

OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Wednesday, 19 June 2019

The Council met at Eleven o'clock

MEMBERS PRESENT:

THE PRESIDENT

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

THE HONOURABLE JAMES TO KUN-SUN

THE HONOURABLE LEUNG YIU-CHUNG

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE 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, B.B.S., J.P.

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

THE HONOURABLE KENNETH LEUNG

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

DR THE HONOURABLE KWOK KA-KI

THE HONOURABLE KWOK WAI-KEUNG, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE DENNIS KWOK WING-HANG

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

DR THE HONOURABLE FERNANDO CHEUNG CHIU-HUNG

DR THE HONOURABLE HELENA WONG PIK-WAN

THE HONOURABLE IP KIN-YUEN

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

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

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE CHUNG KWOK-PAN

THE HONOURABLE ALVIN YEUNG

THE HONOURABLE ANDREW WAN SIU-KIN

THE HONOURABLE CHU HOI-DICK

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

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 WILSON OR CHONG-SHING, M.H.

THE HONOURABLE YUNG HOI-YAN

DR THE HONOURABLE PIERRE CHAN

THE HONOURABLE CHAN CHUN-YING, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE TANYA CHAN

THE HONOURABLE CHEUNG KWOK-KWAN, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE HUI CHI-FUNG

THE HONOURABLE LUK CHUNG-HUNG, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LAU KWOK-FAN, M.H.

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.

THE HONOURABLE CHAN HOI-YAN

MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

THE HONOURABLE SHIU KA-CHUN

PUBLIC OFFICERS ATTENDING:

THE HONOURABLE JAMES HENRY LAU JR., J.P.
SECRETARY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND THE TREASURY

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

CLERKS IN ATTENDANCE:

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

MISS ODELIA LEUNG HING-YEE, DEPUTY SECRETARY GENERAL

MS ANITA SIT, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

MR MATTHEW LOO, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

PAPERS TO BE LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE COUNCIL

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

The 30th Report on the Work of the Advisory Committee on Post-service Employment of Civil Servants
(1 January - 31 December 2018)

Construction Industry Council
Annual Report 2018 (including Financial Statements and Independent Auditor's Report)

Report No. 19/18-19 of the House Committee on Consideration of Subsidiary Legislation and Other Instruments

Report No. 20/18-19 of the House Committee on Consideration of Subsidiary Legislation and Other Instruments

URGENT QUESTIONS

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Questions. Today, the meeting ...

(Mr Jeremy TAM indicated his wish to raise a point of order)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Jeremy TAM, what is your point of order?

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): President, we very much hope that we can hold a one minute silence in memory of Mr Marco LEUNG who had sacrificed his life to stand against the China extradition bill. We will now rise to pay silent tribute for one minute.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): According to the convention of this Council, silent tributes at Council meetings are only offered to incumbent Members, political dignitaries with significant contribution to Hong Kong or victims of catastrophes upon their death.

As Mr LEUNG does not belong to any of the aforesaid categories, this Council will not pay silent tribute to him. Members may consider mourning for him on other occasions or in other ways.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Questions. Apart from six oral questions for this meeting, with my permission, two urgent oral questions will be asked by Mr AU Nok-hin and Mr LAM Cheuk-ting respectively under Rule 24(4) of the Rules of Procedure.

The urgent questions asked today are about the way in which the Police handle large-scale demonstrations and assemblies. I will first call upon: Mr AU Nok-hin to ask his question and the public officer to reply, then Mr LAM Cheuk-ting to ask his question and the public officer to reply. I will forthwith invite the two Members to ask supplementary questions, and then other Members may ask supplementary questions.

Members who wish to ask supplementary questions please press the "Request to speak" button as early as possible, so that we can estimate when the urgent questions will end and the first oral question will start.

Having regard to the situation, I will as far as possible allow Members to ask supplementary questions if they so wish. To allow more Members to ask questions, questions raised by Members should be as concise as possible. Members should not make arguments when asking questions.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): First urgent oral question.

Mr AU Nok-hin, please ask the first urgent oral question.

Use of force by police officers against demonstrators

MR AU NOK-HIN (in Cantonese): *President, can you allow us some more time?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): If you do not ask your urgent oral question, I will invite the other Member to ask his question.

MR AU NOK-HIN (in Cantonese): *I will ask my urgent oral question.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Please ask your urgent oral question.

1. **MR AU NOK-HIN** (in Cantonese): *On the 12th of this month ...*

(Some Members shouted loudly: "Shame on Andrew LEUNG!")

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

(Dr KWOK Ka-ki indicated his wish to raise a point of order)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki, what is your point of order?

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): *President, I have two points of order. First, I demand an explanation. The incident on 12 June has saddened all Hong Kong people, and one of the persons who made the situation worse is you, Mr Andrew LEUNG. After the Government's introduction of the draconian bill, you decided to rush through the bill in two weeks' time, hence tearing society apart. While Carrie LAM had hidden herself for a week, you had also holed up for quite a long time, bringing shame on the Legislative Council, the general public and Members. Carrie LAM, though unwillingly ...*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK, please raise your point of order.

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): *President, I am about to raise my points of order. Yesterday, Carrie LAM finally showed up and apologized unwillingly. You also have an unshirkable responsibility in this incident for the Legislative Council has lost its monitoring function over the Government because of you. Will you give an account on this point? You have two options: first, to bow in apology before the public; second, to assume responsibility and step down. This is my first point of order.*

Regarding my second point of order, I intended to raise an urgent question today concerning the leakage of privacy data of patients and the persons arrested by the Hospital Authority ("HA"). As we all know, the Police may now make arrests and access to patient privacy in HA's hospitals at will. These actions do not merely affect the persons being arrested. Yet, HA has shifted the responsibility to the Police while Stephen LO has pushed the responsibility back to HA. Neither of them has addressed the concerns of the public. When tens of thousands of patients go to HA hospitals each day for treatment, how can my concern over this issue be non-urgent in character? Why didn't you permit me to raise this urgent question? Why didn't you let the officials in charge, including John LEE and Sophia CHAN, answer this question? These are my two points of order.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Regarding the first point of order, I had, following the past practice and in accordance with the Rules of Procedure and the Basic Law, made meeting arrangements to allow time for Members to debate over the relevant bill and monitor the Government. This is my reply to your first point of order.

This time, I received 15 urgent oral questions of similar character, all of which were about the Police's handling of large-scale demonstrations. I then drew reference from the established principles, i.e. whether the urgent questions related to a matter of public importance and were of an urgent character, to decide whether to permit these questions or not. In fact, I have given permission to two of these 15 urgent questions and explained in detail the reasons for permitting or rejecting these urgent questions in my reply to Members. Therefore, Members should stop arguing over my ruling. The urgent oral questions will now start.

(Dr KWOK Ka-ki indicated his wish to raise a point of order)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki, what is your point of order?

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): *President, unless someone pointed a gun at you and forced you to put the bill to vote on 20 June, how would you take the unprecedented move to rush through this highly controversial bill in two weeks?*

President, just now, I gave you two options: first, to bow and apologize for causing troubles in this incident; second, to step down. Of course, neither of these options is easy for you, a shameless person. I do not know which option you will choose.

What is more, you have not responded to my second point of order. The two urgent questions permitted today are completely irrelevant to the serious problem of privacy leakage by HA hospitals which treat tens of thousands of patients a day. This problem has already caused grave concerns among patients. So, why isn't my concern urgent in character? Why can't my question be discussed in the Council?

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I have already made a clear explanation in my written ruling. Please stop labouring this point.

(Ms Claudia MO indicated her wish to raise a point of order)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Claudia MO, what is your point of order?

MS CLAUDIA MO (in Cantonese): *Mr Andrew LEUNG, I am not criticizing you personally, but you give Hong Kong people an impression that you have led the Legislative Council to rush through the bill like a locomotive to support the Government. If you had not decided to hold Council meetings on Monday and Tuesday—an arrangement unheard of—a large-scale demonstration would no have taken place. You are actually an accomplice, and there is no way for you to deny your responsibility. Yet, you now claim that you have fully followed the Basic Law and the Rules of Procedure. We should have regard to basic political ethics and be a person of integrity. Will you bow, apologize and step down?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms MO, this is not a point of order. Please sit down.

Mr AU Nok-hin, please ask the first urgent oral question.

(Mr Jeremy TAM stood up)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Jeremy TAM, what is your point?

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): *President, while we were observing silence just now, you showed great disrespect to the deceased; you interrupted us. Will you apologize to the deceased Mr LEUNG?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I have all along acted in accordance with the Rules of Procedure. As I said earlier, there are established practices regarding the observance of silence at meetings of the Legislative Council. Thus, I hope Members will not dwell on this matter. In fact ...

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): *President, will you apologize to Mr LEUNG or not?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Anyone ...

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): *Your earlier behaviour showed great disrespect to the deceased.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr AU Nok-hin, please put your first urgent oral question.

(Mr Charles Peter MOK stood up)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Charles Peter MOK, what is your point?

MR CHARLES PETER MOK (in Cantonese): *President, in fact, there are many ways to handle the matter in a better way; even a mere utterance of "I express my deepest sympathy" would be a better approach. Would you do so? I understand that there are procedural requirements, but we do not think that the procedures prevent you from allowing us to observe silence. You can at least say, "I express my deepest sympathy", can't you? Your attitude will only further antagonize the general public. If the fury of the public cannot be controlled, you too will be held responsible.*

President, would you show some sympathy if you still have a tinge of sympathy?

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I would express my deepest sympathy in any major incident where casualties are involved.

Mr AU Nok-hin, please put your question.

(Mr Kenneth LEUNG raised his hand to indicate his wish to speak)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Kenneth LEUNG, what is your point?

MR KENNETH LEUNG (in Cantonese): *President, may I request that the meeting be suspended for five minutes so that Members can observe silence? President, it is just a modest request for a five-minute break. Thank you.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): The meeting is now suspended.

11:10 am

Meeting suspended.

11:20 am

Council then resumed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): First urgent question.

MR AU NOK-HIN (in Cantonese): *On the 12th of this month, the Police used various kinds of weapons (including batons as well as pepper balls, bean bag rounds and rubber bullets which were discharged by arms) against demonstrators in the vicinity of Admiralty, and the injured persons included a driver of a press vehicle who was shot in the head and fell unconscious onto the ground, and a demonstrator who was shot in the eye. As seen on the television screen, some police officers aimed at the heads of unarmed demonstrators when they fired. There are comments querying that such acts were in violation of a requirement in Chapter 29 of the Police General Orders, which stipulates, among others, that the level of force to be used by police officers shall be minimal and reasonably required under the prevailing circumstances. Therefore, John LEE should step down.*

Besides, on the day following the Government's announcement of the suspension of the relevant legislative amendment exercise, over a million of members of the public still took to the streets to protest. Given that large-scale demonstrations may be triggered at any moment, will the Government undertake that when a similar demonstration takes place again, police officers will not aim at the upper bodies of demonstrators anymore for firing bean bag rounds and rubber bullets, so as not to cause incidents of serious injuries?

(Mr AU Nok-hin and a number of Members yelled repeatedly, "Down with John LEE!")

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please keep quiet. Secretary for Security, please answer.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, in the morning of 12 June there was a peaceful assembly to be held outside the Legislative Council Complex originally. At around 8:00 am, a large number of people in mask suddenly rushed out to Lung Wo Road, Tim Mei Avenue, Queensway and Harcourt Road in an organized manner, occupying the roads, blocking the traffic and disrupting social order. Some protesters even did threatening and provoking acts. As there were citizens being trapped inside a tunnel at Lung Wo Road, Police Negotiators were deployed, with the incident lasting for eight hours. The

people affected could not use the toilet or drink water when they were trapped. At the same time, roads were congested and blocked, which nearly paralysed the traffic. Notwithstanding this, the Police maintained a high degree of tolerance.

Around 3:00 pm, the situation at the Legislative Council Complex began to deteriorate, when protesters mainly at the front continuously charged towards the police cordon line violently. The Police set up cordon line there mainly to safeguard the Legislative Council Complex and persons therein. The protesters who violently charged towards the Police hurled bricks at police officers, and attacked police officers with metal poles, mills barriers and wooden planks. The police cordon line retreated all the way to the demonstration areas at the entrance of the Legislative Council Complex.

At that time, some of the protesters at the front ignored the Police's repeated advice and warning, and repeatedly charged towards the police cordon line using violence in an organized manner. This posed serious threats to public safety and order, as well as endangered the personal safety or even lives of people at the scene (including other protesters, members of the media and police officers on duty). Having given warning several times and without any other choices, the Police used appropriate and necessary force to disperse the crowd and control the situation in order to protect the safety of their own and others.

Up to present, the Police have arrested a total of 32 people for offences including behaving in a disorderly manner in a public place, unlawful assembly, assaulting police officer, etc. A total of 22 police officers have sustained different degrees of injuries in the incident.

The Police have the responsibility to adopt lawful measures to maintain public safety, public order, as well as safeguard people's life and property. The Police shall, based on the circumstances at the scene, make assessments and exercise professional judgment to take appropriate actions, which include using necessary force in a bid to ensure public safety and public order.

The Police have established guidelines on the use of force. Police officers may use minimum force as appropriate only when such an action is absolutely necessary and there are no other means to accomplish the lawful duty. Police officers shall give verbal warning prior to the use of force as far as circumstances permit, while the person(s) involved shall be given every opportunity, where practicable, to obey police orders before force is used.

The Police have rigorous training with regard to the use of force. Every newly recruited or serving police officer has to go through rigorous training on the use of force, so that they may fully understand how to use different levels of force in a safe and effective manner, including the use of verbal advice/verbal control, empty-hand control, pepper sprays, batons and other equipment, as a means to achieve the relevant lawful purposes.

During the operation on 12 June, as some protesters charged towards police cordon line at the front using violence and hurled bricks, metal poles, wooden planks and mills barriers at police officers, under such life-threatening situation, police officers used force to disperse the crowd and control the situation with the aid of appropriate equipment. During the operation, the weapons used by the Police included batons, pepper sprays, tear sprays, bean bag rounds, rubber bullets and tear gases. All these are non-lethal weapons comparable to those used by the enforcement agencies of overseas countries for dealing with similar violent situations.

If there is any dissatisfaction with the Police operation, the Complaints Against Police Office will conduct a fair and just investigation upon receipt of the complaint. The result of the investigation will be reviewed by the statutory Independent Police Complaints Council. As such, it is not appropriate for me to comment on individual cases. However, with regard to the use of weapons, the Police have clear guidelines and sufficient training. When firearms are used, in accordance with the Police's guidelines, the centre body mass will be aimed, so as to effectively stop the attack.

On 12 June in Admiralty and its vicinity, we could all see on TV that some protesters launched violent attacks, disrupting the peace of society and charging police cordon line. It is the duty of the Police to stop such behaviours to safeguard people's life and property.

Our people have the freedom of assembly and speech. Participants of public events should, when expressing their views, be peaceful and orderly, and abide by the law. This is in line with the common good of the society. However, when violence occurs, it is the Police's duty to take lawful measures to ensure public order and public safety.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Urgent question 2.

Use of force by police officers against journalists performing duties in demonstrations

2. **MR LAM CHEUK-TING** (in Cantonese): *President, I have a question for John LEE, who has adamantly pressed ahead with the draconian bill to sell out Hong Kong for personal gains ...*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, please state your urgent question directly.

MR LAM CHEUK-TING (in Cantonese): *On the 12th of this month, a large-scale confrontation between police officers and demonstrators occurred outside the Legislative Council Complex. According to a foreign journalist, he witnessed that despite some journalists having identified themselves, their equipment was searched, and they were insulted, chased, assaulted and sprayed with tear sprays by police officers, who even hurled tear gas rounds at them. Since over a million of members of the public took to the streets to protest on the Sunday just passed, some members of the public are worried that journalists will be treated in the aforesaid manner when large-scale demonstrations take place again in the near future. In this connection, will the Government guarantee that the Police will not treat journalists in the same manner again?*

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, the Police all along respect press freedom and the media's right of reporting, and will also endeavour to facilitate media reporting ...

(A number of Members spoke loudly in their seats)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please keep quiet. Secretary, please continue with your reply.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): ... President, the Police all along respect press freedom and the media's right of reporting, and will also endeavour to facilitate media reporting ...

(A number of Members kept speaking loudly in their seats)

MS CLAUDIA MO (in Cantonese): *Lying.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Claudia MO. This is my second warning. Members may put their questions to the Secretary at the later session for supplementary questions. As for now, Members will please remain quiet in your seats. Secretary, please continue with your reply.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, the Police all along respect press freedom and the media's right of reporting, and will also endeavour to facilitate media reporting and maintain effective communication and cooperation with the media. Therefore, the Police have been taking measures to facilitate media reporting as far as practicable.

In handling public order events, the Police will conduct holistic risk assessment based on the objectives, nature, number of participants, past experience and the latest situation of individual events for manpower deployment and formulation of operational plans and contingencies. The Police will also deploy manpower flexibly and implement crowd management measures in light of the prevailing circumstances to ensure public safety and public order.

The Police have formulated relevant guidelines for officers to identify and verify the identity of media practitioners during public order events or other police operations with the proof of identity or documents issued by media organizations or associations. While covering public order events, media practitioners should bring along the proof of identity of reporters or testimonials issued by their companies and can wear easily recognizable clothing and armbands so that police officers at scene can easily recognize them. The Police will examine relevant guidelines from time to time and will consider the opinion of frontline police officers in the process.

On the condition of not affecting operations, the Police have all along been assisting in media reporting as far as possible. Generally speaking, unless designating a press area will provide a vantage point for the media to cover the events, in principle the Police will not designate a press area in public place, where the media like other members of the public are allowed free access. If a designated press area is set up under the above mentioned circumstances, the media are still free to move in and out of that press area. If a police cordon is set up for operational or investigative purpose such as at a scene of crime, traffic accident or emergency incident, the Police will consider setting up a designated press area where practicable to facilitate media reporting.

To further enhance communication and cooperation with the media, the Police officially established the Force Media Liaison Cadre in December 2015. When necessary, the Police will deploy Cadre members to the scene of public order events or other police operations to provide facilitation and assistance to media practitioners covering the events at scene. Information officers of the Information Services Department staffed in the Police Public Relations Branch ("PPRB") of the Hong Kong Police Force will also provide support and assist in handling media enquiries. If necessary, media practitioners conducting reporting at scene can seek assistance from the Force Media Liaison Cadre or liaise with the PPRB Newsroom which operates 24 hours round-the-clock.

On 12 June, tens of thousands of protesters gathered in the vicinity of Tim Mei Avenue, Admiralty and Tim Wa Avenue. The scene was chaotic with the occurrence of violent acts. At all times, the Police have to protect the people and to maintain public order and public safety. The objective of the Police operation was against those using violence, with a view to controlling the scene and restoring order as soon as possible. The Police operation was only against unlawful acts, but not against persons of any industry.

In fact, on the day of operation, although manpower was tight, the Police had arranged 32 officers of the Force Media Liaison Cadre to provide facilitation to members of the media at the scene as far as practicable. The police officers at the scene on that day worked in the highly stressful and dangerous environment, with certain operations undertaken in a split-second. The Police have always appealed to media practitioners to put their own personal safety first and comply with the instructions of police officers at the scene while covering public order events or large-scale or chaotic demonstrations.

We understand the concerns expressed by some media practitioners regarding the Police's operation on the day. I reiterate that the Police attach great importance to the relationship with the media, and all along respect press freedom and the media's right of reporting. If anyone is dissatisfied with the Police, he or she may complain to the Complaints Against Police Office ("CAPO"). The existing complaints against police mechanism operates under the Independent Police Complaints Council Ordinance (Cap. 604), with a clear legal basis, as well as effective and independent monitoring. The first tier of the mechanism is CAPO of the Police which receives and investigates into complaints. The second tier is the Independent Police Complaints Council ("IPCC") which is statutory and independent. Under the two-tier police complaints system, any complaint against the Police will be handled in a fair and just manner. As such, it is not appropriate for me to comment on individual cases.

With regard to the Police's operation on 12 June, CAPO has received 27 complaints referred by the Hong Kong Journalists Association ("HKJA"). CAPO has set up a designated team to follow up the complaints where the relevant staff were not involved in the operation concerned to ensure that the complaints are handled properly.

On the basis of mutual respect and understanding, the Police will continue to maintain close communication and cooperation with the media and provide necessary assistance.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Tanya CHAN, please raise your question.

(A number of Members tapped on the bench)

MS TANYA CHAN (in Cantonese): *President, I will not get angry today. But a moment ago, he ...*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Sorry, I should ask Mr AU Nok-hin to raise his question first.

(Mr AU Nok-hin and a number of Members shouted, "Down with John LEE!")

MS TANYA CHAN (in Cantonese): *Yes, you should let those two Members raise their questions first.*

MR AU NOK-HIN (in Cantonese): *It is stipulated in the Police General Orders that police officers shall give verbal warning prior to the use of force and the force used must be of the minimum level required to achieve the purpose. Last Wednesday, the Police fired and hurled tear gas rounds at protesters in various places, including Tim Wa Avenue, Tim Mei Avenue, Lung Wui Road, Lung Wo Road, Harcourt Road and the designated demonstration areas outside the Legislative Council Complex. After watching the media's footages, we could not find that police officers stationed at those places had, before shooting, displayed the black banner to warn the protesters.*

Also, shooting protesters in their head or eyes can cause permanent injuries. As far as we understand, the protester who was shot in the eye by the Police may lose 20% of his eyesight. I have the following supplementary question to the Secretary: Is shooting protesters in their head or eye the minimum force required for the purpose of dispersion? Yes or no?

(A number of Members shouted again, "Down with John LEE!")

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members stop yelling in their seats. Secretary, please answer.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, I have already stated very clearly in my reply just now that on that day, the police cordon lines, especially the ones set in front of the Legislative Council Complex, were seriously stormed. The protesters acted violently, such as hurling bricks, metal poles and mills barriers at the Police. We can all see from television news coverage the violent acts of frontline protesters. Hence, the Police had to take appropriate measures to ensure the safety of all persons present, including journalists and police officers.

The Police had indeed given warnings before using force. They had to take appropriate actions in response to each act of violence. I have said very clearly in my answer just now that when using certain accoutrement, the Police would aim at the centre body mass of the targets to stop their attack.

MR AU NOK-HIN (in Cantonese): *He has not answered my question.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr AU, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR AU NOK-HIN (in Cantonese): *Did the Secretary mean to say that the protester who was shot in the eye engaged in violent acts and the Police had to shoot him in the eye? I just want to say that according to the international standard, it is forbidden to shoot people in the head.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr AU, this is not your supplementary question. But, Secretary, do you have anything to add?

(A number of Members spoke loudly in their seats)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, please answer.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, I repeat again. I have already made it very clear in the main answer that when using firearms, the Police aim at the centre body mass, so as to effectively stop the attack. Of course, in chaotic circumstances, everyone is moving. When complaints expressing dissatisfaction with the Police's actions are received, they will be submitted to CAPO for just and fair investigation and then reported to IPCC for examination. We will handle all complaints solemnly.

MR LAM CHEUK-TING (in Cantonese): *President, we heard John LEE, the guy who sells out Hong Kong for his glory, say that he respected the press and upheld press freedom. These remarks really grossed the people of Hong Kong out.*

HKJA has collated 27 cases concerning the abuse of force by the Police, including 10 cases of firing tear gas objects at journalists at a short distance, 3 cases of shooting journalists directly in the head, 3 cases of assaulting

journalists using batons, 1 case of journalist wounded by object believed to be bean bags rounds or rubber bullet, 8 cases of police officers pushing journalists away from the scene with shields or batons, 2 cases of the Police projecting strong lights at cameras, 3 cases of search without cause and obstructing journalists from reporting. The case of a police officer saying "Fuck you, journalists" to a journalist who declared his status is not included.

President, according to HKJA, these journalists had at that time worn clothing which could reveal their status, such as reflective vests with the word "PRESS" and helmets, just like this picture I have in hand. They were also wearing their press cards, which clearly reflected their status as journalists; and the journalists being assaulted were not standing in the midst of protesters during the attack. HKJA has reasons to believe that police officers, being well aware of the journalists' status, still used unnecessary force and threats against them, far exceeding the legal power to maintain public order.

President, John LEE said that anyone who was dissatisfied with the Police might lodge complaints with CAPO. May I ask John LEE how we can lodge complaints? Those police officers were fully geared, wearing helmets and masks; they did not display their identification numbers on their shoulders or did not produce their police warrant cards. Who then are the targets of our complaints? The Secretary has served as a police officer for 30 years. Can he help us identify those officers? Can we sit before a computer and use our sense of smell to identify the officers? Is this the approach to be taken?

How come a large number of police officers did not display any information, such as identification numbers, to reveal their identity when they were suppressing the protesters? Did the Police deliberately condone frontline officers' abuse of violence so that they would not be held accountable in future? Did the Security Bureau condone such abuse of power? Will the Secretary bear the responsibility and step down?

(A number of Members kept chanting "Down with John LEE!")

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): This is my last time to remind Members that if they continue to yell in their seats, this question session cannot proceed. Secretary, please answer.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): IPCC held a meeting with the Police yesterday, at which the Police indicated that they had received 34 relevant complaints and also 27 complaints from HKJA. The 34 complaints were against the Police's misconduct, poor manners, abuse of power, and so on. In response to the 27 complaints from HKJA, the Police have formed a task force to conduct investigation. It is hoped that the investigation work will be completed expeditiously in a fair and just manner.

Ms Edwina LAU, Director of Management Services, Hong Kong Police Force said that a team of members who had not been involved in the demonstration operation on that day would be selected to conduct an investigation in a fair and just manner. Moreover, with regard to each complaint case, IPCC members or observers may likely attend the interview for taking the statement, or attend other related investigation operations, so as to ensure that the procedures will be conducted fairly and justly. This system has enabled us to handle many cases involving complaints against the Police in the past. I believe that IPCC and CAPO will continue to uphold the longstanding tradition of fairness and justice, and at the same time ensure that all complaints will be followed up appropriately.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LAM, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR LAM CHEUK-TING (in Cantonese): *The Secretary has not answered my supplementary question. I have already laid this photo on his desk, which shows that the police officers have no identification numbers and no police warrant cards. The Secretary keeps saying that the investigations will be conducted in a fair and just manner, but how can the investigation be conducted if you simply do not know which police officers are involved? In the end, will the Commissioner of Police or you, John LEE, bear the responsibility for each beating inflicted on the protesters by police officers?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LAM, you have pointed out the part in your supplementary question that has not been answered. Please sit down.

(Mr LAM Cheuk-ting continued to speak loudly in his seat)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, please answer.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): The Police will comprehensively examine all evidence and various records of what happened at the scene in relation to each complaint, so as to ensure that the evidence required will be found during the investigation.

MS TANYA CHAN (in Cantonese): *As an accountability official, the Secretary has all along taken part in pressing ahead this China extradition bill, resulting in this predicament. At first, 1.03 million people took to the streets and then almost 2 million people took to the streets. Some people even suffered from head injuries. The Chief Executive laid the blame on the Police and the Commissioner of Police laid the blame on the frontline commanders.*

May I ask Secretary John LEE: As a bridge between the Government and the public and as an accountability official, do you have the intent to apologize to members of the general public; and to show your sincerity, will you not only bow but also bear the responsibility and step down?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): When the Chief Executive met with the press yesterday, she made it very clear that there were deficiencies in this legislative amendment exercise. She did apologize to every citizen in Hong Kong for the conflicts, disputes and anxieties caused in society due to our inadequacies.

As a member of the team that initiated the legislative amendment, I certainly must bear my responsibility. Hence, like the Chief Executive, here I apologize for the conflicts, disputes and anxieties caused to the general public.

I hope Members will understand that the Chief Executive has already stated to the public that in the next three years, we have to do a lot of work, including livelihood related work to promote the continuous development in society. The Security Bureau will tie in with the Chief Executive's governance in the next three years. Within the ambit of the Security Bureau, there are also a lot of tasks, such as redefining the offence of access to a computer with dishonest intent, so as to legislate for handling offences such as voyeurism. At the same

time, regarding the handling of non-refoulement claims, we have also promised to enact the relevant legislation. The Security Bureau will tie in with the Chief Executive's work in the next three years.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): *All along, during the process when the Administration has been pushing through the Bill, we have explicitly asked the Secretary not to exploit the Taiwan murder case or Hong Kong people's conscience to push through this draconian law. Yet, the Secretary refused to listen and pretended to be a "dead dog" at the Bills Committee. Secretary, do you know how many people asked you to be accountable to all Hong Kong people in the past week? The Secretary meekly apologized in a soft voice a while ago; does he think that Hong Kong people will accept his apology? Does the Secretary think that he has a clear conscience when facing Hong Kong people? I hope the Secretary can answer clearly whether he will resign and step down. When answering this question, I hope the Secretary will not speak in a soft voice, he should say in a loud and clear voice whether he will or will not resign and step down.*

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, I have explained time and again that the Chief Executive has admitted that there are deficiencies in the Government's work and has apologized to Hong Kong people. In this respect, my attitude is consistent with the Chief Executive's. The Chief Executive would like to continue to work for Hong Kong in different areas in the next three years. As an accountability official, I will work in conjunction with the Chief Executive. Therefore, I hope Members will understand that we will make greater efforts and work in conjunction with the Chief Executive in the next three years.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr KWOK, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): *I have not clearly heard the Secretary's answer as he was speaking very softly. I would like him to tell us again whether he will resign and step down.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, I have already answered the Member's question many times.

MR ALVIN YEUNG (in Cantonese): *President, in the past week, Hong Kong experienced unprecedented clashes between the Police and members of the public. Police officers of the Hong Kong SAR Government shot unarmed members of the public, most of them students.*

The Fugitive Offenders Ordinance was introduced by John LEE who is currently present at the meeting and the Police Force which shot the public is also under his purview. However, the Secretary has the nerve to speak softly in the Chamber of the Legislative Council by merely uttering two words, thinking that the matter ends there. He has no regrets and has the nerve to shirk responsibilities onto the Chief Executive and frontline police officers. Doesn't the Secretary for Security have a role to play? Is the Secretary for Security a mere figurehead? Is he receiving salaries but doing nothing? We only want the Secretary to step down with a bow but he has the nerve to tell us that he has answered the question. Why does he not uprightly bow to Hong Kong people and apologize in a loud voice, telling Hong Kong people that he does not have the face to continue his service as the Secretary? John LEE, why have you not done so?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, I am a member of the team which initiated the legislative amendment exercise, I am also ...

(A number of Members spoke loudly in their seats)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please stop yelling in their seats. You can ask the Secretary questions later. Secretary, please continue with your answer.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): We admitted that there were deficiencies in our work in implementing the amendment exercise, leading to social conflicts, disputes and anxieties in society, and we apologize for that. I have repeatedly said that the Government would like to continue to work in different areas in the next three years and I will work in conjunction with the Chief Executive. I have just mentioned the work that we will be dealing with in future and I hope Members will understand that we would like to do better and listen to more opinions. Certainly, we will listen more extensively to opinions before promoting policies in future.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Prof Joseph LEE, please ask your question.

(Prof Joseph LEE was not present)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Gary FAN, please ask your question.

