \$377,500 a full FRT waiver. Most EV brands supplying e-PCs in the local market have offered EV models eligible for full FRT waiver. We thus believe that this higher ceiling can already cover most EVs on sale in the local market.

Apart from the FRT concessions, the annual vehicle licence fees for e-PCs are significantly lower than those for conventional PCs and the electricity cost for powering e-PCs is also less when compared with fuel cost for powering conventional ones. We thus consider that e-PCs, especially the more economical models, would be attractive to car buyers who have genuine need for driving.

Members have expressed grave concern about the provision of ancillary facilities for charging EVs, including how the Government could encourage the installation of charging facilities in private car parks of new and existing buildings, and how it could expand and enhance the public charging networks.

The Government fully agree that the provision of ancillary charging facilities is essential in the promotion of the use of EVs. However, as I have said in the opening remark, it has always been the Government's policy that e-PC owners should perform their daily e-PC charging to sustain a whole day's journey by using charging facilities at their home, workplace or other suitable places. Public charging facilities in Hong Kong are supplementary in nature. Potential

buyers of e-PCs should fully consider the daily charging arrangements required and should not rely on public charging facilities for daily charging of their e-PCs.

Yet, we can also see a surge in the use of EVs in recent years. In the light of the rapid changes in the usage of EVs, the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") is working with relevant government bureaux and departments to review the various policies and measures on promoting the use of EVs. We would look into ways to enhance the provision of public charging networks and facilities for EVs in public car parks, explore ways to encourage the installation of charging facilities for EVs in private and commercial buildings, review the technical and planning guidelines on the installation of EV charging facilities in new buildings to tie in with the usage of EVs and the installation of more charging facilities in the future.

Some Members have expressed concern that in granting concession on gross floor area for private car parks in new buildings, the Government has only required the relevant developers to provide EV charging-enabling infrastructure (the provision of cabling and conduits) at the car parks, but the installation of chargers with electricity meter connection was not required. Without such facilities, the pre-cabled parking spaces are still not ready for EV charging.

The conditions for the provision of EV charging-enabling infrastructure were drawn up in 2011 to make sure that the future installation of EV chargers would not be hindered by any infrastructure constraint. At that time, EVs were still at the development stage and mainstream standards for EV chargers and related installations were not established yet. Hence, installation of chargers with electricity meter connection at parking spaces with EV charging-enabling infrastructure has not been a requirement. However, in light of the increase in the number of EVs and the recent changes in their usage, the Environment Bureau is working with relevant departments to review this arrangement and examine revision of the relevant guidelines.

However, we would need to carefully consider whether the enhancement should be introduced in a form of administrative measures or law enactment/amendments, taking into account the operational and technical feasibility. Actually, our policy has been effective in prompting the installation of EV charging-enabling infrastructure at over 80% of car parking spaces in newly-built private premises. As the EV charging technology is still in the development stage, it seems to be more appropriate for us to adopt measures that

are flexible and allow for timely update. The Environment Bureau is now working with relevant departments to explore ways to effectively promote the installation of more EV charging facilities in car parks of private and commercial buildings.

Retrofitting existing buildings with EV charging facilities, however, may be restricted by insufficient power supply capacity or space, especially as residential developments in Hong Kong are mostly multi-storey buildings. It also requires time for owners, property management companies, or owners' corporations of residential buildings to be aware of the need to retrofit their buildings with EV charging facilities. In this respect, EPD has established a dedicated team and a hotline to provide information and technical support on the installation of EV charging facilities. EPD has also shared cases of successful installation with the property management sector to update the management companies with the installation work and the procedures involved. The two power companies have also rendered one-stop services to EV owners, including site inspection, provision of technical advice, and connection of power supply. In recent years, several private companies have tapped into the market to help EV owners install charging facilities at their parking spaces. As far as we understand, these companies have provided charging facility installation services in around 30 housing estates—not just 30 parking spaces. According to some EV charging service providers, as owners' corporations have more knowledge about EVs, they are more willing to approve residents' applications for installation of charging facilities. The power companies have also indicated their readiness to accept requests for additional load from private buildings to meet their needs for charging EVs.

To promote greater understanding among owners, property management companies and owners' corporations of residential buildings on the installation of charging facilities, and help them develop a more positive attitude towards residents' applications for the installation of charging facilities in their car parks, the Government will strengthen its communication, publicity, and education efforts and provide the necessary assistance. Yet, the Government considers it necessary to respect the will of individual owners' corporations or owners/residents. We do not think it is appropriate to make the installation of EV charging facilities a mandatory measure for them at the present stage.

Regarding the provision of economic incentives, under the principle of the proper use of public resources, the Government will carefully consider the

feasibility of providing some economic incentives to help or encourage existing buildings to install charging facilities.

In respect of the public charging networks, a number of Members have suggested that the Government should review the provision of ancillary facilities for charging EVs in the Government and public premises, including conducting a study on retrofitting the existing car parks in government properties and public housing estates, on-street parking spaces and public car parks with charging facilities for EVs. The Government should also gradually raise the charging speed of standard EV chargers to medium or quick level, and regulate the occupation of EV parking spaces by non-EVs.

As at the end of 2017, the number of public chargers provided in government and private car parks open for public use in Hong Kong was 1 862. Among them, 680 chargers were installed in government car parks under TD, the Government Property Agency ("GPA"), the Leisure and Cultural Services Department, the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department, the Housing Department, and the Cruise Terminal. To improve the charging efficiency, in government public car parks managed by TD and government car parks managed by GPA which are open for public use, EPD has progressively upgraded the standard chargers to medium chargers in the past few years.

Regarding outdoor charging facilities, EPD is conducting a pilot scheme at four government open car parks (located at the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department Headquarters, Hong Kong Wetland Park, Wai Tsuen Sports Centre and Shek Kip Mei Park) managed by contractors, where a total of 11 outdoor medium chargers have been installed to assess their reliability. We will review the findings of the pilot scheme this year to consider whether more outdoor chargers can be installed in other government premises.

In respect of the feasibility of retrofitting on-street parking spaces with charging facilities, TD has indicated that the provision of on-street parking spaces is to cater for temporary parking needs and such spaces are usually installed with parking meters to increase the circulation of parking spaces, so that more drivers can use on-street parking spaces for short-term parking. Providing charging facilities at on-street parking meters may encourage the prolonged occupation of such parking spaces by EV drivers for charging purposes, whereby affecting other drivers with parking needs and may cause EVs queuing for charging around on-street parking spaces installed with charging facilities, leading to traffic jam.

Therefore, the Government should give careful consideration to choosing parking spaces for this purpose. EPD will study whether trial for EV charging is possible at suitable on-street parking spaces and will discuss the implementation of specific ideas with relevant departments.

Regarding legislating on the regulation and prohibition of occupation of EV parking spaces by non-EVs, we have to point out that at present, e-PCs only account for about 2% of the total number of registered PCs. Given the supplementary nature of charging facilities provided in the government car parks and for full utilization of parking space resources, public parking spaces installed with charging facilities are not designated for exclusive use by EVs. We think the provision of more charging facilities for EVs in government car parks is a better way to improve the situation.

Information on public chargers, including their locations, types and numbers, is currently available on EPD web pages. Certain EV charging service providers and EV suppliers have also developed mobile applications by which EV owners can check instant information of chargers available and make reservations accordingly. As regards public chargers in government car parks, equipment is being installed in these car parks for trials on sending instant electronic information of public chargers' utilization to government electronic platforms for public reference. The trials will be completed this year.

Various issues related to the ancillary facilities for charging EVs have aroused public concern. As I have said in the opening remark, in light of the rapid changes in the usage of EVs, the Environment Bureau will work with relevant government bureaux and departments to review various policies and measures on promoting the use of EVs.

On the provision of support and training, nurturing talents in various sectors has always been one of the key policy priorities of the Government. The schools of engineering at Hong Kong universities have developed different programmes, including programmes on the car industry, to cater to the local needs, and have nurtured a pool of design and scientific research talents in various sectors. The Innovation and Technology Fund ("ITF") has a mechanism in place to provide funds and support as appropriate for the promotion of scientific design.

Apart from ensuring the quality of academic programmes and academic standards of subsidized universities, the University Grants Committee also has to make sure that the programmes can meet the needs of society. Therefore, in reviewing their programmes, local universities will keep regular contact with stakeholders to understand the latest manpower trend and needs of various sectors.

On the training of vehicle mechanics for EVs and hybrid vehicles, the Pro-Act Training and Development Centre (Automobile) of the Vocational Training Council has organized part-time evening courses on the repair of EVs and hybrid vehicles to provide vehicle mechanics with the on-the-job training. The repair training is also available in the curriculum of the higher diploma course in automotive engineering offered by the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education. EV suppliers are also encouraged to share their information on the repair of EVs with the vehicle repair sector to enrich its knowledge.

With the advances in technology, I think Hong Kong, like other major cities, has to timely adjust or enhance its policies to keep pace with the ever-changing technology. Administered by the Innovation and Technology Commission, ITF aims to increase the added value, productivity and competitiveness of our economic activities. It also encourages and assists Hong Kong companies to upgrade their technological level and introduce innovative ideas to their businesses. Through ITF, the Government will continue to support technology projects in relation to the development of EVs.

Despite the absence of unified standards for EV chargers in the international market for the time being, we will keep a close watch on the standards of chargers adopted by local EVs and the global development of standards for EVs and other related factors, to timely formulate the development direction for the standards of EV chargers in Hong Kong.

Some Members have suggested that the Government should conduct a study on using the revenue from EV registration tax to finance environmental protection work and develop charging facilities, and enhance public education in relation to EVs. The Government has always exercised prudence in the use of public money to ensure all tax revenues are put into proper use. It will review and enhance its environmental protection initiatives from time to time and

provide the necessary funding support to meet the needs of society in a timely manner.

On the recovery and handling of old EV batteries, the Government has been in close contact with EV suppliers to remind them of the need to properly handle waste EV batteries in accordance with the requirements under the Waste Disposal Ordinance. As most EVs in Hong Kong are of a low age, the number of retired EV batteries remains small at this stage. Only a number of waste EV batteries which are damaged and cannot be repaired have to be exported to treatment facilities overseas for recycling. We know that various EV suppliers have also arranged for the recovery of their EVs. Nevertheless, as EVs will become more popular in the future, EPD has been exploring with EV suppliers in enhancing the collection and handling of waste EV batteries so as not to bring damages to the environment.

In August 2016, the Environment Bureau launched an International Competition on Second Life for Retired Batteries from Electric Vehicles to collect innovative and practical ideas for re-using retired EV batteries. The competition was concluded last June. We also have plans to launch a trial scheme on the reuse of retired EV batteries in remote facilities in Hong Kong to thoroughly study its feasibility and carry out trial runs. Meanwhile, we also have to make sure that companies which are interested in the reuse of retired EV batteries would follow the mechanism set out in the Waste Disposal Ordinance to properly handle the batteries, and refrain from disposing of them at landfills.

