

OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Thursday, 5 December 2019

The Council continued to meet at Nine o'clock

MEMBERS PRESENT:

THE PRESIDENT

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

THE HONOURABLE JAMES TO KUN-SUN

THE HONOURABLE LEUNG YIU-CHUNG

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE CLAUDIA MO

THE HONOURABLE 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 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

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

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

THE HONOURABLE HO KAI-MING

THE HONOURABLE LAM CHEUK-TING

THE HONOURABLE HOLDEN CHOW HO-DING

THE HONOURABLE SHIU KA-FAI, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE SHIU KA-CHUN

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

THE HONOURABLE YUNG HOI-YAN, J.P.

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., J.P.

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

THE HONOURABLE CHAN HOI-YAN

MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

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

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

PUBLIC OFFICERS ATTENDING:

THE HONOURABLE MATTHEW CHEUNG KIN-CHUNG, G.B.M., G.B.S.,
J.P.

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

THE HONOURABLE PAUL CHAN MO-PO, G.B.M., G.B.S., M.H., J.P.
FINANCIAL SECRETARY

DR DAVID CHUNG WAI-KEUNG, J.P.
UNDER SECRETARY FOR INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY, AND
SECRETARY FOR INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY

DR THE HONOURABLE LAW CHI-KWONG, G.B.S., J.P.
SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE

DR CHUI TAK-YI, J.P.
UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH, AND
SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH

THE HONOURABLE PATRICK NIP TAK-KUEN, J.P.
SECRETARY FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AND MAINLAND AFFAIRS

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

MR SONNY AU CHI-KWONG, P.D.S.M., J.P.
UNDER SECRETARY FOR SECURITY

DR CHOI YUK-LIN, J.P.
UNDER SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION

DR BERNARD CHAN PAK-LI, J.P.
UNDER SECRETARY FOR COMMERCE AND ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT

MR JOSEPH CHAN HO-LIM, J.P.
UNDER SECRETARY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND THE TREASURY

MR JACK CHAN JICK-CHI, J.P.
UNDER SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS

CLERKS IN ATTENDANCE:

MS ANITA SIT, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

MISS FLORA TAI YIN-PING, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

MS DORA WAI, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

MR MATTHEW LOO, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

MEMBERS' MOTIONS

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Council will continue the debate on the motion moved under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law.

Mr WU Chi-wai, please speak.

MOTION UNDER ARTICLE 73(9) OF THE BASIC LAW TO FORM AN INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE CHARGES AGAINST THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE FOR SERIOUS BREACH OF LAW AND/OR DERELICTION OF DUTY

Continuation of debate on motion which was moved on 4 December 2019

MR WU CHI-WAI (in Cantonese): Today's motion is to discuss forming an independent investigation committee to investigate the charges against the Chief Executive for serious breach of law and/or dereliction of duty. Yesterday, I heard the Chief Secretary for Administration say in his opening remarks that the Chief Executive had not breached the law, so no one should support the call to form an independent investigation committee to investigate the charges against the Chief Executive for serious breach of law and/or dereliction of duty. I feel that a fundamental question is involved here. Is it true that the Chief Executive's responsibility for Hong Kong is limited to legality only? Let us just focus on dereliction of duty. Is the inaction of the SAR Government not hurting the interests of Hong Kong society? When 70% of the voters in the society came out to vote in order to show their opinion on the Government's policy, but the Government neither responds nor handles the current political predicament in the direction pointed out by the polling result, I think it is absolutely a dereliction of duty in political terms.

I remember raising a question to the authorities not long ago, asking them whether the Government knew the core issue of the political predicament in this time. The Chief Secretary replied that the Government had not conducted any opinion poll, so it did not have a grasp of the situation. The polling result of the District Council ("DC") Election has now told the Chief Secretary and the Government that the people's opinion is crystal clear. During the election this time, the pro-establishment camp, the pro-Government camp and even the Government's propaganda machine all called for the need to stop violence and

curb disorder. I actually reckon that the people of Hong Kong also wish to see the disorder coming to a halt, so that everyone can resume a normal life. However, to the pro-Government camp, the pro-establishment camp and the SAR Government, to "stop violence" means refusal to appreciate the cause of the people's grievances, and an attempt to continue administration through the brutal crackdown by the Police and the institutional violence. This is inaction, for the Government has not considered "political problems warrant political solutions" as a means to solve the political quagmire presently, and it even kept using hypocritical rhetoric to shirk responsibility.