MR GARY FAN (in Cantonese): *John LEE, Teresa CHENG and Carrie LAM forced through the China extradition bill which adversely affected Hong Kong people; this is tantamount to putting the cat near the goldfish bowl. Their acts have aroused worldwide concern and all of them have become infamous. One million people took to the streets and more than 100 Hong Kong people were arrested or injured; 2 million people took to the streets and one person died in protest against the Bill. The SAR Government insincerely apologized afterwards but that is not enough. It must retract the riot characterization; withdraw the China extradition bill and step down with a bow. These are the demands of Hong Kong people.*

The SAR Government is apathetic. On 12 June, the Civil Human Rights Front, having a letter of no objection issued by the Police in advance, held a gathering outside the CITIC Tower on Lung Wui Road. At 3:45 pm, after a conflict broke out in the demonstration area of the Legislative Council Complex, the Police unexpectedly besieged the assembly participants around Lung Wui Road without any warning, and fired at least four tear gas rounds. Hundreds of peaceful assembly participants thus rushed into the CITIC Tower and fled for their lives through one door; the situation was really dangerous. The videos taken on that day showed that people were forced into a dead end and there was

only one door for escape. The Police almost triggered an incident similar to the Lan Kwai Fong stampede. John LEE, do the Police have established guidelines? Have the Police used a minimum level of force? The Police did not issue a warning on that day; do the Police have intensive training in the use of force? Will the Secretary please answer to Hong Kong people?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, the on-scene commander is responsible for handling the situation in light of the actual circumstances and making professional judgment. Concerning information obtained from the media and other sources, I think CAPO should consider the overall situation, including the actual situation at the time, why the relevant decision was made and whether the decision made at that time was appropriate. Sometimes, the information from some video clips may not help us understand the overall situation. CAPO will holistically scrutinize the relevant information and evidence, conduct a fair and impartial investigation and submit the investigation report to IPCC, a statutory body, for scrutiny.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr FAN, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR GARY FAN (in Cantonese): *John LEE has not answered my supplementary question. I have specifically referred to the remarks made by the Secretary just now. He said that the Police have established guidelines and received intensive training in the use of force, and that police officers would only use force when their lives were threatened. The Secretary has not answered my supplementary question and he has only shirked the responsibilities onto IPCC. Does John LEE still have the audacity?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, the evidence to be collected by CAPO in investigating each case is related to ...

(Mr Gary FAN spoke loudly while standing)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Gary FAN, please sit down. Secretary, please continue with your answer.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): When CAPO is investigating each case ... as in the past ...

(Mr Gary FAN continued to speak loudly while standing)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Gary FAN, please sit down and let the Secretary answer.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): For each case, CAPO has to holistically scrutinize the evidence and it has always conducted investigations fairly and impartially. We also adopted this mechanism in dealing with large-scale incidents in the past and the investigation reports were also submitted to IPCC for scrutiny.

(Mr Gary FAN still continued to speak loudly while standing)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Gary FAN, please sit down. Prof Joseph LEE, please ask your question.

PROF JOSEPH LEE (in Cantonese): *President, simply based on the Secretary's reply I heard just now, members of the public might believe that a riot really took place in Hong Kong last week. According to what I heard from the radio this morning, a journalist said that the Police hurled tear gas rounds outside the CITIC Tower in Admiralty on that day. Although the crowd was retreating from the scene at that time, several tear gas rounds were hurled at the people who were retreating and ready to leave the scene via the CITIC Tower. Many people were standing outside the building as only one door was open at that time. Yet, the Police fired tear gas at them. I would like to ask the Secretary the reason for not depicting this scene in his main reply. The Secretary is responsible for supervising the Police Force. Which guideline or police general order stipulated that police officers could fire tear gas rounds at people who were*

retreating? Which police general order allowed the Police to fire tear gas rounds at people who had no way to retreat outside the building? While the Secretary has called on members of the public to lodge a complaint with CAPO, it would be advisable for him to teach the public how to lodge complaints.

In what ways can IPCC clearly examine this incident? We request that the SAR Government set up a credible committee to look into the incident as a whole and inform the public whether the Police had used force improperly. Our suggestion is different from the Secretary's effort to deceive the public by simply telling lies and putting forward fallacious arguments. Please return justice to Hong Kong people. We were just staging a peaceful demonstration without resorting to violent acts. It was not necessary for the Police to open fire. Will the Secretary please answer my question.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, different incidents may happen during large-scale assemblies held in various places. We have seen on television the very chaotic situations in areas around Admiralty on that day. The Police had been subjected to serious and violent attack, such as being hurled bricks, metal poles and mills barriers. The Commissioner of Police had also urged the public against going to Admiralty because the situation would only become more chaotic if more people gathered there. As such, the Police hoped to achieve two objectives: First, urge the people to leave the scene in Admiralty; second, disperse the crowd from the scene as far as practicable. Of course, every commander will handle the matters confronted by the Police in the light of the actual circumstances. We also strongly believe that only by putting together all the information can we fully understand the situation at that time, the reasons for the commander concerned to make the relevant decision and the process whereby he had arrived at the relevant decision based on the matters that required handling at that time. All these aspects must be fully examined before a fair and just judgment can be made.

Hence, I hope Members will understand that the Police had only discharged their duties under the law in this operation to ensure the safety of people's life and property. Under the difficult situation at that time, anyone could possibly get injured as a result of the confusion and pressure. Such possibilities could not be ruled out. With only the afore-mentioned objectives in mind, the Police hoped to safeguard public order and safety as far as practicable so that no one would get injured. I hope that you will understand that it is the duty and responsibility of

the Police to minimize any damage to all people's life and property in public gatherings.

PROF JOSEPH LEE (in Cantonese): *The Secretary has not answered my supplementary question.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Prof LEE, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

PROF JOSEPH LEE (in Cantonese): *My supplementary question is clear enough. I asked the Secretary to tell us how to lodge a complaint with CAPO and how to enable IPCC to give play to its role. However, the reply given by the Secretary simply shows that they had committed atrocities under the law by allowing the Police to fire tear gas rounds at people who had no way to retreat. How could such acts help disperse the crowds? President, the Secretary has not answered my supplementary question.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, in fact, as I explained just now, it might not be possible to grasp the actual situation as a whole just by watching certain video footage. CAPO will gather all evidence and information, including the information provided by witnesses and collected online, before examining the prevailing circumstances in a holistic manner, so as to carry out a fair and just investigation and determine whether the operation of the Police back then complied with the Police's guidelines.

MR SHIU KA-FAI (in Cantonese): *President, an unfortunate incident took place in Hong Kong on 12 June. I believe that no one in Hong Kong is the winner. I send my regards to the injured protesters and police officers.*

On that day, pro-establishment Members gathered early; we watched the live broadcast of different television stations, including TVB, Cable TV and Now TV, on our mobile phones respectively. As members of the public could see, the

situation had been rather peaceful at first. It was not until 3:00 pm that, as clearly shown on the Now News Channel, a group of protesters attempted to charge towards and storm the Legislative Council Complex by attacking police officers with bricks, metal poles and wooden planks. Police officers had to retreat all the way to the glass facade. President, my colleagues found it so strange that no television stations except Now TV had aired this scene. Hong Kong people who were watching other television stations back then might think that the situation had been extremely calm. Yet, in fact, as clearly shown in the footage captured by Now TV, the protesters had attacked the Police and attempted to storm the Legislative Council Complex in the first place.

Subsequently, I also asked the security staff of the Legislative Council who were at the scene at that time. They also recalled that thousands of protesters at the scene had almost stormed their way into the Legislative Council Complex through the glass door. Would it be appropriate for the Police to retreat and allow the protesters who had apparently lost their reason to charge into the Legislative Council Complex at that moment? Other Members and a number of security staff and Members' assistants were inside the Legislative Council Complex at that time. Protesters might have lost their reason after entering the Legislative Council Complex, jeopardizing our personal safety. Was this the situation which we would like to see?

President, the Chief Executive has already announced the suspension of the legislative amendment exercise, thereby alleviating some grievances of many Hong Kong people. On the other hand, at present, quite a few police officers indicated that they have been bullied in various places. In an article I have read online, a police officer wrote a letter to his six-year-old daughter in reply to her question about whether he would like to stop working as a police officer. I almost came to tears after reading the article. President, police officers are responsible for protecting Hong Kong people, and they have always remained politically neutral. If a group of opponents attack non-establishment Members today, I believe that the Police will likewise come forward to protect those Members.

I would like to ask the Secretary: Are there any possible ways at present to help boost the morale of police officers? Some people in the community have recently vowed to bully their children; in hospitals, health care personnel have called them "black cops" and "police dogs". How can the authorities improve the situation?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, first, I hope Members will understand that over tens of thousands of protesters gathered on 12 June. As Mr SHIU said just now, some of them had charged towards the cordon line outside the Legislative Council Complex with considerable violence. I concur that the protesters in other areas only assembled to express their views without using any violence.

Mr SHIU mentioned the live broadcast of a television station just now. I have also watched the relevant video footage. In this connection, I hope that you will understand, although the situation in other places might not involve violence and a majority of protesters had only intended to express their personal views, it was actually reported that after 3:00 pm on that day, various protesters, especially those at the front, dug up bricks from pavements and attacked police officers with considerable violence. This was the fact as reported by a journalist during the live broadcast of the television station concerned. It was also reported that at about 3:40 pm, some protesters broke through the police cordon line and charged towards the demonstration areas of the Legislative Council Complex all the way from Tim Wa Avenue, moving mills barriers to the demonstration areas along the way. Despite the additional manpower deployed by the Police, some protesters had managed to enter the Legislative Council Complex and continued to hurl miscellaneous objects, and some even started jostling with police officers directly. At that time, a journalist claimed that fire broke out at the scene. The situation turned chaotic as fire and smoke broke out after protesters had hurled objects. Meanwhile, police officers kept retreating. In this connection, I hope that you will understand that a serious and violent incident had indeed taken place back then, particularly at the scene of the Legislative Council Complex. The Commissioner of Police has also pointed out, for those people in other places who had not used violence, the Police had also tried hard to enable them to express their freedom of speech.

Regarding the online bullying mentioned by Mr SHIU just now, in any case, while some members of the public are not satisfied with the Police's operation, the Police have just been performing their duties in their official capacity. We still have to rely on the Police to investigate crimes which take place in Hong Kong. However, some Internet postings do beg the following question: Is it necessary for the public and the Police to be so hostile to each other? While it is certainly the right of the public to express their views, the Police are also duty-bound to discharge their duties to protect public safety and public order, thereby safeguarding the interests of the public.

In one posting I have seen, there are suggestions that building a culture of bullying the children of police officers in schools would enable those children to "take the right side"; there are even claims that those children should be bullied into jumping from height. There was also one view that building a culture of bullying police officers' children in schools, whereby instigating students to fight against police officers' children, will help convey a message to police officers that, as an extension of the hatred, their wife and children would definitely get embroiled. In my view, such a way of venting hatred will not benefit anyone.

I understand that an overwhelming majority of members of the public have been expressing their views in a peaceful and rational manner. Yet, I also hope you will understand that Hong Kong relies on the Police Force to maintain public order. When members of the public are in need of assistance, particularly in cases involving criminal offences, they will turn to the Police for help. Such hostilities between the two sides will not benefit anyone. Of course, I have also noticed that the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data has expressed his views on some recent incidents and urged the public against disseminating the personal information of other people. While it is in nobody's interest to disseminate the personal information of other people, one may even breach the law by doing so.

I hope that members of the public will not vent their dissatisfaction with the Government on the Police Force. Police officers are dedicated to their work in maintaining public safety and public order. Whenever they are subjected to serious and violent attacks, they must take appropriate actions to remove the violent threats. I reiterate that the Police Force is dedicated to maintaining the stability and public order of Hong Kong as a whole. I hope that members of the public will understand this point, address different views with empathy, and expeditiously resolve the conflicts and disputes in Hong Kong in a peaceful and rational manner.

MS CLAUDIA MO (in Cantonese): *Hong Kong people are indeed filled with resentment when they saw John LEE, after speaking for some time, added one more remark "I apologize" in a totally reluctant manner. His remark will definitely add fuel to the fire, further aggravating Hong Kong's situation. When compared with the protesters, the Police were totally not on the same level as police officers have received training in using force and they are fully geared up with helmets, shields and a whole set of assault weapons. Subsequently, the Secretary said that since the lives of police officers were under threats, they used*

the minimum force required to "deal with" the protesters. His comments are indeed hardly convincing. Why did he add fuel to the fire? I really do not get it. On the one hand, the Secretary asked people to be considerate; on the other hand, he said that his subordinates used force only for self-defence. The Secretary should in fact watch the television coverage before speaking; do not quote hearsay from the Internet in this Chamber. I can furnish him with a lot of such hearsay, yet will this serve any purpose if we want to make Hong Kong a good place?

I have some photos of police brutality, but I am not going to show them here; let us just take a step back. I just want to ask John LEE: You keep saying that the Government strongly safeguards freedom of the press; yet journalists were berated "XX you, journalist" when they were reporting—I cannot say out the word "XX" for I am also a teacher besides a Member—how do you, as a father of two sons, interpret those words? I learnt that John LEE has even been awarded "the best father", so I ask him to answer my supplementary question. He is a caring father, indeed! So, how does he interpret the expression "XX you, journalist"?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, as I pointed out just now, if members of the public are dissatisfied with the Police operation, they can complain to IPCC.

I hope people will understand the chaotic situation and the pressure faced by each and every one at the scene on that day. Upon completion of the investigation, if CAPO finds any police officer not acting in a manner as stipulated by the Police Force, actions will definitely be taken. Nevertheless, as I also pointed out just now, this incident is attributed to the deficiencies of the SAR Government (including me) in pressing ahead the legislative amendment, leading to disputes and anxieties in society. Hence we express our apology for this.

Therefore, I hope members of the public will not vent their dissatisfaction of the Government on police officers, because they are only discharging their duties. Legally, they have the responsibility to safeguard the lives and properties of the public. They still stand fast at their posts even when facing such a difficult environment. I hope you will understand that everyone is now facing a tough situation.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms MO, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MS CLAUDIA MO (in Cantonese): *The Secretary has not answered my supplementary question. I asked this caring father how he interpreted the expression "XX you, journalist". Will the Secretary please tell me how he interprets this expression?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Any language-related question will be passed to CAPO for follow up and CAPO will handle the case in the light of the circumstances, evidence or facts at that time.

DR CHENG CHUNG-TAI (in Cantonese): *Secretary, when the Government initially introduced the amendment to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, it claimed that the purpose was to claim justice for the deceased in the CHAN Tong-kai case. Yet, it forced through the legislative amendment disregarding public opinions in Hong Kong and in the international communities. Eventually, a martyr surnamed LEUNG died for the country and Hong Kong.*

I would like to ask the Secretary: Since the Government forced through the legislative amendment to claim justice for the deceased in the CHAN Tong-kai case, why did it not claim justice for Mr LEUNG? What is the difference between the Secretary and CHAN Tong-kai? Why does he refuse to release all persons arrested unconditionally? Please give a clear explanation.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, if anyone wishes to express any views, I certainly hope that he will do so in a peaceful and rational way. I do not want to see anyone getting hurt. We are saddened when someone gets hurt for expressing views.

I have pointed out many times about the Government's deficiencies in this legislative amendment exercise, in the hope that people will understand our

apology and our wish to do better in future. As the Chief Executive has indicated expressly, she hopes to continue serving Hong Kong in the next few years, and we also hope to do more and to do better.

DR CHENG CHUNG-TAI (in Cantonese): *President, the Secretary has not answered my supplementary question.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHENG, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

DR CHENG CHUNG-TAI (in Cantonese): *Should the Secretary pay with his life for doing justice to Mr LEUNG?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, just now I pointed out that we do not want to see anyone getting hurt, and we are also saddened if someone gets hurt when expressing views.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): *President, this legislative amendment pertaining to the extradition of fugitives is under the charge of Secretary John LEE as a principal accountability official. Having whipped up a public outcry, he is impenetrably thickheaded, ignoring the 1 million people who took to the streets. Consequently, 2 million people took to the streets, resulting in incidents of bloodshed.*

Secretary, the Police under your purview used excessive and disproportionate force. We have watched a lot of footages. In one incident that happened in the Drum area of the Legislative Council Complex, a female protester who had fallen on ground with no ability to resist was beaten repeatedly by police officers with batons and big shields. Was this excessive and inappropriate force? How could you be so shameless as to state irresponsibly

that members of the public might lodge complaints with CAPO? How could they possibly lodge complaints? We could not see the identification numbers of those police officers who wilfully beat a female protester already fallen on ground. Please tell us if such actions are appropriate use of force?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, regarding any such complaints, CAPO will certainly examine all evidence at the scene, and the situation mentioned by the Member just now would certainly be examined in detail during the investigation. In the course of investigation, CAPO will certainly examine evidence given by witnesses as well as information seen on the Internet. Such evidence will be considered when conducting comprehensive investigation. Regarding the entire process, a Member cited earlier the situation seen by some television reporters. In the demonstration area of the Legislative Council Complex, some police officers were severely assaulted. They were hit by metal poles, metal barriers and bricks hurled at them. If anyone is of the view that the Police had mishandled the situation on that day, we must examine all circumstances and evidence of the whole incident, because a particular footage only shows a particular situation back then. After consolidating all the evidence, we will definitely understand clearly the violent acts that took place in the demonstration area of the Legislative Council Complex on that day. I believe a fair and impartial outcome can be drawn consequent upon investigation.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHEUNG, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): *President, I was asking him whether the Police had used excessive force in the case of a female protester already fallen on ground with no ability to resist being beaten up by seven or eight police officers with batons and shields. Was this the appropriate level of force used by the Police?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, I have already pointed out just now that every aspect must be investigated. Upon examination of all evidence, we will come up with a fair judgment.

(Dr Fernando CHEUNG kept speaking loudly while standing)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Charles Peter MOK, please state your question.

MR CHARLES PETER MOK (in Cantonese): *John LEE, some 2 million people took to the streets and asked you to step down. All these people are your boss. Carrie LAM is not your only boss, but all members of the public are your boss. Have you ever come across a case in which the boss asks an employee to resign, yet the employee's response is that he still has a lot of work to do? This case is happening now. Because there are people like you, police officers—particularly those who take a neutral stance—are at a loss as what actions should be taken. When the Chief Executive and the Commissioner of Police spoke to the public, they at least put on an act to downplay the issue. However, when the Secretary speaks at the Legislative Council today, he creates division and escalates the issue. What are you up to? Are you acting against the wishes of your boss? Or is this your genuine intention? In every reply you give, you exaggerated people's use of violence, but made no mention of the acts of violence on the part of the Police. Instead, you ask people to lodge complaints. What do you mean by this? Why is it that you only see one side of the issue, and ask people to lodge complaints in respect of the other side that you fail to see? Do you have only one eye? For the sake of social stability, for the sake of the work of civil servants, for the sake of genuine ... I believe that there are also some good officers in the Police Force. For the sake of their normal work, will you seriously consider resignation, so as to cause no hindrance to them and avoid politicizing their work?*

President, my supplementary question is as follows. Many young people are very concerned about their arrested "brothers"—a term used by Mr KWONG Chun-yu. In his reply, the Secretary said that 32 people have been arrested. How many "brothers" among these people have been released? Last night I learnt that some of them are university students. Can you provide the number of arrestees? And, can you tell us when you will respond to the demand of the 2 million people to release the arrestees? If you do not have such numbers at hand, when will you have it and when will you release all arrestees?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, as I have pointed out in my reply to various supplementary questions just now, most of the assembly participants expressed their views in a peaceful manner. As for the scenes concerning the cordon lines, particularly those who stood in the forefront assaulting the Police, I believe Members can see such scenes on television. I have no intention to further argue over such scenes back then ...

(Mr Charles Peter MOK spoke loudly in his seat)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr MOK, please allow the Secretary to answer first.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, as I have said clearly just now, a large crowd of people gathered at various places, and many of them are peaceful assembly participants. I have already pointed out this point. I also learnt that the Police have released eight arrestees because upon investigation, the Department of Justice has decided not to take further actions and has notified these persons to get back their bail money.

In respect of each case, Hong Kong certainly upholds the rule of law. We certainly understand that most demonstrators expressed their views in a peaceful manner. For those who were truly involved in violent acts, they would certainly be dealt with in accordance with legal procedures. We also understand that members of the public expect us to deal with such cases as soon as possible. When the Police have completed the investigatory work, the Department of Justice will examine the evidence, the environment and facts; take account of the overall situation, and make a final decision based on the established prosecution policy. According to the Commissioner of Police, for those who were not involved in violent acts and expressed their views peacefully on that day, they did not have to worry that the Police would take actions against them. However, those who were involved in acts of violence should be dealt with under the established legal system of Hong Kong. In this connection, the Department of Justice will certainly examine the overall situation and environment, and make a final decision based on their prosecution policy.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr MOK, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR CHARLES PETER MOK (in Cantonese): *President, the Secretary has failed to explain clearly how many people are still being detained. Is it 32 people minus 8 people? In addition, the Secretary has asked assembly participants to rest assured, but how can they rest assured? People who were shot and injured went to hospitals to receive treatment, but those who sustained more serious injuries would more likely be regarded by the Government as lawbreakers and were even arrested. How can the Secretary ask them to rest assured? How can they rest assured? Will the Secretary please clearly explain how many people are still being detained? Do not merely say that eight people have been released. Are these 8 people included in the 32 people mentioned by the Government?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): I do not have an overall figure from the Police, for I was only informed yesterday of the urgent questions session to be held today. As for the accurate number of arrestees, I hope that it will be announced by the Police. I do not hope that the inadequate information I now have in hand will cause any misunderstandings among Members. That said, I know that at least eight people were notified yesterday that they could get back their bail money and the Government would not take any further actions against them.

(Mr Charles Peter MOK kept speaking loudly while standing)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr MOK, you have already raised your supplementary question. If you are not satisfied with the Secretary's reply, you can follow it up with the Bureau through other channels.

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): *President, I have really never seen anyone who is so brazen, thick-skinned and mean. Based on available information, John LEE was a British national before he became a Director of Bureau in August 2012. In other words, his family and children hold British citizenship, as in the case of Carrie LAM. As a result, he and Carrie LAM have piggybacked on the Taiwan murder case and eaten steamed buns dipped in human blood. They then sought to extradite all people in Hong Kong—his family excluded—to*

Mainland China. He further caused 1 million and then 2 million people to take to the streets. Now he wants to get the issue off his hands, saying that it had nothing to do with him, and he and Carrie LAM should not be held accountable. How can such a person still have the cheek to sit here?

In addition, police officers beat up journalists, young people, students and unarmed people. Such beatings took place at 3:00 am on that night. As we all know, since the crowd dispersed at around 3:00 am, the Police did not have the so-called pressure. But an officer said to a journalist, "XX you, journalist". What kind of pressure did they have? These police officers behaved like beasts in beating up people, and they all went crazy. I was also there watching them shooting arbitrarily. However, I will not ask a question in this regard. Stephen LO said that this had nothing to do with him and shifted the responsibility onto several frontline commanders, and these commanders would certainly say that this had nothing to do with them. John LEE, given such police brutality, were you and Carrie LAM in the know in advance? If you were not in the know, was this order made by the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("the Liaison Office")? Was this order made by the Liaison Office or John LEE? You must give us a clear explanation.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): All actions are undertaken by the Police Force, and the top person in charge of the Police Force is certainly the Commissioner of Police. I was not involved in any operation actions. In dealing with the incident, the Commissioner of Police and his colleagues took actions based on their consistent training, guidelines or requirements in this regard. Members must understand that in an assembly that involved such a large crowd, any chaos arisen would cause a number of injuries. For this reason, the Police must certainly take certain actions. Apart from taking corresponding measures when being violently attacked, the Police also endeavoured to disperse the crowd at the scene, with the aim of effectively minimizing chaos and avoiding casualties. I hope Members will understand that in dealing with such a large crowd under such difficult circumstances, police officers still performed their duties in a dedicated manner. For incidents that happened in a place or in an environment subjected to immense pressure, I hope we can perceive the incidents from the perspective of understanding the difficulties faced by the other side, and allow, as far as possible, the Police or CAPO to deal with the viewpoints or complaints raised about the incident.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): *Police officers have the licence to beat up people. While those who were beaten up were unable to hit back or defend themselves, the Police could initiate investigations conducted by their peers. However, President, my follow-up question does not concern this aspect. Just now, I have clearly asked the Secretary whether he should shoulder some responsibilities, and whether he and Carrie LAM were in the know about the actions of the Police. If his answer is in the negative, is he conveying a message that he will continue to distance himself from the Police and let Stephen LO bear all the responsibility?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, as I have pointed out time and again, police actions were undertaken by police officers, and they have steadfastly discharged their duties in a dedicated manner. They faced difficulties in this regard, but they must take appropriate measures to ensure public safety, maintain public order, and minimize threats to life or property. I hope Members will understand that the Police have such a duty.

(Dr KWOK Ka-ki kept speaking loudly while standing)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki, please sit down.

MR WU CHI-WAI (in Cantonese): *President, the text of John LEE's reply reads: "Police officers may use minimum force as appropriate only when such an action is absolutely necessary and there are no other means to accomplish the lawful duty. Police officers shall give verbal warning prior to the use of force as far as circumstances permit, while the person(s) involved shall be given every opportunity, where practicable, to obey police orders before force is used".*

At that time, I was at Tim Mei Avenue where the Police and the crowd were some 50 to 100 ft apart. I stepped forward and requested to have a dialogue with the commander of that road section, so as to seek as far as possible a way—as stated by the Secretary—to make people leave the scene. However, not only was the relevant person-in-charge of the Police Force unwilling to have a dialogue with me, but some people fired tear gas rounds on my side. May I ask John LEE: As I am a Legislative Council Member, when the Police fired tear gas rounds at me, was such an action "absolutely necessary and there are no other means to accomplish the lawful duty"?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, the truth of each case will, upon investigation, be clear to all people, for we will collect all the facts. CAPO will make reference to and examine all evidence, including statements of the persons concerned, statements of other people, online information or evidence that can be collected in any other areas. I believe that CAPO will handle the relevant complaints in a fair and just manner, and IPCC will also examine all complaints in a fair and just manner. I will refer all complaints about the incident to IPCC and CAPO for comprehensive investigation.

MR WU CHI-WAI (in Cantonese): *President, he has not answered my question.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WU, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR WU CHI-WAI (in Cantonese): *My question is simple enough. When I was standing between the crowd and the Police at a distance of some 100 ft, I had nothing in my hands and I also identified myself, but the Police still fired tear gas rounds at me. Does this mean that my behaviour at that time made the Police believe that the situation justified the requirement that "there are no other means to accomplish the lawful duty"?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, what Mr WU said just now will certainly form part of the statement. In any investigation conducted by CAPO, statements provided by people at the scene and other people will certainly be considered and dealt with. As I have pointed out just now, as far as each complaint is concerned, IPCC members or observers will be present to ensure that statements are given in a voluntary and fair manner. These statements must be dealt with and examined when investigating individual cases.

(Mr WU Chi-wai kept speaking loudly while standing)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): The Secretary has already answered your supplementary question. If you are not satisfied with his answer, you can follow it up through other channels.

MR KENNETH LEUNG (in Cantonese): *President, Mr LEE, a letter was posted on the Internet today, which was also published in a number of newspapers. It was written by an uniformed ambulanceman of the Fire Services Department. According to him, he was trying to rescue a badly injured young person who had difficulty in breathing. The young person might be a passer-by or he might be a protester taking part in the peaceful demonstration. His identity was unknown. Although this injured young person had been carried into an ambulance by the ambulanceman and was about to be sent to the hospital, a police officer dragged him out of the ambulance and said to the ambulancemen "Don't obstruct our work". The ambulanceman wrote: "Taking off my uniform, I am just an ordinary Hong Kong people who wish to protect Hong Kong, just like everybody else in Hong Kong ... Hong Kong has degraded into a society governed by an authoritarian regime and this makes me feel distressed and frustrated!"*

My supplementary question is: President, if the above mentioned incident is true, has that police officer committed any criminal offence for obstructing another public officer from performing his duty?

Another question that I would like to ask is ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, you may only raise one supplementary question, so please sit down. Secretary, please answer.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): We certainly understand that different people were involved in each case. Thus, when CAPO conducts an investigation, it will thoroughly examine evidence involving various parties. Given the chaotic situation, there is a need to take into consideration many other objective factors. There is no doubt that CAPO will, after consolidating all the evidence in the course of investigation, come up with a fair and just judgment.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR KENNETH LEUNG (in Cantonese): *I am not lodging a complaint; I just want to know if someone has brought the case to the attention of the Bureau, will the Secretary take the initiative to conduct an investigation and institute criminal prosecution? President, it is definitely not my intention to ask about complaints against police officers.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): If anyone reports to the Police through whichever channels, follow-up actions will be taken by the Police based on the information provided.

MR LEUNG CHE-CHEUNG (in Cantonese): *President, first of all, I would like to express my condolences to people who were innocently injured in this fiasco of amending the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, including police officers, journalists and some young students.*

On 12 June, I was also present in the Legislative Council Complex and I witnessed the storming acts on that day. Originally, the majority of demonstrators were peaceful. When I arrived at the Legislative Council

Complex, it was surrounded by people who were nonetheless very calm. However, some violent confrontations broke out when it was approaching 3:00 pm. Some demonstrators started to frantically attack police officers who were protecting the Legislative Council Complex by metal poles taken from a nearby construction site, bricks dug up from pavements as well as metal barriers and even helmets. Police officers were forced to retreat to the glass panels of the Legislative Council Complex. I even witnessed a police officer falling down after being hit on the head by a brick thrown from the side.

May I ask pro-democracy colleagues sitting on the opposite side if they had seen such scenes? The Police had used appropriate force at that time—I considered the force appropriate. Had tear gas rounds not been used to disperse or "control" the crowds under such a critical situation, police officers would have nowhere to retreat, and they might not be able to protect the hundreds of staff inside the Legislative Council Complex, including colleagues of the Legislative Council Secretariat. The situation was indeed very dangerous because I saw some rioters, after being forced to retreat by the tear gas rounds, subsequently regained their foothold and charged the police cordon line repeatedly for four to five times. This is indeed very shocking. Just imagine, how can this be regarded as a peaceful demonstration?

While the Civil Human Rights Front and the pro-democracy camp claimed that it was a peaceful demonstration, they had not condemned the violent charging acts or attacks, and even demanded the release of the rioters who had violently charged the Police. I think this is tantamount to calling a stag a horse.

May I ask the Secretary if the rioters arrested in this incident will be charged for violently attacking the Police, and if the mastermind behind the acts of the rioters to violently charge the Police be prosecuted?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, I thank Mr LEUNG for his supplementary question. I strongly believe that the majority of people who joined the assembly to express their views did not endorse any acts of violence and the creation of chaos to cause injuries to the participants. I fully understand that many participants who joined the procession and assembly expressed their views in a peaceful manner. And yet, on 12 June, the Police were duty-bound to defend the cordon line at the Legislative Council Complex so as to ensure that the Complex and the staff therein would not be assaulted.

Police officers had indeed been violently treated. I hope Members will understand that we did not think that all participants who joined the procession were involved in violent acts; in fact, the majority of them had actually expressed their views in a peaceful manner. I hope that Members will understand the view of the Government in this regard.