Deputy President, the SAR Government will definitely be proactive in seizing the opportunity of the rapid development of EV technology to further promote the use of EVs. To do so, the Government will actively encourage the transport sectors to run trials on and use e-CVs and CV manufacturers to introduce more EV models that can meet the operational needs locally. A review will also be conducted to enhance the policies and measures on the promotion of EVs and the installation of charging facilities to tie in with the increased usage of EVs, and to improve the roadside air pollution. Finally, I would like to thank Members once again for their speeches on the motion and their inputs on the promotion of the use of EVs.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): After the Secretary has made a 30-minute speech to give his responses, I now call upon Mr Kenneth LEUNG to move an amendment.

MR KENNETH LEUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I move that Mr Frankie YICK's motion be amended.

The amendment moved by Mr Kenneth LEUNG (See the marked-up version at Annex 1)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Mr Kenneth LEUNG to Mr Frankie YICK's motion, be passed.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you as stated. 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 Tommy CHEUNG rose to claim a division.

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

(THE PRESIDENT resumed the Chair)

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

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes.

(Some Members made some noise at their seats)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please remain quiet.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr CHAN Chun-ying and Mr Kenneth LAU voted for the amendment.

Mr James TO, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan, Mr SHIU Ka-fai and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted against the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming and Mr LUK Chung-hung abstained.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Ms Claudia MO, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Gary FAN, Mr AU Nok-hin and Mr Vincent CHENG voted for the amendment.

Mr Michael TIEN, Mr WU Chi-wai, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting and Mr HUI Chi-fung voted against the amendment.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung and Dr CHENG Chung-tai abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 25 were present, 14 were in favour of the amendment, 6 against it and 4 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 21 were present, 11 were in favour of the amendment, 6 against it and 4 abstained. Since the question was agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was passed.

MS STARRY LEE (in Cantonese): President, I move that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of the motion on "Promoting the popularization of electric vehicles" or any amendments thereto, this Council do proceed to each of such divisions immediately after the division bell has been rung for one minute.

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

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(No hands raised)

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

I order that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of the motion on "Promoting the popularization of electric vehicles" or any amendments thereto, this Council do proceed to each of such divisions immediately after the division bell has been rung for one minute.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Members have already been informed that as Mr Kenneth LEUNG's amendment has been passed, Mr HUI Chi-fung has withdrawn his amendment.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Charles Peter MOK, as Mr Kenneth LEUNG's amendment has been passed, you may move your revised amendment.

MR CHARLES PETER MOK (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr Frankie YICK's motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG be further amended by my revised amendment.

The further amendment moved by Mr Charles Peter MOK to the motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG (See the marked-up version at Annex 2)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That Mr Charles Peter MOK's amendment to Mr Frankie YICK's motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(No hands raised)

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

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, as the amendments of Mr Kenneth LEUNG and Mr Charles Peter MOK have been passed, you may move your revised amendment.

IR DR LO WAI-KWOK (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr Frankie YICK's motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG and Mr Charles Peter MOK be further amended by my revised amendment. I only retain part of the suggestions in my original amendment as in point (1), "examine the development

strategy for environment-friendly vehicles in Hong Kong", and point (6), "corresponding to its vigorous promotion of the development of scientific research and innovation and technology ...". The above are the core suggestions in my original amendment, which I explained already in my main speech earlier. I hope that Members can support my revised amendment. Thank you.

The further amendment moved by Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok to the motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG and Mr Charles Peter MOK (See the marked-up version at Annex 3)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok's amendment to Mr Frankie YICK's motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG and Mr Charles Peter MOK be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr AU Nok-hin rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr AU Nok-hin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Mr James TO, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kiok, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kiok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr Kenneth LAU and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr Gary FAN and Mr Vincent CHENG voted for the amendment.

Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr CHU Hoi-dick voted against the amendment.

Mr Michael TIEN, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Mr AU Nok-hin abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 26 were present and 25 were in favour of the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 21 were present, 14 were in favour of the amendment, 2 against it and 5 abstained. Since the question was agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, as the amendments of Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK and Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok have been passed, you may move your revised amendment.

MS YUNG HOI-YAN (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr Frankie YICK's motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK and Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok be further amended by my revised amendment.

The further amendment moved by Ms YUNG Hoi-yan to the motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK and Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok (See the marked-up version at Annex 4)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That Ms YUNG Hoi-yan's amendment to Mr Frankie YICK's motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK and Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(A Member raised his hand)

Mr AU Nok-hin rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr AU Nok-hin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Mr James TO, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr Kenneth LAU and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr Gary FAN and Mr Vincent CHENG voted for the amendment.

Dr Fernando CHEUNG voted against the amendment.

Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Ms Tanya CHAN, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Mr AU Nok-hin abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 26 were present and 25 were in favour of the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 22 were present, 15 were in favour of the amendment, 1 against it and 6 abstained. Since the question was agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan, as the amendments of Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok and Ms YUNG Hoi-yan have been passed, you may move your revised amendment.

MR CHAN HAK-KAN (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr Frankie YICK's motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok and Ms YUNG Hoi-yan be further amended by my revised amendment.

The further amendment moved by Mr CHAN Hak-kan to the motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok and Ms YUNG Hoi-yan (See the marked-up version at Annex 5)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That Mr CHAN Hak-kan's amendment to Mr Frankie YICK's motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok and Ms YUNG Hoi-yan be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(No hands raised)

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

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Tanya CHAN, as the amendments of Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHAN Hak-kan have been passed, you may move your revised amendment.

MS TANYA CHAN (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr Frankie YICK's motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHAN Hak-kan be further amended by my revised amendment.

The further amendment moved by Ms Tanya CHAN to the motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHAN Hak-kan (See the marked-up version at Annex 6)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That Ms Tanya CHAN's amendment to Mr Frankie YICK's motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHAN Hak-kan be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(No hands raised)

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

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): As Dr Junius HO is not present, this Council will not deal with his amendment.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Frankie YICK, you still have 1 minute 16 seconds to reply. Then, the debate will come to a close.

MR FRANKIE YICK (in Cantonese): President, I have listened to Members expressing their different views on a proposal in my original motion regarding mandatory provision of charging facilities in newly constructed commercial and residential buildings. Some Members agree with it and some do not. I wish to explain a little further. The Government already has some incentive measures in place, but they are not 100% effective. If we do not aim at 100% effectiveness now, as Mr CHAN Kin-por said just now, most of the buildings will not be able to install charging facilities in the future even if they wish to because their fuse room will not have the space for the installation. When EVs are popularized, there will be less fuel-engined vehicles, and there will naturally be less petrol filling stations. It will then be more difficult for fuel-engined vehicle owners to refuel their vehicles. They will then be forced to support Mr CHU Hoi-dick's proposal and take public transport or ride bicycles because they have no other options. Hence, I hope the Government will seriously reconsider my proposal.

I hold that it is worthwhile to consider doing some preparation now to embrace the popularization of EVs. I thank 28 Members for speaking actively on this subject and providing many views to the Government. We hope that the Government can (*The buzzer sounded*) ... implement them expeditiously.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Frankie YICK, please stop.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Mr Frankie YICK, as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHAN Hak-kan and Ms Tanya CHAN, 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 CHU Hoi-dick rose to claim a division.

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

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung and Mr Kenneth LAU voted for the motion as amended.

Mr James TO and Mr KWONG Chun-yu abstained.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth

QUAT, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Gary FAN, Mr AU Nok-hin and Mr Vincent CHENG voted for the motion as amended.

Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr CHU Hoi-dick voted against the motion as amended.

Mr Michael TIEN, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr HUI Chi-fung and Dr CHENG Chung-tai abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 25 were present, 22 were in favour of the motion as amended and 2 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 22 were present, 15 were in favour of the motion as amended, 2 against it and 5 abstained. Since the question was agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the motion as amended was passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Debate on motion with no legislative effect. The Council is now conducting the motion debate on "Setting up an information database on the conduct of police officers".

Members who wish to speak on the motion will please press the "Request to speak" button.

I call upon Dr CHENG Chung-tai to speak and move the motion.

SETTING UP AN INFORMATION DATABASE ON THE CONDUCT OF POLICE OFFICERS

DR CHENG CHUNG-TAI (in Cantonese): Good afternoon, Members. The subject of this motion is "Setting up an information database on the conduct of police officers". It was originally scheduled for debate in a Council meeting of November 2017, but due to various reasons ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHENG Chung-tai, please begin your speech with moving that the motion, as printed on the Agenda, be passed.

DR CHENG CHUNG-TAI (in Cantonese): I am sorry. I move that the motion, as printed on the Agenda, be passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Please continue with your speech.

DR CHENG CHUNG-TAI (in Cantonese): Good afternoon, the subject of my Member's motion is "Setting up an information database on the conduct of police officers". It was originally scheduled for debate in a Council meeting of November 2017, but due to various reasons, the debate is not conducted until today when it is close to the middle of 2018. Some of my friends thus say it is a bit strange to debate on this subject now because it seems that people no longer care about the conduct of police officers or the excessive police powers. Yet, I wish to give a point-by-point elaboration to tell Members that this debate on the Member's motion concerns more about the problem of corruption, being the most core part of the future governance of the Hong Kong Government, than the conduct of police officers or the excessive police powers.

First, German sociologist Max WEBER has pointed out that the state is a "human community that claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force". What does this mean? Apart from the United States where the Constitution empowers its citizens to carry guns, Max WEBER's description is applicable to almost all sovereign states or governments. It is beyond doubt that states or governments monopolize physical force or violence. Hence, the legitimate basis of ruling powers and the appropriateness of their use of the monopolized force are the key considerations and the sources of controversy as well. In general, the controversy lies in whether the states are under autocratic or democratic rule and the constitutional regimes or relevant systems which such rule bases. In simple terms, it is all about how governments are empowered to monopolize and do violence to societies and individuals.

Yet, the situation in Hong Kong is different. The political conflict in the city has intensified after LEUNG Chun-ying came to power. The Hong Kong Police Force ("the Police Force") has completely become the repressive tool of

the ruling power after the outbreak of the umbrella revolution. I will elaborate this in the second part of my speech. As the social resistance movement came to a fiasco, the winning parties of the SAR Government, the Police Force, and their supporters have increasingly been dominated by the victor-to-rule mentality. This would not only do harm to the political or social movement, but also caused the internal governance of the Police Force to lose control.

The Police Force sought to distort the history as early as in the beginning of 2013. In the "Police History" section of its website, the Police Force said it was a universally known objective fact that the poor wages of police officers which could hardly catch up with the economic development was the cause of the rampant corruption of the Police Force before the establishment of the Independent Commission Against Corruption ("ICAC"). Having said that, the Police Force described Peter GODBER, a former Chief Superintendent, as an aggrieved hero confronting rioters in 1967, ignoring the fact that this corrupted cop had aroused public anger and jumped bail. According to the 2013 website, however, ICAC's anti-graft efforts were described as "going too far". In the climax of the conflict between the Police Force and ICAC in 1977, over 1 000 police officers and their relatives marched in protest to the ICAC headquarters causing a disturbance and assaulting people in knowingly violation of the law. But their mutiny-like vicious behaviours were described as a moderate possession and assembly in the website. The Police Force revised the contents only after the public reacted strongly against the distortion of the police history. But this distortion to history reflects the mindset of the Police Force, or some police officers and their supporters, who consider the Police Force as great, glorious, right, and could do no wrong. Any doubts or criticisms so raised will be regarded as insults to the Police Force, which warrants the introduction of "the offence of insulting public officers" to keep their mouths shut. This is utterly putting the cart before the horse.