Society demanded the Government to form an independent commission of inquiry, and opinion polls showed that 80% of the Hong Kong people think this is the quest with the highest consensus. After considering this for half a year, and after the DC Election, the Government said it would form an independent review committee, but can this be considered as a response? It can be likened to a situation in which you go to a café and order breakfast Set A, but the café gives you Set C, would you accept that? Do you think the café has fulfilled its responsibility in doing that? You have ordered breakfast Set A, but it gives you Set C, now what would be your reaction? The reaction might differ from one person to another, but everyone would remember this café which could not do even a simple thing as that, so how could we have confidence in the services of this café?

The problem before the SAR Government is this kind of plight. To the Police and the SAR Government, half of the people give them a zero score, and the Government's popularity rating is just above two points, so how can it govern? The Government does not solve the core problems and regain trust from the people, but talk lavishly about the need to continue its effort to connect, to stand fast at its post, and to assume responsibilities for Hong Kong. In fact, the very remark per se is utterly irresponsible, because she does not even know what responsibilities she should take. Worse still, she is unwilling to cope with the situation either.

When the Chief Executive responded to the polling result of the DC Election, I found one line of her words amazing. She said, to this effect, "The Central Government has not asked me, Carrie LAM, to take responsibility for the result of the District Council Election." Does Mrs LAM know that this line of hers has leaked a state secret? Hong Kong implements "one country, two systems", and the SAR Government has described the DC Election as a

"referendum", a way to stop violence and curb disorder. Then, there came the result, and any government and society which respects popular will should, in theory, give a response. It should find the highest common factor through the "referendum" on how to handle the matter, that is, to stop police brutality, stop the institutional violence, and seek a way out for Hong Kong. Our Chief Executive shirks all of her responsibility on this most basic issue, and even leaks a state secret. As everyone knows, the Chief Executive is only a puppet manipulated by the Central Government. Does she have any personal will? No one sees that. In the past six months, an overwhelming number of issues had to wait for decisions from the Central Government, and only after that did she have some ideas of her own, but then in the course of implementation she would add her own interpretation to the decisions, whereas in this course she failed to grasp the intention of the Central Government, to the extent that a great deal of confusion arose as a result of her interpretation. For example, I believe that when the decision was made to suspend the bill on 15 June, the Chief Executive had already talked to the Central Government and secured its consent. As for the Central Government, does it really see a big difference between suspension and withdrawal? Or had Carrie LAM acted of her own accord and twisted the Central Government's intention? Maybe she wanted to protect and defend the pro-establishment camp and felt she was standing on the wrong side in case of a withdrawal—how could there be a withdrawal, which would mean admitting that everything done was wrong? In fact, Carrie LAM said exactly just this. Why not withdraw the bill? Because withdrawing it would mean the Government's original intent was wrong, and she could not accept this kind of mistake. However, after three months, Carrie LAM finally admitted that the Government's original intent was wrong. The matter was entirely one in which the Government had completely ignored society's opposition that had all along existed during the process of the legislative amendment. She thought she had the continued support from the pro-Government and pro-establishment camps, so she could push all the way to the limit.

On 9 June, popular will exploded for the first time, with 1 million people taking to the streets. Thereafter, many reports pointed out that the SAR Government had asked the pro-establishment and pro-Government camps that night whether they would support her. The Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong, and the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions issued statements supporting her and urged her to push on. On 12 June, the fight broke out eventually as it tabled the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the

Bill") before the Council for deliberation, making use of the institutional violence and leveraging the majority seats in the Council while ignoring the people's opinion and attempting to bulldoze the Bill through the Council, a bill that was considered by everyone to be breaking the firewall that separated the legal systems between China and Hong Kong. The status and value of Hong Kong lie exactly in our stark contrast with the Mainland in terms of economic development, livelihood and laws. We are protected by law, and we wish to make sure that the Mainland laws that we do not trust will not be applied to Hong Kong through any window.

In fact, Executive Council Member Ronny TONG put it most honestly indeed. He once said that upon implementation of the Bill, incidents like the one involving Causeway Bay Bookstore would not happen again, because there would be no more need to rely on the "shampoo boats" to come to Hong Kong to seize people for trial in the Mainland, as the Mainland Authorities could instruct the SAR Government direct to detain people for them. Therefore, superficially the problem of someone crossing the border for law enforcement does not seem to exist, but this is exactly what sheds light on the terrible aspect of this legislative amendment.