As shown on the television screen, some people violently stormed the Legislative Council Complex on that day and attacked the Police by bricks, metal poles and metal barriers. The Police had handled such cases according to the established practice. Of course, with regard to people using violence, the Police will surely collect evidence and conduct investigation. For cases relating to the public assembly, the Police will refer them to the Department of Justice. After comprehensively examining all the evidence and considering the circumstances of the case, the Department of Justice will decide whether or not to institute prosecution. In Hong Kong, we enjoy the rights of procession, assembly and expression, and I trust that our core values will not tolerate any violence. I understand that the deficiencies in the Government's legislative amendment work had led to various conflicts, the Chief Executive and I had already extended our apology. As always, we respect Hong Kong's spirit of the rule of law and entrust the Department of Justice to, after examining all the circumstances and thoroughly considering all the environmental factors, decide whether prosecution will be instituted based on their prosecution policy.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): *President, this morning, we have spent 90 minutes on the two urgent questions and have raised more than 15 supplementary questions. Secretary John LEE's replies were simply irrelevant to the questions. He kept repeating himself, failing to answer Members' questions at all. People watching the television broadcast are very angry for they consider that the Secretary's answers are even worse than those provided by 1823 Contact Centre. If John LEE was really sincere in apologizing to Hong Kong people, he should have proactively done so at the outset of his speech, instead of tendering an apology unwillingly when asked by a Member whether he would step down. He said that since the Chief Executive had apologized, he might as well do the same. All he said in the whole morning was that police officers were discharging their duties, keeping the Legislative Council Complex safe and maintaining law and order. In other words, police officers had no choice but inevitably used force to suppress the protesters. But, is it true that they had no choice?*

According to the main reply of the Secretary, "Around 3:00 pm, the situation at the Legislative Council Complex began to deteriorate". In fact, many people doubted the authenticity of this statement. Some police officers queried why Andrew LEUNG did not announce in the first place that no meeting would be conducted for the whole day, but instead said that the meeting would be postponed to a time to be decided by him. If he had said that the meeting on that day would be adjourned, some of the protesters would have left and would not have charged the Legislative Council Complex, and the confrontation would have been avoided. In fact, President, you can answer this question. Do you think you should apologize, and do you think you should bear some responsibility for the improper arrangement made by you?

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN, you should put questions to public officers in this session.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): *OK. President, you may answer questions from the press when you go outside later. Friends of the press, please ask Andrew LEUNG this question.*

My supplementary question is the one raised by Mr Kenneth LEUNG earlier which the Secretary has not answered. At Harcourt Road, an ambulanceman carried a young man into an ambulance. The young man had multiple injuries; he could hardly breathe and was on the verge of death, but a police officer surprisingly said that the young man could not leave. He dragged the young man out of the ambulance and did not allow him to get back into it. I am not asking the Secretary whether a complaint should be lodged; I am asking him what kind of guideline is this. Do not fool me by saying that this is an individual case. The Secretary has talked wildly about television footages of people digging out bricks, pushing mills barriers, and fixing metal poles on wooden planks, but he did not comment on cases in which police officers beat people up, dragged a person out of an ambulance and prevented him from going to the hospital. May I ask John LEE whether he has adopted double standards?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, any incident of this kind should be investigated. Investigations will be conducted on the basis of statements, whether the persons concerned lodged a complaint with CAPO or reported to the Police ...

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): *President, I did not ask him about investigations. If a person, injured from beating, was in an ambulance and an ambulanceman told the Police that the man was on the verge of death and had to be sent to the hospital immediately, are there guidelines allowing police officers to drag the injured person out of the ambulance, arrest him and prevent him from going to the hospital? Are there such guidelines?*

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, that is certainly the situation described by Mr CHAN. If the Police receive any report or complaint in this regard, I will ask them to ascertain the facts and evidence in a fair and just manner before making a final decision.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): *President, I did not ask him about complaints. My question was whether the Police have any guidelines which stipulate that arresting an injured person is more important than sending him to the hospital in an ambulance. Are there such guidelines?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): I cannot comment on this case on the basis of some inadequate information. We should make a decision on the case after obtaining adequate information and conducting an investigation.

DR PRISCILLA LEUNG (in Cantonese): *President, I think many Members have already voiced the views of the protesters; and now I would like to speak on behalf of the silent majority, which includes family members of police officers who are also Hong Kong people. They would like me to ask the Secretary a question.*

Since the case of Superintendent CHU, many people would not like their family members to be police officers owing to the great pressure. In their view, even if a police officer has acted according to the guidelines, he or she would not

be protected by the law; and Superintendent CHU was not just a police officer, but a police trainer as well. Under the circumstances, the protesters or Members representing them asked ...

(Mr LAM Cheuk-ting indicated his wish to raise a point)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr Priscilla LEUNG, please hold on. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, what is your point?

MR LAM CHEUK-TING (in Cantonese): *President, may I seek an elucidation from Dr Priscilla LEUNG? Which guideline had Superintendent CHU followed when he hit pedestrians who were leaving the scene and were not committing any acts of assault? Did CAPO and the courts make a wrong decision? Dr Priscilla LEUNG is a legal scholar, will she not talk nonsense here.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr Priscilla LEUNG, you may choose whether to elucidate or not. If you do not elucidate, please continue with your question.

DR PRISCILLA LEUNG (in Cantonese): *President, I hope Mr LAM Cheuk-ting and other Members will show some respect as I ask a question on behalf of family members of police officers. If they dislike any question asked on behalf of family members of police officers, or if they think they can represent these family members, they can speak too, alright?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr Priscilla LEUNG, please put your supplementary question directly.

DR PRISCILLA LEUNG (in Cantonese): *President, I think we have heard and understood why some Members would not like a Member to ask a question on behalf of family members of police officers. There is no need for Members to be so anxious, for I have not finished putting my question and I am only voicing the views of family members.*

Family members of police officers think that the law cannot protect police officers even if they have followed the guidelines; has the Security Bureau reviewed the relevant guidelines after the case of Superintendent CHU? Is there any ambiguity in the guidelines? Family members of police officers hope that I can clearly convey the following message to the Secretary: If, after major protests, the authorities do not prosecute protesters regardless of their background, this would mean that matters which should have been handled according to the spirit of the rule of law will be handled by political means. They would rather police officers and protesters be treated in the same way by forwarding the cases of both sides to the court for fair handling.

It turns out that police officers may not be protected by the law even if they have taken actions in accordance with the requirements or the guidelines. May I ask the Secretary again whether the Security Bureau has conducted any review after the case of Superintendent CHU so that law enforcement officers can rest assured when they carry out orders according to the guidelines of the Security Bureau?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, I thank Dr Priscilla LEUNG for the supplementary question. The Police will conduct a review after every major operation and draw lessons from it.

In October 2017, the Police set up a steering committee to review different approaches and guidelines adopted by the Police in major operations. The steering committee, chaired by a Senior Assistant Commissioner of Police, was tasked with reviewing the relevant policies of using force, examining and following-up the recommendations. A working group has also been established under the steering committee, chaired by an Assistant Commissioner of Police. The working group, comprising representatives of staff members and the relevant departments, is tasked with reviewing guidelines and procedures of using force and training matters, as well as making recommendations on action strategies. After collating the views of different stakeholders and taking reference from overseas experience, the working group will report to the steering committee on areas where improvement is needed and implement the recommendations accordingly.

Reviews on guidelines and orders of using force will be conducted on a continuous basis. The Police will conduct a review after every major incident.

At the press conference, the Commissioner of Police also mentioned that the approach of handling this incident would be reviewed and lessons would be drawn from it.

Members have to understand that the Police have really encountered various challenges and difficulties, which include manpower, accoutrements deployment and communication with the media. As I said in the main reply, the Police have established a standing mechanism of media communication and it will review on the issue of protective accoutrements for police officers. Thus, my reply to Dr LEUNG is that the Police will review these matters.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr LEUNG, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

DR PRISCILLA LEUNG (in Cantonese): *The Secretary has not answered my question. After the case of Superintendent CHU, family members of police officers think that police officers may not be protected by the law even if they have followed the guidelines. Has the Security Bureau considered the matter from a legal perspective; has it drawn up a new set of clearer guidelines for the public or asked the Police to do the same so as to prevent any law enforcement officers from inadvertently breaking the law even if they believe they have enforced the law according to the guidelines?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, I thank Dr LEUNG for the supplementary question.

As I said earlier, the steering committee has all along been reviewing the orders and guidelines on using force and it will also consult the Department of Justice to ascertain whether the principles for using force adopted by the Police are consistent with the Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials adopted by the United Nations. The Police will also pay attention to the work in this regard as they conduct the review.

MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): *Mr LEUNG, yesterday, the Chief Executive gave her sincere apology to the public. But just one day later, when John LEE, the officer-in-charge, comes to the Legislative Council today, he continues to censure young protesters for being violent and say that the Police had used appropriate and proportionate force. How can his attitude convince people that the Government is truly sorry and its apology is sincere? The people will not be convinced.*

Here is my question for John LEE. In handling the Taiwan murder case, he showed his sympathy and said in sadness that justice should be done. He also told the family of the deceased that he would do his best and hoped that they could move on. But what about the young people in Admiralty? They were hurt by the Police and a young man even fell from height and sacrificed his life. Does the Secretary have any words for him? How does the Secretary feel? What will the Secretary say to the young people and their family members? Should he apologize and step down to do justice to them?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, I must reiterate that a vast majority of people joining the processions on that day or some other days were peaceful, as stated clearly in my earlier replies to different supplementary questions. However, we cannot pretend that the violent attacks shown on television did not happen. I understand the grievances of people taking to the streets and expressing their views about the anxieties, controversies and disputes caused by deficiencies of the Government in this amendment exercise, and I have already apologized for that. The Government did have deficiencies in its relevant work.

I must emphasize once again that a vast majority of protesters were peaceful. They were not those referred to by the Police or targeted by the Police. We can see on television the confrontation in the demonstration areas of the Legislative Council Complex on 12 June. This incident was covered by various news reports, and I hope that people will not put words into my mouth regarding my comments on the storming of the Complex on 12 June. Most of the protesters were peaceful in their expression of views. I understand that they were there to express their views and dissatisfaction with the Government's deficiencies in this amendment exercise. I do understand their grievances and have heard their opinions.

Yesterday, the Chief Executive also apologized to the public for this matter, saying that it was her wish to continue serving the community and to do more and do better for Hong Kong in different areas. I hope members of the public will appreciate our wish to do more and do better in supporting the Government in different areas. I also appeal for an understanding from the people. No one would love to see violence, and please understand that the Police were just performing their duties to maintain public order and ensure public safety. They were just doing what the law asked them to do. The public should not vent their dissatisfaction with the Government on the Police.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr HUI Chi-fung, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): *The Secretary has showed sympathy and sadness for the deceased in the Taiwan murder case and extended his condolences to the deceased's family. How come he dares not say a word to the young people in Admiralty? How come he dares not resign, apologize or do justice to them? Although the following question has just been put to the Secretary for more than 10 times, I must ask him once again: Will he resign, step down and apologize?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, my earlier reply was clear enough. For those who expressed their views in a peaceful and rational manner, we have heard every one of them and we have also apologized for our deficiencies in this amendment exercise. Of course, I do not want to see anyone getting hurt when they express their views, and I feel sad for the injured. However, we must understand that in a large-scale public assembly, it is the duty of the Police to minimize any potential risks while facilitating the assembly. The Police must perform their duties to ensure safety and order in large-scale public events.

MR JEFFREY LAM (in Cantonese): *President, on the whole, the 12 June protest was peaceful but a handful of protesters threw bricks, steel bars, metal poles and mills barriers, and confronted the Police. The confrontation had resulted in a number of police officers being injured. We clearly saw on television that a police officer, with blood on his face, was assaulted even when he had fallen on the ground. We should be fair to police officers who stood fast at their posts on that day. From what we saw, some protesters acted violently first and the Police took corresponding actions afterwards; the Police had not taken the initiative to act violently against the protesters.*

President, we saw on television how different places suppressed violent acts. For example, when protesters in France took to the streets and had conflicts with the Police, the police officers in a western democratic country would, after being attacked, hurl tear gas rounds at the protesters and used force to control the crowd. This approach has also been adopted in the United States and other western countries. In fact, the degree of force used by police officers in overseas countries was higher than that used by the Police in Hong Kong on that day. Why should the Police in Hong Kong be criticized for their actions? At present, many police officers have been maligned viciously and insulted with abusive language, and their personal information has even been uploaded to the Internet. This is really outrageous. As the personal information of some police officers and their family members has been publicly disclosed, they have even been harassed and their personal safety is threatened. Has the Government received their appeals for assistance or complaints? How will the Government deal with and help the affected police officers?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): *President, apart from the various posts and videos online attacking police officers, the personal information of some police officers or their relatives and friends have been publicly disclosed. I have also mentioned earlier that some people declared that they would hurt the family members of police officers, or even hurt their children at school. I believe that these actions are inappropriate and the persons concerned should not create confrontations in society as police officers are duty-bound to maintain public order and protect the lives and properties of the public.*

According to the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data, freedom of speech, free flow of information and protection of personal privacy are subject to

statutory restrictions, and factors such as the reputation and privacy of individuals, public order, etc., must be taken into account. Any person posting the personal information of others on a social platform must consider whether the relevant information is collected in a lawful and fair manner. If the collection and disclosure of personal data have led to the unlawful purposes of bully, sedition and intimidation, such acts are certainly illegal. The Police have set up a hotline for police officers to report on cyberbullying. In fact, a large number of people have been affected, including those whose personal information has been publicly disclosed. The information of more than 400 police officers and nearly 100 relatives and friends of police officers has been publicly disclosed. I hope people will understand that the work of the Police is to maintain law and order as well as the safety of Hong Kong. Police officers have stood fast at their posts and have not retreated in times of difficulty. The actions taken to combat the attacks were meant to ensure the personal safety of all those at the scene, including people working inside the Legislative Council Complex and police officers. We should consider whether the creation of confrontation in society, especially confrontation against the Police Force, will be conducive to combating criminal offences in future or maintaining the current level of public security in Hong Kong? I believe we should all think about this question. Regarding this incident, there are deficiencies of the Government in this amendment exercise. The SAR Government should undertake responsibility and we have accepted criticisms and made pledges. I hope that the public will understand that the Police discharge their duties to maintain law and order and members of the public should not vent their dissatisfaction with the Government on the Police.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LAM, Which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR JEFFREY LAM (in Cantonese): *The Police discharged their duties but their family members have been harassed. The Secretary has not answered the question about how to protect or help the affected police officers.*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): I thank Mr LAM for his question. The Police have set up a 24-hour hotline to receive the relevant information or reports. For police officers and his family members, first, the Police Force will ensure their safety; second, if they need any support, including psychological or other support, the Police Force will make concerted efforts to help them overcome difficulties and protect them.

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): *President, I have recently received a short letter from a member of the public. Let me read it out. It reads, "Hello, Mr LEUNG. I am a peaceful demonstrator outside the CITIC Tower on 12 June, and I am also one of the persons being unreasonably and violently driven away by the Police firing tear gas rounds with the intent to kill. I am the boss of a local advertising company. In response to calls in society, I staged a strike on that day and, together with colleagues of my company, attended a peaceful assembly on a voluntary basis. As many young ladies of my company joined in, we decided to go to the area at Lung Wui Road where a letter of no objection for assembly was issued to the Civil Human Rights Front. We decided to stay there, so as to ensure that my co-workers could express their discontent with the Government in a safe environment. Regrettably, we were ultimately driven away by the Police unreasonably and violently. The scene was so chaotic that the danger of a stampede might take place any time. If people at the scene had not helped each other to flee from the dangerous areas, it would not be exaggerated to say that a disaster causing great casualties would have occurred. From that day on, my colleagues and I have been haunted by the terror on that day. Some people even seem to suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder with symptoms such as nightmare, insomnia and hyperarousal. As for me, apart from feeling indignant, I am also saddened. I believe that society cannot accept the saying that the Police were 'restraint in law enforcement' and their acts were 'perfectly justified'. Having learnt that you were also at the scene on that day, I urge Honourable Members to pursue those who should be held accountable for the seriousness of the incident. If the Police are not ultimately brought to book for their abuse of power and excessive use of weapons, the situation of the Police having excessive power, IPCC being incapable, and the Police and IPCC harbouring each other will go from bad to worse in the days to come; and members of the public will not be duly protected in Hong Kong in future."*

President, the content of the letter runs exactly counter to the Secretary's reply today. One paragraph of the Secretary's reply reads, "The Police shall, based on the circumstances at the scene, make assessments and exercise professional judgment to take appropriate actions, which include using necessary force in a bid to ensure public safety and public order." President, contrary to the content of the reply, the Police took inappropriate actions, used unnecessary force, and failed to ensure public safety and public order. For this reason, I join that member of the public to ask the Secretary if anyone should be held responsible for the incident. And, if the Police are not ultimately brought to book for their abuse of power and excessive use of force, should and can Hong Kong people be accorded the proper protection of their lives and properties if they demonstrate peacefully, given that the Secretary said just now that many people who joined the procession and assembly were peaceful?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): The first few lines of my reply to the first urgent question are as follows: In the morning of 12 June there was a peaceful assembly to be held outside the Legislative Council Complex originally. At around 8:00 am, a large number of people in mask suddenly rushed out to Lung Wo Road, Tim Mei Avenue, Queensway and Harcourt Road in an organized manner, occupying the roads, blocking the traffic and disrupting social order. As there were citizens being trapped inside a tunnel at Lung Wo Road, Police Negotiators were deployed, with the incident lasting for eight hours. Roads were congested and blocked, which nearly paralysed the traffic. The Police maintained a high degree of tolerance. Around 3:00 pm, the situation outside the Legislative Council Complex began to deteriorate, when demonstrators mainly at the front continuously charged towards the police cordon line violently. In my replies to the supplementary questions of other Members, I mentioned some violent attacks in front of the demonstration area of the Legislative Council Complex. The Police then retreated some 100 m to the demonstration area outside the Legislative Council Complex, with the hope of mitigating the attacks through a continuous retreat, but demonstrators continued to attack police officers, including hurling bricks, metal poles, wooden planks and mills barriers.

I would like to state clearly, as I said in the first sentence of my main reply, there was a peaceful assembly to be held outside the Legislative Council Complex originally. In my replies to various Members just now, I have also reiterated that most of the participants were not involved in violent acts. The cordon line set up by the Police in front of the Legislative Council Complex was

mainly to safeguard the Complex and persons therein. I believe Members have watched such attacks on television, and I do not intend to describe again what happened back then.

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

For those who are not involved in violent acts but merely exercise their freedom of speech and freedom of assembly, the Government will show its respect, and the Police will provide them with convenience as far as possible. This was the case with large-scale processions in the past, where people expressed their views in a peaceful and orderly manner. We have heard people's views, and the Chief Executive offered her public apology yesterday. I hope people will know that we have acknowledged our deficiencies. Following the conclusion of each large-scale event, the Police will invariably draw on their experience, with the hope that in dealing with similar incidents in future, they will be able to do a better job in terms of accoutrements, approach and communication with the crowd and media. The Police will pay heed to the relevant situations when drawing on their experience. The investigation into any incident will invariably be conducted by CAPO in a fair and just manner. As far as the incident is concerned, CAPO has set up a special team to deal with the relevant complaints on a priority basis and in a fair and just manner. For example, during the statement-taking or investigation process, IPCC members or observers will be present to ensure fairness and justice. I hope that Members will allow the relevant cases to be dealt with by CAPO and IPCC.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, the Secretary has kept repeating his message like a "human tape recorder" just now. He has failed to address the core of my question.*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, please point out directly the part of your supplementary question that has not been answered.

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): *The core of my question is not about the locations he mentioned, but he evaded my question and merely raised other issues. Members of the public and I are concerned about people who assembled at Lung Wui Road, a location covered by the letter of no objection issued to the Civil Human Rights Front. At that time, apart from me, many colleagues assembled at that place. Since we were having a peaceful assembly, why did the Police abuse their power and hurl tear gas rounds to disperse the crowd? The Secretary has failed to answer my ...*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, you have clearly pointed out the part of your supplementary question that has not been answered.

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): *... Given the abuse of police power, how can the Police ensure the personal safety of people in future? If the relevant police officers are not brought to book, how can the Police ensure that people can participate safely in peaceful assemblies in future?*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, you have clearly pointed out the part on which an elucidation is sought. Please stop speaking. Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, as I have explained just now, the Police will draw on their experience after handling any large-scale event. In any event, the Police will take into account the personal safety of all people. However, if a handful of people in a large crowd stir up chaos, such chaos can easily extend to other locations. Under such circumstances, the Police must take actions to minimize chaos, and minimize the impacts on public safety and public order. As for the approach and accoutrements of the Police, we have fully considered the approach and accoutrements of foreign governments in handling similar incidents. In my reply to Dr Priscilla LEUNG just now, I said that the Police might, in their review, consult the Department of Justice about the guidelines on operation or other matters, so as to determine whether an appropriate approach had been adopted from the legal perspective. I believe that the Police will handle all the issues seriously.

MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, to put it simply, the Police shot protesters in their eyes and bashed them in the head. They have become addicted to beating up journalists, students and members of the public. It is well evident that the Hong Kong Police Force treats human lives as if they were worthless.*

Attending the Legislative Council meeting today, John LEE has been pretending to be submissive and has dissociated himself from the operation of the Police, claiming that he trusted and understood the frontline commanders and police officers concerned. The decision made by them back then was simply made at the behest of Secretary John LEE himself. Despite being repeatedly asked by a number of Members if he would step down, he has shied away from answering the questions. His supervisor Carrie LAM apologized publicly yesterday. When we asked him to bow, apologize and step down just now, he simply pretended to be submissive, slurred his replies and refrained from answering any questions.

Deputy President, it is very difficult for us not to get angry. At present, the fact before us is that the Secretary has suggested that we lodge complaints with CAPO and he has requested journalists to wear press cards in order to avoid being beaten. Have the officers of the Special Tactical Squad displayed their identification numbers, warrant cards or other form of identification? Even officers of the Criminal Investigation Department, etc. cannot be identified. Yet, the Secretary has asked us to lodge complaints.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr KWONG, please raise your supplementary question directly.

MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): *I know that the Secretary will, at the request of his supervisor, endure whatever criticisms directed against him now, so as to avoid disrupting peace in society. I will no longer ask the Secretary to step down, apologize and bow to the public because he has given the same reply while responding to over 10 supplementary questions just now; he has been acting like a tape recorder.*

Deputy President, I now ask one question which the Secretary should be able to answer. First, will frontline police officers display their police identification numbers, identification documents and warrant cards in future?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr KWONG, you have raised your supplementary question.

MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): *In addition ...*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): You may only ask one supplementary question.

MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): *... Will the Secretary disclose the information on police officers deployed on 12 June for Members to follow up?*

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, the uniforms of police officers for performing day-to-day duties are known to all; and the uniforms and accoutrements of police officers in various work units are all distributed by the Hong Kong Police Force respectively. The Police Force will try its best to cooperate with the investigation of CAPO and IPCC and will submit all information to CAPO for follow-up actions.

In response to the various complaints in the past, CAPO had taken action to investigate whether the acts of the people involved in the complaints complied with the established guidance and requirements of the Police. Hence, we should refer all complaints to CAPO for comprehensive investigation to be conducted. As I also told Members just now, CAPO has set up a designated team to accord priority to handling the complaints in this respect.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr KWONG Chun-yu, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered? You may only ask one follow-up question.

MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, the Secretary appeared to be panic-stricken while giving his reply just now. My "brothers" have shed blood and got injured in the incident. I would like to ask the Secretary if the Special Tactical Squad will carry identification documents, identification numbers and warrant cards in future, and whether he will submit the information on the police officers deployed on 12 June to the Legislative Council.*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr KWONG, you have clearly stated the part of the question for which you request a follow-up.

MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): *Although I asked the Secretary in a very calm manner, he failed to answer my question. Deputy President, please let me add one point. While the Secretary asked us to lodge complaints, we do not even have the identification numbers of the relevant police officers. Secretary, where can we get the police identification numbers? Please do not read from your script again! You have already repeated three times!*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr KWONG, your question is very clear. Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): The Police keep all information on the identity, uniforms and attendance records of all police officers. According to internal requirements, the Special Tactical Squad is equipped with specific accoutrements and uniforms. In light of the actual needs, the Police Force will require its forces to implement the relevant requirements. When investigating complaints, CAPO will refer to the information on the police officers deployed on that day. Based on previous investigation experience, CAPO will examine all the information to ensure that investigation is conducted in the fairest and most impartial manner.

(Mr KWONG Chun-yu indicated his wish to ask a follow-up question)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr KWONG, you have asked your follow-up question, and the Secretary has also provided additional information in his reply. I know that you are dissatisfied with the answer, but please follow up the matter on other occasions. This has been the established practice of the Legislative Council. Please stop speaking.

(Mr KWONG Chun-yu continued to indicate his wish to ask a follow-up question)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Traditionally, Members may only ask one question as a follow-up to their supplementary question.

(Mr KWONG Chun-yu continued to indicate his wish to ask a follow-up question)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr KWONG, please ask your question expeditiously.

MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, to put it simply, the Secretary has apparently tried to protect the information of police officers. How come the authorities failed to protect the information of patients? We do not even know which police officers were deployed on that day. Just now, the Secretary completely failed to answer the question of whether he will provide the information to the Legislative Council.*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr KWONG, this is not a debate session. Please stop speaking.

DR HELENA WONG (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, I was once a member of IPCC. We have pointed out many times in IPCC that police officers must wear uniforms showing their identification numbers when they discharged duties in major operations. Does the Secretary know whether identification numbers are displayed on the uniforms, including helmets, of the Special Tactical Squad provided by the Police Force? We could hardly identify the police officers on*

that day. As police officers put on gas masks to hurl tear gas rounds, they looked like objects in black without any marking for identification. Given the Police's decision, does the Secretary know that members of the public cannot identify the police officers concerned and are therefore unable to lodge complaints? Does the Secretary endorse this practice?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, this is the internal operation of the Police Force. Regarding the uniform and accoutrements of the Special Tactical Squad, I do not have the information in hand. If Members wish to obtain such information, they may first ...

(Mr James TO stood up and spoke loudly)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr James TO, please stop speaking.

(Mr James TO spoke loudly while standing)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr TO, please stop speaking. Secretary, please continue with your reply.

(Mr James TO kept speaking loudly while standing)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr TO, please stop speaking. Secretary, please continue with your reply.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): The internal operation of the Police Force is its own ...

(Mr Dennis KWOK indicated his wish to raise a point of order)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, please hold on. Mr Dennis KWOK, what is your point of order?

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, as the Secretary is replying to a very important question, can we suspend the meeting so that he can obtain the information required? How come police officers had no identification while they discharged their duties? This is a very crucial point.*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr KWOK, I understand your proposal, but that is not a point of order.

Secretary, do you need additional time for preparing the response to Member's question? Do you request to suspend the meeting to get the supplementary information? Secretary, please respond.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): I need to obtain the information in this regard from the Police. Certainly, I can provide the information to Members after the meeting because I do not have the information they request right now.

(Mr James TO indicated his wish to raise a point of order)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, please hold on. Mr James TO, what is your point of order?

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, if the Secretary needs, say, 30 minutes to obtain the information, since we have already spent two hours on these two urgent questions today for the purpose of clarifying the facts in one go, I hope the Deputy President will give the Secretary sufficient time—say, 30 minutes—to obtain the relevant information. If the Secretary fails to obtain the information required within 30 minutes, I think he is just putting us off.*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr TO, this is an issue about meeting arrangement. Just now I have already asked the Secretary if he needed additional time or if he requested that the meeting be suspended so that he could get more information to respond to Members' questions.

Secretary, please respond.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): The information in this regard is related to the internal operation and accoutrements of the Police, which may be provided to Members by the Police after the meeting.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr Helena WONG, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

DR HELENA WONG (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, just now I asked the Secretary whether he knew if the uniforms provided by the Police to the Special Tactical Squad had any identification tag. According to our observation at the scene, no identification tag was displayed on the uniform in question. My questions to the Secretary are: Is he aware of this practice of the Police and does he endorse the act because such a practice breaches IPCC's guidelines. Moreover, since the officers concerned did not display their identification numbers ...*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr WONG, you have pointed out clearly the part of your supplementary question that has not been answered.

DR HELENA WONG (in Cantonese): *... we could not possibly identify them and lodge complaints. Also, many members of the public were also worried whether such officers were actually members of the People's Liberation Army who had merely changed their hoods ...*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr WONG, please stop speaking. You have already asked a supplementary question, and now you can only ask the Secretary to respond to the follow-up issue. Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I have nothing to add.

(Mr IP Kin-yuen indicated his wish to raise a point of order)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr IP Kin-yuen, what is your point of order?

MR IP KIN-YUEN (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, the Secretary said that the information requested was internal to the Police. At the moment, he was not going to ask the Police for the information, but he might provide the information to us after the meeting. I do not know why the time factor is so important. Why do we have to wait for the provision of the information after the meeting? If information can be obtained after the meeting, why not obtain the information now? I think the Legislative Council should make this very important request, i.e. the Secretary should immediately provide the relevant information.*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr IP Kin-yuen, this is a matter of meeting arrangement rather than a point of order. Earlier, I directly sought the Secretary's view on this issue. Should the Secretary need additional time and request me to suspend the meeting, I will, in the capacity as the Deputy President, seriously consider the request. However, given that the Secretary has not made the request, the meeting should thus proceed.

(Mr James TO indicated his wish to raise a point of order)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr James TO, what is your point of order?

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): *In my opinion, since so many colleagues wish to get hold of the relevant information expeditiously, and if the information is readily available, I—but not the Secretary—request the Deputy President to suspend the meeting for 30 minutes, so as to allow some time for the Secretary to gather the information. There are still close to 17 Members waiting to ask supplementary questions, and I am also waiting to ask a question in this regard.*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): This is not a point of order, but I understand that Members are very concerned about this issue. Secretary, do you need a suspension of meeting, so that you and your colleagues can have

additional time to obtain more information to respond to Members' questions? Your response is crucial to my consideration for a suspension of meeting. Secretary, may I have your response?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, regarding the information required by Members, I think it may be answered by the Police directly. I do not have such information in hand. Also, such information is internal to the Police, thus the decision on how to handle the information must be made by the Police.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Since Members are so concerned about such information, it will be conducive to the proceeding of this Council if the Secretary asks your fellow colleagues to gather the relevant information while the meeting is in progress. I hope the Secretary will handle the matter in a multi-pronged manner.

(Mr CHU Hoi-dick indicated his wish to raise a point of order)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, what is your point of order?

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, the Secretary said that the information requested by Members was internal to the Police, so Mr James TO asked him if he could obtain the information from the Police within 30 minutes. However, the Secretary did not positively answer if he could obtain the information from the Police.*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I have already sought the Secretary's views on Members' proposal, and advised the Secretary to ask his fellow colleagues to collect the relevant information. I think the Secretary has already responded clearly to Members' concerns. The meeting shall proceed.

Dr Elizabeth QUAT, please state your question.

(Mr Jeremy TAM indicated his wish to raise a point)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Jeremy TAM, what is your point?

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, since the Secretary has reiterated that only the Police can answer the questions, would it be more desirable for us to suspend the meeting for 30 minutes so that you can ask Mr Stephen LO to attend the meeting to answer the questions raised just now? Every Member has raised the same question: Why wasn't there any identification number on police uniforms? An officer of the Criminal Investigation Department has even claimed that plainclothes officers are not required to show their warrant card if they are wearing a police vest. Is that really the case? In response to the questions raised by Members just now, the Secretary has reiterated that he would ask the Police to provide the relevant information after the meeting. What is the reason for not asking the representative of the Police to attend the meeting now?*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr TAM, you have clearly expressed your view. Please stop speaking.

I asked the Secretary just now to expeditiously gather the relevant information in response to Members' views. At present, a number of Members are still waiting for their turn to speak. If time allows, I believe that the Secretary will inform Members after acquiring the up-to-date information. I have just directly consulted the Secretary on the suggestion to suspend the meeting, but the Secretary has not indicated that he needed additional time to gather the relevant information.

As to which public officer will answer Members' question, I believe that, after getting an understanding of the views expressed by Members just now, the Secretary will make arrangement for other public officers to respond if he considers it necessary to do so.

Dr Elizabeth QUAT, please ask your question.

(Mr James TO and a number of Members chanted repeatedly: "Down with John LEE!")

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please stop shouting.

(Mr James TO kept chanting repeatedly: "Down with John LEE!")

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr James TO, please stop shouting. I am giving you a warning.

(Mr James TO still kept chanting repeatedly: "Down with John LEE!")