The second point I want to raise is how a state can maintain the state or social order. A new Marxist philosopher, Louis Pierre ALTHUSSER (there is a different Chinese transliteration for the last name in Taiwan), thinks there are two major state apparatuses to reinforce the autocratic rule: the Ideological State Apparatus ("ISA") and the Repressive State Apparatus ("RSA"). ISA is a form of ideological control. To put it simple, it seeks to make the subjects to become slaves willingly. RSA is the control through the repression of the police force or army. Why do I have to raise this ideological viewpoint? The common belief that Hong Kong is a society with a rule of law is a misconception under this viewpoint. Instead, Hong Kong has all along been under the rule by law. It

was particularly so in times of the colonial rule, though the Government gave the rule by law a better image and packaged it as an enlightened autocracy.

One example is the Hong Kong Police Force. During the British-Hong Kong era, the Government boosted the image of the then Royal Hong Kong Police Force by means of ideology building through the adoption of ALTHUSSER's ISA. However, the Police Force's attitude towards the protestors or even their attitude towards the ordinary people in daily life has totally swept away their positive image. The change in the attitude of the Police Force reinforces the point that Hong Kong's upholding the rule of law is utterly a misconception. Hong Kong is rather under the control of RSA, the other apparatus to maintain social order aside ideology control in ALTHUSSER's theory. Only that the RSA control was packaged in a more liberal and beautiful way in a bid to maintain the legitimacy of the Government. However, the RSA control has become blatantly obvious to us in the past few years.

As for the situation in Hong Kong today, why do I have to move the motion on "Setting up an information database on the conduct of police officers"? The Police Force had once won great respect and trust from Hong Kong people, but the favourable impression vanished in 30 years. If we looked back to the history, the Police Force were regarded as the hotbed of corruption, and were deeply hated by Hong Kong people several decades ago. Old folks of Hong Kong should be familiar to the nickname of "licenced thugs" given to police officers to show the disapproval. There were also saying that "good guys would not join the Police Force". It was not until the riots in 1967 when the unpopular police offices confronted and suppressed the leftists that the image of the Police Force was slightly improved. In the 1970s, Murray MACLEHOSE came to Hong Kong to fix the governance problem. His establishment of ICAC had brought fear to the entire Police Force. In 1977, as I have just said, numerous police officers marched to the ICAC headquarters to cause a disturbance in an attempt to force the Government to give in. The conflict was finally resolved after the Government agreed not to pursue the cases. This was the conflict between the Police Force and ICAC in the history of Hong Kong. A compromise was reached after ICAC agreed not to pursue any pre-ICAC corruption cases involving police officers. Post-ICAC corruption cases, however, would be dealt with in accordance with the Independent Commission Against Corruption Ordinance. From 1970s through 1990s, corruption cases involving police officers had drastically reduced while their image has kept to improve. The period between 1980s and 1990s could be regarded as the heyday of the Police Force. Some gangsters from Mainland China had committed a number of large-scale robberies in Hong Kong during that period of time when

the number of police officers on routine patrol was insufficient. Hence, the image of police officers risking their lives to protect Hong Kong people won admiration from the public. This was further boosted by mainstream media which produced a lot of programmes featuring police officers. Among them, TVB's drama series on police officers were highly popular among Hong Kong people.

However, with the number of large-scale robberies significantly declining after 1997, the pressure of the Police Force no longer comes from Mainland gangsters or some unexpected circumstances. Rather, police officers have to face the increasingly aggressive protests as the deficiency in the Hong Kong political system has caused more and more peaceful demonstrations to go aggressive in 2000.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHENG Chung-tai, the subject of your motion is the "Setting up an information database on the conduct of police officers". You have spoken for over nine minutes, but you have yet to mention the subject matter. Please come back to the subject of the motion.

DR CHENG CHUNG-TAI (in Cantonese): President, I hope you can understand that the setting up an information database on the conduct of police officers is not a single measure. So, I would like to first speak on the wider perspective of the development or governance of Hong Kong. I will talk about issues which you consider relevant to the subject shortly.

Thanks to the ideological control, the image of the Hong Kong Police Force has improved. Hong Kong people no longer fear about the Police Force as there have been more and more interactions between the two. The work of the Police Public Relations Branch and the subsequent setting up of the complaint mechanism helps give Hong Kong people an impression that police officers in Hong Kong are truly members of the Royal Hong Kong Police Force, not undisciplined cops.

The city has experienced drastic changes in recent years, against the autocratic power's belief that it can maintain an iron grip on Hong Kong through the adoption of the twin tools of ISA and RSA. All of these were exposed in the years between 2014 and 2016. As I have just said, holding all the trump cards, the Hong Kong Government no longer cares about the image of the Police Force.

In other words, it would not hesitate to check discontent in society or grievance of the public by means of suppression or the imposition of pressure.

What harms would be done to Hong Kong? In an open letter issued in around January 2017, Chairman of the Junior Police Officers' Association CHAN Cho-kwong considers criticism about the enforcement and the image of the Police Force as an ill-motivated attempt to confuse police officers with criminals. Vowing that police officers are under strict discipline, CHAN also says even sage will commit minor mistakes. Besides, there is also saying that every organization will have a black sheep, let alone the Police Force with such a large workforce. Our Chief Executive has also said so. However, the criticisms are not unfounded accusations, and are rather backed by facts and statistics. For example, in a book entitled 《有種罪犯叫休班警察》 (*There is a type of criminals called off-duty police officers*) first published in 2017, it records 29 types of criminal cases involving police officers, including 73 cases of police officers knowingly violating the law and four cases of police officers making blunders. There are also cases of police officers embezzling in the course of duty, including the theft of several million dollars at Wan Chai Police Station.

From end of 2016 or early 2017, the Police Force have been a bit mindful about their discipline in response to widespread criticisms in society. Yet, I wish to provide some figures on crimes committed by off-duty police officers. Since January 2017, there have been 50 or so reports of off-duty police officers committing crimes, or a monthly average of nearly five crimes. There were three such cases in each of the past two months.

These statistical figures will not lie. I am not solely speaking from the angle of procession and demonstration. We are facing the fact that Hong Kong will have to rely on the disciplined services to maintain its social order. However, the problem is our Chief Executive as well as chiefs and senior officials of the civil service do not realize that Hong Kong's upholding of the rule of law is essentially a packaged image. For example, in the Sally AW case years ago, the image of the judge and barristers putting on wigs, black robes, pairs of silk stockings and patent-leather shoes was teased and ridiculed. Yet, those who have mocked this attire do not understand that it represents the image of the rule of law, an image Hong Kong had once built up.

The same is for the naming of the Royal Hong Kong Police Force. Naming our police force with the word "Royal" carries enormous implications. Unfortunately, senior officials of the SAR Government do not realize that the

destruction of the image of rule of law which was built up during the British-Hong Kong era will make Hong Kong become ungovernable.

Finally, I would like to quote a Confucius saying. In the *Analects of Confucius—Zi Lu*, the Master said, "When a prince's personal conduct is correct, his government is effective without the issuing of orders. If his personal conduct is not correct, he may issue orders, but they will not be followed." Even a single scandal about the disciplined services is too much and is enough to shake the legitimacy of the ruling power. I wish to point out that this speech or this motion does not intend to cause confrontation or to target anyone. Nor does it seek entirely to facilitate or embolden the opposition camp. I cannot think of any reasons why the pro-establishment camp would oppose the motion. The stability of Hong Kong actually relies on the trust between the public and the ruling power, the frontline enforcement officers in particular. That trust should have been embodied in the principle of sovereignty residing with the people in a democratic society, but unfortunately, it is not the case for Hong Kong. Hence, we can only make some small and patch-up improvements. My motion on "Setting up an information database on the conduct of police officers" exactly seeks to patch up the problem of the excessive police powers by the public themselves. Thank you. (*The buzzer sounded*)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHENG Chung-tai, please stop speaking.

Dr CHENG Chung-tai moved the following motion: (Translation)

"That, in recent years, there have been cases from time to time of on-duty and off-duty police officers committing criminal offences, including theft, sex crimes, violence, false allegations and corruption, and convicted and dismissed police officers may become potential hazards to law and order in society, causing people to worry more about the threat to their personal safety and security of their property; on the other hand, many people have complained to the Complaints Against Police Office and the Independent Police Complaints Council about abuse of power by police officers, but the relevant departments have failed to handle such cases in an open, fair and impartial manner; in this connection, this Council requests the Government to set up an information database on the conduct of police officers, allowing public access to information about faults committed by and complaints against various police officers."

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Dr CHENG Chung-tai be passed.

Mr James TO will move an amendment to this motion. This Council will conduct a joint debate on the motion and the amendment.

I call upon Mr James TO to speak and move an amendment to the motion.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): President, I move that Dr CHENG Chung-tai's motion be amended.

President, when preparing my speech, both my assistant and I wanted to understand the background or premise of Dr CHENG's original motion. We therefore collected a lot of information online or in newspapers but we did not find any relevant information. I admit that I have not listened to all the opinions expressed by Dr CHENG in online television programmes, so I can only literally understand, interpret and analyse why he moved this motion. I am really pleased to hear the detailed explanation given by Dr CHENG just now. One of the reasons why he moved this motion is due to an incident that happened more than a year ago. He is most worried that if the Police Force become fearless with someone's backing or become unbridled, the foundation of the Hong Kong regime may be shaken or it may be impossible to govern Hong Kong. Therefore, he requests the setting up of an information database on the conduct of police officers.

President, I have been listening very carefully to Dr CHENG's explanation just now. The information database will include information on criminal offences committed by police officers including theft, sex crimes, violence, false allegations and corruption, but I still have some doubts. Putting aside issues such as a black sheep or the number of police officers involved, be it big or small, what are the relations between these incidents and the premise and history mentioned by Dr CHENG? Does Dr CHENG think that, due to LEUNG Chun-ying's connivance or fear of police officers in the past few years, and his reliance on the Police to be the tool of autocratic rule, some police officers have thus become fearless or even bold enough to commit criminal offences including theft, sex crimes and corruption?

I do not think the two are necessarily related. Had police officers committed criminal offences before the governance of LEUNG Chun-ying? Given that there are tens of thousands of police officers in the Police Force, some of them must have committed criminal offences. But I cannot say that the number of such cases is particularly on the high side in recent years; I can only say that "There is a black sheep in every flock". Dr CHENG may not agree, but in my view, even if there are some police officers who have committed criminal offences, such as shoplifting, how can this act be related to LEUNG Chun-ying's governance and connivance of police officers?