The Chief Executive has treated with indifference the fact that Hong Kong, as an international financial centre enjoying its economic status under "one country, two systems", is dependent on the firewall. Once this firewall is pulled down, the international community will see Hong Kong as part of the Mainland. And once Hong Kong has lost its value, the Central Government will find no more need to consider how best to help Hong Kong. From this perspective, although Carrie LAM's action has been lauded as an effort to plug a loophole in law, it is actually an "extradition to China" of Hong Kong economy, just like we called the Bill "China extradition bill" during the whole movement.

Carrie LAM and the SAR Government—were they worthy of Hong Kong people when they did things like that? As the Chief Executive, can such behaviour and process not be viewed as dereliction of duty? Has she not done things that hurt the core interest of Hong Kong society? The Chief Secretary for Administration often stresses that no breach of law equates no dereliction of duty, but this is wrong in concept. As everyone knows, in any place or city, no government can stand without the trust of its people. Causing the people to lose trust in the Government is in itself a significant political mistake by the Chief Executive, an indication of her dereliction of duty in political work, for she has

not properly performed her duties. In particular, during this last election, Carrie LAM said she had to deal with two bosses—the Central Government and Hong Kong people—so it was very difficult for her. However, she chose to take care of the Central Government's views, and forgot that she has a duty to defend the different voices and opinions of Hong Kong people, and this also reflects dereliction of duty on her part.

Her dereliction of duty has already become a contagious disease, which makes the top echelons of the SAR Government and its Secretaries of Departments and Bureau Directors tell lies every day, saying things that carry little credibility. Even on a question as simple as the ingredients of tear gas, government officials keep saying that they cannot reveal them, for fear that so doing will affect the deployment of police operations. I really want some enlightenment from them, for I cannot figure out how the ingredients of tear gas can affect the deployment of police operations. After all, is Hong Kong governed by SAR government officials or by the Police Force? Is it true, just like Carrie LAM once said, that she had nothing to rely on but the 30 000 police officers? Or whether it is true, like she once said, that she could not appoint an independent commission of inquiry due to the opposition and resistance from the Police, so she promised the Police she would not appoint one? If that is the case, then Hong Kong is no longer a metropolis for 7 million residents, but a city left with 30 000 persons. If only 30 000 persons live here, then they really have no need to live in Hong Kong; these 30 000 policemen had better go back to the Greater Bay Area on the Mainland.

Lastly, just a while ago, I heard the Financial Secretary's proposal for a series of alleviation measures to tackle the current economic and political difficulties. I wish to remind the Financial Secretary that, if he cares to pay attention to all the live broadcasts on television, he will see the complications ensuing from many peaceful demonstrations were caused by provocation by the Police. The situation in Tsim Sha Tsui looked exactly like that (*The buzzer sounded*) ... the Police fired tear gas rounds to disperse the crowds, even though the crowds were there for a peaceful petition ...

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

PROF JOSEPH LEE (in Cantonese): President, the 25 pan-democratic Members of us have proposed this impeachment motion today. Mr WU Chi-wai cited some examples earlier, and I have done some researches or collated some documentary records in order to find out the elements for initiating an impeachment process. Certainly, it is clearly stipulated in the Basic Law that we can propose a motion of impeachment if the Chief Executive is charged with breach of law or dereliction of duty but refuses to resign and if this, in our view, is considered a problem.

I think this is a matter of great significance constitutionally, as the Chief Secretary also said so yesterday. Then why have we proposed a motion of impeachment? I have looked up some documents or literature in order to understand the circumstances constituting breach of law or dereliction of duty on the part of the Chief Executive who nonetheless refuses to resign as I talked about just now. I found that there are six major elements. The first is clearly specified as abuse of power. Yesterday, the Chief Secretary made a lengthy response and in the two hours of discussion yesterday, five or six Honourable colleagues cited various examples—more examples may be cited by other colleagues later—to explain what it means by abuse of power.

The Chief Secretary must have a team of aides in the room listening to us at this meeting now. He said yesterday that our allegations were incorrect. Our colleagues will later on present various views or examples or allegations, and some colleagues already did so yesterday. I would like him to try to—we teachers are always like this—look at the six major elements or categories that I am going to expound later and figure out the categories to which our allegations belong, and also whether we are not right in saying that or we have said anything wrong. For instance, the first element is abuse of power, and has the Chief Executive abused her power? Has she used her power to the fullest extent? On the issue relating to Lantau and many various issues in the past, did she abuse her powers? Did she always want to bulldoze her way through? And, for example, when handling this bill which made us propose a motion of impeachment now, is it because she sought to forcibly push it through or she insisted on pushing it through this Council at all costs because she has enormous powers? I look forward to seeing the rebuttal by the Chief Secretary. Has the Chief Executive abused her powers?