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr James TO, please stop shouting.

(Mr James TO kept chanting and a number of Members talked loudly in their seats)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr Elizabeth QUAT, please raise your question.

DR ELIZABETH QUAT (in Cantonese): *How can I ask my question when it is so noisy?*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr James TO, I warn you for the second time. Please stop shouting.

(Mr James TO and a number of Members kept yelling repeatedly: "Down with John LEE!")

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please remain calm. The atmosphere of the meeting is relatively tense now. Dr Elizabeth QUAT, please raise your question.

(A number of Members still kept chanting repeatedly: "Down with John LEE!")

DR ELIZABETH QUAT (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, they are so noisy that it is impossible for me to raise my question. Will you please ask them to keep quiet and respect other Members who intend to ask a question?*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Members please keep quiet. I have just dealt with a point of order raised by a Member. However, since it is almost 2:00 pm now and the Secretary has been answering Members' questions for a long time since this morning, I will now suspend the meeting for a while. On the one hand, Members may calm down so that the meeting can resume to normal; on the other hand, I hope that the Secretary will try his best to gather the information requested by Members in the meantime.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now suspend the meeting.

1:51 pm

Meeting suspended.

2:16 pm

Council then resumed.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Council resumes. I remind Members that you did not always get a satisfactory reply from public officers in the past question sessions. I urge Members to raise questions in the usual manner to keep the meeting going. As I notice, the atmosphere in the Council is tense for the moment, but I hope our meeting will proceed smoothly, so that members of the public can grasp the actual situation. The meeting now continues.

Dr Elizabeth QUAT, please ask your question.

DR ELIZABETH QUAT (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, many people took to the streets on 9 and 12 June to express their views in a peaceful and rational manner, which was worthy of our respect. Yet, some of them violently charged towards the Police after the procession, attacking police officers with bricks, metal poles, mills barriers, and so on. These people were not unarmed. The Police were thus obliged to maintain and restore law and order. I have never seen any better ways in other countries for the Police to handle the same situation. Unfortunately, Hong Kong is now so ill that it is filled with hatred, with frontline police officers being caught in the cross-fire when performing their duties, being personally attacked and doxxed. Their family members and children are also intimidated and bullied. Some people even claim that they will hound the children of police officers to death. Many police wives told me in tears that they, as mothers, are deeply worried about the safety of their children. Some police officers are even afraid that they will be politically oppressed. Here, I would like to ask the Government: Were there unlawful assemblies on 9 and 12 June? Will frontline police officers be prosecuted for handling unlawful assemblies according to the law? How can the Government boost the morale of the Police?*

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I thank Dr QUAT for the question. As explained in my earlier replies to different Members, the cordon line set up to protect the Legislative Council Complex on 12 June was violently charged. I have in hand some news summaries reporting how the Police were charged at that time. According to the description of certain reporters, some protesters piled up loads of bricks on the road, some carried bricks with them when moving towards the police cordon line, and some hurled bricks. The Police, who were under attack, retreated to the entrance of the Legislative Council Complex but the attacks continued. The Police must hence take action to ensure public safety and order. During the lawful performance of duties, police officers are bound by the law and, at the same time, protected by the law. They are required to take appropriate action and use reasonable force to handle the situation when performing their duties according to the law.

Noting that the family members of police officers, particularly their children, have fallen prey to doxxing and cyberbullying, the Police will definitely take the necessary action to protect our officers and, especially, their family members. As I just said, these doxxers are likely to have violated the law. The Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data has already made a statement in this

regard to call on the people to stop doxxing. I repeat once again: The Police are required to take appropriate action to protect the personal safety of individuals and safeguard public order in case of violent attacks.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr QUAT, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

DR ELIZABETH QUAT (in Cantonese): *My questions for the Secretary are: Were there unlawful assemblies on 9 and 12 June? Will police officers be prosecuted for handling unlawful assemblies according to the law? The Secretary has not answered my supplementary questions directly.*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr QUAT, you have already clarified the issues that you want a direct answer from the Secretary. Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Any attacks on the Police are certainly against the law. If police officers must take action to combat the attacks, they are just discharging their duties.

(Dr Elizabeth QUAT indicated that her supplementary question had not been answered)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr QUAT, we had the same arrangement for the question session in the past. You were specific in asking your question and the Secretary had responded as he thought fit.

Mr Andrew WAN, please ask your question.

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, Cantonese people have a saying that "a person will not weep until he sees the coffin" and the remark made by the Secretary precisely shows that our Government "will not weep even when it sees the coffin". Not only has the Secretary not wept, he has even continued to respond to the Legislative Council in a pretentious and generalized*

manner in a bid to divert our attention. In my opinion, the only thing that the Secretary should feel gratified is that "there is nothing better than having a genuine friend in life" as some pro-establishment Members dared to talk nonsense. Just now, I heard a number of pro-establishment colleagues say that the Police had seemingly obtained some concrete evidence, and with supporting evidence from many news reports, footages, photographs and Members present at the meeting, the conclusion drawn was that the Police were not well armed on that day. Should the Police be adequately armed as in the "4 June massacre"?

Furthermore, a Member suggested that we should act in accordance with the law. Deputy President, this is exactly the issue under discussion. Why did the Police not act in accordance with the law? We have never thought that unlawful acts are justified, nor has anyone said that bullying is right. Will Members please do not be too generalized by focusing merely on the few inadvertent or occasionally exaggerated messages on the Internet, which vowed to bully the family members of police officers. Bullying is definitely not right and I can tell Members that bullying is not right, but is it right for the Police to blatantly ill-treat members of the public and snipe at them?

Deputy President, just now colleagues have said very clearly that our discussion today is about whether the Police have enforced the law unlawfully. Acts of opening fire without displaying any warning banner, opening fire without warning, opening fire at the unarmed public, frantically firing tear gas rounds or shooting people in their head had all violated the requirement of the Police General Orders on the use of minimal force. In the course of it, many colleagues ...

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WAN, please state your supplementary question directly.

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): *I get it, Deputy President, just now many colleagues also put their questions in a very detailed manner. I need to describe what I saw before putting a question to the Secretary.*

We saw a large number of police officers at the scene. Members of the Special Tactical Squad and ordinary police officers of the Criminal Investigation Department wearing vests had no police identification number or police warrant card. When Mr Jeremy TAM and I questioned them, they replied "When I say I

am a police officer, I am a police officer". That is outrageous. I also witnessed at the CITIC Tower police officers pointing their guns at people leaving the scene, and frantically beating up young people while they were leaving the scene. Why did the Secretary still try to argue and deny?

Deputy President, my supplementary question is very simple. As I said earlier on, when a group of demonstrators were beaten up by some self-proclaimed police officers whose identities could not be verified as they did not have identification numbers and warrant cards, if these demonstrators used various means to protect themselves for self-defence or other reasons, will they be prosecuted?

Furthermore, Deputy President, just now I put forward a bunch of questions which are very simple, so will the Secretary please stop digressing from the question. Earlier on, Mr WU Chi-wai put a question to the Secretary, but the Secretary said that he would not comment on individual cases. I am not asking the Secretary to comment on individual cases now; I just want to ask a question concerning the above mentioned scenarios. Regarding acts of opening fire without forewarning or displaying warning banners; hurling incessantly tear gas rounds within a short distance at crowds who were leaving the scene, which had almost caused a stampede round the CITIC Tower; or sniping at demonstrators who were leaving the scene as if it was some kind of hunting or firing practice, will such acts violate the law if they are substantiated? Will the Secretary take disciplinary action or pursue criminal responsibility?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, when the Commissioner of Police met with the press on 13 June, he had already pointed out that before taking any action, especially the use of force, the Police had already repeatedly displayed warning banners and issued warnings, including verbal warnings. Thus, warnings had been issued by the Police before the use of force, and it could be seen on television that the Police did display warning banners.

The Police will, in accordance with the established practice, issue warnings before the use of force so that the people concerned will stop their violent acts; and if they stop violently attacking the Police, there is no need for the Police to use force. On 12 June, the Police's actions and use of force against the people were essential after repeated warnings had been issued.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WAN, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, the Secretary still has not answered my supplementary question but continued to give generalized reply. My question is a specific example, so he should stop saying that warning banners had been displayed. I am certainly aware that warning banners had been displayed, but what I asked is, regardless of whether ...*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WAN, please point out the part of your supplementary question which has not been answered.

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): *... from what was shown on television or from what I saw with my own eyes, if police officers had done what I have just described, that is, opening fire without warning, attacking demonstrators who were leaving the scene, which included sniping repeatedly for at least three times according to what I witnessed, or beating up demonstrators, had they violated the Police General Orders? Are these misconduct of police officers? Will they assume criminal liabilities?*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WAN ...

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): *... stop shirking responsibility onto the lower tiers. Is the Secretary aware that ...*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): You have clearly pointed out the question requiring direct response from the Secretary. Please stop speaking.

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): *... Deputy President, do you know what members of the public said lately? Let me add one last remark ...*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WAN, you have clearly pointed out the question requiring elucidation from the Secretary. Secretary, do you have any response?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, what the Member said just now were some allegations, which certainly require investigation. I will therefore ask CAPO to, upon receipt of these allegations or complaints, collect evidence and find out what had actually happened and the reasons for that. We will handle these cases in a fair and just manner.

MR HOLDEN CHOW (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, we certainly understand that not all demonstrators had taken part in the violent charging acts on 12 June. Yet, some demonstrators did take part in the violent attacks on that day. We all saw clearly on television that some demonstrators charged towards the Police by hurling bricks and metal poles. We also saw that the Police had, in the face of the violent charging acts of demonstrators who hurled bricks and metal poles, retreated all the way to the glass panels of the Legislative Council Complex. When the Police could retreat no further, they had no choice but to use appropriate force to disperse people who were violently charging.*

Deputy President, I just want to say that in the past few days, many people from different strata of society, which certainly include families of police officers, reflected to us that during the riot on that day (12 June), police officers had to risk their lives discharging their duties. Just think, if the police officers on duty on that day were members of your families, will you worry about them? On that day, when families of police officers and many members of the public saw the riot scenes on television, they were indeed very anxious.

I trust that no Hong Kong people would wish to see anyone get hurt, therefore I want to say something on behalf of the police officers who risked their lives on that day in all fairness through this platform today.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHOW, please state your supplementary question directly.

MR HOLDEN CHOW (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, my supplementary question is: Given that police officers had to discharge their duties risking their lives in the face of violent attacks such as hurling bricks, may I ask the Bureau, on the question of whether there were someone masterminding behind the violent charging acts or riots on 12 June, how will the Police deal with the case and hold the persons responsible? As the incident has aroused the concern of Hong Kong people over the overall public security and order, especially what police officers should do when they face other charging acts and life-threatening conditions while on duty in the future, I therefore wish to clearly ask the Secretary about the handling of such incidents.*

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I thank Mr CHOW for the question. With regard to the deliberate violent charging acts, the deliberate use of violence to inflict bodily harm on other people or the performance of dangerous acts, the Police will surely conduct investigations. As reflected from television footage or press reports, some people had taken premeditated actions on that day by prying up bricks from the pavements and moving them to the scene, while other people had seized metal poles from a construction site and brought them to the police cordon line. We will certainly combat these deliberate violent acts in accordance with the laws of Hong Kong. Although a vast majority of assembly participants were peaceful and did not involve in any violent acts, Members could see clearly from television broadcast or clips on the Internet that the charging acts were violent.

Before I came to the Legislative Council this morning, I watched a news footage of a foreign media—I believe Members also consider foreign news footages more impartial—which recorded the moment when some people deliberately staged violent charging acts and attacked police officers in the demonstration area of the Legislative Council Complex. Members may also watch the footage on the Internet. With regard to these acts, we will certainly act in accordance with the law. Under such a difficult situation, the Police had still faithfully performed their duties and risked their lives to stand fast at their post. Of course, we will consider how the matter should actually be followed up based on the evidence collected by the Police and subsequently referred to the Department of Justice.

MR IP KIN-YUEN (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, this incident has seriously tarnished the image of the Police. As a matter of fact, the image of the Police had been very good in the past. According to a public opinion poll conducted by the University of Hong Kong after the reunification, the satisfaction rate had once reached as high as 64.8%. However, it dropped to 22% before the two recent mass processions. I trust that the image of the Police would be further tattered by this incident.*

The Police's image is built on the behavior and performance of police officers. If the Police had behaved responsibly and satisfactorily, I believe their image would have been better. However, the problem was very serious this time, and I think the Secretary or even the entire Government should face squarely.

In the main reply, the Secretary pointed out that the demonstration was largely peaceful and problems only arose around 3:00 pm. Many Members only mentioned the chaotic situation at that moment, but was silent on the fact that no violence had been committed by demonstrators at other times.

Can the Secretary please tell us clearly how long the violent acts which occurred at around 3:00 pm lasted? During which period of time and in which geographical location did the violent acts occur? Did the violent acts occur in the tiny area outside the Legislative Council Complex? If so, should the shooting or firing of tear gas rounds be confined to that period of time and that location in a bid to disperse people using violence? Or, were the actions not confined to that particular period of time and location with the intent to disperse the peaceful demonstrators? Should peaceful assembly participants be treated in these ways? I would like the Secretary to clearly point out the time slot and the geographical location of the violent acts, and why the Police used force beyond that time slot and geographical location. Will the Secretary conduct an investigation of the whole incident by, for example, setting up an independent committee of enquiry?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, on that day, the most critical and serious violent charging acts occurred near the Legislative Council Complex, particularly around the cordon line set up by the Police to protect the people therein. As I mentioned just now, when the Police dealt with large-scale public events, they had to consider the fact that the chaos and attacks*

at a certain hotspot could easily spread to other places. Therefore, the Commissioner of Police had called on the crowds to leave as the situation might become chaotic and spread to other places.

As to what had happened in individual location, we certainly need to consolidate all the information before any judgment can be made. And yet, the violent charging acts mainly occurred outside the Legislative Council Complex on that day, just as I have mentioned earlier on. The Police had already called on the crowds to leave the dangerous place at that time, and the Commissioner of Police had also publicly called on members of the public not to go to Admiralty and leave the place where serious incidents might take place at any time. The earlier they left the scene, the better. If the crowds continued to gather, the tense atmosphere might spread. Therefore, the Police took action to urge the crowds to leave the scene, and it was necessary to take such action to ensure public safety and order.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr IP, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered. Please point out.

MR IP KIN-YUEN (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, the Secretary obviously has not answered my supplementary question. I asked the Secretary on which locations the violent charging acts occurred and whether the Police had used excessive force at the same location. Had the Police extended the use of force to the entire Admiralty to deal with the demonstrators? I think this is a critical question. Can the Secretary give a clear reply?*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, as the actual situation of different location was different, the changes might vary greatly, the Police will thus take this into account when they look into or conduct an evaluation of the incident. If anyone is not satisfied with the action taken by the Police at a certain location, he can surely lodge a complaint. We will look into the actual situation at the scene and deal with the relevant complaint.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): *First of all, I would like to urge Mr Holden CHOW, the first person to piggyback on the Taiwan murder case to push through the China extradition bill, not to evade responsibilities anymore. He should immediately step forward to apologize to the public and the family members of the deceased.*

The problem is that the Government and pro-establishment Members are still seemingly unable to understand why the Police are detested by the public. There are actually two reasons. First, some "black cops" have abused power. It is true that the protesters hurled objects, but it does not mean that police officers could beat, kick and punch the protesters after they were being suppressed. Second, senior government officials such as John LEE, Teresa CHENG and Carrie LAM and the supervisors of the Police are incompetent rascals. They refused to step down after the incident. I do not intend to ask John LEE to drop dead but I hope that he will learn from Mrs Regina IP. He must have the integrity and guts to bear responsible for the incident. He should not hurt Hong Kong anymore. He should try to step back and think from a broader perspective.

My supplementary question is: Stephen LO mentioned at a press meeting the night before yesterday that 32 people were arrested for the 12 June incident and five of them were involved in riots. Yet, the Secretary mentioned in the main reply that the offences committed by these 32 people included behaving in a disorderly manner in a public place, unlawful assembly, assaulting police officer, etc. At present, Hong Kong people objected to the Government's categorization of the 12 June assembly as a riot and the Government's prosecution of protesters for the offence of riot. Can the Secretary explain whether the content of the main reply mean that the judgment of the authorities is different from the judgment made by Stephen LO the night before yesterday, i.e. among the 32 people arrested on 12 June, will some others be prosecuted for the offence of riot?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, when the Commissioner of Police met with the press on 17 June, he said that 15 people were arrested on that day for various offences, and five of them were arrested on suspicion of rioting. However, after the Police have completed the investigation on any person, they will hand over the evidence to the Department of Justice for examination. The Commissioner of Police has also said that there are stringent evidence requirements for conviction of riot.

I noticed that in a media interview, a barrister talked about the elements involved in the offence of riot. He mentioned that assembly participants who were purely bystanders should have no risk and the offence of riot did not involve absolute liability. Hence, the prosecution must prove that a defendant's intentions and actions meet the definition of the offence of riot before initiating prosecution. The protesters who were purely watching the charging acts should not be prosecuted for the offence of riot. This was the explanation given by the legal professional during the interview.

Of course, the Police will collect evidence in the course of investigation. As regards the criminal offence committed by a person, evidence will be submitted to the Department of Justice so as to examine whether there is sufficient evidence and what the facts are before determining whether prosecution will be initiated or not. If prosecution will be initiated, the Department of Justice will also determine the offence for which the person will be prosecuted.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): *The Secretary has not answered my question.*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHU, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): *I notice that "the offence of riot" was obviously not mentioned in his written reply today but the offence of unlawful assembly was mentioned. Does the Secretary mean to say that he is not sure about Stephen LO's statement the night before yesterday that five people were involved in the offence of riot? He has not answered the question clearly.*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHU, you have clearly stated the point that you asked the Secretary to clarify, please sit down.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): *The main reply has not mentioned this point.*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, it is mentioned in my main reply that the offences involved included behaving in a disorderly manner in a public place, unlawful assembly, assaulting police officer, etc. I have not listed all the offences but this is not inconsistent with the remark made by the Commissioner of Police.

MR CHAN HAK-KAN (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, I saw that most of the demonstrations on 12 June were peaceful, but it was true that acts of violence and storming had occurred, resulting in police officers and ordinary citizens getting hurt. This is the situation that no one wishes to see.*

Pan-democratic colleagues have displayed many pictures showing the law enforcement actions taken by the Police, but they have not mentioned the other side of the story, that is, protesters charged towards the Police with bricks and metal poles. To be objective and comprehensive, one should tell both sides of the story. I have in hand a picture captured from live broadcast on television, showing protesters throwing bricks at the Police. This is also an irrefutable fact.

On the day of 12 June, I was in the Legislative Council Complex. From early in the morning till 2:30 pm, the protest was very peaceful and the Police were only guarding their cordon lines. However, around 3:00 pm, I heard in my office someone shouting through a loudspeaker, "1, 2, 3, charge" and "1, 2, 3, charge again". Obviously, they intended to break the police cordon lines. I also saw the Police keep retreating under wave after wave of charging by protesters.

I understand that the Police set up cordon lines before the Legislative Council Complex to ensure the safety of Members, colleagues of the Secretariat and assistants of Members therein. The Police would not use force if protesters did not charge at them. If protesters did not use violence against the Police, the Police would not combat with force. I would like to ask the Secretary to confirm this point in front of the public.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, thank you Mr CHAN. When handling any incident, the Police will certainly respond to the situations they are faced with. We all know that assemblies are often held in Hong Kong and no incidents had happened over the years because the assemblies had all been peaceful and orderly. However, on that day, someone with ulterior motives deliberately stirred up troubles and attacked the Police using bricks dug up from pavements, metal poles taken from construction sites, and wooden planks transported from elsewhere. These did not happen by chance. People deliberately attacked the Police violently and charged their cordon lines. After the Police had retreated repeatedly in the hope of reducing the attacks but to no avail and the attacks continued, they had to take action. As we can see from previous peaceful and orderly demonstrations and processions, the Police would, in their course of actions, make their best effort to facilitate protesters in expressing their views. Hence, I call upon all participants of assemblies to refrain from using violence and maintain law and order when expressing their views, which is in the interest of all people in Hong Kong. If people deliberately use violence against the Police, the Police will have to take appropriate actions.

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, among the various Directors of Bureaux, I believe John LEE is the one who is most worthless. The Deputy President may think that I should retract this remark but I will not. Why? That is because we will not talk about "retract" now, for "suspend" is the right word. As such I will "suspend" my remark of saying that John LEE is worthless. I will not bring up the remark again in this legislative session, which practically means that I have withdrawn or retracted the remark.*

Secretary John LEE, please listen clearly and try to understand why people are so furious. That is because there is no way for them to lodge complaints after they have been beaten up or shot at by a mob of police officers. On that day I was present at the scene and saw a group of police officers checking people's identity cards, searching their body and belongings. The whole group of police officers only wore vests with the word "Police", but they did not show their police warrant cards. When I asked them to show their warrant cards, they refused. And then a self-proclaimed Superintendent CHAN said to me that he, being the highest ranking officer present, was in charge. He said, "When I say they are police officers, they are." That was really funny. Can police

officers be self-proclaimed? Does it mean that from now on, people of Hong Kong do not have to carry their identity card when they go out, and they can just wear clothes with the word "Hongkonger"? Why is it necessary to check people's identity cards? That is totally absurd. When I pursued further, he grimaced cheekily, first claiming to be a reporter and then a police officer. When I asked him for his warrant card, he flatly refused and said, "You have taken pictures of everyone's face. We cannot run away." What did he mean by not running away? Did he suddenly think that he was a criminal? Did we besiege them and not let them go? Can we lodge complaints just by taking the pictures of their faces? How can we lodge complaints after taking the pictures of their faces? We do not know their names. Is him Andy LAU and when we show his picture at the police station, the police officers there will know who he is? Ridiculous! Is someone a police officer by just wearing a vest with the word "Police" on the back?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr TAM, please raise your supplementary question directly.

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): *If you wear a vest with the words "State President" on the back, do I have to call you President XI Jinping? Ridiculous!*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr TAM, please raise your supplementary question directly.

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): *Secretary, we have given you sufficient time just now. Tell us once again clearly: when plainclothes police officers exercise their authority, do they need to show their warrant cards? When members of the public ask police officers to show their warrant cards, do they have the right to refuse? Also, is it true that members of the Special Tactical Squad are not required to show their police identification numbers on their uniforms? If so, will you change such a practice? If it is confirmed that police officers are required to show their identification numbers but they fail to do so, will you hold them accountable?*

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I got the following information from the Police, "The special uniforms of the Special Tactical Squad are designed in the light of the practical and tactical needs. The design of the uniform leaves no space to display the police identification number. Police officers will endeavour as far as possible to show their identification numbers during their actions. The Police understand the public's concern and will review this practice and follow up as appropriate." That is the information I received from the Police. As regards the accusations or complaints mentioned by the Member just now, the Police will conduct a comprehensive review and investigation after complaints have been received, and will handle the complaints in a fair and just manner.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr TAM, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): *He has not answered my supplementary question. He has admitted that there is no space on the uniforms of the Special Tactical Squad to display the police identification number. This means that the policy formulated is wrong and the uniforms made are also wrong. My question is clear enough: Is it true that plainclothes police officers are not required to show their warrant card when they wear a vest showing the word "Police" on the back? Is it true that even if the public asked for their warrant cards, they need not comply. The Secretary did not answer these questions.*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, under the actual circumstances, if the Police are unable to show their warrant cards while attending to certain matters during an operation, we hope that the public will understand. In case when police officers should show their warrant cards but have not done so, of course, after investigation by CAPO, such matters will be handled in a fair and just manner and we will review whether such matters are in compliance with the Police General Orders and other general guidelines.

(Mr Jeremy TAM indicated that his supplementary question had not been answered)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Jeremy TAM, your question time is up.

This Council has spent close to four hours on the two urgent questions. As there are many items on the Agenda required to be attended to, I will only allow Members who have not asked questions before to ask questions and then the session for urgent questions will come to an end.

As a matter of fact, today is not the only occasion for Members to follow up on this matter. Members are still able to continue to follow up on other platforms later on. For Members who have not asked questions before, please press the "Request to Speak" button as soon as possible.

Ms CHAN Hoi-yen, please ask your question.

MS CHAN HOI-YAN (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, I am extremely unhappy and distressed about the large-scale protests and assemblies last week, as well as the serious dissension and confrontation in our society today. It could be seen from different media reports that the majority of assembly participants, including young people and parents, expressed their views and dissatisfaction peacefully. We also clearly saw from the news reports on television that some people deliberately attacked the Police, threw bricks, metal poles and mills barriers etc. and some even stormed into the Legislative Council Complex, threatening the lives of the police officers and the peaceful protesters at the scene. During the process, apart from participants who were on the spot and police officers who witnessed what happened, there were journalists who reported the situation to the public, photographers and press photographers who filmed and recorded what happened in a split second at the scene, as well as engineers and other assistants who helped transmit the images. Without their reports, the Secretary could not have said repeatedly "we watch the news reports" and "we can see on television". Without media reports, we basically cannot see these images, so I would like to talk about the second urgent question.*

While frontline police officers work and perform their duties at the scene, journalists also have to perform their interviewing duties on the spot. No matter how chaotic the situation was, when journalists were conducting interviews, they had not deliberately obstructed the work of the Police. Hence, journalists definitely should not be berated with abusive language, unreasonably driven

away or even beaten. When the Secretary replied earlier, he said that 32 officers of the Force Media Liaison Cadre were present. Can he tell me why the situation had come to such a pass? Why have so many journalists complained against police officers? Can the Secretary ensure that journalists will not be treated in such an unfriendly manner in the course of interviewing in the future? I believe that even CAPO cannot answer these questions, so I hope the Secretary would respond.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I would like to thank Ms CHAN for her question. On the second urgent question, I clearly stated in the main reply that the Police will facilitate media reporting. Although manpower was tight, the Police had, as pointed out by Ms CHAN, arranged 32 officers of the Force Media Liaison Cadre to provide facilitation to members of the media at the scene as far as practicable. However, firstly, a vast number of locations were involved and secondly, the number of people involved was great and the charging scenes were quite chaotic. Of course, I respect that media workers have to film important scenes at the first instance to let the public know what is going on. Similarly, if there is a possibility of violence, police officers must take speedy and decisive actions to prevent the escalation of events and protect the lives and properties of other people. Of course, both sides are working under pressure. They should try to achieve mutual understanding that the other party is also performing their duties. After this major incident, the Commissioner of Police has indicated that he would sum up the experience e.g. explore how to strengthen communication with journalists or facilitate their work.

In addition, the Police Public Relations Branch has constantly reviewed the media liaison work and examined how both parties can maintain friendly relations. I believe that the Police have upheld this spirit in this incident. If any person is dissatisfied with the work of the Police in this respect and wish to complain, as I have just said, CAPO has set up a dedicated team to handle these complaints fairly and impartially.

DR JUNIUS HO (in Cantonese): *Secretary John LEE, many people, particularly opposition Members, one-sidedly denounced police officers as "black cops" today, but those who are clear-headed have clearly seen and understood the ins and outs of the incident. Anyway, the Secretary has been rebuked by many today. Some have condemned him and asked him to step down or to kneel down*

and apologize, etc. However, I can tell the Secretary that all pro-establishment Members support the Police in maintaining law and order in Hong Kong in accordance with the law. People should not think that the opposition camp will stand a better chance to win by speaking louder. In fact, such behaviour only shows that those Members have a propensity for violence and have forgotten that things should be done according to the rules and procedures. Thus, police officers should not be dejected; they should stand fast in their positions and Secretary John LEE should do his job well. Apart from pro-establishment Members, many members of the public will stand by the Police and give them support. When the time is ripe, these people will come forward to support the Government in its work.

From the questions asked by some opposition Members, they have apparently prejudged the existing 30-odd complaints. They think that the Government can hardly shirk its responsibilities and should be held accountable. These Members have spoken as if they were veteran police officers who knew how to handle the situation in question. Is it a must for Special Tactical Squad officers to show their identification numbers on their uniforms? If so, do special police have to show their identification numbers too? When these officers combat terrorists, do they really have to identify themselves by showing their warrant cards before arresting terrorists? No. Opposition Members are laymen, but they want to command police officers who are the professionals and throw them into great confusion. In this connection, I hope the Secretary ...

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr HO, please put your supplementary question directly.

(Mr LAM Cheuk-ting indicated his wish to raise a point of order)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr HO, please hold on. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, what is your point of order?

MR LAM CHEUK-TING (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, I wish to seek an elucidation from Dr Junius HO. When Dr HO mentioned terrorists earlier, was he referring to the protesters outside the Legislative Council Complex on the day in question?*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr HO, you may elucidate your point, or you may choose to continue with your question.

DR JUNIUS HO (in Cantonese): *I have not said anything to that effect. Such a junior investigator did not even understand what I said and asked me for an elucidation. Sorry, Deputy President, there is no need for me to elucidate the point.*

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr HO, please continue.

DR JUNIUS HO (in Cantonese): *I would like to make one point. In all that we do, we should not forget our original intent, nor should we fear or back down.*

I heard Mr CHU Hoi-dick say earlier that Mr Holden CHOW should come forward to apologize. How can Mr CHU put the cart before the horse? The legislative exercise of amending the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance seeks to redress the grievances of POON Hiu-wing, the deceased. We must uphold justice and then assist in extraditing suspects to different jurisdictions within the same country for trial. It is that simple. However, some people have overplayed the issue. The United States, and I will name it, have actively participated in the matter. After the Bill was gazetted on 10 February, the Consul General representing the United States to Hong Kong already made criticisms and arbitrary comments after 20 February. Then, some opposition Members visited Washington and Europe. They have not only failed to perform their duty in explaining the main purpose of amending the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, but also smeared the Bill as the "China extradition" ...

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr HO, please put your supplementary question directly.

DR JUNIUS HO (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, I hope you can be a little bit more tolerant. Many opposition Members have talked nonsense one after another earlier and you have not intervened, and I am only voicing righteous*

opinions and telling people the truth now. I hope you can be more tolerant. We are not frequent speakers, but when we speak, we surely have reasons and justifications for doing so.

Deputy President, last Saturday, the Chief Executive suspended the amendment of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance with a view to pacifying the people, given the current situation and the overall development. But, unexpectedly, her retreat failed to create more leeway. Instead, 1 million more people joined the protest, making it a total of over 2 million people taking to the streets. The number was exaggerated by the opposition camp. Those people keep pressing on. One should not think that the problem can be solved if the Government tenders an apology. Those people want to spill people's blood and make heads roll. I think for the sake of upholding justice and redressing the grievances of POON Hiu-wing, the Government should not back down. The Chief Executive said that she was not withdrawing the Bill, but suspending the amendment exercise. I appreciate this approach. We must calm the people down. We must take a step back, stop and think. Yet, this does not mean that we do not strike back if others have pressed on after we have retreated; otherwise, how can the 30 000-odd police officers who have maintained law and order in accordance with the law work under the Secretary anymore? I highly commended the Secretary because he is committed in his work and he has stated the reasons ...

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr HO, please put your supplementary question directly.

DR JUNIUS HO (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, I will put my supplementary question now. The Government said that it would suspend the legislative amendment exercise, but it seemed that it had backed down a bit afterwards, saying that it had no time to consider holding further seminars to promote the amendment exercise. I think such work should be done to show that we have not forgotten the original intent of the amendment exercise. Even though we do not have a timetable for the Second Reading and Third Reading of the Bill, we should spare no effort in doing a good job since the work has already commenced. Although the authorities do not have a legislative timetable, it does not mean that they cannot set a timetable to further explain the amendment exercise to the*

public. As the Government has admitted deficiencies in its work, can the Secretary make a pledge in this regard? If the authorities have a timetable, I will give my total support; if not, I will launch my first explanatory session on 30 June.