What matters most is whether we can trust that the Police Force will handle these cases fairly. If a police officer commits an offence, it is vital that: First, do we trust the current handling mechanism of the Police Force? Second, as I have been saying for decades, if the mechanism of the Complaints Against Police Office ("CAPO") is not independent of the Police Force, but remains a mechanism of "investigation by peers", no matter how fair the investigation results, the community will not consider these results fair. To solve this problem, we must let the community believe that the investigation is fair and the major premise is that CAPO must be independent. This is the most important point.

Lastly, I hope Dr CHENG will also agree that CAPO must be independent. What are the problems with the setting up of an information database on the conduct of police officers? The database mentioned by Dr CHENG allows public access to information on faults committed by and complaints against any police officer. Of course, convicted and dismissed police officers may become potential hazards to law and order in society. I think there is such a possibility, but is the public only given the access to information on dismissed police officers? Do they also have access to information on serving police officers who have committed faults but have not been dismissed or convicted? In fact, the Police Force have a way to deal with police officers' conduct and this method is commonly known as "giving adverse comment on conduct report". Can the public have access to information on serving police officers who have not been dismissed or convicted?

Dr CHENG has also mentioned information on complaints against police officers. I would like to ask if we can only have access to cases in which the complaints are substantiated. Can we also have access to cases in which the complaints are unsubstantiated? I do not know how other people think of the

Police Force because I also have some views on the Police. If you want me to say that the Hong Kong Police Force are out-and-out tools of the autocratic government, having the power to use force and being the accomplices or executors of the violent government, I am afraid I cannot say so. I can only say that during the years of LEUNG Chun-ying's governance, there were major conflicts in Hong Kong, and the Government had not taken the stringent measures as in the past and had been lax in requiring police officers to remain politically neutral and in regulating police officers.

Am I worried that police officers will run wild? I am worried but I still cannot say that police officers are tools of the violent or autocratic government. To cite the remark of Max WEBER, a sociologist, the Police have the legitimate use of physical force. This is the definition made by a sociologist but I think the Hong Kong Police Force are still generally trustworthy. When I need help, I will seek help from the Police. If my friends or members of the public need help, I will ask them to seek help from the Police.

Nevertheless, if we really find that the Police have gradually failed to adhere to political neutrality and that the Secretaries of Departments, Directors of Bureaux and the Chief Executive, and even the Central Government have allowed the Police to develop in that direction, we must be vigilant. If pro-establishment colleagues disagree and think that we must support the Police, I advise them not to render support blindly. We support the Police because we hope that society will be stable and orderly. We also hope that the Police will have good morale and will be able to properly implement the law and safeguard the rule of law. If we blindly support the Police, the painful consequence will eventually have to be borne by the entire community, including supporters of the pro-establishment camp.

On one occasion, a supporter of the pro-establishment camp sought my help. He often canvassed votes opposite my street booth and hurled insults at me, even using swear words. He asked me for help because he experienced the abuse of power by law enforcement officials. He used to think that law enforcement officers would not abuse power and that the pro-establishment camp should absolutely support the Police because they are administering Hong Kong on behalf of the Chinese communist regime. Yet, when this supporter of the pro-establishment camp became a victim of the abuse of power by violent police officers, he realized that the disciplined service should be under proper monitoring.

President, I have repeatedly mentioned why CAPO must be independent. In the upcoming Budget debate, I will move amendments to the relevant subheads of expenditure and I will then explain why CAPO must be independent. I will keep raising this argument until I attain success in my struggle. So, I will not repeat those remarks. The practice of "investigation by peers" has insufficient credibility and the public are not convinced regardless of what the relevant organization is called. I believe it is most important that CAPO must be independent and it should investigate whether police officers have violated the law and then punish the offenders.

The amendment moved by Mr James TO (See the marked-up version at Annex 7)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Mr James TO to Dr CHENG Chung-tai's motion, be passed.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, Hong Kong is one of the safest cities in the world, with its overall law and order situation remaining stable over the years. In 2017, Hong Kong's crime rate measured by the number of crimes per 100 000 population stood at 758 cases, representing a new low since 1971. This good result obviously owes much to the contribution of the Police, particularly the efforts of frontline police officers. I believe the general public will agree that the Police Force is an efficient and professional team.

With a disciplined establishment of 29 000-plus officers, the Police strictly implement stringent integrity management and an effective disciplinary system. The average number of police officers dismissed following convictions in each of the past three years was 11, accounting for 0.00037 of the entire Police Force. Dr CHENG Chung-tai's original motion describes this tiny handful of officers as "potential hazards to law and order in society". I cannot agree with it. It is an overstatement that misrepresents the people's protector, the Police, as the people's enemy and provokes confrontation in society.

Both Dr CHENG's original motion and Mr James TO's amendment make reference to abuse of power by the Police. In my view, this is an accusation that can be easily made and easily exaggerated. The work of the Police is regulated by law and monitored from multiple angles by various parties including the

public, the Legislative Council, the media, the Government internally, and the police departments themselves. The Police have put in place a comprehensive internal management system, as well as operational guidelines and codes, to regulate the details of police officers' performance of their duties. Moreover, Hong Kong has an independent judicial system, and the Police have an effective disciplinary mechanism. All these can prevent and tackle officers' misconduct. In fact, among the complaints received by the Complaints Against Police Office ("CAPO") in the past three years, there were only few complaints about "abuse of power" by police officers, accounting for an average of just 2% to 3% of the total number of complaints.

The Police set great store by the discipline and conduct of police officers. The Police require that their officers, irrespective of seniority and whether on or off duty, must maintain high standards of discipline and conduct at all times. Police officers, like all citizens, must abide by the law, and take responsibility for and bear the consequences of their actions. The Police management will not condone any illegal acts of police officers. All cases of breach of the law or discipline will be investigated by the Police in a fair, just and serious manner, and any illegal acts will be handled impartially according to the law. If a police officer contravenes the Police (Discipline) Regulations (Cap. 232A), the Police General Orders or relevant civil service regulations, the Police Force will conduct an investigation according to the established mechanism, and decide whether to take disciplinary action, or what disciplinary action to take, in the light of the investigation result.

In fact, the Police attach great importance to the integrity management of police officers. As early as 2009, the Police formulated the Integrated Integrity Management Framework promoting a character of integrity and honesty among officers through a four-pronged approach of "education and integrity culture building", "governance and control", "enforcement and deterrence" and "reintegration and support". Currently, the Police have three levels of standing committees to implement integrity management. At the highest level is the Force Committee on Integrity Management, with a Deputy Commissioner of Police as Chairman and three Assistant Directors of the Independent Commission Against Corruption as members, responsible for formulating and assessing integrity management strategies. In addition, the Integrity Management Co-ordinating Committee and the Formation Integrity Committees are responsible for coordinating the above work and implementing relevant measures in Headquarters units and various Police Districts respectively.

Given the increasingly high public expectations about the conduct of police officers nowadays, the Police have kept enhancing their integrity management work. In addition to the existing three levels of committees, the Police set up in February 2017 a Special Working Group on Integrity Management chaired by an Assistant Commissioner of Police to explore the effectiveness of the Police's integrity management and look for enhancement plans. The Special Working Group on Integrity Management has conducted studies on three areas, namely "integrity education", "early intervention in behaviour involving integrity issues and inconsistent with the Police's values" and "risk management for specific posts". The Working Group has submitted its recommendations to the Force Committee on Integrity Management. The relevant police departments are now making arrangements for implementing the details of the recommendations.

The original motion alleges that CAPO and the Independent Police Complaints Council ("IPCC") "have failed to handle such cases in an open, fair and impartial manner". This is an unfair allegation which I absolutely disagree with. The current police complaints system is an effective one with independent monitoring, and has a clear legal basis. The first tier of the system is CAPO of the Police, which is responsible for receiving and investigating complaints. While CAPO is composed of police officers, its operation is independent of other police departments. The second tier of the system is IPCC, which is a statutory and independent body. The Independent Police Complaints Council Ordinance (Cap. 604 of the Laws of Hong Kong) ("IPCCO") clearly provides for the role, functions and powers of IPCC. All the 28 members and 110 observers of IPCC are drawn from different sectors of the community and completely independent of any government department. IPCC is responsible for observing, monitoring and reviewing CAPO's handling and investigation of complaints; and observers are responsible for observing the work of CAPO, and reporting to IPCC on whether the interviews and collection of evidence by CAPO were conducted in a fair and impartial manner.

Under the two-tier complaints handling mechanism, after completing the investigation of each reportable complaint, CAPO must submit a detailed investigation report to IPCC for examination. Should IPCC have any queries on the investigation results, it may ask CAPO for clarification or more information under IPCCO, and may interview the complainants, police officers and witnesses concerned. IPCC may even ask CAPO to reinvestigate a complaint or change the classification of investigation results, and advise and make recommendations to the Commissioner of Police and the Chief Executive. Over the past three

years, the numbers of reportable complaints against the Police and cases handled by IPCC have been falling. In 2014-2015, IPCC received investigation reports on a total of 2 159 new cases. In 2016-2017, this figure dropped by some 27% to 1 567, showing a positive trend.

The amendment alludes to the transparency of IPCC. IPCC is an independent body which has been operating with a high degree of transparency by holding open meetings regularly, issuing quarterly publications and annual reports every year, organizing press briefings, and maintaining communication and contact with the media. According to a public opinion survey conducted by an independent organization commissioned by IPCC in 2017, the respondents' net confidence in IPCC rose with the majority (55%) of them expressing satisfaction with the work of IPCC (the satisfaction rating increased to 60.5), reflecting that most of them recognized the work of IPCC.

In the amendment, Mr James TO urges police officers to uphold the principles of political neutrality and impartiality. The Police always adhere to the principle of political neutrality, and only consider whether the relevant acts are illegal when discharging their duties. Regardless of the backgrounds of the persons involved, the Police will treat them equally and discharge their duties in a fair, just and impartially manner. It is stipulated in the Police General Orders that a police officer shall at all times abstain from any activity which is likely to interfere with the impartial discharge of his/her duties, or which is likely to give rise to the impression amongst members of the public that it may so interfere. Under the relevant requirements, except in certain specific circumstances, a police officer shall not participate in political activities, which include political activities of a political organization, speaking publicly on matters of a political nature, distributing political publications, promoting or advocating political views or the electioneering platform of any candidate, and canvassing or campaigning on behalf of a political organization. Police officers always strictly uphold the above principle of political neutrality and discharge their duties professionally.

President, Hong Kong believes that everyone is equal before the law, and that lawbreakers will be duly punished while law-abiding citizens will be duly protected. Irrespective of the identity of the person appearing before the court, the judge will make a fair and just ruling according to the evidence and the law.

The Police Force is a major law enforcement agency. Under the principle of everyone being equal before the law, a police officer who has broken the law shall be judged in accordance with the law. The Police do not allow corruption,

malfeasance and violation of the law on the part of any officer, and always hold fast to the principle of handling in a fair, just and impartial manner all cases of officers breaching the law or discipline. The proposal for setting up a so-called "open database on police officers breaching the rules" outside the existing legal system and the stringent internal disciplinary system of the Police is completely unwarranted. It is an attempt to stick a negative label on the Police, disregarding the tremendous efforts made by the Police to serve the public day after day and achieve a low crime rate in Hong Kong, and disregarding their contribution to maintaining Hong Kong's status as one of the safest cities in the world.