I am presenting these elements not according to their priorities or importance. I only wish to point out that there are six major elements. The second element is "going against or jeopardizing public interest". Let us take a

look at whether she has jeopardized public interest. Actually there are many examples I can talk about. What does it mean by public interest? The latest example is that her subordinate, namely, the Financial Secretary, said just yesterday that a deficit would be expected in Hong Kong and therefore, cash handouts would be made. This morning I tuned in to a radio programme in which a shop operator said that the concession of \$20,000 provided by the Government is better than none. Yet, it still seems to compare less favourably with the support provided by Mr LI, and I wonder if it can be of any help. Why have we degenerated over the past 15 years to a state where we face a deficit and where cash handouts have to be made? Of course, they will definitely argue that it is because we have stirred up troubles in Hong Kong, thus making the conditions very bad in Hong Kong over the last six months and the economy slides into recession. But the Chief Secretary must not forget that as he should know very clearly, this has to do with the general environment.

So, what did the Chief Executive do that was contrary to the public interest? What happened in Hong Kong during the period of around two and a half years under the leadership of the Chief Executive? I would like to read out an interesting commentary that I have just read online, so that we can look at whether public interest has been jeopardized under the governance and leadership of the Chief Executive. It says that for the past two and a half years, under the Carrie LAM Administration, property prices in Hong Kong have soared by 18%; rental in the private sector has risen by 6.6%; the waiting time for public rental housing has been lengthened by 8 months, meaning that the waiting time, which actually exceeded three years and takes five years, may further rise to six years with the waiting time being lengthened by an additional 8 months; and the rent of subdivided units, which should not have existed in the first place, has increased by 11.3%.

Besides, we have finally become No. 1, not because we have a turnout rate of over 71% in the District Council ("DC") Election but because our standard of living has become second to none in the world. Now we have really overtaken the United Kingdom and caught up with the United States. So this is what happened in Hong Kong under the governance of your boss and her ruling team. Moreover, the negative comments received by the incumbent Chief Executive are also second to none. It seems that none of the former Chief Executives has a popularity rating as low as that of Carrie LAM and yet, she still refuses to resign.

What does this have to do with public interest? Let us further look at what it says here. This commentary said that in the Democracy Index of the world, she has caused Hong Kong to be rated as a "flawed democracy"—there are benchmarks for measuring the Index, and we teachers like to use evidence as the basis—It says here that according to the Democracy Index of the world, we are rated as a "flawed democracy" under the Administration led by your boss, while the identity rating of Hongkongers seems to have risen by 3.8%. Of course, they will again allege that we are advocating localism. But why have we come to this pass? It seems that this has not happened before, not even after the reunification. Why are there these changes? Has the Government conducted any studies? Has it done any introspection?

Carrie LAM often says that she would engage in self-reflection, and this word "reflection" is what I learned from the newspaper that I just read. As an old saying goes, "I engage in self-reflection three times a day". But after making self-reflection, it is necessary to make improvement and conduct reviews. Reflection is not enough because it is necessary to conduct reviews, too. If a person only knows that he is wrong after examining himself and if he is all talk but no action, what use is there? Does it do any harm to public interest? Yes, actually it does. In this commentary there are two other points relating to public interest. Firstly, the percentage of the people's distrust in the Government has risen by 26.7%, meaning that the public no longer trust the Government as these people in the Government are doing nothing but drinking water, getting paid, or occasionally listening to what other people have got to say, and they do not even mind being chided by the Police. However, there is indeed very strong public distrust in the Government. Besides, the percentage of distrust in "one country, two systems" has also risen by 12.1%. The many examples that I cited just now have all shown clearly that public interest has been jeopardized considerably and they are instances of the Government doing a disservice to the public interest. This is the second point.

Regarding these two elements based on which we initiated this motion of impeachment, the Chief Secretary actually knows what happened. His team of staff sitting behind him who are also listening should know what happened. How should these examples be categorized? Are these proof or wrong allegations made by us? I would be convinced if the Chief Secretary can, in his response later, cite actual examples to point out that our comments are unfounded. But the reality seems to suggest otherwise. I hope he can explain

why the public interest has not been jeopardized, not to mention the many consequences of their attempts to bulldoze the "China extradition bill" through this Council.