The 30 elite representatives of the legal profession and members of the Election Committee indicated that they would not make an appointment to meet with the Chief Executive, but when I asked them to discuss the matter with me, they challenged my standing because I was neither a public officer nor the Chief Executive's representative. I never claimed to be any of those, but since I am a Member of the Legislative Council ...

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr HO, you have put your supplementary question. Please sit down.

DR JUNIUS HO (in Cantonese): *Thank you, Deputy President.*

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I thank Dr HO for the supplementary question. When the Chief Executive met with the press yesterday, she clearly pointed out that deficiencies in our work in the legislative amendment exercise had caused conflicts, dissensions and anxieties in society. We think that these conflicts, dissensions and anxieties were caused by deficiencies in our work, thus the Chief Executive apologized.

We also understand that in order to address these conflicts, dissensions and anxieties, time is needed to iron out differences in opinion. However, the Chief Executive also said that there were a number of more important tasks to be taken forward in Hong Kong society in the next three years. Thus, the Government understands that if we do not have time to deal with the legislative amendment exercise and if we cannot address all the conflicts, dissensions and anxieties which have arisen before the end of this term of the Legislative Council, we will accept the reality that the Bill will lapse upon that time.

I hope that Members will understand that the Chief Executive and her team, myself included, hope to improve people's livelihood, promote economic development and boost employment in various ways. We will continue to

facilitate the positive development of Hong Kong society and make everyone feel that Hong Kong is a place of hope. Accordingly, we will actively take these tasks forward.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): There are still nine Members waiting to ask their first question, with Mr WONG Ting-kwong being the last one. After that, this Council will proceed to other items on the Agenda.

Mr Vincent CHENG, please ask your question.

MR VINCENT CHENG (in Cantonese): *The outbreak of serious confrontation around the Legislative Council Complex and the Central Government Offices on 12 June caused injuries to a number of police officers and protesters. Before I start, I would like to first express my sincere hope for their speedy recovery. No one would want to see casualties, be they police officers or protesters. The scenes of injury are always distressing.*

I, however, understand that the Police were just performing their duties and have hence been subjected to various pressures. On that day, the Police were responsible for ensuring the safety of hundreds of staff inside the Legislative Council Complex while maintaining public order and safety outside. We saw on television that some radical protesters had charged towards the last cordon line of the Police and the situation was extremely dangerous. As I know, this incident has put many police officers and their family members under considerable pressure. I hope there will be no more bullying.

Deputy President, it is reported that—and as stated by the Secretary just now—CAPO has set up a designated team to handle the complaints about the operation of the Police on 12 June. Can the Secretary please explain how this designated team will enhance the impartiality of investigation to convince people that all relevant complaints will be handled fairly and impartially?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Thank you, Mr CHENG. As advised by Acting Assistant Commissioner of Police Tammy MAK Wai-man at the IPCC meeting yesterday, the Police have already set up a designated team comprising of 13 colleagues who are completely independent of the Police's

operation in question. They are tasked to handle the complaints full-time. If necessary, they will invite IPCC members or observers to monitor their investigation, such as statement taking. They will also fully consider the evidence of each case and meet all relevant witnesses to take statements from them and obtain information. After that, they will submit a report to IPCC for review to ensure a completely fair and impartial investigation.

MR CHAN HAN-PAN (in Cantonese): *Secretary, I notice that some people have bullied police officers and their children online because of this incident. While most of the protesters have played up the importance of justice and claimed that they took to the streets to fight for justice, the current cyber abuses go against their claimed intention. It is very unfair to the children of police officers as well as police officers who have maintained the public order of Hong Kong faithfully.*

Today, it is outrageous to see the opposition camp repeatedly defending, rather than condemning, these cyber abuses and violent attacks despite their violation of social justice. Secretary LEE, how will the Government protect the human rights of these faithful police officers and their family members to shield them from bullying?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Thank you, Mr CHAN. Firstly, upon receiving the relevant complaints and enquires, the Office of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data has taken the initiative to contact the operators of the online platforms and discussion forums concerned, urging them to remove some of the online contents or posts, so that the illegal doxxing of police officers and their family members will not persist.

The Police have set up a 24-hour hotline for people to report cyberbullying of police officers. The Police will always respond to any dissemination of unlawful messages, given that the world of Internet is not lawless. A myriad of laws apply to the use of Internet. For example, verbal intimidation can be a criminal offence. The Police will also take action to care for police officers and their family members, ensure their safety and safeguard their rights. Should any police officers or their family members need psychological support, the Police will provide them with the necessary assistance.

MR CHEUNG KWOK-KWAN (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, most of those who participated in the demonstration and procession on 9 June and 12 June ... I agree with the Secretary and the SAR Government that most of these people were peaceful protesters who wanted to clearly voice their political demands. This is undeniable but we also cannot deny that on 12 June, some people standing at the front of the procession and those who besieged the Legislative Council Complex committed violent acts, e.g. they attacked the Police and tried to charge the cordon line in the Legislative Council Complex.*

I have just heard pan-democratic Members say to the media that the Government was creating division as it claimed that only a portion of people were involved in violent acts. In fact, this is not division but distinction. Why do they think this is division? That is because some people want to bundle these two groups of people, i.e. bundling the bad guys and the good guys. When the Police arrest the bad guys, they will arrest everybody and the good guys will shield the bad guys.

I strongly resist the comment made by pan-democratic Members that the protest was absolutely peaceful and the protesters were unarmed. If so, what did we see on television? Who were digging up bricks in the morning on 12 June? Some people were holding sharpened metal poles, throwing bricks, wearing helmets, masks and goggles; are these gears for peaceful protests? Why were they wearing these gears and carrying sharpened metal poles to participate in peaceful protests at the Legislative Council Complex? Deputy President, they were well prepared. How come pan-democratic Members failed to see these video clips? Have their speeches and their questions to the Secretary today shown that they are aware of the situation? Deputy President, the answer is no. Have they not seen what happened? I only noticed that Dr KWOK Ka-ki unthinkingly said "beat the police" a while ago. When Dr Fernando CHEUNG previously held a press conference, he also unthinkingly called upon the social welfare community to participate in the riot. I do not want to guess their motives but what actually do they have on their mind? Have they really not seen that some people attacked the Police and committed violent acts on that day? I hope the public can make clear judgments. Should we tolerate violence and these criminal behaviours for the sake of strong political demands?

A Member has just asked the Secretary a question about many people settling accounts on the Internet with the police officers who carried out the relevant actions on that day. The family members and children of these police

officers are also affected. I feel very sad after getting the information. One person has indicated on the Internet that he is an in-service teacher and he knows how to fix the students in his class whose parents are police officers. Have pan-democratic Members publicly called upon members of the public not to do so? They can request a suspension of the Bill, but I wonder if they can call upon members of the public not to do so. Have they stopped using white terror tactics? The pan-democrats have not said anything ...

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHEUNG, please put your supplementary question directly.

MR CHEUNG KWOK-KWAN (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, the supplementary question I would like to ask is related to the question raised by Mr KWONG Chun-yu. He asked the Secretary whether he could submit information on all police officers on duty at the scene on that day. I have never heard of such a request. Mr KWONG Chun-yu is really concerned about his "brothers". If his "brothers" committed the violent acts on that day, can he hand over their information to law enforcement officers?*

A Member has asked a question about how to protect police officers who are subjected to white terror. The Secretary has just said that they can call the hotline. Do the Police or the SAR Government have more proactive ways to express their concerns to these police officers? Apart from asking them to call the hotline for assistance when necessary, can the authorities take the initiative to contact police officers who are victims of bullying and white terror on the Internet and express concern about their situation and the pressure on their family members? I believe it is better for the authorities to take the initiative to express concerns than asking police officers to call the hotline for assistance as they will realize that the SAR Government cares about them.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I would like to thank Mr CHEUNG for his supplementary question. The Police were under great pressure in performing their duties this time. There are also online doxxing attacks on police officers and their family members have been bullied. As I said earlier, the Police will take actions to combat crime-related acts such as intimidation or bullying on the Internet. The Police attach importance to the

well-being of all police officers and their family members. Police clinical psychologists will also intervene to ensure that the morale and emotions of police officers are taken care of. Different support teams in the Police will participate in the related work, for example the Welfare Offices have taken the initiative to provide assistance and support during this operation. The Police will take the initiative to understand and contact police officers and attend to their needs. Certainly, the Police will conduct investigations under the law on the dissemination of unlawful information on the Internet.

MR LUK CHUNG-HUNG (in Cantonese): *Deputy President, I feel helpless and sad that the amendment of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance is suspended, as justice cannot be done and the loophole in the legislation cannot be unplugged. As a result, Hong Kong may continue to be a safe haven for fugitives. At the same time, I fully understand the reasons why the Government has to make this difficult decision because we did not want to see the escalation of violent attack, more bloodsheds and the society being ripped further apart.*

Different people have different understanding of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance but for whatever reasons, peaceful procession, assembly and demonstration are respected and protected in this city. I believe the vast majority of people, except those who are keen on stirring up more trouble, do not wish to see any bloodshed or confrontation between the Police and the public. As regards this urgent question, I think we must be clear about one point, i.e. we must call a spade a spade and avoid generalizing the whole issue. Most participants of the assembly and demonstration were peaceful but a handful of people resorted to violence and stormed various places illegally. I think it is fair to call these people rioters. We cannot turn a blind eye to the radical, law-breaking and violent actions of a small minority even though the vast majority of participants of assembly and demonstrations were peaceful. Similarly, we cannot call the majority of peaceful assembly participants rioters because a small number of people have acted violently. As such, we should not generalize the whole situation and we must discuss different issues separately.

Many opposition Members have kept saying that the majority of demonstrators were unarmed, ignoring the violent charging acts of a small number of people. By glossing over these people's crimes, they lied with their eyes open, which I consider a misery of this city. We saw that on 12 June, the Legislative Council Complex was besieged by a large number of demonstrators

who barred us from holding meeting. At 3:00 pm, a small number of people charged the police cordon lines by bricks, sharpened metal poles and other tools that could cause injuries or even death. I watched the retreat of the Police until they were only a few feet from the glass panel of the demonstration area of the Legislative Council Complex. I saw about 20 to 30 police officers being cornered against the walls. One of the police officers, being my good primary school mate, told me there was almost no escape at that time.

Deputy President, demonstrators have parents, do members of this fine Police Force serving Hong Kong not have parents and families? Aren't their lives important too? May I ask the Secretary whether the authorities have recorded clearly which party started the confrontation first? Was it the demonstrators or the police officers who provoked the confrontation? If demonstrators were the ones charging the police cordon line first, how long did the charging continue before the Police retaliated, and what weapons did they use? What kinds of weapons did they use, how many bricks and sharpened metal poles were used? The opposition Members said that the demonstrators were unarmed. Indeed, they had no small weapon in their hands, but they had big weapons and super weapons in their hands.

Concerning those weapons, I wish to know whether the Police have conducted an accurate and scientific statistical analysis because that will facilitate the formulation of down the criteria on the degree of force that could be used for self-protection. Hence, I consider such an analysis very important. Do the authorities have such information?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I thank the Member for raising the supplementary question. Around 8:00 am on 12 June, large numbers of people began to gather, reaching several ten thousand at the peak. Before 3:00 pm, the Police did not take any action and tolerated the gathering of the crowds, even though the traffic was seriously congested and some places were almost paralysed. Around 3:00 pm, at a section of Tim Wa Avenue, confrontations broke out between some demonstrators and the Police. News footages showed that the police had issued warnings, such as raising red flags warning demonstrators against charging the police cordon lines and that the Police might use force if demonstrators continued to do so. However, demonstrators gave no heed to the warnings but continued to attack the Police with bricks and other objects including metal poles and wooden planks. The

Police kept retreating to about 100 m from the entrance of the Legislative Council Complex to ensure the intact of the Legislative Council Complex and the lives and properties of the people therein. However, under such circumstances, demonstrators did not stop charging the Police. Both news footages and evidence collected by the Police showed that some people threw bricks and other objects at the Police and some even threw objects that were burning with smoke. Therefore, we can see clearly from news footages that the Police took necessary actions only when they were under attack.

(THE PRESIDENT resumed the Chair)

There are also video recordings taken by the Police. The various objects used to attack the Police that I just mentioned included metal poles, mills barriers and bricks, which were also recorded in the footages taken by the Police. It is thus evident the violence used by demonstrators on that day was serious. Apart from news footages, the Police's information also revealed that the Police only took necessary actions when they were under violent attack.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LUK, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR LUK CHUNG-HUNG (in Cantonese): *I wish to further ask the Secretary whether he can ...*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LUK, you cannot ask further questions. You can only point out the part of your supplementary question that has not been answered.

MR LUK CHUNG-HUNG (in Cantonese): *The Secretary has not answered about the numbers of bricks dug up and the number of sharpened metal poles found at the scene on that day, neither did he provide the relevant statistics. If the Secretary is unable to provide the statistics for the time being, will he provide them after the meeting?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, the Police's actions are still ongoing in the past few days and it takes time to compile the information, which may likely be handed to the Department of Justice after the completion of the investigation, as the information may be needed for relevant judicial procedures in future. Hence, I hope that the Member will understand we must respect the judicial system.

DR PIERRE CHAN (in Cantonese): *At the press conference held on 13 June, the Commissioner of Police admitted that demonstrators waiting for consultation and treatment at public hospitals were arrested, but he had not explained how he obtained the relevant information of the demonstrators. Spokesman of the Hospital Authority ("HA"), on the other hand, issued a statement on 17 June stating that HA had not disclosed any patients' information to the Police. May I ask the Secretary for Security if he is aware that the computer systems of the Police and HA are connected, and whether the Police had made use of the information in the computer system to arrest the demonstrators?*

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): I believe the Commissioner of Police had stated clearly at the press conference that the computer systems of the Police and HA are not connected, therefore it is completely impossible for the Police to access information in HA's computer system.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHAN, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

DR PIERRE CHAN (in Cantonese): *What the Secretary has not answered is that as shown in a paper of this Council, the computer systems of HA and the Police are connected by a computer program called "MIIDSS", that is, Major Incident Investigation and Disaster Support System ...*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHAN, this is not the content of the supplementary question raised by you just now.

DR PIERRE CHAN (in Cantonese): *According to this Council paper, HA does have a computer system that is connected with that of the Police. Can the Secretary elaborate on this?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): I am not going to comment on HA's computer system, but I can tell Members unequivocally that the computer systems of the Police and HA are not connected in any way. But if in the case of major incidents, HA considers that information may concurrently be released to the Police, it may decide to do so. However, I can tell Members categorically that there is no connection between the computer systems of the Police and HA and they are two independent systems.

MR KWOK WAI-KEUNG (in Cantonese): *I always believe that justice is in the hearts of the people, but what makes me feel uneasy today is that justice has been abused. It seems that people who are willing to see the entire truth are getting fewer and fewer, while more and more people choose to see what they wish or prefer to see, or accept information that they know have been filtered, and even accept false and irresponsible information on the Internet which have been deliberately fabricated. They have turned a blind eye and a deaf ear to the legitimate information provided by the Government. No wonder in the lyrics of the song "Belief Without Complaint" rewritten by the Police to boost morale, it says "Grievances held, for reasons that are twisted".*

President, as a matter of fact, the crime figures in Hong Kong have been declining. The overall crime figure in 2018 was 54 225 cases, which is a record low since 1974 (that is, for 45 years). Members of the opposition camp were simply using the Police's handling of the "12th June" political incident to create a buzz. This has not only trampled upon the dignity of the Police, but has also denied their previous contribution in fighting crimes, which is absolutely unfair to them.

President, the Government has announced that it would not proceed with the amendment of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance in the current term of the Legislative Council. Our loopholes have been exposed worldwide, and criminals from different parts of the world should know what our loopholes are.

May I ask the Secretary if there are any ways to prevent Hong Kong from becoming the haven for fugitives at least in the next two years? Is it possible to refuse the entry of criminals to prevent an increase in the overall crime figure of Hong Kong?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, thank you Mr KWOK. With regard to the work on intelligence, all law enforcement departments should step up their efforts to ensure that we can grasp in the first instance any intelligence that are relating to crimes, having an implication on the overall law and order in Hong Kong and making Hong Kong more vulnerable to attacks. Also, we should step up our communication and intelligence exchange with overseas law enforcement agencies. In addition, we should enhance the capability of the Police or other law enforcement agencies in intelligence analysis. This would ensure that if a person involved in any crime comes to Hong Kong, we can refuse his entry to avoid putting Hong Kong at risk.

As for cooperation in other respects, including making concerted efforts to combat money laundering and other crimes, I believe the various disciplined services will work hard to ensure that outsiders involved in any crimes cannot enter Hong Kong so easily and put local law and order at risk. Of course, for those who may be involved in any crimes and have already entered Hong Kong, different government departments will keep a close watch to see if their activities would pose any threat to Hong Kong's law and order.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): *President, the confrontation on 12 June was caused by the China extradition bill. In fact, just for the poor handling of the China extradition bill, the Secretary for Security should have resigned and stepped down from power to resume responsibility long ago. We now deal with the handling of confrontation on that day. In 2014, when tens of tear gas rounds were fired in the Umbrella Movement, the then Secretary LAI Tung-kiok told us that he and the Chief Executive had monitored the whole process in the Government House. My question for the Secretary is: Did he and the Chief Executive monitor the somewhat foreseeable large-scale confrontation on 12 June? If they had not, what were the reasons? If they had, what was his monitoring role when he saw the firing of tear gas rounds, particularly the firing of tear gas rounds from both sides and even into the crowd outside the Citic Tower, leaving the people with no way out?*

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, I was in the coordination centre at the Central Government Offices on 12 June. The Police Force was fully in charge of the operation matters and details, with police officers taking measures and making deployment as appropriate in light of the actual situation.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr TO, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): *The Secretary has not answered one point. Did he mean to say that he did not have any monitoring role?*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary, please answer.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, I think I have already answered Mr TO's question.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr YIU Si-wing, please ask your question.

(Mr James TO chanted repeatedly: "Down with John LEE!")

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr James TO, please stop shouting.

MR YIU SI-WING (in Cantonese): *President, on 12 June, I was not in the Legislative Council Complex but outside the Complex, terrified by the scenes shown on television. A crowd of armed rioters kept charging the police's cordon line. At that time, I was very much worried that they would break the cordon line and rushed to the area under the Drum, storming into the lobby. We all know that the door of the lobby is made of glass. If the crowd had stormed into the lobby, which is a small place, the personal safety of police officers, protesters, staff members as well as Members upstairs would have been at risk. In view of this, I would like to ask the Government, the then commander or the Secretary:*

Has an assessment been made on the potential damage and personal safety risks in case the rioters or protesters stormed into the lobby of the Legislative Council Complex or even went upstairs? Had the Secretary made such an assessment? If he had, what was the risk level?

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, I wish to thank Mr YIU. After assessment, we had concerns over the situation because the atmosphere back then was extremely tense. Protesters deliberately attacked the Police with violence and broke some of the Police's accoutrements. If protesters broke through the cordon line, they would storm into the Legislative Council Complex and might result in serious casualties as some other people were inside the building. That was why police officers insisted on guarding their posts to protect the Complex and the staff therein despite facing huge difficulties and personal safety risks. I urge members of the public not to vent their dissatisfaction with the deficiencies of the Government on police officers because they were the ones who strived to ensure the safety of lives and properties in the Legislative Council Complex regardless of difficulties.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr YIU, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

MR YIU SI-WING (in Cantonese): *President, I do not think the Secretary has given a clear explanation. He only said that the Legislative Council Complex might likely suffer damage. Did he weigh the price of firing tear gas rounds or rubber bullets against the damage caused by the storming of the Complex lobby? Which one would outweigh the other?*

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): President, I thank Mr YIU for his supplementary question. For operations like firing of tear gas, all of the weapons used by the Police were non-lethal, and the accoutrements were more or less same as those used by the police officers overseas. The objective of these operations was to create a safe distance between the violent people and police officers as well as the Legislative Council Complex. That was very important because if there had not been such a safe distance, people who deliberately

attacked police officers would have stormed into the Legislative Council Complex and posed serious threat to personal safety. As it was hard to tell whether the storming would be life-threatening, the Police must take the necessary action to stop that from happening.

MR WONG TING-KWONG (in Cantonese): *President, the urgent questions raised by Mr AU Nok-hin and Mr LAM Cheuk-ting today provide us with a good platform to reveal to the public what happened on 12 June. On 12 June, I was one of the eight pro-establishment Members who stayed inside the Legislative Council Complex. I arrived at the Complex at 8 am, where I stayed there throughout the day. From the terrace on the fifth floor of the Complex, I could see what happened at Tim Mei Avenue and Legislative Council Road. Protesters were rather peaceful before around 2:50 pm. They sang and chanted slogans, and listened to speeches given by Members of the opposition camp. I saw police officers maintaining order while there was no contact between the two parties. It was a relieving sight, since I was very worried about possible clashes.*

Unfortunately, at around 2:50 pm, the situation took a sharp turn when a group of people wearing yellow and white helmets, eye goggles and face masks began digging up pavement bricks at the construction site across the Legislative Council Complex—not just one or two, but hundreds of pavement bricks. They took metal poles from the construction site to the entrance of the demonstration area at the Legislative Council Complex, where they confronted the Police. At around 3:00 pm, protesters charged the police cordon line. They began by pushing mills barriers. After that, miscellaneous objects including bricks and metal poles were thrown around. I was frightened by the sight as I watched from the upper floors.

The Police were lightly equipped with shields and batons. What was the use of batons which were merely one or two feet long? As bricks kept being hurled, I saw with my own eyes a police officer being hit and injured. While I did not know how serious his injury was, Members could imagine the harm caused by a hit in the face with a brick, even if one has worn a steel helmet. As the Police were forced back, protesters continued to push the mills barriers, all the way from the pavement into the demonstration area and to the area outside the Legislative Council Complex's entrance, commonly known as the area under the Drum, where L-shaped barriers were placed. The Police then replaced their

gear with tear gas, bean bag rounds and other riot control equipment. The Special Tactical Squad then arrived to provide reinforcement, driving protesters off and far away from Complex.

Frankly speaking, most protesters were peaceful; however, there were a handful among them who ruined the demonstration and turned it into a riot, dragging the peaceful protesters onto their chariot and making them commit the offence of riot. I believe that the SAR Government will make a clear distinction between the majority of peaceful protesters and the extremely small minority of rioters.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WONG, please state your supplementary question directly.

MR WONG TING-KWONG (in Cantonese): *I must point out what actually happened on that day. President, I was present at the scene on that day; it left me with a deep and unforgettable impression.*

Mr Charles Peter MOK was also on the fifth floor on that day, where he talked to foreign journalists. He should repeat what he told the journalists, which was far different from what actually happened. We could verify by watching the video. The journalists recorded what he said and reported the events. He was also on the fifth floor on that day, looking down from high above.

In relation to a supplementary question asked by a Member earlier on why the Special Tactical Squad did not display their identification number, here I would like to ask Secretary "Ka-chiu": Are Special Tactical Squad members deployed independently and in pairs, or as a whole team? Is the Special Duties Unit required to have their identification number displayed while on duty? The Special Duties Unit would even cover their faces with hoods when performing duties and make hasty departure when they leave a scene, without showing their faces. Even if the Special Tactical Squad did not have their identification numbers displayed, one should be able to tell from their gear that they were members of the Police.

Secondly, a Member of the opposition camp queried just now how come the Secretary could not answer a question about the Police's accoutrements. Are

you really unable to answer the question, Secretary? Or is the question on accoutrements a confidential matter? Should the Police be required to display their accoutrements to the public at all times? I would like the Secretary to give me a reply to the question regarding the Police's identification number and their accoutrements.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Thank you, Mr WONG. I have mentioned the actual circumstances of the Special Tactical Squad when replying to the questions asked by other Members. They are a Special Tactical Squad and their special protective uniform was designed with operational and tactical needs in mind. There is no space on their uniform to display their identification number. Since Members has raised the matter today, the Police will be willing to conduct a review afresh. I also agree with what Mr WONG said, that is, all accoutrements serve a different operational purposes and the Police will not disclose all their accoutrements. Of course, in reviewing the operation, I will leave it to the Police to assess whether new arrangements are necessary. However, as Mr WONG has said, the Police gear is designed according to specific tactical needs of each operation as well as an array of factors which I have mentioned.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Last Member. Mr HO Kai-ming, please raise your question.

MR HO KAI-MING (in Cantonese): *Secretary, on 11 June, the U.S. Consulate General Hong Kong and Macau issued a "demonstration alert", warning Americans in Hong Kong not to go to demonstration areas on 12 June. However, as far as I remember, the situations in the areas concerned were actually quite peaceful on that night, without any large-scale conflicts. On the next day (12 June), no large-scale conflicts occurred before 3:00 pm. Has the Secretary inquired with the U.S. Consulate General Hong Kong and Macau how come they could have the foresight and vision to issue a "demonstration alert" to Americans in Hong Kong long before the occurrence of large-scale conflicts? Have we inquired with the Consulate General why it issued a "demonstration alert"?*

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Thank you, Mr HO. Since we have not communicated with the U.S. Consulate General Hong Kong and

Macau in this regard, I do not know their rationale for issuing the "demonstration alert", and I have no information thereof.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): The Council has spent five hours on these two urgent questions. Urgent questions end here.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): First question. Mr HO Kai-ming, please raise your question.

(Mr Andrew WAN indicated his wish to raise a point of order)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr HO, please wait a moment. Mr Andrew WAN, what is your point of order?

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): *I request a headcount.*

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

(The summoning bell stopped after ringing for 15 minutes)

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): As the summoning bell has rung for 15 minutes but a quorum is still not present in the Chamber, I now adjourn the meeting according to Rule 17(2) of the Rules of Procedure.

Adjourned accordingly at 4:13 pm.

Note of meeting:

Written answers to Questions 7 to 22 for this meeting are set out at Appendix.

Appendix

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Elderly persons receiving specialist outpatient services

7. **DR HELENA WONG** (in Chinese): *President, in 2015, around 75% of the elderly persons (i.e. persons aged 65 or above) in Hong Kong suffered from chronic illness. Some patient groups have pointed out that elderly patients with a number of chronic illnesses at the same time have to make a lot of efforts attending specialist outpatient clinics ("SOPCs") in various public hospitals on different dates for treatment. Besides, they may not have the ability to sort out the medications prescribed by different doctors in order to take the medications according to schedule. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (1) *whether it knows in the past 12 months,*

 - (i) *the median and maximum numbers of SOPCs attended by the various elderly patients;*
 - (ii) *the number of elderly patients attending SOPCs for treatment, with a breakdown by the number of SOPCs attended by them (i.e. 1 to 2, 3 to 4, 5 to 6, and 7 or more) and the relevant percentages;*
 - (iii) *the median and maximum numbers of public hospitals visited by the various elderly patients for attending SOPCs for treatment; and*
 - (iv) *a breakdown of the number of elderly patients attending SOPCs for treatment by the number of public hospitals visited by them (i.e. 1 to 2, 3 to 4, 5 to 6, and 7 or more), and the relevant percentages;*

- (2) *whether it knows, in each of the past three years, (i) for how many days on average were medications prescribed for each elderly patient by SOPCs, and (ii) the number of elderly patients who were*

prescribed five or more medications and the percentage of that number in the total number of such patients;

- (3) *given that under the Drug Refill Services E-Fill pilot programme launched by the Hospital Authority ("HA"), patients' prescriptions are split into smaller and manageable quantities, and pharmacists will review and reaffirm the latest condition of the patients before each refill, whether the Government knows the current number of patients covered by the pilot programme; and*
- (4) *given that while elderly patients who suffer from a number of chronic illnesses have to attend a number of SOPCs for treatment and take a number of medications, they may not have adequate care support and the ability to manage the medications, whether it knows if HA will consider providing health management services for such patients under a case approach; if HA will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?*

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Chinese): President, my reply to the various parts of the question raised by Dr Helena WONG is as follows:

- (1) In 2018-2019, the number of patients aged 65 or above who attended specialist outpatient clinics ("SOPCs") of the Hospital Authority ("HA") was about 687 000 (provisional figure), about 80% of them received treatment by one to two specialties. HA does not maintain statistics on the median and maximum number of specialties attended by each elderly patient and the number of public hospitals each elderly patient has visited for specialist treatment.
- (2) In each of the years between 2016 and 2018, the average prescription duration for HA patients aged 65 or above attending SOPCs with prescribed medications is around 94, 96 and 98 days respectively. The numbers of prescriptions involving five or more items were around 870 000, 900 000 and 940 000 in the past three years, accounting for about 40% of the total number of prescriptions for the above-said patients in each year respectively.

- (3) Since December 2017, HA has implemented the Drug Refill Services "E-Fill" pilot programme in phases at the Prince of Wales Hospital, the Tuen Mun Hospital and the Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital. Currently, the pilot programme covers about 25 000 Medical SOPC patients aged 60 or above who are typically prescribed with relatively more drug items. HA will review and refine the scope and operation workflow of the programme in a timely manner and extend its coverage to other hospitals progressively in order to benefit more patients.
- (4) At present, medication review clinics are set up in a number of public hospitals where clinical pharmacists provide individual patients and their care-givers with medication consultation, counselling and related drug education as needed so as to enhance patient compliance in use of drugs.

Tourism Federation of Cities in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area

8. **MR YIU SI-WING** (in Chinese): *President, to enhance tourism exchanges and cooperation within the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area ("the Greater Bay Area"), the Hong Kong Special Administration Region ("HKSAR") Government and the tourism departments of the other 10 cities in the Greater Bay Area established the Tourism Federation of Cities in the Guangdong, Hong Kong and Macao Greater Bay Area ("the Federation") and signed the Agreement on the Tourism Federation of Cities in the Guangdong, Hong Kong and Macao Greater Bay Area in December 2017. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (1) *of the goals, mission and work schedule of the Federation, and the mode of cooperation and division of work among the various member cities;*
- (2) *of the expenditure involved in the work undertaken by the Federation on developing and promoting tourism in the Greater Bay Area since its establishment, and the effectiveness of the work; and*

- (3) *of the future work priorities of the Federation; among them, the specific work for which the HKSAR Government is responsible, and the manpower and financial resources it will allocate for such work?*

SECRETARY FOR COMMERCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (in Chinese): President, the Tourism Federation of Cities in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area ("the Federation") was jointly established by the tourism departments of the Hong Kong and Macao Special Administrative Regions as well as the nine Mainland cities in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area ("the Greater Bay Area") in December 2017. The Federation's advisory unit and secretariat are the national Ministry of Culture and Tourism and the Department of Culture and Tourism of Guangdong Province respectively. The Federation's first annual meeting was held in April 2018 in Guangzhou. The Government has all along been actively leveraging the platform of the Federation to deepen cooperation with other cities in the Greater Bay Area in areas of tourism exchange and promotion, as well as strengthening market regulation.

As the Outline Development Plan for the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area announced in February 2019 expressly supports Hong Kong in developing into an international tourism hub, a core demonstration zone for multi-destination tourism, as well as a diverse tourism platform, the Government will actively grasp such opportunities to promote the overall tourism development within the Greater Bay Area for mutual benefits.

As such, the Commissioner for Tourism, as the rotating Chairman of the Federation's second Annual Meeting, convened the second Annual Meeting of the Federation on 12 June 2019 in Hong Kong to discuss with the tourism departments of the Macao Special Administrative Region and the nine Mainland cities in the Greater Bay Area in further enhancing tourism cooperation in various areas, including pursuing more facilitating measures for tourists travelling within the Greater Bay Area, strengthening cooperation in market regulation and publicity and promotion, and supporting the trade in developing more multi-destination tourism products, etc.