The Hong Kong Police Force keeps striving to maintain law and order. I am against sweeping generalizations. I am against the proposals in the original motion and the amendment.

President, I will respond after Honourable Members have spoken.

I so submit.

MR CHAN CHUN-YING (in Cantonese): President, Dr CHENG Chung-tai moved a motion today, saying that police officers committing criminal offences may become potential hazards to law and order in society, thus requesting the Government to set up an information database on the conduct of police officers for public access. As far as I know, the Hong Kong Police Force has maintained information on persons arrested or convicted, but such information is kept in a confidential way to facilitate future crime investigation. The relevant name lists have never been made public. As a matter of fact, persons of any nationality and occupation may be convicted for breaking the law, but the motion today proposes to set up an information database on conduct that only covers police officers, and even information on their faults and complaints against them will be made public. In fact, there are at present different databases of various natures for employers or credit providers to consider matters concerning employment or loans. The objectives of such databases are clear and specific. On the contrary, regarding the setting up of an information database on the conduct of police officers as proposed by today's motion, people who have access to the information are members of the public, and the purpose of obtaining the information is not clear, so I will not support this motion.

Take for example the credit reference agency for the financial industry. The agency enables credit providers to consider the financial position of borrowers before deciding on the provision of loans. Under the mechanism, financial institutions must first obtain the permission of borrowers before applying to the agency for obtaining information on the indebtedness and credit history of the borrowers. Not all Hong Kong people can have access to the credit data. Only credit providers which have a credit business relationship with borrowers or have the intent to provide credit service can have access to the data on borrowers. The data can only be used for the purpose of credit assessment and debt collection.

President, some people may opine that the provision of loans is only a commercial activity between the borrower and the lender, and therefore should not be made public. As such, let me cite the example of the Sexual Conviction Record Check Scheme for child protection, a matter of great social concern, for further elaboration. The Scheme enables prospective employers to check the sexual convictions record of persons who intend to undertake child-related work as an important reference for offering employment. Since December 2011, persons seeking child-related jobs can apply to the Police for allowing prospective employers to check their sexual convictions record. However, prospective employers must obtain the permission of prospective employees before filing the application. At the same time, positions for which prospective employees apply must involve frequent or regular contacts with children or mentally incapacitated persons, such as teachers, social workers, health care workers, librarians and school bus drivers. In recent years, the Scheme has even been extended to cover employees of private tutorial centres and institutions offering interest classes. In short, this database, though having a great bearing on public interests, is not fully available to the public.

The objectives of the aforesaid two databases are clear and specific, and the operation of the database can meet the actual need by striking a balance between confidentiality and information disclosure. On the contrary, the positioning of the information database on the conduct of police officers as proposed in the motion is not clear. In future, whenever members of the public seek help from police offices, do they have to first obtain the permission of police officers, obtain information from the database on the conduct of the police officers in question, and then decide whether or not to seek help from them or allow them to discharge their duties? Is this a feasible practice?

On the other hand, President, the amendment to the motion requests on-duty or off-duty police officers not to support or participate in any political activities, so as not to affect enforcement actions taken by police officers with professionalism, impartiality and selflessness. In this connection, I think any people committed to professional ethics will uphold their professionalism when discharging their duties. Just as we believe that doctors will not give up saving the lives of patients due to their differing political views, and teachers will not give up teaching students due to their differing political views, I also believe that given the professionalism of the Police Force nowadays, police officers will not be affected by their political stances in enforcing the law. According to statistics from the Police, in 2017 the overall crime figure of Hong Kong dropped to 56 017 cases, a decrease of 4 629 cases or 7.6% when compared with that in 2016, and this was a record low since 1975. As law and order in Hong Kong is almost the best in the world, the professional ethics and efficiency of the Hong Kong Police Force are trustworthy. I will therefore not support the amendment.

President, I so submit. Thank you.

MR TOMMY CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, from time to time we hear accusations against police officers for their bad manners, misconduct and abuse of power during law enforcement operations. While there are indeed black sheep in the Police who have committed serious crimes such as indecent assault, rape, theft and assault, most police officers are dedicated to their duties and endeavour to maintain law and order. There are after all very few police officers who have committed crimes. Is it necessary to go to such lengths as to, as proposed in the original motion, set up an information database on the conduct of police officers to label all police officers just because of the criminal behaviours of a small handful of undesirable elements? To us, the answer is definitely no.

One point that merits our serious consideration is whether the purpose of setting up an information database is really to re-establish the morals of the Police and safeguard public safety or it is merely the radicals' tactic to play to the gallery, make a generalized excuse to incite political conflicts and force police officers to keep playing the role of "bad guys".

As a matter of fact, the system that handles complaints and monitors the Police has worked well all along. The current two-tier police complaints system consists of the Complaints Against Police Office ("CAPO") and the Independent

Police Complaints Council ("IPCC"). Although some opine that the two organizations are ineffective in handling the complaints or monitoring the conduct of law enforcement officers, one must understand their functions before making criticisms.

As the name suggests, IPCC is to monitor the Police, and the public's confidence in IPCC has increased in recent years. In the past, IPCC has, based on the principle of "going further, listening more and speaking more", adopted a series of strengthening measures internally and externally to improve the relevant systems and enhance its monitoring power. According to the result of a survey conducted by the Public Opinion Programme of the University of Hong Kong last year, even under the prevailing climate rife with political conflicts, improvements were seen in the areas of public confidence in, perception of and satisfaction with IPCC as compared with the previous year.

CAPO is often criticized for "investigation by peers" but according to the statistics submitted by CAPO to IPCC, most of the cases received were complaints against police officers' neglect of duty. There was a 50% increase in the number of such cases compared with the previous year, a sign that such complaints had been dealt with fairly.

Apart from IPCC, the Police have also established a Special Working Group on the Integrity Management recently with the aim of reviewing the existing integrity management system and studying measures for enhancement, thereby further improving the Police's integrity. The Police management has been reminded to raise police officers' integrity, monitor them as appropriate from time to time and advise them against adopting any behaviour that may embarrass the Police and result in disciplinary or criminal consequences against themselves. This system can improve and monitor law enforcement officers' conduct and at the same time avoid affecting their morale.

Setting up an information database only dampens the Police's morale, and is powerless to deter criminal activities of bad elements in the Police. The police officers violating the law must be subjected to legal sanctions. Setting up an information database will only facilitate those who have a hidden agenda to hunt down the police officers concerned. As a result, apart from being sanctioned legally, these police officers may also be subjected to various degrees of mental ordeal and even a trial on the Internet by the general public. By the

same token, should we also set up information databases on the conduct of frontline staff in public hospitals, staff of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department, Traffic Wardens and even all civil servants in general?

In the present environment where there are so many uncertainties about our political future, some people are very antagonistic towards the Police. We often see videos of people openly lashing out at frontline police officers or posting comments on the Internet. Normally the police officers involved are quite restrained. However, when some police officers refuse to be humiliated and make suitable and legal counter-attacks, such actions may be kept in the database if complaints are lodged against them. I worry this will exert great psychological pressure on police officers, making them refuse to enforce the law or evade enforcing the law. In the long run, the social order in Hong Kong will be adversely affected.

Therefore, the Liberal Party strongly objects to setting up such an information database because it will not only bring negative impact but also become a tool for political persecution by those who have a hidden agenda.

Thank you, President.

MR CHRISTOPHER CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, to begin with, I have to declare that I am a Vice-Chairman of the Independent Police Complaints Council ("IPCC"). I speak to oppose Dr CHENG Chung-tai's original motion and Mr James TO's amendment. In my view, both the motion and the amendment are based on prejudices and hostility towards police officers, and are deliberately belittling and denying the functions of the Complaints Against Police Office ("CAPO") and IPCC. As they are unfair, I firmly oppose them.

First, it is totally unnecessary to set up an information database on the conduct of police officers. In recent years, there have been continuous improvements to the quality of police officers. Many young people with high academic qualifications and the aspiration to serve the community have joined the Police Force. The conduct of police officers is currently under strict supervision. Apart from abiding by the laws of Hong Kong as common citizens do, they must also observe other rules such as the Police (Discipline) Regulations, the Police General Orders and relevant civil service regulations. Meanwhile,

there is also a comprehensive system to handle complaints against the Police, that is, misconducts of police officers are handled by CAPO of the Hong Kong Police Force, and IPCC, an independent statutory body, will examine the complaint cases handled by CAPO. Under such circumstances, it is totally superfluous to set up an information database on the conduct of police officers, which is neither fish nor fowl.

Furthermore, Hong Kong is a society where the rule of law prevails. For illegal acts committed by a small handful of police officers, the Police and the judicial authorities will certainly conduct investigation and handle impartially. All along, there is no evidence indicating that faults committed by police officers are being harboured or concealed by the Police and the Judiciary. If we set up an information database on the conduct of police officers allowing public access to information about faults committed by and complaints against various police officers, then not only will it be difficult to safeguard the personal privacy of the officers concerned, but will also give rise to a series of problems such as the so-called "cyber-profiling" and "cyber-trial" to encourage social malady.

The most terrible problem is that the setting up of an information database on the conduct of police officers may indirectly fan public hatred of the Police. The Hong Kong Police Force has innumerable deeds that command people's respect and praise. However, Dr CHENG Chung-tai just turns a blind eye to the positive power of police officers, but focuses on the misconducts of a few police officers, and even advocates the setting up of an information database on the conduct of police officers to vilify their image. Such kind of advocacy obviously aims at smearing the Police, spreading hatred of the Police under the name of supervision.

President, next I would like to respond to some questions regarding IPCC. First, I have to point out solemnly that Dr CHENG Chung-tai did definitely spout nonsense to maliciously defame IPCC and all its members by claiming that IPCC has failed to handle complaints against police officers in an open, fair and just manner. Likewise, Mr James TO has totally ignored the independence and functions of IPCC by advocating the expeditious setting up of a Complaints Against Police Office independent of the Police to handle complaints against police officers.

In fact, IPCC is an independent and impartial organization. It bases on evidence alone when examining complaint cases. When IPCC has divergent views with CAPO, it will spare no trouble to seek explanations from CAPO through emails, meetings, etc. Very often, IPCC will negotiate with CAPO for more than 10 times or even more in connection with a single complaint case. For cases of public concern, such as the case involving Superintendent CHU King-wai and the case of wrongful arrest of a mentally retarded male, IPCC ultimately decided to overturn CAPO's original classifications after various discussions and repeated examination of the case details. This adequately proves that IPCC has never acted in favour of the Police, and is fully impartial and unbiased. I even dare to say that every single case examined by IPCC is able to withstand scrutiny and can be examined under the sun.

President, political disputes have become more and more frequent in recent years. On many occasions, the Police are inevitably caught in the middle and some people have even harboured an anti-police sentiment, which is indeed very unfortunate. I hope Dr CHENG Chung-tai and his fellow opposition Members will understand that the Police's contributions to making Hong Kong one of the safest cities in the world cannot be denied, and the maintenance of a good social order requires the cooperation between the Police and the public. If we do not support the work of the Police but are even hostile to police officers, eventually the maintenance of normal social order will become very difficult. At the end of the day, the general public will suffer.