The work in relation to the Federation falls under the charge of the Tourism Commission. Relevant staffing and expenses are subsumed within the latter's establishment and provision, and can hardly be separately quantified.

Unsold private residential units

9. **MR CHAN HAK-KAN** (in Chinese): *President, as at 31 March this year, out of the units in the private residential projects which had been completed in or after 2012 and issued with an occupation permit ("OP"), about 9 000 of them were unsold ("unsold units with an OP"). On the other hand, the Government has proposed to amend the Rating Ordinance (Cap. 116) to introduce "Special Rates" on private residential units that have been issued with an OP for 12 months or more, are unsold, and were not rented out for more than six months at a rent not lower than the market rent in the past 12 months. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (1) of the number of unsold units with an OP as at 31 March in each of the past three years, broken down by the unit floor area classification used by the Rating and Valuation Department in compiling its statistics;*
- (2) as the Government has indicated that the figures of unsold units with an OP are consolidated based on the inputs from different government departments, of the specific calculation formula used;*
- (3) of the respective justifications of the Government for (i) using the date of issuance of an OP and (ii) not using the date of issuance of the Certificate of Compliance, as the relevant date for the Special Rates;*
- (4) in view of the public's strong demand for small and medium-sized units, whether the Government will introduce targeted measures, such as imposing a higher level of Special Rates on small and medium-sized unsold units with an OP; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and*
- (5) whether it knows the current number of units being rented out as serviced apartments; whether it has estimated the changes in the number of such units in the first year upon the implementation of the Special Rates initiative?*

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Chinese): President, the Chief Executive announced on 29 June 2018 the proposed introduction of "Special Rates" on vacant first-hand private residential units, with a view to encouraging a more timely supply of first-hand private residential units in the market. The Government proposes to amend the Rating Ordinance (Cap. 116) to require developers of first-hand private residential units with occupation permits ("OP") issued for 12 months or more to furnish annual returns to the Government on the status of these units. Unsold first-hand units that have not been rented out for more than 6 months during the past 12 months will be subject to "Special Rates". "Special Rates" will be collected by the Rating and Valuation Department annually at two times (i.e. 200%) of the rateable value of the units concerned. The Government is now formulating the details of the Rating (Amendment) Bill. My reply to various parts of the question raised by Mr CHAN Hak-kan is as follows:

(1) and (2)

The Government releases statistics on private housing supply in the primary market on the website of the Transport and Housing Bureau on a quarterly basis, including the number of unsold first-hand private residential units in completed projects (hereinafter referred to as "unsold units"). The number of unsold units is obtained by deducting the number of units sold from the total number of first-hand private residential units in completed projects,⁽¹⁾ i.e. projects that have obtained OP. If an agreement for sale and purchase was made in respect of a certain unit and has been delivered to the Land Registry for registration, that unit will be regarded as sold. The number and mix of unsold units keep changing as new first-hand private residential units are completed and sold from time to time. The number of unsold units as at 31 March in each of the past three years is at Annex 1.

- (1) The figure for each year includes only the number of units completed in that year or in the previous seven years. For example, the 2018 figure covers the units completed between 2011 and 2018, while the 2019 figure covers the units completed between 2012 and 2019, and so on. The purpose of compiling the number of unsold units is to reflect the projected supply of the first-hand private residential units in the coming three to four years. As unsold units which have been completed for eight years or more are unlikely to be offered for sale in the market in the coming few years, they are not included in the calculation.

The Government in the past did not compile breakdown of unsold units by flat size. For the number of unsold units of last quarter (i.e. as at 31 March 2019), the breakdown by saleable area of the units is at Annex 2.

- (3) The Government considers it appropriate to adopt the date of OP, rather than the date of Certificate of Compliance ("CC"), as the reference point in determining when the developers should start submitting returns on the status of the units. The justifications are as follows:
 - (a) In principle, the issue of an OP implies that the relevant unit can be occupied and put into effective use.
 - (b) According to the Consent Scheme, developers may apply to the Lands Department for pre-sale consent at a maximum of 30 months in advance of the completion of a residential property development. Developers may also choose to rent out the units after the issue of OP.⁽²⁾ In other words, developers do not have to wait till the issue of CC to sell or rent out the units.
 - (c) Some redevelopment projects covered by old leases are not subject to the Consent Scheme. Developers do not have to apply for pre-sale consent or CC prior to selling these units. Furthermore, even if the development projects are subject to the Consent Scheme, the lease conditions do not specify a time limit for developers to obtain the CC. We are concerned that adopting the date of CC as the reference point may induce circumvention, e.g. delay in applying for CC, or even not applying for CC on the grounds that the units are for rental only.
- (2) Starting from 2002, lease conditions in general provide that developers can rent out completed units with OP issued. Developers who are able to fulfil certain requirements (e.g. the tenancy period shall not exceed 10 years) can rent out the units without the need to obtain prior consent from the Director of Lands.

- (d) On the contrary, in accordance with the "Building Covenant" clause in the land grant or lease conditions, developers are required to complete the construction of the minimum gross floor area specified in the land grant or lease conditions and obtain the OP within the specified period. Adopting the date of OP as the reference point help guard against possible circumvention.
- (4) The Government proposes that "Special Rates" are chargeable at two times of the rateable value of the concerned units (regardless of flat size), the amount of which is equivalent to about two years of market rent. Based on the average rental yield of 2.5% for residential units at present, the "Special Rates" chargeable is roughly equal to 5% of the property value. We consider that the amount is appropriate and is conducive to encouraging developers to sell or rent out completed first-hand private residential units within a reasonable time frame.

It may be fairly controversial to define the meaning of small and medium-sized units. Compared to applying different tax rates to units of different flat sizes, we consider that a uniform yet forceful tax rate will be easier to understand.

- (5) Unsold units refer to those completed but unsold first-hand private residential units, which may therefore include vacant units or units rented out by developers (e.g. serviced apartments). As developers currently are not required to declare the status of these unsold units, we do not have information on how many of them have been rented out as serviced apartments.

Whether developers will rent out their first-hand private residential units as serviced apartments is subject to a number of factors, e.g. prevailing market demand and supply, property price, rental level, economic situation, business strategies of the developers, etc. It is difficult for the Government to estimate the changes in the number of such units after the implementation of "Special Rates".

Annex 1

Number of Unsold First-hand Private Residential Units in Completed Projects
(Between 2017 and 2019)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Number of Unsold First-hand Private Residential Units in Completed Projects</i>
As at 31 March 2017	8 000
As at 31 March 2018	9 000
As at 31 March 2019	9 000

Notes:

- (1) The figure in each row only reflects the position as at 31 March of that year.
- (2) The figures are rounded to the nearest thousand.
- (3) "Completed projects" refer to projects with OPs issued by the Buildings Department.
- (4) The figure for each year includes only the number of units completed in that year or in the previous seven years. For example, the 2018 figure covers the units completed between 2011 and 2018, while the 2019 figure covers the units completed between 2012 and 2019, and so on.
- (5) The figures do not include village houses.

Annex 2

Number of Unsold First-hand Private Residential Units in
Completed Projects by Saleable Area

	<i>Number of Units (as a percentage of total)</i>				
	<i>Class A</i>	<i>Class B</i>	<i>Class C</i>	<i>Class D</i>	<i>Class E</i>
As at 31 March 2019	2 800 (31%)	2 600 (29%)	800 (9%)	1 200 (14%)	1 500 (17%)

Notes:

- (1) The figures are rounded to the nearest hundred.
- (2) Class A flats—saleable area less than 40 sq m
Class B flats—saleable area of 40 to 69.9 sq m
Class C flats—saleable area of 70 to 99.9 sq m
Class D flats—saleable area of 100 to 159.9 sq m
Class E flats—saleable area of 160 sq m or above

Rehabilitation services for pre-school children

10. **MR IP KIN-YUEN** (in Chinese): *President, the Social Welfare Department ("SWD") provides three types of rehabilitation services for pre-school children with disability respectively through (i) the Early Education and Training Centre ("EETC"), (ii) the Integrated Programme in Kindergarten-cum-Child Care Centre ("IP/KGs") and (iii) the Special Child Care Centre ("SCCC"). It is learnt that due to the shortage of service places of SCCCs, quite a number of children waiting for such services attend ordinary kindergartens and kindergartens-cum-Child Care Centres (collectively known as "KGs"). Furthermore, SWD provides On-site Pre-school Rehabilitation Services ("OPRS"), under which inter-disciplinary service teams from non-governmental organizations provide on-site training services for children with mild disability who are studying in participating KGs. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (1) *whether it knows the annual numbers of children waiting for SCCC services in 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 school years whilst studying in KGs, and the number of KGs involved;*
- (2) *whether it knows, among the children mentioned in (1), the respective annual numbers of (i) those receiving EETC services, (ii) those receiving OPRS and (iii) those not receiving any of these two types of services, in 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 school years (set out in the table below);*

	2017-2018 school year	2018-2019 school year
(i)		
(ii)		
(iii)		
<i>Total</i>		

- (3) *of the annual numbers of children in 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 assessed to be in need of SCCC services; among such children, the respective numbers of (i) those waiting for the services provided by IP/KGs, (ii) those waiting for EETC services, (iii) those waiting for OPRS, and (iv) those not waiting for any of those services (set out in the table below); and*

	<i>2017-2018 school year</i>	<i>2018-2019 school year</i>
<i>(i)</i>		
<i>(ii)</i>		
<i>(iii)</i>		
<i>(iv)</i>		

- (4) *whether the Education Bureau ("EDB") has provided additional resources to KGs which have admitted children who are waiting for SCCC services, so as to ensure that those children can receive appropriate education, training and care; if so, of the details; if not, whether EDB will, by making reference to the approach adopted by it for supporting non-Chinese speaking students with special educational needs, provide additional resources to those schools?*

SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Chinese): President, my reply to the Member's question is as follows:

- (1) and (2)

Pre-school children on the waiting list of special child care centres ("SCCCs") may also apply for and receive transitional services of early education and training centres ("EETCs") or on-site pre-school rehabilitation services ("OPRS") until they are allocated SCCC places. Besides, pre-school children waiting for SCCCs and who have not received transitional services may apply for non-means-tested training subsidies under the Training Subsidy Programme for Children on the Waiting List of Subvented Pre-school Rehabilitation Services ("TSP"), so that they can receive self-financing pre-school rehabilitation services operated by recognized service providers as soon as possible to facilitate their learning and development.

In 2017-2018 and 2018-2019, there were 1 984 and 2 205 pre-school children on the waiting list of SCCC services respectively. Details of these pre-school children who received other pre-school rehabilitation services or training subsidies under TSP are set out in the table below:

	<i>2017-2018 (as at 31 March 2018)</i>	<i>2018-2019 (as at 31 March 2019)</i>
Number of children who received other pre-school rehabilitation services or training subsidies under TSP while on the waiting list of SCCC services		
Integrated Programme in Kindergarten-cum-Child Care Centre	56	63
EETCs	176	165
OPRS	NA ^{Note}	427
Training subsidies under TSP	922	1 111
Total	1 154	1 766

Note:

OPRS commenced in October 2018. The Social Welfare Department ("SWD") does not have statistics on the number of applicants who received services under the Pilot Scheme on OPRS while on the waiting list of SCCCs.

SWD does not have information on the kindergartens ("KGs") where children on the waiting list of SCCCs are attending and the number of KGs involved.

- (3) Pre-school children may ascertain the level of their disabilities and their special needs as well as the type of pre-school rehabilitation services required through assessments by relevant government departments/bodies, including child assessment centres of the Department of Health ("DH") and the Hospital Authority ("HA"), or paediatricians/clinical psychologists/educational psychologists/psychiatrists, etc. in non-governmental organizations ("NGOs") or private practice. In 2017 and 2018, the child assessment service of DH arranged pre-school and school placements for training, remedial and special education for 14 294 and 17 539 children aged under 12 who were suspected to have problems during their growth respectively. DH does not maintain a breakdown by age of children who underwent assessments, nor does it maintain a breakdown of various types of support services for which the children concerned were referred. In 2017-2018 and 2018-2019, there were 218 and 232 cases referred for SCCC after assessment by HA respectively. The Government does not have statistics on the

number of cases where children were assessed by paediatricians/clinical psychologists/educational psychologists/psychiatrists, etc. in NGOs or private practice to be in need of SCCC services.

Pre-school children with disabilities or special needs may register their applications in the Central Referral System for Rehabilitation Services of SWD for designated services according to their assessment results. Those diagnosed as or suspected of having moderate to severe disabilities will be put on the waiting list of SCCC services, and they may also wait for and receive other pre-school rehabilitation services as transitional services. SWD does not have statistics on the number of cases assessed to be in need of SCCC services and not on the waiting list of any pre-school rehabilitation services.

- (4) In view of the fact that children attending ordinary KGs and on the waiting list of SCCC services may wait for and receive other pre-school rehabilitation services as transitional services, and that the Education Bureau has been providing KG teachers with structured in-service training to enhance their professional capacity of catering for learner diversity, and has also enhanced the teacher-to-pupil ratio in KGs to strengthen support for teachers to address the developmental needs of KG students, the Education Bureau indicated that it has no plan to provide additional resources for KGs at this stage.

Support provided for the ethnic minorities

11. **MR KWONG CHUN-YU** (in Chinese): *President, the Government has commissioned non-governmental organizations to run six support service centres for the ethnic minorities ("EMs") and two sub-centres ("support centres"). The services provided by the support centres include organizing language classes for EMs. One of these centres, namely the CHEER Centre operated by the Hong Kong Christian Service, also provides interpretation and translation services for EMs using public services. Regarding the support provided for EMs, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (1) *of the number of occasions in each of the past three years on which the various policy bureaux/government departments ("B/Ds") arranged interpretation and translation services for EMs using public services, with a breakdown by (i) B/D, (ii) name of service provider, and (iii) EM language;*
- (2) *of the number of occasions in each of the past three years on which the various B/Ds engaged the interpretation and translation services provided by the CHEER Centre, with a breakdown by (i) service category (i.e. telephone interpretation service, on-sight interpretation service, on-site (escort) interpretation service, simultaneous interpretation service, written translation service and proofreading service) and (ii) EM language;*
- (3) *of the following details of the Cantonese classes and English classes offered by each support centre in each of the past three years: (i) number of classes offered, (ii) medium of instruction, and (iii) number of students enrolled (with a breakdown by ethnicity); and*
- (4) *of the current population of EM who are aged 65 or above, and the number of those who are receiving the various types of allowances under the Social Security Allowance Scheme, with a breakdown by (i) type of allowances and (ii) ethnicity?*

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Chinese): President, in 2010, the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau issued the "Administrative Guidelines on Promotion of Racial Equality" to provide guidance to relevant bureaux and departments to promote racial equality and ensure equal access by ethnic minorities ("EMs") to public services in the key areas concerned, and to take this into account in the formulation, implementation and review of relevant policies and measures.

After consulting the relevant bureaux and departments, the consolidated reply to the question raised is as follows:

- (1) Various bureaux and departments will provide interpretation services for EMs in need to ensure their equal access to public services. The Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau is conducting a review on the "Administrative Guidelines on Promotion of Racial Equality". To enhance the provision of interpretation services by bureaux and departments, the Bureau is exploring the feasibility of including guidance on the provision of interpretation services in the Guidelines.

The number of interpretation services for EMs arranged by bureaux, departments and public organizations under the scope of application of the Guidelines in the past three years and names of service providers are shown in Annex 1. The above bodies have not provided the breakdown of the number of interpretation services by EM languages.

- (2) The Home Affairs Department provides support services for EMs to help them integrate into the community. Major services include the provision of language learning classes and integration programmes through six support service centres for EMs and two sub-centres. One of these centres, namely the CHEER Centre operated by the Hong Kong Christian Service, also provides interpretation and translation services in seven EM languages⁽¹⁾ for non-specialized areas. Bureaux and departments and EMs are welcome to make use of these services. Interpretation services include mainly instant telephone interpretation services. Subject to the availability of resources, on-site or simultaneous interpretation services can also be arranged. From 2019-2020 onwards, the Home Affairs Department will enhance the interpretation services provided by the CHEER Centre, including the introduction of interpretation services in Vietnamese.

The usage of CHEER Centre's interpretation and translation services with breakdowns by bureaux, departments, public organizations and EMs as well as by EM languages in the past three years are shown in Annexes 2 and 3 respectively.

(1) The seven EM languages are Bahasa Indonesia, Hindi, Nepali, Punjabi, Tagalog, Thai and Urdu.

- (3) The support service centres for EMs and sub-centres of the Home Affairs Department provide Cantonese classes and English classes with the aim to help EMs meet the needs in their daily social lives and strengthen their capability and confidence to integrate into the community. The languages of instruction for Cantonese classes in the centres are mainly English and Cantonese, while English is the primary language of instruction for English classes. The centres will, depending on the situation, arrange EM teaching assistants to assist the teachers.

The number of Cantonese classes and English classes organized in the centres and the number of participants by ethnicities in the past three project years are shown in Annex 4.

- (4) According to the information of the 2016 Population By-census by the Census and Statistics Department, there are 20 124 EMs (excluding foreign domestic helpers) who are aged 65 or above in Hong Kong, including 2 838 Indian, 713 Nepalese, 633 Pakistani, 1 256 Filipino, 1 400 Indonesian and 1 011 Thai. The total population of EMs who are aged 65 or above for the above mentioned six ethnicities is 7 851. The Social Welfare Department does not collect information on the ethnicity of the recipients of the Social Security Allowance Scheme.

Annex 1

Number of interpretation services for EMs
arranged by bureaux, departments and public organizations under the scope of
application of the Administrative Guidelines on Promotion of Racial Equity and
names of service providers in the past three years

<i>Bureaux and departments</i>	<i>Interpretation service providers</i>	<i>Total number of interpretation services arranged⁽¹⁾</i>		
		<i>2016-2017</i>	<i>2017-2018</i>	<i>2018-2019</i>
Hospital Authority	Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui ("HKSKH") Lady MacLehose Centre; part-time court interpreters; Consulate Offices; and non-governmental organizations	12 393	15 257	12 453 (up to end December 2018)

<i>Bureaux and departments</i>	<i>Interpretation service providers</i>	<i>Total number of interpretation services arranged⁽¹⁾</i>		
		<i>2016-2017</i>	<i>2017-2018</i>	<i>2018-2019</i>
Immigration Department ⁽²⁾	Part-time non-government interpreters; and service contractors	12 326	11 776	12 233
Security Bureau ⁽³⁾	Full-time in-house interpreters; and part-time interpreters of the Judiciary	Not applicable	3 893	9 321
Correctional Services Department	Part-time court interpreters	1 213	1 278	1 487
Construction Industry Council	In-house EM staff	654	1 508	1 428
Department of Health	CHEER Centre; part-time court interpreters; and HKSKH Lady MacLehose Centre	731	916	1 091
Legal Aid Department	Part-time court interpreters	632	691	725
Labour Department	CHEER Centre; part-time court interpreters; and service contractors on Government's purchase card list	364	451	546
Customs and Excise Department	Part-time court interpreters; and service contractors	384	431	464
Social Welfare Department ⁽⁴⁾	CHEER Centre; part-time court interpreters; and other service contractors	247	178	347
Working Family and Student Financial Assistance Agency	CHEER Centre; and service contractor	55	80	218
Efficiency Office ⁽⁵⁾	CHEER Centre; and service contractor	3	2	121
Education Bureau ⁽⁶⁾	CHEER Centre; and service contractor	78	96	107

<i>Bureaux and departments</i>	<i>Interpretation service providers</i>	<i>Total number of interpretation services arranged⁽¹⁾</i>		
		<i>2016-2017</i>	<i>2017-2018</i>	<i>2018-2019</i>
Housing Department ⁽⁷⁾	CHEER Centre	15	39	31
Hong Kong Police Force ⁽⁸⁾	CHEER Centre; and part-time court interpreters	77	50	21
Fire Services Department	Part-time court interpreters	1	0	11
Census and Statistics Department	CHEER Centre; HKSKH Lady MacLehose Centre	22 ⁽⁹⁾	0	0
Registration and Electoral Office	CHEER Centre	3	0	0
Employees Retraining Board ⁽¹⁰⁾	Teaching assistants of training bodies	6 classes	21 classes	12 classes

Other bureaux and departments

The following bureaux and departments have not arranged interpretation services for EM service users in the past three years:

Civil Service Bureau, Commerce and Economic Development Bureau, Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau, Development Bureau, Environment Bureau, Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau, Food and Health Bureau, Home Affairs Bureau, Innovation and Technology Bureau, Labour and Welfare Bureau, Transport and Housing Bureau, Architectural Services Department, Buildings Department, Civil Aviation Department, Civil Engineering and Development Department, Companies Registry, Drainage Services Department, Electrical and Mechanical Services Department, Environmental Protection Department, Government Logistics Department, Government Property Agency, Highways Department, Home Affairs Department, Hong Kong Observatory, Information Services Department, Inland Revenue Department, Innovation and Technology Commission, Land Registry, Lands Department, Leisure and Cultural Services Department, Marine Department, Office of the Communications Authority, Office of the Government Chief Information Officer, Official Receiver's Office, Planning Department, Post Office, Rating and Valuation Department, Transport Department, Treasury, Vocational Training Council and Water Supplies Department.

Notes:

- (1) Interpretation services include telephone interpretation and enquiry service, and on-site interpretation service.

- (2) The Immigration Department has currently employed a total of 19 in-house interpreters on non-civil service contract terms mainly for provision of relevant services to non-refoulement claimants.
- (3) Interpretation services provided by the Pilot Scheme Office for Provision of Publicly-funded Legal Assistance for Non-refoulement Claimants ("PSO"), which started its operation since 4 September 2017. Upon request from Pilot Scheme Lawyers, PSO arranges interpretation services for conferences between lawyers and claimants in processing non-refoulement claims. The number of interpretation services arranged is therefore the number of conferences arranged with interpretation services.
- (4) The Social Welfare Department has started collecting statistics on the utilization of interpretation services of part-time court interpreters, CHEER Centre and other service contractors since January 2019. The numbers of usage of interpretation in 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 as shown in the table only refer to the service provided by CHEER Centre.
- (5) The 1823 Centre under the Efficiency Office provides a round-the-clock one-stop service to answer enquiries for 22 departments and to receive complaints about any area of Government services. 1823 has handled the dedicated hotline for foreign domestic helpers set up by the Labour Department since 19 December 2018 and more requests for interpretation service from EMs have been received in that year compared to the previous years.
- (6) Every year, the Education Bureau arranges dedicated briefing sessions with simultaneous interpretation services of major EMs languages for parents of non-Chinese speaking ("NCS") students on various topics such as admission to kindergartens ("KG") (including KG education policy and financial assistance for pre-primary students), allocation systems of Primary One and Secondary One school places, and workshops for parents of NCS students organized by the Chinese Language Learning Support Centres. Besides, telephone interpretation and enquiry services are provided on a need basis through the CHEER Centre. The figures shown in the table only covered the number of participants who used the interpretation services in a total of 21 briefing sessions on Primary One Admission and Secondary School Places Allocation System for parents of NCS students in the past three years and those provided by the CHEER Centre according to their records, but not all of such briefing sessions and other events, as the Education Bureau did not collect such statistics.
- (7) The Estate Management Division of Housing Department does not have records on the figures for provision of interpretation services in respective estate offices.
- (8) At present, apart from providing instant telephone interpretation service at police report rooms and reporting centres in collaboration with CHEER Centre, the Police will also, with regard to the needs of the situation (e.g. taking statements from EMs), arrange for part-time court interpreters to provide interpretation service. However, the Police do not keep statistics on the usage of interpretation service provided by part-time court interpreters.
- (9) Refers to interpretation services rendered to respondents of the 2016 Population By-census.
- (10) Employees Retraining Board provides dedicated training courses for EMs. Where necessary, interpretation support will be arranged. The figures shown in the table are numbers of classes provided with interpretation support in the respective years.

Service requesters	Telephone Interpretation and Enquiry Service			On-site (Escort) Interpretation Service			On-Sight Interpretation Service*			Written Translation Service			Simultaneous Interpretation Service		
	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Immigration and Visa															
Immigration Department	3	1	2	0	0	0	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0
EMs and others	40	35	31	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other areas															
Other bureaux and departments	77	47	100	80	107	65	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	13	6	17	4	6	2
EMs and others	2 439	1 925	2 217	47	111	52	13	5	9	15	13	11	30	10	108
Total	3 993	3 179	3 891	776	1 053	1 145	241	271	252	55	74	76	37	31	132

Note:

- * EMs can bring along documents in English to CHEER Centre for oral translation service provided by interpreters. This service is applicable to individual EM users only.

Annex 3

Usage of CHEER Centre's interpretation and translation services by bureaux, departments, public organizations and EMs with breakdown by EM languages in the past three years

Service	Telephone Interpretation and Enquiry Service			On-site (Escort) Interpretation Service			On-Sight Interpretation Service*			Written Translation Service**			Simultaneous Interpretation Service**		
	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Bahasa Indonesia	370	179	291	33	46	37	1	2	2	21	29	34	22	4	51
Hindi	217	226	177	23	41	57	1	9	7	22	40	35	4	1	0
Nepali	952	850	1 175	74	149	147	4	21	39	28	48	36	9	13	59
Punjabi	343	338	367	82	100	109	1	1	7	20	18	32	0	0	1
Tagalog	98	81	168	16	125	43	0	2	1	17	20	29	0	0	4
Thai	139	98	129	27	18	41	8	5	19	19	27	30	0	10	18
Urdu	1 079	708	622	521	574	711	226	231	177	43	53	41	9	7	3
Other languages	795	699	962	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3 993	3 179	3 891	776	1 053	1 145	241	271	252	170	235	237	44	35	136

Notes:

- * EMs can bring along documents in English to CHEER Centre for oral translation service provided by interpreters. This service is applicable to individual EM users only.

- ** More than one EM languages may be involved in a request of written translation service and simultaneous interpretation service.

Number of language classes organized in support service centres for EMs and number of participants by ethnicities in the past three project years

Cantonese classes (2015-2016 project year)

<i>Centre/ Sub-centre</i>	<i>HOPE Centre</i>	<i>CHEER Centre</i>	<i>SHINE Centre</i>	<i>YLTH Centre</i>	<i>HOME Centre and Sub-centre</i>	<i>TOUCH Sub-centre</i>	<i>LINK Centre</i>
<i>Reporting period</i>	<i>31 May 2015 to 30 May 2016</i>	<i>5 September 2015 to 4 September 2016</i>	<i>1 August 2015 to 31 July 2016</i>	<i>28 June 2015 to 27 June 2016</i>	<i>11 December 2015 to 10 December 2016</i>	<i>21 December 2015 to 20 December 2016</i>	<i>30 October 2015 to 29 October 2016</i>
Number of classes	29	15	16	10	23	10	17
Number of participants by ethnicities							
Indian	191	40	76	9	39	53	4
Nepalese	22	22	54	18	106	0	6
Pakistani	14	17	19	20	135	10	176
Filipino	147	15	75	18	9	23	0
Indonesian	64	138	12	69	8	0	0
Thai	13	42	0	0	7	0	0
Others	215	18	63	16	31	26	59
Not known*	54	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	720	292	299	150	335	112	245

Cantonese classes (2016-2017 project year)

<i>Centre/ Sub-centre</i>	<i>HOPE Centre</i>	<i>CHEER Centre</i>	<i>SHINE Centre</i>	<i>YLTH Centre</i>	<i>HOME Centre and Sub-centre</i>	<i>TOUCH Sub-centre</i>	<i>LINK Centre</i>
<i>Reporting period</i>	<i>31 May 2016 to 30 May 2017</i>	<i>5 September 2016 to 4 September 2017</i>	<i>1 August 2016 to 31 July 2017</i>	<i>28 June 2016 to 27 June 2017</i>	<i>11 December 2016 to 10 December 2017</i>	<i>21 December 2016 to 20 December 2017</i>	<i>30 October 2016 to 29 October 2017</i>
Number of classes	27	13	16	10	25	10	20
Number of participants by ethnicities							
Indian	148	46	55	17	49	53	8
Nepalese	23	13	25	31	235	5	14
Pakistani	13	8	43	21	68	6	104
Filipino	113	43	62	20	9	24	0
Indonesian	35	133	6	37	7	0	16
Thai	9	28	0	0	1	0	0
Others	227	17	68	19	23	34	119
Not known*	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total	568	289	259	145	392	122	261

Note:

* Ethnicity of some participants is not known.

Cantonese classes (2017-2018 project year)

<i>Centre/ Sub-centre</i>	<i>HOPE Centre</i>	<i>CHEER Centre</i>	<i>SHINE Centre</i>	<i>YLTH Centre</i>	<i>HOME Centre and Sub-centre</i>	<i>TOUCH Sub-centre</i>	<i>LINK Centre</i>
<i>Reporting period</i>	<i>31 May 2017 to 30 May 2018</i>	<i>5 September 2017 to 4 September 2018</i>	<i>1 August 2017 to 31 July 2018</i>	<i>28 June 2017 to 27 June 2018</i>	<i>11 December 2017 to 10 December 2018</i>	<i>21 December 2017 to 20 December 2018</i>	<i>30 October 2017 to 29 October 2018</i>
Number of classes	40	17	14	10	27	10	17
Number of participants by ethnicities							
Indian	187	35	95	6	78	49	13
Nepalese	26	16	64	13	240	2	25
Pakistani	21	14	0	24	58	8	156
Filipino	215	75	20	43	8	11	27
Indonesian	55	146	15	47	2	4	3
Thai	20	18	0	1	0	0	0
Others	369	29	2	7	39	53	42
Total	893	333	196	141	425	127	266

English classes (2015-2016 project year)

<i>Centre/ Sub-centre</i>	<i>HOPE Centre</i>	<i>CHEER Centre</i>	<i>SHINE Centre</i>	<i>YLTH Centre</i>	<i>HOME Centre and Sub-centre</i>	<i>TOUCH Sub-centre</i>	<i>LINK Centre</i>
<i>Reporting period</i>	<i>31 May 2015 to 30 May 2016</i>	<i>5 September 2015 to 4 September 2016</i>	<i>1 August 2015 to 31 July 2016</i>	<i>28 June 2015 to 27 June 2016</i>	<i>11 December 2015 to 10 December 2016</i>	<i>21 December 2015 to 20 December 2016</i>	<i>30 October 2015 to 29 October 2016</i>
Number of classes	19	19	4	10	22	0	16
Number of participants by ethnicities							
Indian	10	5	8	0	20	0	13
Nepalese	5	0	9	2	159	0	30
Pakistani	3	4	4	0	138	0	176
Filipino	35	9	2	0	0	0	0
Indonesian	346	355	12	149	0	0	0
Thai	32	6	30	0	0	0	0
Others	10	5	3	1	6	0	56
Not known*	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	448	384	68	152	323	0	275

Note:

* Ethnicity of some participants is not known.

English classes (2016-2017 project year)

<i>Centre/ Sub-centre</i>	<i>HOPE Centre</i>	<i>CHEER Centre</i>	<i>SHINE Centre</i>	<i>YLTH Centre</i>	<i>HOME Centre and Sub-centre</i>	<i>TOUCH Sub-centre</i>	<i>LINK Centre</i>
<i>Reporting period</i>	<i>31 May 2016 to 30 May 2017</i>	<i>5 September 2016 to 4 September 2017</i>	<i>1 August 2016 to 31 July 2017</i>	<i>28 June 2016 to 27 June 2017</i>	<i>11 December 2016 to 10 December 2017</i>	<i>21 December 2016 to 20 December 2017</i>	<i>30 October 2016 to 29 October 2017</i>
Number of classes	17	20	4	10	20	1	23
Number of participants by ethnicities							
Indian	22	5	4	1	30	0	17
Nepalese	5	1	10	18	221	0	139
Pakistani	18	5	8	1	71	11	90
Filipino	62	13	0	12	1	0	0
Indonesian	209	324	10	100	0	0	0
Thai	11	9	44	0	0	0	0
Others	31	2	0	1	3	0	90
Not known*	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	365	359	76	133	326	11	336

Note:

* Ethnicity of some participants is not known.

English classes (2017-2018 project year)

<i>Centre/ Sub-centre</i>	<i>HOPE Centre</i>	<i>CHEER Centre</i>	<i>SHINE Centre</i>	<i>YLTH Centre</i>	<i>HOME Centre and Sub-centre</i>	<i>TOUCH Sub-centre</i>	<i>LINK Centre</i>
<i>Reporting period</i>	<i>31 May 2017 to 30 May 2018</i>	<i>5 September 2017 to 4 September 2018</i>	<i>1 August 2017 to 31 July 2018</i>	<i>28 June 2017 to 27 June 2018</i>	<i>11 December 2017 to 10 December 2018</i>	<i>21 December 2017 to 20 December 2018</i>	<i>30 October 2017 to 29 October 2018</i>
Number of classes	22	17	3	10	17	0	16
Number of participants by ethnicities							
Indian	24	4	2	2	16	0	22
Nepalese	13	0	7	5	198	0	15
Pakistani	11	8	2	4	60	0	101
Filipino	119	28	0	11	6	0	17
Indonesian	179	279	2	107	2	0	2
Thai	22	6	20	2	0	0	0
Others	51	9	7	6	13	0	91
Total	419	334	40	137	295	0	248

Parking spaces for tourist coaches

12. **MR TONY TSE** (in Chinese): *President, some members of the tourism industry have relayed that, in recent years, with the Government developing the brownfield sites in the New Territories and gradually resuming, for long-term development, a number of temporary car park sites let by way of short-term tenancies, the number of parking spaces for tourist coaches has been reduced. Meanwhile, the rise in the number of visitors to Hong Kong year after year has resulted in a rise in the utilization rate of tourist coaches, leading to a more acute shortage of parking spaces for tourist coaches as well as aggravating the problems of illegal parking of tourist coaches and traffic obstruction. In addition, some parking spaces for tourist coaches in hotels and industrial buildings are available for picking up/dropping off passengers or stopping and waiting only. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (1) of the number of parking spaces for tourist coaches in the territory in each of the past three years, with a breakdown by the locations of such parking spaces (i.e. private premises, hotel, industrial building, roadside, and other places) and the modes of parking/stopping (e.g. available for parking 24 hours a day, for picking up/dropping off passengers only, and for those tourist coaches with drivers on board stopping and waiting); and*
- (2) of the details and implementation timetable of the various measures to increase the number of parking spaces for tourist coaches?*

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

- (1) The numbers of parking spaces and picking up/setting down spaces for tourist coaches in Hong Kong over the past three years are provided in the Annex.
- (2) To cope with the parking demand of tourist coaches, the Government will continue to pursue actively the following measures to increase the supply of parking spaces:

- (a) designating suitable on-street locations as night-time parking spaces: From 2016 to end April 2019, a total of 18 night-time parking spaces for tourist coaches were newly provided, whereas 25 such parking spaces are under planning, with five of them expected to be put into service by 2020;
- (b) following the principle of "Single Site, Multiple Uses" to provide public car parking spaces in suitable "Government, Institution or Community" facilities, public open space projects and public housing developments: A total of about 20 works projects are under planning providing about 5 100 parking spaces, of which eight projects providing about 100 parking spaces for tourist coaches are anticipated to be put into service progressively in the next few years;
- (c) increasing the number of parking spaces and picking up/setting down facilities for tourist coaches: In 2018-2019, the Transport Department ("TD") increased a total of 41 on-street parking spaces and 85 picking up/setting down facilities for tourist coaches in such areas as Tsim Sha Tsui, Southern District, Wan Chai, Eastern District, Jordan (near the Express Rail Link station), Tsing Yi and Sai Kung. In 2019-2020, TD has planned to provide 137 additional parking spaces and 52 additional picking up/setting down facilities in Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon City, Wong Tai Sin, Kwun Tong, Wan Chai, Southern District, North Point, Tsuen Wan, Tuen Mun, Tung Chung, etc.;
- (d) specifying in the tenancy agreements of suitable short-term tenancy ("STT") car parks a minimum number of parking spaces to be reserved for commercial vehicles such as tourist coaches and goods vehicles: Currently, 21 STT car parks are required to provide a total of about 900 coach parking spaces in accordance with the tenancy conditions under this arrangement; and
- (e) continuing with the consultancy study to assess the parking demand of commercial vehicles (including tourist coaches) and formulating short, medium and long-term measures to

address the anticipated demand: The study is scheduled to be completed in end 2019.

Annex

Numbers of parking spaces and picking up/setting down spaces
for tourist coaches in Hong Kong

Year [#]	Parking spaces (available for parking round the clock)				Picking up/ setting down spaces		Total
	On- street	In STT car parks	In government premises and community facilities	In private developments [*]	On- street	Off- street	
2017	1 087	1 361	954	1 485	264	341	5 492
2018	1 120	1 374	956	1 397	309	416	5 572
2019 (end March)	1 119	1 374	956	1 405	320	416	5 590

Notes:

Unless specified otherwise, year-end figures are provided in the table above.

* As TD does not maintain statistics on the numbers of parking spaces broken down by the use of the premises in which the parking spaces are located, the numbers of parking spaces provided in premises such as hotels and industrial buildings for tourist coaches are not available.

Support for the development of the darts sport

13. **MR JIMMY NG** (in Chinese): *President, in recent years, the darts sport has become increasingly popular in Hong Kong, and Hong Kong's darts athletes have repeatedly attained great results in international competitions. Quite a number of darts athletes and enthusiasts hope that the Government supports the development of the darts sport. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (1) *whether the Government provided, in the past five years, the darts sport with support on aspects such as finance, venues, organization of events and promotion; if so, of the respective details; if not, the reasons for that;*
- (2) *whether it has plans to provide, in the coming five years, the darts sport with the various support mentioned in (1); if so, of the respective details; if not, the reasons for that;*
- (3) *whether there is now any subvention scheme open for application by darts sport associations; if so, of the eligibility requirements and other details;*
- (4) *whether the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD") has plans to provide, in the coming five years, venues for the darts sport; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;*
- (5) *given that LCSD is conducting a review on the Sports Subvention Scheme, whether the scope of the review includes relaxation of the eligibility requirements so as to cover new sports such as the darts sport; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;*
- (6) *whether LCSD will, in the coming five years, include the darts sport in the School Sports Programme so as to cultivate students' interest in the darts sport; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and*
- (7) *whether it will ask the Commissioner for Sports to (i) include the promotion of the darts sport in his work plan for the coming five years, (ii) strengthen his communication with darts sport associations, and (iii) assist in striving for the inclusion of the darts sport as a medal sport in the Asian Games and the Olympic Games; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?*

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Chinese): President, the Government has been committed to promoting the development of different sports through the Sports Subvention Scheme ("the Scheme") of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD"), under which 60 eligible "national sports

associations" ("NSAs") are provided with subvention to organize various sports activities. Since 2011-2012, subvented NSAs under the Scheme must fulfil six criteria,⁽¹⁾ including that NSA must be a member of the Sports Federation and Olympic Committee of Hong Kong, China ("SF&OC") and concurrently be affiliated to the relevant International Federation ("IF"). However, 26 organizations which could not fulfil all the six criteria had long been subvented under the relevant subsidy scheme of the two former municipal councils in the past, and were therefore transitioned and included in the current Scheme.

My reply to the enquiries raised is as follows:

(1) to (3)

Currently, there is no NSA responsible for darts among the members of SF&OC. However, the Hong Kong Darts Association ("HKDA") had long been subvented under the relevant subsidy scheme of the two former municipal councils in the past, and was therefore transitioned and included in the current Scheme. HKDA may apply for subvention from the Scheme to organize various activities, including promotional activities, training and local events. HKDA may also reserve venues for activities subvented under the Scheme and enjoy rental subsidy in accordance with LCSD's booking procedures for recreational and sports facilities. In addition, HKDA may apply for funding support from the Arts and Sport Development Fund ("ASDF") (Sports Portion) to organize international events in Hong Kong.

- (1) Since 2011-2012, LCSD has required that any sports organization applying for the Scheme must fulfil all of the following criteria:
- (1) it is a member of SF&OC;
 - (2) it is affiliated to IF of the respective sports;
 - (3) it is registered under the Companies Ordinance and has Articles of Association;
 - (4) it is a non-profit-making sports organization;
 - (5) it has been in operation and has organized sports programmes for at least three years; and
 - (6) the kind of sports it promotes is one of the medal sports/potential medal sports of the following major games: Asian Games, Asian Winter Games, Asian Youth Games, Asian Indoor and Martial Arts Games, Asian Beach Games, Asian Para Games, Asian Youth Para Games, Olympic Games, Olympic Winter Games, Youth Olympic Games, Winter Youth Olympic Games, World Games, Paralympic Games and Paralympic Winter Games.

In the past five years, we did not receive any application from HKDA on the Scheme or ASDF (Sports Portion).

- (4) To cater for the needs of different sports, most of the leisure venues under the management of LCSD are multipurpose sports venues. Some of these venues would be available for use by various new sports, such as darts. We have no plan to provide dedicated venues for darts at this stage.
- (5) To further enhance the development of sports in Hong Kong, LCSD is conducting a comprehensive review of the Scheme, covering the funding principles and eligibility for NSAs and/or sports organizations. The findings and recommendations will be announced upon completion of the review at the end of 2019.
- (6) LCSD has all along been committed to providing a wide range of sports and recreational activities for the public. It would keep in view the development of new sports. Relevant eligible organizations may request to include new sports in the School Sports Programme. LCSD would take into consideration a number of factors, including community adoption, venues and relevant technical support, when making a decision.
- (7) The work of the Commissioner for Sports includes promoting and implementing the policy objectives of promoting sports in the community, supporting elite sports and developing Hong Kong into a centre for major international sports events, as well as taking forward the various initiatives for promoting and supporting sports development. If NSAs or other organizations have relevant suggestions, they are welcomed to put them forward to the Commissioner for Sports.

The International Olympic Committee ("IOC") and the Olympic Council of Asia ("OCA") are responsible for the events and organization of the Olympic Games and the Asian Games respectively. Both IOC and OCA are non-governmental organizations. SF&OC, which is a member of both IOC and OCA, is responsible for the participation of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region in these two major games.

Work of civil service lifeguards

14. **DR ELIZABETH QUAT** (in Chinese): *President, regarding the work of civil service lifeguards under the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD"), will the Government inform this Council:*

- (1) *given that candidates for civil service lifeguards must pass a trade test of skin-diving to a depth of two metres,*

 - (i) *of the current number of public swimming pools with a depth of more than two metres, broken down by District Council ("DC") district in which the pool is situated and name of the public swimming pool complex to which the pool belongs; and*
 - (ii) *of the current number of public beaches provided with beach rafts, and set out a breakdown of such number and the names of the beaches concerned by DC district;*

- (2) *of the rank of the officers who are currently responsible for supervising lifeguards in performing skin-diving and scuba-diving at beaches for carrying out duties such as search and rescue operations, as well as inspections of seabed conditions and clearance of objects after the onslaught of typhoons;*
- (3) *whether LCSD has ensured that the supervising officers mentioned in (2) meet the qualification requirements for a diving supervisor (including having an adequate knowledge of the required diving mode and underwater work, possessing the experience required of a diver, as well as having received training on first aid and cardiopulmonary resuscitation and possessing the relevant experience); if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;*
- (4) *whether the regular drills of lifeguards include skin-diving or scuba-diving to a depth of five metres; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and*
- (5) *of the respective standard protective gear provided by LCSD for lifeguards for their (i) handling oil pollution and (ii) carrying out post-typhoon clearance work?*

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Chinese): President, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD") currently manages 44 public swimming pools and 41 gazetted beaches. Lifeguard services are provided at all public swimming pools and 38 gazetted beaches. My reply to Dr Elizabeth QUAT's question is as follows:

- (1) Currently, the vast majority of LCSD's public swimming pools are swimming pools of 2 m or less in depth, except diving pools and individual pool facilities. A breakdown of the pool facilities with a depth of more than 2 m by District Council ("DC") district is tabulated at Annex 1. Raft facilities are provided at 18 gazetted beaches managed by LCSD. A breakdown of these beaches by DC district is tabulated at Annex 2.

- (2) and (3)

The major responsibilities of civil service lifeguards of LCSD include lifesaving and first aid, assisting in law enforcement and maintaining order as well as assisting in cleansing work. The major responsibilities of senior civil service lifeguards include deputizing for Amenities Assistants, supervising lifeguards in performing daily tasks, leading and performing lifesaving and first aid duties, providing training to lifeguards, assisting in implementing departmental drill programmes, etc. The entry requirements for senior lifeguards, include the compulsory attainment of a valid Beach Lifeguard Management Award and Pool Lifeguard Management Award or above from the Hong Kong Life Saving Society within the last three years, and the possession of a valid First Aid Certificate issued by the St. John Ambulance Association, Hong Kong Red Cross or Auxiliary Medical Service. They are also required to possess five years of lifesaving experience in public swimming pool, beach or water sports centre. Hence, they should have adequate knowledge and experience to lead rescue operations.

Underwater search by skin-diving is one of the basic skills and responsibilities of lifeguards' daily lifesaving work. Lifeguards deploy skills taught and assessed in the training associated with lifeguard qualifications, including underwater search by skin diving, etc., in drowning incidents. Upon receiving a report of suspected missing swimmer in beach water, lifeguards will carry out a search

operation and the officer in-charge of the venue will report to the Police and ask the Fire Services Department ("FSD") to deploy firemen to the scene to provide support. In addition to skin diving used in underwater search operations, trained and qualified lifeguards may carry out emergency underwater search for missing victim(s) using scuba diving equipment under the supervision of senior lifeguard and continue assisting in the rescue operation upon arrival of diving personnel of FSD where necessary.

Scuba diving is not a daily duty of lifeguards of LCSD. Contractors are normally hired by LCSD for tasks requiring diving for prolonged periods (e.g. underwater inspection or maintenance of facilities, etc.). For instance, two professional contractors have been engaged for the inspection and maintenance of shark prevention nets respectively, which involve the deployment of professional divers to carry out the work. Diving tasks involved in the inspection of seabed conditions and the clearance work in the aftermath of the passage of Typhoon Mangkhut in September 2018 were undertaken by outsourced contractors.

- (4) LCSD has established guidelines requiring all lifeguards to participate in regular rescue drills and drills for mobilization plans at their workplace to ensure that they are familiar with the corresponding rescue operation under different circumstances. In addition to drills on swimming and physical fitness, emergency operation plan, resuscitation skills, use of first aid equipment, etc., the regular drill programme for lifeguards also includes rescue by skin-diving into the deep end of a pool or deep-water zone of a beach.
- (5) One of the major responsibilities of lifeguards is to assist in cleansing work. In performing their daily cleansing work, lifeguards may be required to assist in cleaning up oil spill occasionally found at beaches or clearance work of beaches in the aftermath of typhoons. When LCSD is notified by the Marine Department of any oil spill incident near beach area or when venue staff find signs of oil contamination of beaches, officers-in-charge of the beaches will lead lifeguards and venue staff to assist in handling oil spill, including monitoring whether beaches will be contaminated

with oil spills, assisting and advising swimmers to go back to the shore, preventing dispersion of oil to beaches as far as possible with the use of oil absorbent strips, in accordance with LCSD's contingency plan for oil pollutions. Where oil spill is found in beach area, the officer-in-charge of the beach will contact and seek professional assistance from relevant departments in cleaning up the contaminated sand on the beach. Besides, LCSD will provide appropriate personal protective equipment, such as plastic gloves and boots, for lifeguards to carry out these tasks. All oil-contaminated waste, such as used oil absorbent strips and contaminated sand, etc., will be disposed of by contractors of the department concerned. Service contractors will be hired by LCSD to carry out inspection of the seabed conditions and the clearance work following serious damage caused to beaches by typhoons.

Annex 1

Swimming pool facilities with a depth of more than 2 m
in LCSD's public swimming pools

<i>District</i>	<i>Name of swimming pool</i>	<i>Main pool</i>	<i>Multi-purpose pool</i>	<i>Diving pool</i>
Eastern	Chai Wan Swimming Pool			1
Southern	Pao Yue Kong Swimming Pool			1
Wan Chai	Victoria Park Swimming Pool		1 ⁽³⁾	
Kowloon City	Kowloon Tsai Swimming Pool	1 ⁽¹⁾		
	Tai Wan Shan Swimming Pool	1		
Sham Shui Po	Lai Chi Kok Park Swimming Pool			1
	Lei Cheng Uk Swimming Pool			1
	Sham Shui Po Park Swimming Pool			1
Yau Tsim Mong	Kowloon Park Swimming Pool	1 ⁽²⁾		1
Wong Tai Sin	Morse Park Swimming Pool			1
Kwai Tsing	Kwai Shing Swimming Pool			1
	North Kwai Chung Jockey Club Swimming Pool			1
Sai Kung	Tseung Kwan O Swimming Pool	1 ⁽¹⁾		1

<i>District</i>	<i>Name of swimming pool</i>	<i>Main pool</i>	<i>Multi-purpose pool</i>	<i>Diving pool</i>
Sha Tin	Sha Tin Jockey Club Swimming Pool			1
Tai Po	Tai Po Swimming Pool			1
Tsuen Wan	Shing Mun Valley Swimming Pool			1 ⁽⁴⁾
Tuen Mun	Tuen Mun Swimming Pool			1
Yuen Long	Yuen Long Swimming Pool			1
Total		3	1	16

Notes:

- (1) The main pools of Kowloon Tsai Swimming Pool and Tseung Kwan O Swimming Pool have a water depth of 3.7 m and 2.2 m respectively.
- (2) The main pool of Kowloon Park Swimming Pool has a water depth of 2.5 m. Part of the pool floor is adjustable which allows the water depth to be set at 1.2 m, 1.5 m or 1.8 m.
- (3) The multi-purpose pool of Victoria Park Swimming Pool is provided with an adjustable pool floor. The water depth is set at 5 m when it is used for diving, or 2.5 m for water polo and synchronized swimming, or 1.2 m when it is open for general public use.
- (4) The diving pool of Shing Mun Valley Swimming Pool is provided with an adjustable pool floor with a maximum water depth of 5 m, which is set at 1.2 m when it is open for general public use.

Annex 2

Gazetted beaches of LCSD
Raft facilities

<i>Name of beach</i>	<i>Number of raft(s)</i>
Southern District	
Deep Water Bay Beach	3
Repulse Bay Beach	5
Middle Bay Beach	1
South Bay Beach	1
Stanley Main Beach	3
Chung Hom Kok Beach	1
St. Stephen's Bay Beach	1
Turtle Cove Beach	1

<i>Name of beach</i>	<i>Number of raft(s)</i>
Island District	
Lo So Shing Beach	1
Kwun Yam Beach	1
Cheung Chau Tung Wan Beach	3
Sai Kung District	
Trio Beach	2
Kiu Tsui Beach	1
Hap Mun Bay Beach	2
Silverstrand Beach	2
Clear Water Bay First Beach	2
Clear Water Bay Second Beach	3
Tsuen Wan District	
Lido Beach	2
Total	35

Implementation of municipal solid waste charging

15. **MR WU CHI-WAI** (in Chinese): *President, it has been reported that municipal solid waste ("MSW") charging will be implemented next year the earliest. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (1) *given that the current population residing in public rental housing ("PRH") estates exceeds two millions, whether the Government will discuss with the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") the implementation of a pilot scheme on MSW charging by amending the tenancy agreements signed with tenants, so as to grasp the actual situation of large-scale implementation of MSW charging;*
- (2) *of the details of the preparatory work, undertaken by HA up to 30 April this year, for the implementation of MSW charging at its PRH estates, e.g. formulating refuse collection procedure as well as modifying the design of and the usage arrangements for refuse stations and refuse chutes;*
- (3) *given the absence of a domestic food waste collection system at present, of the measures to be put in place by the Government to*

facilitate the proper handling of domestic food waste by the public, so as to lower the impact of MSW charging on general households; and

- (4) *whether it will extensively set up closed circuit television systems in various districts to curb illegal dumping of domestic waste that may occur after the implementation of MSW charging?*

SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (in Chinese): President, our responses to the question raised by Mr WU are as follows:

- (1) Premised on the "polluter-pays" principle and built upon the existing municipal solid waste ("MSW") collection and disposal system as well as the recommendations made by the Council for Sustainable Development ("SDC") after conducting an extensive public engagement exercise, MSW charges are proposed to be levied across the territory through the dual modes of (a) charging by designated bags ("DBs")/designated labels ("DLs") and (b) charging by weight-based "gate-fee". Specifically, charging by DBs/DLs requires members of the public to wrap MSW in pre-paid DBs properly or attach with pre-paid DLs before disposal. This charging mode is applicable to most residential buildings, village houses, street-level shops, and institutional premises, accounting for some 80% of the daily MSW disposed of at landfills. Charging by weight-based "gate-fee" is applicable to the remaining around 20% of the daily MSW collected and disposed of by private waste collectors using waste collection vehicles without compactors (including grab lorries, demountable trucks, and tippers, etc.). Charges are calculated based on the weight of MSW disposed of at landfills or refuse transfer stations.

As most of MSW from public rental housing ("PRH") are generally collected by refuse collection vehicles with rear compactors (except for oversized waste subject to charging by DLs), charging by DBs will be applicable to PRH.

The Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") has launched different pilot schemes and involvement projects to facilitate different stakeholders to try out MSW charging in actual settings.

We launched a six-month pilot scheme in some PRH estates and private housing estates in 2014 to try out the effectiveness of different modes of quantity-based charging. The Environment and Conservation Fund ("ECF") has been funding non-profit-making organizations and bodies since 2015 to carry out Community Involvement Projects ("CIPs") in different types of premises to try out MSW charging and prepare for its implementation. As at today, more than 80 MSW charging CIPs have been sponsored, of which three of them are PRH estates.

In addition, to enable more stakeholders in PRH estates to try out MSW charging in actual settings in advance and help PRH residents to get prepared for the implementation of MSW charging, EPD and the Housing Department ("HD") have jointly commenced Trial Projects in 10 PRH estates for a period of approximately six months each by batches in end 2018. EPD provides free dummy DBs to PRH residents for on-site trial and simulating MSW charging arrangements during the trial period. EPD also organizes various publicity and public education activities to enrich participants' understanding of MSW charging, source separation of waste and clean recycling.

- (2) Based on the recommendations made by SDC, the proposed MSW charging implementation arrangements are built upon the existing MSW collection system. EPD and HD have maintained close liaison on implementation of MSW charging. To ensure effective implementation of MSW charging, EPD has taken into account the waste collection arrangements and relevant facilities in PRH such as waste chutes and waste collection rooms, etc. in devising the implementation arrangements.

Upon the passage of the Waste Disposal (Charging for Municipal Solid Waste) (Amendment) Bill 2018, HD will consult the Subsidised Housing Committee of the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") on the implementation details of MSW charging at PRH having regard to the passed legal provisions and requirements. HD will also provide clear guidelines to estate management staff including property management companies and cleansing service contractors to ensure that waste would be handled in accordance with the legal requirements.

- (3) To promote proper recycling of food waste and make good use of innovation technology mainly on turning food waste into energy to suit the local situation in Hong Kong, the Chief Executive mentioned in her 2018 Policy Agenda that a pilot scheme would be introduced to examine the feasibility of implementing government-run free food waste collection services in the long run.

EPD will allocate a portion of the treatment capacity of the Organic Resources Recovery Centre Phase 1 (O·PARK1) and the Food Waste/Sewage Sludge Anaerobic Co-digestion Trial Scheme at the Tai Po Sewage Treatment Works ("STW") to provide free collection and recycling services for about 50 tonnes of domestic food waste per day (the total food waste treatment capacity of the two facilities will be 250 tonnes per day). We will liaise with HD and the Hong Kong Housing Society to invite their participation in the pilot scheme. We will accord priority to and invite housing estates with experience in waste separation and/or handling food waste separation and recycling to join the pilot scheme. For example, housing estates that have participated in the food waste recovery trial under "Green Delight in Estates" organized by HA, or those PRH estates who have participated in aforementioned CIPs funded by ECF and Trial Projects etc.

We are planning to extend the "food waste/sewage sludge anaerobic co-digestion" technology to Sha Tin STW and seeking funding approval of the Legislative Council for the Organic Resources Recovery Centre Phase 2 ("ORRC2"). Upon commissioning of the two projects in 2022, we will allocate one-third of this treatment capacity to treat domestic food waste, which means the domestic food waste treatment capacity will be increased to around 200 tonnes per day.

We are conducting an engineering feasibility study and an Environmental Impact Assessment for the Organic Resources Recovery Centre Phase 3 ("ORRC3"). Depending on the progress in the preparation and subject to the approval of funds from the Legislative Council, we hope to commission ORRC3 in 2026 with a daily food waste treatment capacity of 300 tonnes.

Subject to the progress and development of the remaining food waste treatment facilities (including other ORRCs and food waste/sewage sludge anaerobic co-digestion facilities which may be built in the future), we anticipate that Hong Kong's overall food waste treatment capacity will be increased to about 1 800 tonnes per day by around mid-2030s. This would amount to 50% of food waste generated at present. According to overseas experience in food waste recycling, only around 50% of food waste can be recycled even if comprehensive food waste recycling facilities are available.

- (4) In order to step up efforts in combating offences of illegal land filling and fly-tipping of construction waste, EPD has installed surveillance camera systems at about 80 locations, and plans to further extend with 35 sets of surveillance camera systems equipped with artificial intelligence by mid-2019, for enhancing the Department's enforcement tactics and mobility, including deploying the installation of systems to new black spot locations flexibly with reference to public concern on illegal waste disposal and intelligence shared among relevant departments. We will also deploy manpower resources for inspection having regard to risk assessments and actual conditions of the locations being monitored, and adopt appropriate enforcement strategy, to enhance enforcement effectiveness and deterrent effect.

On the other hand, from June 2018 to May 2019, the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department ("FEHD") installed surveillance cameras at 118 blackspots across the territory to curb the illegal dumping of waste. The surveillance cameras are used in conjunction with other enforcement strategies, including preliminary public education and targeted blitz operations, to achieve a deterrent effect on repeated offenders. FEHD often reviews its enforcement approach in tackling illegal waste dumping blackspots in various districts. If frequent illegal dumping of waste is detected in the vicinity of the blackspots with surveillance cameras installed, FEHD will plan and mount blitz enforcement operations.

FEHD intends to extend the surveillance camera scheme for two years starting from the third quarter of 2019 in consultation with the District Councils ("DCs"). Surveillance cameras will be installed at

some 150 illegal waste dumping blackspots in phases according to the locations and priorities proposed by DCs. If the hygiene conditions of a particular blackspot show significant improvement after the installation of cameras, the cameras will be relocated to other blackspots. FEHD will progressively extend the scope of the scheme to cover more than 300 locations.

EPD and FEHD will continue to combat fly-tipping under a multi-pronged approach. Apart from installing more surveillance cameras having regard to the actual circumstances, the two departments will enhance enforcement actions against those who violate the law.

Reindustrialisation and Technology Training Programme

16. **MR CHARLES PETER MOK** (in Chinese): *President, in August last year, the Government launched a Reindustrialisation and Technology Training Programme ("RTTP") to subsidize staff members of local companies to receive training in advanced technologies. Training courses that are open for applications by various companies ("public courses") and training courses that are designed for particular companies ("tailor-made courses") are subsidized under RTTP. In respect of public courses, course providers should submit applications for course registration at least eight weeks before course commencement, and eligible companies should submit applications for training grants at least two weeks before course commencement. For tailor-made courses, eligible companies should submit applications for course approval and training grants in one go. Some members of the trade have relayed that the procedure for registration and approval of the training courses are cumbersome and time-consuming, leaving course providers and eligible companies only a very short time for recruiting students and submitting applications for training grants respectively. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (1) *of the number of companies subsidized under RTTP (broken down by type of business), and the number of staff members who participated in the training courses (broken down by post title), as at the end of last month;*

- (2) *of the average number of working days taken for completing the registration of public courses, and the average number of working days prior to course commencement were course providers notified that registration was successful, as at the end of last month; and*
- (3) *whether it has plans to review and streamline the procedure for course registration and approval, so that more companies can make arrangements for their staff members to receive training in advanced technologies; if so, of the details?*

SECRETARY FOR INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY (in Chinese): President, in order to nurture local innovation and technology talent, the Government launched the "Re-industrialisation and Technology Training Programme" ("RTTP") in August 2018 to subsidize existing staff of local enterprises on a 2(Government):1(Enterprise) matching basis to receive technology training, especially those relating to "Industry 4.0". The Vocational Training Council administers RTTP and serves as its secretariat.

Our reply to various parts of the question is as follows:

- (1) As at end May 2019, RTTP has funded a total of 831 staff from 335 local enterprises to receive technology training with a total funding amount of about \$5.57 million. The distribution of the type of business of these enterprises is as follows:

<i>Type of Business</i>	<i>Number of Enterprises</i>
Manufacturing Technology	99
Innovation and Technology	44
Fashion and Textile	42
Biomedical and Healthcare	38
Import, Export and Wholesale Trades	31
Automobile	25
Retail Trade	19
Electronics and Telecommunications	17
Management and Supervisory (e.g. consultancy companies)	11
Print Media and Publishing	10

<i>Type of Business</i>	<i>Number of Enterprises</i>
Electrical and Mechanical Services	7
Hotel, Catering and Tourism	7
Building, Civil Engineering and Built Environment	6
Media and Communications	6
Banking and Finance	4
Beauty Care and Hairdressing	4
Transport and Logistics	4
Jewellery, Watch and Clock	3
Real Estate Services	2
Security Services	2
Insurance	1
Others (e.g. environmental protection industry)	19
Total	401
	Note: As individual funded enterprises engage in more than one type of business, the sum of the above breakdown is not equal to the total number of funded enterprises (i.e. 335 enterprises)

RTTP requires enterprises applying for training grants to fill in, among others, the post of the staff nominated for training in the application form. As the post titles of different industries and enterprises vary, the secretariat has received a large variety of post information and does not maintain a breakdown by different post titles. In general, the staff subsidized to receive technology training are engaged in a broad range of duties, such as quality management, product design and research and development, information technology, marketing and promotion, sales and human resources, etc. They also include senior management of the enterprises (such as chief executive officers and chief financial officers), other management personnel and frontline staff, etc.

- (2) As at end May 2019, the secretariat takes an average of 30 working days to process applications for public course registration submitted by training providers, and on average, training providers would be notified of the result of application 71 working days before the start of the training course.
- (3) Since the launch of RTTP, the Innovation and Technology Commission ("ITC") and the secretariat have been closely monitoring the application and vetting situation, and have implemented enhancement measures. For example, since May 2019, training providers could re-run the same public course previously registered for a maximum of two times by notifying the secretariat in writing, without the need to go through the secretariat vetting process again. In addition, we launched an online application system on the website of RTTP <<https://rttp.vtc.edu.hk/>> in March 2019 to facilitate training providers in submitting applications for registration of public courses. Enterprises can also submit applications through the system for organizing tailor-made courses and training grants. We have also enhanced the design and function of the website to enable enterprises to search registered public courses that suit their staff more easily.

ITC and the secretariat will continue to maintain contact with training providers and enterprises, and will review and improve the arrangements of RTTP as appropriate.