I also hope the Government will adopt more effective measures for promoting the positive image of the Police, so that the general public will have more confidence in the work of the Police. I so submit.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHENG Chung-tai, you may now speak on the amendment. The time limit is five minutes

DR CHENG CHUNG-TAI (in Cantonese): Just now, I heard Mr James TO raising queries about my original motion when he spoke on his amendment. For example, he remarked that I had not clearly stated in the motion why an information database on the conduct of police officers should be set up. Let me try to shorten my earlier speech of 15 minutes to a brief explanation ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHENG Chung-tai, you are only allowed to speak on the amendment now. Please speak on Mr James TO's amendment and do not repeat your previous viewpoints.

DR CHENG CHUNG-TAI (in Cantonese): I see. Thanks. In his amendment, Mr James TO proposed to set up an independent mechanism for monitoring police officers. However, as far as I understand it, there is presently a monitoring mechanism independent of the Hong Kong Police Force, i.e. the Independent Police Complaints Council ("IPCC"). Of course, in terms of member appointment and composition, IPCC and the monitoring mechanism advocated by Mr TO may not be exactly the same. Yet, I am not convinced that the proposal in his amendment can, in any way, achieve the goals that I wish to achieve by setting up the information database on the conduct of police officers.

My goals are actually very simple. As the current system does not offer any means to monitor and keep in check the behaviour of on-duty and off-duty police officers, the only solution is to disclose their conduct to be monitored by the people of Hong Kong. In my view, under the political system that is defective with limitations, this approach has the utmost openness, fairness and impartiality.

Just now, Mr James TO who moved an amendment and many other Members queried if I had overplayed the misbehaviour of a small number of black sheep in the Police Force. As I have stressed all along, what I want to highlight is not the problems with a small number of police officers but the fact that our system is truly defective in monitoring the conduct of police officers. I do not only talk about the serving officers. In fact, there is a chance that police officers may break the law knowingly or even abuse their official authority. Just now, some Members had, during their speech on the motion, questioned why I only requested to set up an information database on the conduct of police officers, but not on the conduct of other professions. The reason lies exactly on the fact that police officers are allowed to use force; or, in brief, they are armed.

Besides, there is a fundamental defect in the Police, i.e. in case a police officer has done something wrong or broken the rules, there is no way for the public to know how the Police will internally ... although the authorities say that punishment will be made in accordance with the Police General Orders or their own rules, we have learnt from many cases that some police officers can still

receive pension payments after being convicted by the court. We do not know whether there will be any punishment. It is something that we have no way to know ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHENG Chung-tai, your remarks are not related to the amendment of Mr James TO. Please speak on Mr James TO's amendment.

DR CHENG CHUNG-TAI (in Cantonese): Therefore, in my view, the amendment of Mr James TO is deficient and I hope that an information database on the conduct of police officers will be set up, so as to give Hong Kong people the power to monitor the Police and hold the Police accountable to the public. Thank you.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, I thank Members for their speeches. In his original motion, Dr CHENG Chung-tai claimed that "convicted and dismissed police officers may become potential hazards to law and order in society". This expression is not only exaggerated and sensational, but will even aggravate social confrontation. First, I have to point out that only an insignificant number of police officers have been dismissed on grounds of conviction every year. From 2015 to 2017, 11 police officers were dismissed on average on grounds of conviction every year, accounting for 0.037% of the Police Force. Despite the small proportion of police officers who have breached the law, the Police Force will not tolerate and will strictly investigate and handle all cases.

As for political neutrality, police officers have to adhere to the principle of political neutrality when discharging their duties. As I just pointed out in my opening speech, under the Police General Orders, police officers shall not participate in political activities except in certain specific circumstances, lest their discharge of duties and the public's perception be affected. Clear and stringent requirements have been put in place under our system to ensure that police officers remain politically neutral.

In recent years, the social atmosphere has become more politicized. Due to their own political stance, some people have always indiscriminately labelled police arrests as being politically motivated, disregarding the fact that those arrested have actually breached the law. Such accusations are intended to vent

political frustrations. The Police Force is a professional law enforcement agency responsible for upholding the rule of law. The Police have been handling all breaches of the law on an equal footing, treating all citizens fairly and enforcing the law irrespective of affiliation and political inclination. Police officers will only make arrests in accordance with the law should anyone break the law. In fact, among the people who have been arrested and convicted, there have been both supporters and opponents of the stance of the Government. This precisely shows that the Police Force is fair and impartial when enforcing the law. Criticisms over purported "police crackdown on social campaigns" and "indiscriminate arrests and prosecution" are all unsubstantiated and wilful accusations. The political stance of the arrested is absolutely not a factor for consideration for instituting prosecutions. Prosecutions will only target breaches of the law, and they have nothing to do with a person's stance on the Government or other issues. Those who take part in public events should comply with the law. Anyone who has breached the law must be held liable. All prosecutions have to be made in accordance with the Prosecution Code of the Department of Justice.

In the speeches delivered just now, some Members have called for reforming the existing system for handling complaints against police officers, whereas some other Members have expressed trust and support for the existing system. President, under the existing two-tier police complaints system, a fair and impartial arrangement has been put in place to ensure that public complaints against police officers are effectively handled. In fact, we have already had a lot of discussion on the police complaints system. As the police complaints regimes in other places have been tailored to meet their respective needs and their actual situation, there is not a standardized global system available. In some places, a dedicated department of the police force is responsible for investigating and handling all complaints; in some places, an independent body has been set up to investigate complaints; and there are other places where a two-tier system similar to the one of Hong Kong has been adopted. Different mechanisms have been put in place in various places to suit their respective circumstances. The motion proposed by the Member has disregarded the effectiveness of the local system. Although a survey has found that the majority of people are satisfied with Hong Kong's system, the system has still been described as "not trustworthy", which is an unfair and unjust comment.

I understand the primary consideration of the Member who has questioned whether the practice of "investigation by peers" adopted by the Complaints Against Police Office ("CAPO") would harbour their colleagues. However, the existing Independent Police Complaints Council ("IPCC") has been set up to

ensure fair, impartial and comprehensive investigation. Members of IPCC are independent persons drawn from various sectors of the community. To ensure that all members can independently oversee every case under investigation, anyone with immediate family members who are police officers cannot be appointed as IPCC members. The investigation file and report of every reportable complaint have to be submitted to IPCC for scrutiny. Under the Independent Police Complaints Council Ordinance ("IPCCO"), IPCC has the statutory power to require CAPO to provide additional information, request an interview with witnesses, and even remit cases back to CAPO for a fresh investigation, etc. The Police have proactively taken prosecution action against law-breaking police officers every year, which is a clear indication of the determination and commitment of the Police to deal with their internal problems. I have to reiterate that the operation of CAPO is independent of other police units. Most CAPO officers have been trained for criminal investigation, and they are fully equipped with the knowledge, skills and experience in criminal investigation which enable them to deal with complaint cases of different nature, including complaints involving criminal charges. Therefore, CAPO can effectively investigate all kinds of cases, particularly cases involving criminal charges.

A Member is concerned that IPCC's lack of investigative power will undermine the reliability of the police complaints system. In this connection, the Government has made it clear on many occasions that IPCCO has provided strong checks and balances under the two-tier police complaints system of Hong Kong, enabling IPCC to fully perform its monitoring role. At present, the professional investigators of CAPO are responsible for investigating the complaints, while IPCC is responsible for reviewing the investigation reports on reportable complaints. IPCC may raise queries, request a fresh investigation and make recommendations on matters relating to the system or policies. In 2016-2017, IPCC raised 994 queries or suggestions to CAPO. CAPO has endorsed 574 of them and provided satisfactory explanations and solutions in respect of the remainder after discussing with IPCC. This precisely shows the effective implementation, independence, accountability and integrity of the existing CAPO system, under which fair and impartial handling of public complaints against police officers can be guaranteed.

To enhance public confidence in the two-tier police complaints system, CAPO has continued to enhance its transparency in recent years. For example, a digital telephone recording system has been set up to record all the telephone conversations about complaints investigation between CAPO officers and complainants, complainees and witnesses; and closed circuit television and video recording equipment have been installed at CAPO. Meanwhile, IPCC has been

proactively introducing its functions to stakeholders and the public through different channels, such as visiting various District Fight Crime Committees and schools and maintaining liaison with concern groups, with a view to further deepening public understanding of the two-tier police complaints system. These measures will enable IPCC to maintain its high level of transparency and will enhance public confidence in IPCC's ability to operate independently and handle complaints in a fair and impartial manner.

President, as I have said in my opening speech, the Police understand that the public have very high expectations of the conduct of police officers. The Police have attached great importance to the discipline and conduct of police officers, and have been proactively and continuously promoting integrity management in four areas, namely "education and integrity culture building", "governance and control", "enforcement and deterrence" and "reintegration and support". For example, integrity management elements have been incorporated in induction and in-service training courses, promotion and selection interviews and "living-the-values" workshops to require officers to remain highly vigilant of their personal integrity and conduct at all times and under all circumstances. In addition, the Police have strengthened training of frontline supervisors on investigations so as to equip them for conducting stringent criminal investigations and disciplinary reviews on cases involving integrity issues. The Police have also stepped up the promotion of the "Individual Reintegration Plan" in a bid to render more appropriate support and encouragement to police officers previously with integrity issues. Police management will continue to enhance integrity management by making it more target-oriented.

President, there are nearly 30 000 disciplined services officers in the Police Force. The number of regular police officers who have been dismissed on grounds of conviction every year accounts for 0.037% of the total. The overwhelming majority of police officers are strictly law-abiding and disciplined, and they have been making an effort to contribute to maintaining the law and order of Hong Kong. Hong Kong is blessed with a professional, outstanding and clean Police Force. The Police will continue to reinforce and uphold the core values of integrity, fairness, impartiality and professionalism, etc., with a view to consistently enhancing public trust and confidence in the discharge of duties by police officers.

The original motion of Dr CHENG has put a negative label on the Police Force based on a tiny portion of 0.037% of law-breaking police officers. The motion has disregarded the efforts and contribution of the Police Force in maintaining law and order, discredited the Police Force which have been

contributing to the low crime rate of Hong Kong, and misrepresented police officers as "potential hazards to law and order of the Hong Kong society". As I disagree with his way of working, his view and his position, I oppose to his motion on setting up an information database. In his amendment to the motion, Mr James TO has criticized the Police Force for abuse of power, and called for the establishment of a Complaints Against Police Office independent of the Hong Kong Police Force and a reform of the existing IPCC regime. In my view, his view is a one-sided generalization, and he has disregarded the effectiveness of the existing two-tier police complaints system and the independence and legality of IPCC. For these reasons, I implore Members to vote against Dr CHENG's original motion and Mr TO's amendment.

President, I so submit.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Mr James TO to Dr CHENG Chung-tai's motion, 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)

Dr CHENG Chung-tai rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHENG Chung-tai 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.

Functional Constituencies:

Mr James TO, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

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

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WU Chi-wai, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr Jeremy TAM and Mr AU Nok-hin voted for the amendment.