Sponsors and listing applications

17. **MR KENNETH LEUNG** (in Chinese): *President, in recent months, a number of sponsors were reprimanded, fined and/or had their licences suspended by the Securities and Futures Commission ("SFC") for failing to discharge their obligations. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council whether it knows:*

- (1) *the respective numbers of complaints or reports about sponsors failing to discharge their obligations (i) received, (ii) an investigation into which was launched and (iii) the investigation of which was completed, as well as the number of cases in which*

disciplinary sanctions were imposed on sponsors found guilty of misconduct (and the details of each case), by SFC in each of the past five years;

- (2) *if SFC has studied new measures to make issuers of listed securities, their directors and underwriters shoulder greater responsibilities for ensuring the accuracy and completeness of the contents of the prospectuses, so as to avoid such responsibilities being borne solely by sponsors; and*
- (3) *if SFC maintained, in the past three years, communication with the various parties involved in the issue of listed securities, with a view to understanding their needs and adjusting from time to time the measures concerned; if SFC did, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?*

SECRETARY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND THE TREASURY (in Chinese): President,

- (1) During the period from January 2014 to May 2019, the Securities and Futures Commission ("SFC") received a total of 113 complaints or reports related to alleged sponsors failures. The details are set out in Annex 1. During the same period, SFC has taken 16 disciplinary actions against the failures of sponsors and/or sponsor principals (including cases that are originated from complaints or reports received outside the said period). The respective penalties of these cases are set out in Annex 2.

SFC will take follow-up actions on every complaint and report received. However, the position of the follow-up actions of the complaints and reports and the progress of investigations are details that are subject to the secrecy provisions of the Securities and Futures Ordinance ("SFO"). SFC cannot disclose such information.

- (2) The existing legislation has already prescribed the respective responsibilities of the sponsors, listing applicants and their directors involved in an initial public offering. Following the established in strictly adhering to the provisions of SFO, SFC may object to listing

applications that contain false or misleading information and prosecute the persons involved, including listing applicants and their directors.

According to the Companies (Winding Up and Miscellaneous Provisions) Ordinance, directors of a listing applicant shall bear legal liability in respect of the contents of the prospectus.

According to the Securities and Futures (Stock Market Listing) Rules, SFC may object to a listing application on certain grounds, including that if it appears to SFC that the listing applicant has provided false or misleading information regarding a material fact (or through the omission of a material fact).

In addition, according to SFO, if SFC has reasonable cause to believe that a person (including the directors of a listing applicant) has knowingly or recklessly provided false or misleading information in its statutory filing with SFC, SFC may exercise its statutory power and conduct investigation against that person. Where appropriate, SFC may prosecute the offenders.

- (3) SFC conducts regulatory supervision of sponsors based on its risk-based supervisory approach, and with particular attention to the possible deficiencies in their due diligence work. During the regulatory supervision, SFC communicates with the sponsors about the concerns that it may have on the sponsors' work. SFC also provides the industry with examples of cases that fall short of the expected standards through publishing circulars or thematic reports. For example, SFC issued a thematic report in March 2018 which draws the industry's attention to specific deficiencies and the instances of non-compliance as observed by SFC during its regulatory supervisions. The report also highlights the practices that meet SFC's expected standards. In addition, SFC issued a circular in March 2018 to remind licensed corporations engaging in sponsors work of SFC's expected standards on conduct and due diligence practices and to urge them to critically review and enhance their internal system and control measures.

Annex 1

Complaints or Reports Related to Alleged Sponsors Failures
Received by SFC from January 2014 to May 2019

<i>Calendar Year</i>	<i>Number of Complaints/Reports Received</i>
2014	19
2015	25
2016	20
2017	20
2018	14
2019 (up to May)	15
Total	113

Annex 2

Details of SFC's Disciplinary Actions Against Sponsors and/or
Sponsor Principals Failures from January 2014 to May 2019

<i>Serial No.</i>	<i>Sponsors and/or Sponsor Principals Involved</i>	<i>Disciplinary Action</i>	<i>Listed Companies/Listing Applicants Involved</i>	<i>Date</i>
1	Sun Hung Kai International Limited	Public reprimand, \$12 million of fine and one-year suspension of licence	Sino-Life Group Limited	27 Jan 2014
2	Eric Shum Kam Chi	Three-year suspension of licence		16 Sep 2014
3	Quam Capital Limited	\$0.8 million of fine	Gayety Holdings Limited	1 Aug 2016
4	BOCOM International (Asia) Limited	Public reprimand and \$15 million of fine	China Huinong Capital Group Company Limited	15 Mar 2017

<i>Serial No.</i>	<i>Sponsors and/or Sponsor Principals Involved</i>	<i>Disciplinary Action</i>	<i>Listed Companies/Listing Applicants Involved</i>	<i>Date</i>
5	Citigroup Global Markets Asia Limited	Public reprimand and \$57 million of fine	Real Gold Mining Limited	17 May 2018
6	CCB International Capital Limited	Public reprimand and \$24 million of fine	Fujian Dongya Aquatic Products Co., Limited	9 Jul 2018
7	UBS AG and UBS Securities Hong Kong Limited	Public reprimand, \$375 million of fine and one-year suspension of licence ⁽¹⁾	Tianhe Chemicals Group Limited	14 Mar 2019
8	Morgan Stanley Asia Limited	Public reprimand and \$224 million of fine		
9	Merrill Lynch Far East Limited	Public reprimand and \$128 million of fine		
10	UBS AG and UBS Securities Hong Kong Limited	Public reprimand, \$375 million of fine and one-year suspension of licence ⁽¹⁾	China Forestry Holdings Company Limited	14 Mar 2019
11	Standard Chartered Securities (Hong Kong) Limited	Public reprimand and \$59.7 million of fine		
12	Cen Tian	Two-year suspension of licence		
13	Joseph Hsu Kar Hing	Three-year ban from re-entering the industry		17 Jul 2018

<i>Serial No.</i>	<i>Sponsors and/or Sponsor Principals Involved</i>	<i>Disciplinary Action</i>	<i>Listed Companies/Listing Applicants Involved</i>	<i>Date</i>
14	UBS AG and UBS Securities Hong Kong Limited	Public reprimand, \$375 million of fine and one-year suspension of licence ⁽¹⁾	China Metal Recycling (Holdings) Limited	27 May 2019
15	China Merchants Securities (HK) Co., Limited	Public reprimand and \$27 million of fine		27 May 2019
16	Wu Yinong	18-month suspension of licence		27 Feb 2019

Note:

- (1) The disciplinary actions against UBS AG and UBS Securities Hong Kong Limited are the aggregate of three cases (i.e. Serial No. 7, 10 and 14).

Shortage of professionals in the banking industry

18. **MR CHAN CHUN-YING** (in Chinese): *President, some members of the banking industry have relayed that the granting of eight virtual banking licences by the Hong Kong Monetary Authority so far may aggravate the shortage of manpower of the various professional grades in the industry, which will affect the operation and development of the banking industry in the long run. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (1) *whether it knows the numbers of members of the various professional grades in the banking industry listed in the table below;*

<i>Professional grade</i>	<i>Number of members</i>
<i>Fintech</i>	
<i>Compliance</i>	

<i>Professional grade</i>	<i>Number of members</i>
<i>Risk management</i>	
<i>Data audit</i>	

- (2) *whether it has estimated the numbers of members of the various professional grades to be employed by virtual banks in each of the coming three years; (i) of the respective percentages of such numbers in the relevant total numbers in the banking industry, and (ii) out of such numbers, the respective numbers of those who will come from conventional banks and from places outside Hong Kong;*
- (3) *given that experienced professionals in Fintech are included in the Talent List of Hong Kong promulgated by the Government in August last year, and such professionals may apply to work in Hong Kong through the Quality Migrant Admission Scheme, of the respective to-date numbers of the relevant applications received and approved by the Government, and the average time taken for the vetting and approval of each approved case; of the measures in place to expedite the vetting and approval process; and*
- (4) *whether it will introduce incentive measures (e.g. accommodation, education allowances for children and medical allowances) to attract experienced professionals in Fintech from the Mainland and overseas to work in Hong Kong; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?*

SECRETARY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND THE TREASURY (in Chinese): President, having consulted the Hong Kong Monetary Authority ("HKMA") and the Security Bureau, our reply to the different parts of the question is as follows:

- (1) and (2)

HKMA does not collect statistics on the number of practitioners of professional grades in the banking sector. According to the business plans of the eight licensed virtual banks, the manpower required for the first three years of their operation only represents a tiny fraction of that of the banking sector in Hong Kong. HKMA

expects that the impact of virtual banks on the manpower of the banking system should be manageable. HKMA does not collect information on the background of employees of virtual banks and is not in a position to provide any estimate to this end.

(3) and (4)

The Government promulgated on 28 August 2018 the first Talent List of Hong Kong. The Talents List covers 11 professions, including "Fintech Professionals", "Data Scientists and Cyber Security Specialists" and "Asset Management Professionals". Applicants who meet the requirements of the Talent List will be awarded 30 bonus points under the General Points Test of the Quality Migrant Admission Scheme ("QMAS").

As at April 2019, a total of 11 applicants under QMAS have met the eligibility criteria of the said professions, of which seven applicants have been allotted quotas. The remaining four applications are being processed by the Advisory Committee on Admission of Quality Migrants and Professionals ("the Advisory Committee"). The breakdown statistics on such applications and the quotas allotted are as follows:

<i>Profession</i>	<i>Applications received</i>	<i>Successful cases</i>	<i>Being processing</i>
Fintech professionals	4	2	2
Data scientists and cyber security specialists	7	5	2
Asset management professionals	0	Not applicable	Not applicable

The processing time mainly depends on whether the required documents and information are submitted by the applicant within the specified time frame. Upon submission of the required documents and information, it normally takes two weeks to process applications which will then be submitted to the Advisory Committee for further assessment. The Immigration Department may also seek professional advice from relevant trade and professional bodies having regard to individual cases and verify each application. In

accordance with the existing assessment criteria, all applications which satisfy the prerequisites and the minimum passing mark will be shortlisted and submitted to the Advisory Committee for further assessment.

The selection exercise is conducted quarterly for quota allocation to applicants and the Advisory Committee will recommend to the Director of Immigration how best to allocate available quota. Results of each selection exercise will be published on the Immigration Department website within 15 days.

The Immigration Department will ensure efficient processing of QMAS applications through flexible staff deployment and streamlined workflow.

Apart from QMAS, professionals can also apply to work in Hong Kong through the General Employment Policy ("GEP") for overseas, Taiwan and Macao residents and the Admission Scheme for Mainland Talents and Professionals ("ASMTP") for the Mainland residents. The statistics on applications approved under GEP and ASMTP from applicants who were from the "Financial Services" sector in the past three years are as follows:

<i>Year</i>	<i>GEP</i>	<i>ASMTP</i>
2016	4 148	1 433
2017	4 441	2 084
2018	5 057	2 141

The Government will review the relevant schemes and measures from time to time with a view to encouraging talents from the Mainland and overseas to work in Hong Kong.

Projects to improve pedestrian and traffic networks in Kowloon East

19. **MR PAUL TSE** (in Chinese): *President, some residents in Kowloon East have pointed out that a number of projects, implemented by the Energizing Kowloon East Office since its establishment to improve the pedestrian and traffic networks in an attempt to ameliorate the situation of traffic congestion, air*

pollution and competition between pedestrians and vehicles for road space in Kwun Tong and the Kowloon Bay Business Area ("KBBA"), are ineffective. As at early this year, Kowloon East had over 2.6 million square metres of commercial floor area, which was expected to increase to 7 million square metres in future. By then, the working population in Kwun Tong and KBBA will inevitably increase rapidly, driving an even greater demand for road space. Currently on weekdays, roads in the vicinity of Kwun Tong Road and Hoi Yuen Road are clogged with pedestrian and vehicular traffic during the periods when people commute to and from work. The situation will only worsen when the working population in the district increases substantially in future. In view of the above, I raised a question on 7 June 2017 suggesting that the Government should model on the Mong Kok footbridge system and construct a footbridge system in Kowloon East connecting the MTR Kwun Tong Station, Hoi Yuen Road, Shing Yip Street and Kwun Tong waterfront, so as to divert the pedestrian flows on the ground and facilitate pedestrian circulation in the district. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (1) as the Government indicated in reply to my question that it would study the feasibility of constructing a footbridge at Hoi Yuen Road of Kwun Tong, of the progress of the study; in view of the convoluted walking route to the waterfront via the MTR Kwun Tong Station at present and the strong demand of pedestrians for the footbridge, whether the Government will expedite the study;*
- (2) as the Government has introduced an incentive, by way of land premium waiver since 2017, to encourage landowners in the business areas of Kowloon East to apply for constructing footbridges at their own cost, of the respective numbers of applications received and approved by the Government so far; the number of footbridges that will be completed in the coming three years; if only a few applications have been received, whether the Government has evaluated the causes for the lukewarm response for the initiative and considered the construction of pedestrian link bridges by the Government instead, so as to avert the situation that the pedestrian link network cannot be completed due to complicated title disputes involved in individual projects; and*
- (3) whether it has assessed the increase and the rate of increase in the resident and business population in Kai Tak Action Area, Kwun Tong Action Area and Kowloon Bay Action Area in the coming five*

years; in the light of the additional traffic demand to be generated by the population growth and the comments of some members of the public that the construction of the Environmentally Friendly Linkage System for Kowloon East ("EFLS") to connect those Action Areas will effectively alleviate the current pressure on road traffic and facilitate the development of Kowloon East, whether the Government will expedite the feasibility study for EFLS, and decide and announce expeditiously if EFLS will be constructed?

SECRETARY FOR DEVELOPMENT (in Chinese): President, Kowloon East (including the Kai Tak Development Area ("KTDA"), the Kwun Tong Business Area ("KTBA") and the Kowloon Bay Business Area ("KBBA")) is transforming into the second Core Business District. Government departments concerned will continue to work on various fronts to improve the pedestrian environment and traffic in KTBA and KBBA to cater for the developments in the district.

The Energizing Kowloon East Office of Development Bureau promotes the concept of "Walkable Kowloon East" in the two Business Areas through such short-term measures as providing pedestrian crossings and traffic signals, widening footpaths, providing roadside loading and unloading areas and improving junction arrangements, etc. to improve the pedestrian environment and traffic. We are also taking forward various medium- and long-term improvement schemes in collaboration with relevant government departments, which include provision of three footbridges near MTR Kowloon Bay Station (i.e. footbridges near MTR Kowloon Bay Station Exits A and B and footbridge across Wai Yip Street near Siu Yip Street). In tandem, an investigation study is in progress to enhance walkability near MTR Ngau Tau Kok Station. The plan is to provide two pedestrian subways connecting to the area near Hoi Bun Road Park. We are also exploring the possibility of providing travelators along some road sections of Lai Yip Street and Sheung Yee Road.

On the traffic aspect, the Government is proactively taking forward transport infrastructure projects, including Route 6 (i.e. Tseung Kwan O-Lam Tin Tunnel and Central Kowloon Route under construction, and Trunk Road T2 and Cha Kwo Link Tunnel pending funding approval by the Legislative Council) would provide relief to the traffic loads on the existing key road links (including Kwun Tong Bypass and Kwun Tong Road). We will also leverage the future development of the two Action Areas in Kowloon East to improve the traffic condition. Proposals include a new through road extending from Kei Yip Lane

in the Kwun Tong Action Area ("KTAA") to divert traffic away from the Wai Yip Street/Hoi Yuen Road roundabout, conversion of the roundabout to a traffic signal controlled junction to rationalize the traffic flows, and widening of Sheung Yee Road and modification of Hoi Bun Road/Cheung Yip Street junction in the vicinity of the Kowloon Bay Action Area to increase traffic capacity. In addition, the Police has stepped up enforcement actions against illegal parking to help ease the traffic flows.

Having consulted the views of relevant departments, my consolidated responses to the various parts of the question are as follows:

- (1) Hoi Yuen Road is a major pedestrian corridor in KTBA. Formulation of pedestrian environment improvement measures thereat must take into account existing activities. We are widening the footpaths on both sides of Hoi Yuen Road in phases to improve the existing congestion situation on the footpaths. The "Planning and Engineering Study on Kwun Tong Action Area—Feasibility Study" recommends constructing a footbridge across Wai Yip Street to connect Hoi Yuen Road to KTAA and the promenade along with the proposed junction improvement scheme at Hoi Yuen Road/Wai Yip Street. On exploring the feasibility of constructing a footbridge along Hoi Yuen Road to connect MTR Kwun Tong Station and Wai Yip Street, after examining the actual site conditions, the footbridge proposal would affect the emergency vehicular access for buildings on both sides of Hoi Yuen Road and is therefore not feasible.

Moreover, the Kwun Tong "Government, Institution or Community" Composite Development Project is studying whether to use an elevated pedestrian platform to connect MTR Kwun Tong Station and the Kwun Tong Town Centre Redevelopment Project. A commercial site and a proposed footbridge at King Yip Street near the Composite Development Project, the Tsui Ping River Garden which has been completed for use, and the revitalization of Tsui Ping River project (including streetscape enhancement on streets linking Hoi Yuen Road and Tsui Ping River) pending funding approval by the Legislative Council will form a green river corridor connecting MTR Kwun Tong Station and the Kwun Tong Promenade, thereby help divert pedestrians away from Hoi Yuen Road and cater for the developments in the Business Area.

- (2) To enhance walkability and connectivity, the 2016 Policy Address announced a policy initiative, waiving the land premium payable for lease modification for provision of pedestrian links (including footbridges and subways). Kowloon East is the pilot area. From February 2017, landowners in KBBA may submit lease modification applications to the District Lands Office/Kowloon East for constructing pedestrian links at their own costs in accordance with the planned pedestrian network. As for KTBA, the Outline Development Plan showing the planned pedestrian network was promulgated in January 2019, landowners in the area may also submit applications in the same way.

We have received three applications in Kowloon East. The first application proposes to connect seven commercial buildings in KBBA which would make pedestrian movements between MTR Kowloon Bay Station and KBBA more convenient. The second application proposes to construct a footbridge to strengthen the connection between Ngau Tau Kok and the East Kowloon Cultural Centre. The third application proposes to construct two footbridges to enhance the connectivity between KTDA and the vicinity of Kowloonbay International Trade and Exhibition Centre. We could assess the completion time of the relevant footbridges exactly only after the landowners have submitted the detailed design of the relevant footbridges and completion of the gazetting procedures under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370). We are also conducting a mid-term review on the above mentioned policy initiative to evaluate its effectiveness.

- (3) For the next five years, the residential and worker population of KTDA, KTBA and KBBA are estimated to increase as follows:

<i>Area</i>	<i>Estimated Residential Population</i>			<i>Estimated Worker Population</i>		
	<i>2019</i>	<i>2024</i>	<i>Increase</i>	<i>2019</i>	<i>2024</i>	<i>Increase</i>
KTDA	49 200	72 400	+23 200 (+47%)	14 500	27 700	+13 200 (+91%)
KTBA	-			172 300	196 600	+24 300 (+14%)
KBBA	-			87 800	102 400	+14 600 (+17%)

The Civil Engineering and Development Department is conducting the second stage of the Detailed Feasibility Study of the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System ("EFLS") in Kowloon East with a view to formulating a scheme that could meet the relevant statutory and technical requirements (including fire services and the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance), as well as coming up with a scheme which is generally acceptable to the stakeholders and cost-effective to the general public. The second stage of the Study mainly includes the coverage, alignment and station locations, etc. of the proposed system. We will also make reference to the latest development and experiences in the environmentally friendly transportation technology at home and abroad, with the associated technical and financial assessments being carried out concurrently (including considerations of patronage assessment and fare estimate, etc.), so as to ascertain the feasibility of the proposed EFLS. Upon completion of the Study, the Government will formulate the way forward for the proposed EFLS project. The precise implementation programme is not available at this stage.

Regulation of money lenders

20. **DR ELIZABETH QUAT** (in Chinese): *President, the number of licensed money lenders (i.e. finance companies) in Hong Kong has increased substantially over the past decade from 760 in 2008 to 2 153 in 2018 (by about a twofold increase). Moreover, in recent years, quite a number of finance companies have launched massive advertising campaigns on television and the Internet and encouraged borrowing money. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (1) *whether it knows, (i) the respective total amounts of loans offered by licensed money lenders and by authorized institutions (including licensed banks) under the supervision of the Hong Kong Monetary Authority, (ii) the change in the ratio between these two amounts, as well as (iii) the number of people borrowing money from the former and the median age of such borrowers, in each of the past 10 years in Hong Kong;*

- (2) *given that under the existing regulatory regime, the Licensing Court, the Police and the Money Lenders Unit respectively regulate money lenders according to the relevant provisions in the Money Lenders Ordinance (Cap. 163) ("MLO"), coupled with the facts that the number of licensed money lenders has increased substantially and cases of unscrupulous business practices of money lenders and financial intermediaries have occurred from time to time, whether the Government will examine (i) the establishment of an independent institution to regulate money lenders, and (ii) the introduction of legislative amendments to require that money lenders must, before approving a loan, conduct a test on the repayment ability of the loan applicant, so as to reduce the risk of over-borrowing by the borrower;*
- (3) *given that the operation modes of the money lending business and the ecosystem of the industry have changed along with technological development, whether the Government will conduct a comprehensive review on the provisions of MLO to see if they can still suit present-day needs (e.g. whether the ceiling set on the annual interest rate on loans should be lowered); and*
- (4) *in respect of finance companies' practices of launching massive advertising campaigns and encouraging borrowing money, whether the Government will take measures to prevent students and young people from being misled and corrupted by such messages, including (i) stepping up efforts in instilling correct money management and consumption attitudes in students and young people, (ii) imposing restrictions on the contents and airtime of finance companies' advertisements, and (iii) adding other appropriate warning messages in the advertisements concerned, apart from the existing warning message of "You have to repay your loans. Don't pay any intermediaries" required to be included in such advertisements?*

SECRETARY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND THE TREASURY (in Chinese): President, in consultation with the relevant department and financial regulator, we have prepared a consolidated reply to Dr Elizabeth QUAT's question as follows:

- (1) The Administration does not maintain statistics of the annual total amount of loans issued by licensed money lenders, nor the total number and median age of the borrowers. The total amount of loans offered by authorized institutions (including licensed banks) under the supervision of the Hong Kong Monetary Authority ("HKMA") in each of the past 10 years is set out at Annex.

(2) and (3)

Licensed money lenders provide an alternative source of finance for individuals and enterprises with financial needs outside the banking system. Currently, the Licensing Court, the Police and the Money Lenders Unit ("MLU") of the Companies Registry have respective roles to play under the regulatory regime for money lenders. The Licensing Court is responsible for the determination of applications for and granting of money lender licences as well as the imposition of licensing conditions. The Police is responsible for enforcing the Money Lenders Ordinance ("MLO"), including examination of applications for money lender licences and renewal of licences, and investigating complaints against money lenders. As for MLU, it is responsible for processing applications for money lender licences, maintaining a register of money lenders for public inspection, as well as adopting risk-based supervisory measures to monitor licensed money lenders' compliance with MLO and the conditions imposed by the Licensing Court when carrying on their money lending business. MLU also conducts site inspections to ensure licensed money lenders have appropriate systems and measures in place for their business operations.

As for the annual interest rate, section 24 of MLO provides that if any person lends at an effective rate of interest exceeding 60% per annum, he shall commit an offence punishable on conviction by a fine and/or imprisonment, and the relevant loan agreement shall also be unenforceable. Section 25 of MLO also provides that where proceedings are taken in any court by any person for the recovery of any money lent, or on application by a debtor, the court may, if satisfied that the loan transaction is extortionate, reopen the transaction and substitute just terms. A transaction where the effective rate of interest exceeds 48% per annum is presumed prima facie to be extortionate.

The existing regime strikes an appropriate balance between combating the money lending activities of usury, and providing those in need a lawful channel to borrow money and suitable protection. We will continue to monitor the implementation of the relevant provisions in MLO. The Companies Registry and the Police will also maintain close liaison and strengthen enforcement actions.

- (4) To remind the public of the risk of over-borrowing, more stringent licensing conditions have been imposed on all money lenders since 2016. Licensed money lenders are required to include a warning statement in their advertisements, namely, "Warning: You have to repay your loans. Don't pay any intermediaries". The Government has also rolled out public education and publicity activities, including collaborations with the Investor and Financial Education Council and the Consumer Council to remind the public of issues requiring attention when borrowing and to promote the message of prudent borrowing. We will continue to monitor the latest development in the market, and to review and update our public education activities as appropriate.

Annex

The total loans offered by authorized institutions (including licensed banks) under the supervision of HKMA in each of the past 10 years are tabled below:

<i>As at end of</i>	<i>Total loans (HK\$bn)</i>
December 2009	3,288
December 2010	4,228
December 2011	5,081
December 2012	5,567
December 2013	6,457
December 2014	7,276
December 2015	7,535
December 2016	8,023
December 2017	9,314
December 2018	9,723

Works for substandard premises of aided schools

21. **MR IP KIN-YUEN** (in Chinese): *President, earlier on, the Education Bureau indicated that it had set aside \$1 billion for implementing a programme under which funding would be provided, for carrying out minor internal conversion works, to those aided schools whose premises had facilities not up to the current standards for school premises. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:*

- (1) *of the objectives and the following details of the aforesaid programme: (i) the respective numbers of secondary schools, primary schools and special schools expected to benefit from the programme, and (ii) the number of conversion works projects in respect of which each school may apply for funding and the maximum amount of funding which may be allocated to each school;*
- (2) *of the specific differences in the nature of the works projects carried out under the programme and those under the regular Aided Schools Applications for Capital Subventions: Major Repairs/Alterations ("major works"); the number of schools which applied for subvention for major works, the number and nature of the alteration works projects involved in such applications, the number of alteration works projects for which subvention was granted and the total amount of subvention involved, and the percentage of that amount in the relevant estimated expenditure of that year, in each of the past five school years, together with a breakdown by type of schools (namely secondary school, primary school and special school);*
- (3) *whether that \$1 billion funding was included in the budgeted expenditure for the 2019-2020 financial year; if so, of the head and subhead of the expenditure, and the percentage of the funding in the total amount of expenditure under the relevant subhead; if not, the financial resources from which the funding was drawn and whether approval by the Finance Committee of this Council is required;*
- (4) *why it is stipulated that schools may submit applications for the programme only within this year and next year; whether it has assessed if the contractors concerned can cope with the conversion*

works to be carried out by a large number of schools in these two years; if it has assessed, of the outcome; if not, the reasons for that;

- (5) of the expected number of schools whose premises will meet the current standards for school premises upon completion of the conversion works, as well as the types of school facilities that can be upgraded up to the current standards (together with a breakdown by type of schools); and*
- (6) whether the priority accorded to, and the success rate of, the schools' applications for (i) subvention for major works and (ii) redevelopment/reprovisioning will be affected as a result of the funding allocated to the schools under the programme?*

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION (in Chinese): President, in respect of the six questions asked by Mr IP Kin-yuen, our reply is as follows:

At present, there are about 900 public sector schools (including special schools) in the territory. Their premises were built in different periods in accordance with the building standards at the time of construction and facilities in the premises vary. While the standards have been changing over the years, existing school premises in operation are required to comply with prevailing statutory requirements. As at May 2019, about 200 of them were built according to prevailing standards.

Over the years, the Education Bureau has put in place various measures to enhance school facilities. These measures include the School Improvement Programme implemented between 1994 and 2006, where over 700 public sector schools built according to the planning standards when the schools were constructed have their school facilities enhanced (e.g. through provision of additional or conversion of classrooms and special rooms) as far as technically feasible. We have also sought to address shortfall in space and school facilities through reprovisioning and redevelopment programmes.

In addition, the Education Bureau is providing school premises maintenance and repair support to some 840 aided schools (including special schools) through the annual Major Repairs ("MR") and Emergency Repairs ("ER") mechanism. For the scope of works under the mechanism, apart from providing repairs to impaired items, we also seek to improve school premises facilities through, e.g. retrofitting of lighting systems, paving of non-slip floor

tiles, improvement of ventilation systems, replacement of surfacing materials, etc. In the recent five financial years (i.e. 2015-2016 to 2019-2020), an annual average of about 840 aided schools submitted MR applications. When the Education Bureau considers the allocation of funding for taking forward MR requests from schools, priority will be accorded to those works items that are required under law and ought to be carried out from the repairs angle (i.e. "must-repair items"), e.g. items related to safety, health and hygiene or those that are statutorily required. During these five financial years, applications for must-repair items have all been approved. And, with the increase in resources allocation in recent years (the relevant non-recurrent subvention provision has increased from \$1 billion in 2015-2016 to \$1.5 billion in 2019-2020), on average, about 50% of the MR applications for other repairs and improvement works were approved in the recent two years. The total approved project estimates of approved MR works has increased from some \$560 million to over \$1 billion in the recent five financial years.

We understand that the community is concerned about conditions of facilities at old school premises. As provided in our response to the Legislative Council Education Panel on 19 March 2019,⁽¹⁾ as well as in our reply to the Special Finance Committee Question raised by Mr IP about improvements to existing school premises,⁽²⁾ based on the consensus reached with the Legislative Council and the sector earlier on, the Education Bureau is carrying out improvement works for those primary schools operating in "matchbox-style school premises",⁽³⁾ with a focus on addressing the problems arising from the unique architectural design of those premises. Under this programme, our works consultants have also explored technically feasible means for more flexible use of existing space, such as minor internal conversion and installation of moveable partition walls to turn existing facilities into temporary special rooms, with a view to improving the teaching and learning environment. Such minor internal conversion works were well received by the schools concerned.

(1) Re LC Paper No. CB(4)666/18-19(01).

(2) Re Reply Serial No. EDB506.

(3) The so-called "matchbox-style school premises" are cuboidal-shaped premises constructed between mid-1960s and 1980 in public housing estates for primary school use. Following the reprovisioning of one public sector primary school previously operating in "matchbox-style school premises" to a vacant school premises ("VSP") in September 2018, there are at present 27 public sector primary schools operating in "matchbox-style school premises". Among these 27 schools, 6 have been allocated with new school premises or VSP through the School Allocation Exercises for reprovisioning or expansion.

Taking into account the experience from the aforementioned "matchbox-style school premises" improvement programme and views of different stakeholders (including the Hong Kong Aided Primary School Heads Association and the Subsidized Primary School Council), we are working on a programme to conduct similar minor internal conversions at the other 600 odd aided school premises (including special schools) constructed according to past building standards to facilitate more flexible use of existing space by schools, thereby enhancing the teaching and learning environment and efficacy.

We have reserved \$1 billion under the Capital Works Reserve Fund ("CWRF") to take forward this time-limited minor conversion works programme ("the Programme"). Individual schools may submit works proposals to the Education Bureau this year and next (i.e. 2019 and 2020) having regard to their premises conditions and school-based needs. The works consultants and contractors engaged by the Education Bureau will continue to help take forward the Programme. They have sufficient capacity and experience in handling the works concerned. We have arranged briefing sessions in April 2019 for the schools concerned to explain the detailed arrangements of the Programme, as well as to share the experience from similar improvement works in "matchbox-style school premises" for the schools' reference. Over 480 schools have attended the briefing session and the feedbacks were very positive. The 2019 application period was just closed on 6 June. Since the premises conditions and school-based needs of individual schools vary, the conversion works applied for and in turn the related works schedule and costs would vary. We are now processing the applications received, and will follow up with the schools concerned on the proposed works and related arrangements as soon as practicable. The Education Bureau will also follow the established mechanism to seek the Legislative Council Finance Committee's approval with regard to the annual cashflow requirements for the Programme under the CWRF Block Votes allocation.

Meanwhile, we will continue to enhance school facilities and improve the teaching and learning environment in accordance with the schools' needs through the various ongoing measures, including the annual MR and ER mechanism, reprovisioning and redevelopment arrangements.