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

Mr Paul TSE and Dr CHENG Chung-tai abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 24 were present, 5 were in favour of the amendment and 18 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 23 were present, 10 were in favour of the amendment, 11 against it and 2 abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): As Dr CHENG Chung-tai has used up his speaking time, I now put the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Dr CHENG Chung-tai 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)

Dr CHENG Chung-tai rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHENG Chung-tai 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.

Functional Constituencies:

Mr James TO, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr Kenneth LAU, Mr KWONG Chun-yu and Mr Tony TSE voted against the motion.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM and Mr AU Nok-hin voted for the motion.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Paul TSE, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Helena WONG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr HUI Chi-fung and Mr Vincent CHENG voted for the motion.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 24 were present and 23 were against the motion; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 23 were present, 6 were in favour of the motion and 17 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was negatived.

NEXT MEETING

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now adjourn the Council until 11:00 am on Wednesday, 25 April 2018.

Adjourned accordingly at 3:08 pm.

Annex 1

**The marked-up version of the amendment moved by Mr Kenneth LEUNG
(Translation)**

That, ~~since the global awareness of environmental protection has been rising and~~ *climate change and air pollution have become increasingly serious worldwide; since* emission from fuel-engined vehicles is one of the main sources of *roadside* air pollution, the governments of various countries, including China, Norway, Germany and the United Kingdom, have announced the prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles successively after 2025; meanwhile, the biggest vehicle manufacturer in the world has indicated that it will completely cease the production of fuel-engined vehicles in 2050, and various vehicle manufacturers have also indicated that they will inject more resources into the research and development of new-generation zero-emission electric vehicles ('EVs'), thus evident that the production of EVs has become the general direction of the development of the automobile industry worldwide; the SAR Government has waived the first registration tax for EVs for more than 20 years since 1994, but as at end of August 2017, the result has been unsatisfactory with only 11 033 EVs in Hong Kong, accounting for 1.3% of the total number of registered vehicles in the territory; *meanwhile, the SAR Government has since 1 April 2017 abolished the full waiver of first registration tax for electric private cars and instead capped their first registration tax concession at \$97,500, thus impeding the pace of promoting the popularization of electric private cars;* to further promote the popularization of EVs, this Council urges the SAR Government to:

- (1) comprehensively review the policy on the promotion of EVs and set phased targets for such promotion, *such as setting a target proportion of EVs (including electric private cars and electric commercial vehicles) among registered vehicles in Hong Kong;*
- (2) amend the relevant provisions of the Buildings Ordinance to mandate ~~the provision of charging facilities for charging EVs at all~~ *that a specified percentage of* parking spaces in *all* newly constructed commercial and residential buildings *must be equipped with charging facilities for EVs, and provide incentives and technical support to encourage owners of old buildings to install the relevant facilities;*

- (3) review the provision of ancillary facilities for charging EVs, including conducting a study on retrofitting the existing car parks in government properties and public housing estates, on-street parking spaces and public car parks with charging facilities for EVs, ***gradually raise the charging speed of standard EV chargers to medium or quick level, and legislate on the regulation of occupation of EV parking spaces by non-EVs;***
- (4) in light of the successive replacement of batteries of registered EVs, formulate expeditiously a ~~mechanism for the recycling and disposal of waste vehicle~~ ***policy for the recovery and reuse of EV*** batteries, so as to prevent such batteries containing toxic substances from being dumped at landfills, ~~causing serious perils to~~ ***seriously polluting*** the environment and ***damaging the*** ecology; ~~and~~
- (5) ~~incentivize~~ ***provide funding support for*** tertiary institutions to offer programmes on the design, scientific research, maintenance, etc. of EVs for nurturing talents for the EV industry, so as to assist Hong Kong in developing the industry of EVs or EV parts; ***and***
- (6) ***restore the full waiver of first registration tax for electric private cars to incentivize members of the public to use electric private cars instead of fuel-engined private cars of higher emission.***

Note: Mr Kenneth LEUNG's amendment is marked in ***bold and italic type*** or with deletion line.

Annex 2**The marked-up version of the further amendment moved by Mr Charles Peter MOK to the motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG (Translation)**

That, climate change and air pollution have become increasingly serious worldwide; since emission from fuel-engined vehicles is one of the main sources of roadside air pollution, the governments of various countries, including China, Norway, Germany and the United Kingdom, have announced the prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles successively after 2025; meanwhile, the biggest vehicle manufacturer in the world has indicated that it will completely cease the production of fuel-engined vehicles in 2050, and various vehicle manufacturers have also indicated that they will inject more resources into the research and development of new-generation zero-emission electric vehicles ('EVs'), thus evident that the production of EVs has become the general direction of the development of the automobile industry worldwide; the SAR Government has waived the first registration tax for EVs for more than 20 years since 1994, but as at end of August 2017, the result has been unsatisfactory with only 11 033 EVs in Hong Kong, accounting for 1.3% of the total number of registered vehicles in the territory; meanwhile, the SAR Government has since 1 April 2017 abolished the full waiver of first registration tax for electric private cars and instead capped their first registration tax concession at \$97,500, thus impeding the pace of promoting the popularization of electric private cars; to further promote the popularization of EVs, this Council urges the SAR Government to:

- (1) comprehensively review the policy on the promotion of EVs and set phased targets for such promotion, such as setting a target proportion of EVs (including electric private cars and electric commercial vehicles) among registered vehicles in Hong Kong;
- (2) amend the relevant provisions of the Buildings Ordinance to mandate that a specified percentage of parking spaces in all newly constructed commercial and residential buildings must be equipped with charging facilities for EVs, and provide incentives and technical support to encourage owners of old buildings to install the relevant facilities;

- (3) review the provision of ancillary facilities for charging EVs, including conducting a study on retrofitting the existing car parks in government properties and public housing estates, on-street parking spaces and public car parks with charging facilities for EVs, gradually raise the charging speed of standard EV chargers to medium or quick level, and legislate on the regulation of occupation of EV parking spaces by non-EVs;
- (4) in light of the successive replacement of batteries of registered EVs, formulate expeditiously a policy for the recovery and reuse of EV batteries, so as to prevent such batteries containing toxic substances from being dumped at landfills, seriously polluting the environment and damaging the ecology;
- (5) provide funding support for tertiary institutions to offer programmes on the design, scientific research, maintenance, etc. of EVs for nurturing talents for the EV industry, so as to assist Hong Kong in developing the industry of EVs or EV parts; and
- (6) restore the full waiver of first registration tax for electric private cars to incentivize members of the public to use electric private cars instead of fuel-engined private cars of higher emission; *and*
- (7) *conduct a study on using the revenue from EV registration tax to finance environmental protection work and develop charging facilities, and enhance public education in relation to EVs.*

Note: Mr Charles Peter MOK's amendment is marked in *bold and italic type*.

Annex 3**The marked-up version of the further amendment moved by Ir Dr LO Wai-kiwok to the motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG and Mr Charles Peter MOK (Translation)**

That, climate change and air pollution have become increasingly serious worldwide; since emission from fuel-engined vehicles is one of the main sources of roadside air pollution, the governments of various countries, including China, Norway, Germany and the United Kingdom, have announced the prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles successively after 2025; meanwhile, the biggest vehicle manufacturer in the world has indicated that it will completely cease the production of fuel-engined vehicles in 2050, and various vehicle manufacturers have also indicated that they will inject more resources into the research and development of new-generation zero-emission electric vehicles ('EVs'), thus evident that the production of EVs has become the general direction of the development of the automobile industry worldwide; the SAR Government has waived the first registration tax for EVs for more than 20 years since 1994, but as at end of August 2017, the result has been unsatisfactory with only 11 033 EVs in Hong Kong, accounting for 1.3% of the total number of registered vehicles in the territory; meanwhile, the SAR Government has since 1 April 2017 abolished the full waiver of first registration tax for electric private cars and instead capped their first registration tax concession at \$97,500, thus impeding the pace of promoting the popularization of electric private cars; to further promote the popularization of EVs, this Council urges the SAR Government to:

- (1) comprehensively review the policy on the promotion of EVs and set phased targets for such promotion, such as setting a target proportion of EVs (including electric private cars and electric commercial vehicles) among registered vehicles in Hong Kong;
- (2) amend the relevant provisions of the Buildings Ordinance to mandate that a specified percentage of parking spaces in all newly constructed commercial and residential buildings must be equipped with charging facilities for EVs, and provide incentives and technical support to encourage owners of old buildings to install the relevant facilities;

- (3) review the provision of ancillary facilities for charging EVs, including conducting a study on retrofitting the existing car parks in government properties and public housing estates, on-street parking spaces and public car parks with charging facilities for EVs, gradually raise the charging speed of standard EV chargers to medium or quick level, and legislate on the regulation of occupation of EV parking spaces by non-EVs;
- (4) in light of the successive replacement of batteries of registered EVs, formulate expeditiously a policy for the recovery and reuse of EV batteries, so as to prevent such batteries containing toxic substances from being dumped at landfills, seriously polluting the environment and damaging the ecology;
- (5) provide funding support for tertiary institutions to offer programmes on the design, scientific research, maintenance, etc. of EVs for nurturing talents for the EV industry, so as to assist Hong Kong in developing the industry of EVs or EV parts; and
- (6) restore the full waiver of first registration tax for electric private cars to incentivize members of the public to use electric private cars instead of fuel-engined private cars of higher emission; and
- (7) conduct a study on using the revenue from EV registration tax to finance environmental protection work and develop charging facilities, and enhance public education in relation to EVs;
- (8) *examine the development strategy for environment-friendly vehicles in Hong Kong; and*
- (9) *corresponding to its vigorous promotion of the development of scientific research and innovation and technology, support the industry to develop EV batteries and explore the possibility of interoperability among chargers of various standards, so as to further facilitate the use of EVs.*

Note: Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok's amendment is marked in *bold and italic type*.

Annex 4**The marked-up version of the further amendment moved by Ms YUNG Hoi-yan to the motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK and Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok (Translation)**

That, climate change and air pollution have become increasingly serious worldwide; since emission from fuel-engined vehicles is one of the main sources of roadside air pollution, the governments of various countries, including China, Norway, Germany and the United Kingdom, have announced the prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles successively after 2025; meanwhile, the biggest vehicle manufacturer in the world has indicated that it will completely cease the production of fuel-engined vehicles in 2050, and various vehicle manufacturers have also indicated that they will inject more resources into the research and development of new-generation zero-emission electric vehicles ('EVs'), thus evident that the production of EVs has become the general direction of the development of the automobile industry worldwide; the SAR Government has waived the first registration tax for EVs for more than 20 years since 1994, but as at end of August 2017, the result has been unsatisfactory with only 11 033 EVs in Hong Kong, accounting for 1.3% of the total number of registered vehicles in the territory; meanwhile, the SAR Government has since 1 April 2017 abolished the full waiver of first registration tax for electric private cars and instead capped their first registration tax concession at \$97,500, thus impeding the pace of promoting the popularization of electric private cars; to further promote the popularization of EVs, this Council urges the SAR Government to:

- (1) comprehensively review the policy on the promotion of EVs and set phased targets for such promotion, such as setting a target proportion of EVs (including electric private cars and electric commercial vehicles) among registered vehicles in Hong Kong;
- (2) amend the relevant provisions of the Buildings Ordinance to mandate that a specified percentage of parking spaces in all newly constructed commercial and residential buildings must be equipped with charging facilities for EVs, and provide incentives and technical support to encourage owners of old buildings to install the relevant facilities;

- (3) review the provision of ancillary facilities for charging EVs, including conducting a study on retrofitting the existing car parks in government properties and public housing estates, on-street parking spaces and public car parks with charging facilities for EVs, gradually raise the charging speed of standard EV chargers to medium or quick level, and legislate on the regulation of occupation of EV parking spaces by non-EVs;
- (4) in light of the successive replacement of batteries of registered EVs, formulate expeditiously a policy for the recovery and reuse of EV batteries, so as to prevent such batteries containing toxic substances from being dumped at landfills, seriously polluting the environment and damaging the ecology;
- (5) provide funding support for tertiary institutions to offer programmes on the design, scientific research, maintenance, etc. of EVs for nurturing talents for the EV industry, so as to assist Hong Kong in developing the industry of EVs or EV parts; and
- (6) restore the full waiver of first registration tax for electric private cars to incentivize members of the public to use electric private cars instead of fuel-engined private cars of higher emission; and
- (7) conduct a study on using the revenue from EV registration tax to finance environmental protection work and develop charging facilities, and enhance public education in relation to EVs;
- (8) examine the development strategy for environment-friendly vehicles in Hong Kong; and
- (9) corresponding to its vigorous promotion of the development of scientific research and innovation and technology, support the industry to develop EV batteries and explore the possibility of interoperability among chargers of various standards, so as to further facilitate the use of EVs; *and*
- (10) *review the mode of subsidization and effectiveness of the Pilot Green Transport Fund, with a view to expediting the promotion of the switch of public transport and commercial vehicles to EVs.*

Note: Ms YUNG Hoi-yan's amendment is marked in *bold and italic type*.

Annex 5

The marked-up version of the further amendment moved by Mr CHAN Hak-kan to the motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok and Ms YUNG Hoi-yan (Translation)

That, climate change and air pollution have become increasingly serious worldwide; since emission from fuel-engined vehicles is one of the main sources of roadside air pollution, the governments of various countries, including China, Norway, Germany and the United Kingdom, have announced the prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles successively after 2025; meanwhile, the biggest vehicle manufacturer in the world has indicated that it will completely cease the production of fuel-engined vehicles in 2050, and various vehicle manufacturers have also indicated that they will inject more resources into the research and development of new-generation zero-emission electric vehicles ('EVs'), thus evident that the production of EVs has become the general direction of the development of the automobile industry worldwide; the SAR Government has waived the first registration tax for EVs for more than 20 years since 1994, but as at end of August 2017, the result has been unsatisfactory with only 11 033 EVs in Hong Kong, accounting for 1.3% of the total number of registered vehicles in the territory; meanwhile, the SAR Government has since 1 April 2017 abolished the full waiver of first registration tax for electric private cars and instead capped their first registration tax concession at \$97,500, thus impeding the pace of promoting the popularization of electric private cars; to further promote the popularization of EVs, this Council urges the SAR Government to:

- (1) comprehensively review the policy on the promotion of EVs and set phased targets for such promotion, such as setting a target proportion of EVs (including electric private cars and electric commercial vehicles) among registered vehicles in Hong Kong;
- (2) amend the relevant provisions of the Buildings Ordinance to mandate that a specified percentage of parking spaces in all newly constructed commercial and residential buildings must be equipped with charging facilities for EVs, and provide incentives and technical support to encourage owners of old buildings to install the relevant facilities;

- (3) review the provision of ancillary facilities for charging EVs, including conducting a study on retrofitting the existing car parks in government properties and public housing estates, on-street parking spaces and public car parks with charging facilities for EVs, gradually raise the charging speed of standard EV chargers to medium or quick level, and legislate on the regulation of occupation of EV parking spaces by non-EVs;
- (4) in light of the successive replacement of batteries of registered EVs, formulate expeditiously a policy for the recovery and reuse of EV batteries, so as to prevent such batteries containing toxic substances from being dumped at landfills, seriously polluting the environment and damaging the ecology;
- (5) provide funding support for tertiary institutions to offer programmes on the design, scientific research, maintenance, etc. of EVs for nurturing talents for the EV industry, so as to assist Hong Kong in developing the industry of EVs or EV parts; and
- (6) restore the full waiver of first registration tax for electric private cars to incentivize members of the public to use electric private cars instead of fuel-engined private cars of higher emission; and
- (7) conduct a study on using the revenue from EV registration tax to finance environmental protection work and develop charging facilities, and enhance public education in relation to EVs;
- (8) examine the development strategy for environment-friendly vehicles in Hong Kong; and
- (9) corresponding to its vigorous promotion of the development of scientific research and innovation and technology, support the industry to develop EV batteries and explore the possibility of interoperability among chargers of various standards, so as to further facilitate the use of EVs; and
- (10) review the mode of subsidization and effectiveness of the Pilot Green Transport Fund, with a view to expediting the promotion of the switch of public transport and commercial vehicles to EVs;

- (11) *launch an official mobile application for EVs to provide drivers with information about EVs, including real-time information on the availability of charging-equipped parking spaces across the territory and the latest official information in relation to EVs; and*
- (12) *offer financial incentives to attract vehicle owners to switch to EVs, including conducting a study on offering ex gratia payments to owners of fuel-engined vehicles replacing such vehicles with EVs.*

Note: Mr CHAN Hak-kan's amendment is marked in *bold and italic type*.

Annex 6

The marked-up version of the further amendment moved by Ms Tanya CHAN to the motion as amended by Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr CHAN Hak-kan (Translation)

That, climate change and air pollution have become increasingly serious worldwide; since emission from fuel-engined vehicles is one of the main sources of roadside air pollution, the governments of various countries, including China, Norway, Germany and the United Kingdom, have announced the prohibition of sale of fuel-engined vehicles successively after 2025; meanwhile, the biggest vehicle manufacturer in the world has indicated that it will completely cease the production of fuel-engined vehicles in 2050, and various vehicle manufacturers have also indicated that they will inject more resources into the research and development of new-generation zero-emission electric vehicles ('EVs'), thus evident that the production of EVs has become the general direction of the development of the automobile industry worldwide; the SAR Government has waived the first registration tax for EVs for more than 20 years since 1994, but as at end of August 2017, the result has been unsatisfactory with only 11 033 EVs in Hong Kong, accounting for 1.3% of the total number of registered vehicles in the territory; meanwhile, the SAR Government has since 1 April 2017 abolished the full waiver of first registration tax for electric private cars and instead capped their first registration tax concession at \$97,500, thus impeding the pace of promoting the popularization of electric private cars; to further promote the popularization of EVs, this Council urges the SAR Government to:

- (1) comprehensively review the policy on the promotion of EVs and set phased targets for such promotion, such as setting a target proportion of EVs (including electric private cars and electric commercial vehicles) among registered vehicles in Hong Kong;
- (2) amend the relevant provisions of the Buildings Ordinance to mandate that a specified percentage of parking spaces in all newly constructed commercial and residential buildings must be equipped with charging facilities for EVs, and provide incentives and technical support to encourage owners of old buildings to install the relevant facilities;

- (3) review the provision of ancillary facilities for charging EVs, including conducting a study on retrofitting the existing car parks in government properties and public housing estates, on-street parking spaces and public car parks with charging facilities for EVs, gradually raise the charging speed of standard EV chargers to medium or quick level, and legislate on the regulation of occupation of EV parking spaces by non-EVs;
- (4) in light of the successive replacement of batteries of registered EVs, formulate expeditiously a policy for the recovery and reuse of EV batteries, so as to prevent such batteries containing toxic substances from being dumped at landfills, seriously polluting the environment and damaging the ecology;
- (5) provide funding support for tertiary institutions to offer programmes on the design, scientific research, maintenance, etc. of EVs for nurturing talents for the EV industry, so as to assist Hong Kong in developing the industry of EVs or EV parts; and
- (6) restore the full waiver of first registration tax for electric private cars to incentivize members of the public to use electric private cars instead of fuel-engined private cars of higher emission; and
- (7) conduct a study on using the revenue from EV registration tax to finance environmental protection work and develop charging facilities, and enhance public education in relation to EVs;
- (8) examine the development strategy for environment-friendly vehicles in Hong Kong; and
- (9) corresponding to its vigorous promotion of the development of scientific research and innovation and technology, support the industry to develop EV batteries and explore the possibility of interoperability among chargers of various standards, so as to further facilitate the use of EVs; and
- (10) review the mode of subsidization and effectiveness of the Pilot Green Transport Fund, with a view to expediting the promotion of the switch of public transport and commercial vehicles to EVs;

-
- (11) launch an official mobile application for EVs to provide drivers with information about EVs, including real-time information on the availability of charging-equipped parking spaces across the territory and the latest official information in relation to EVs; and
 - (12) offer financial incentives to attract vehicle owners to switch to EVs, including conducting a study on offering ex gratia payments to owners of fuel-engined vehicles replacing such vehicles with EVs;
and
 - (13) *allocate resources to enhance publicity and promotion to encourage property owners to install more charging facilities in the car parks of private housing estates, so as to perfect the charging network in the community.*

Note: Ms Tanya CHAN's amendment is marked in *bold and italic type*.

**The marked-up version of the amendment moved by Mr James TO
(Translation)**

That, in recent years, there have been cases from time to time of on-duty and off-duty police officers committing criminal offences, ~~including theft, sex crimes, violence, false allegations and corruption, and convicted and dismissed police officers may become potential hazards to law and order in society, causing people to worry more about the threat to their personal safety and security of their property; on the other hand, many people have complained to the Complaints Against Police Office and the Independent Police Complaints Council about abuse of power by police officers, but the relevant departments have failed to handle such cases in an open, fair and impartial manner; in this connection, this Council requests the Government to set up~~ *and handling public processions and assemblies with abuse of power; although there are opinions that the setting up of an information database on the conduct of police officers, allowing will facilitate public access to information about faults committed by and complaints against various police officers, the top priority of the Government should be to expeditiously set up a Complaints Against Police Office independent of the Hong Kong Police Force, enabling this department to handle complaints in a fair, just and impartial manner and make known the investigation results to the public in a timely manner; to prevent police officers from committing any offences while on duty or off duty and inviting suspicions of them acting against political neutrality and impartiality, this Council urges the Government to ensure that police officers uphold the principles of political neutrality and impartiality in discharging duties, and off-duty police officers, apart from not being allowed to support or participate in political activities in accordance with the Police General Orders, should also refrain from attending public events or saying and doing anything which would arouse negative public impressions and affect the image of political neutrality of the Police Force; the Government should ensure that the Hong Kong Police Force uphold the rule of law, maintain law and order, and safeguard the lives and property of members of the public with professionalism, impartiality and selflessness.*

Note: Mr James TO's amendment is marked in *bold and italic type* or with deletion line.