What is the third element based on which we initiated this motion of impeachment? It is perversion of justice, which is obvious. What does justice mean? Of course, the Government's definition of justice is different from our definition or that of the pro-establishment Members. But clearly enough, one of the five demands championed by us now is the forming of an independent commission of inquiry and this is precisely meant to seek justice. Has the Government done it? The Government has not done it even after such a long time. It only said that a review committee would be set up, and as a former Member of this Council by the surname of LAM has said, a review committee cannot stop public opinions. Now that the public opinions are overwhelming, and as clearly shown by the results of the DC Election, the public opinions are loud and clear, and one of the points conveyed by this election is that while we are unable to change the Government, we might as well use our ballots to punish the pro-establishment camp, stripping them of a large number of seats. The pro-establishment camp ultimately suffered a landslide defeat but what has the Government done after seeing it? This goes to show that when the people are seeking justice, the Government has outrageously obstructed the people in seeking justice. Did these things happen? If they did not happen, why can the Government not undertake to form an independent commission of inquiry? This is the third point. I still have three points to make.

Fourth, according to the relevant documents or literature, what will constitute dereliction of duty? Contempt of representative assemblies. It is evident that the Government despises this Council as it knows that it can pass anything once it managed to secure enough votes, and no sooner had the pro-establishment camp threatened to withhold their support than the Government withdrew the proposals on the provision of funding to universities in the Finance Committee. According to the press reports today, it is because certain people have seen problems with the governance of universities. But governance and management are two different concepts. I do not have high education qualifications. I am just a professor and yet I know what governance means and what management is all about. Governance sees the participation of the Government, and the Government will place its people in universities and in the Legislative Council. What about university autonomy? This is provided for in

law and if even this has to be tightened, does it not mean that the Government is contemptuous of the functions of this Council, thinking that any proposal can be passed when it has got enough votes and when it does not have enough votes, it simply will not present its proposal. If such being the case, what exactly is the responsibility of the Legislative Council?

So far, there should be separation of powers among the executive, legislature and Judiciary in Hong Kong under "one country, two systems". Perhaps there is the view that this is just a concept of the British but the fact is that we have separation of powers with the Legislative Council exercising checks and balance. Why can we propose a motion of impeachment today? Because the Legislative Council is responsible for performing checks and balance. We hold that the Chief Executive has committed mistakes because over the last six months, she has done many things wrong, including the examples I mentioned just now. We, therefore, took steps to perform our check and balance functions in order to punish her politically. We cannot do what overseas countries can do but we can propose a motion of impeachment. In fact, she is indeed contemptuous of this Council, thinking that any proposal can be passed as long as she has got enough votes and so, she simply does not care about anything. The "China extradition bill" is a case in point, and there are also other examples before this. The Express Rail Link is one of them. Does the Chief Secretary think that they are contemptuous of this Council and disrespectful to this check and balance mechanism?

The fifth element is lying, as also mentioned by Mr WU Chi-wai and many colleagues earlier on. They have told so many lies. Some people may disagree and argue that the Chief Executive has told no lies. I will not look into it in depth, nor will I discuss or debate it with Members. But the fact is that the ruling team under the Chief Executive has told a pack of lies. For instance, they lied about the tear gas rounds, and they condoned the Police in telling lies, in calling a stag a horse, and in reversing the cause and result. It was obvious that a policeman had driven into the people but they said that it was meant to disperse the crowds. It was obvious that the Police had fired shots at the people but they said that the people had attacked the Police and attempted to snatch the police gun first. And when a police officer was heard as having said that aim should be taken at the people's heads when firing shots, they denied and argued that it was just a slip of tongue. What professionalism is there to speak of?

We have seen the development of the Hong Kong Police Force into a corrupt force all the way until the establishment of the Independent Commission Against Corruption. Just six months ago we were still respectful to the Police, thinking that they were truly professional. But it seems that during the last six months, with Carrie LAM's connivance or under her order, the Police have become totally unrestrained as they lied and altered the facts. I do not know if the Chief Executive has lied or not and only she herself knows best. But when her team has lied and if she being the Chief Executive continues to condone their behaviour, does it not constitute the fifth element of an impeachment motion?

The sixth and also the last element is giving false evidence. What does it mean by giving false evidence? It means providing false information. I think colleagues may have a lot more to say later on, or the Chief Secretary, being a member of her team, may perhaps take a look at her in the office to see if she had provided false evidence. What does it mean by giving false evidence? It means that something, which is clearly false, is said to be true. This is different from lying, though. Clearly enough, when everyone can see that "one country, two systems" has really been undermined, she nevertheless said "No". Another example is the response just made by her to the results of the DC Election. She said that Hong Kong is very free and that there is no problem at all.

In fact, does the Chief Executive know the actual situation? Today there is a programme of a certain television service operator about a youngster wanting to run away from Hong Kong for he thought that he might have broken the law in this incident. So he fled to Taiwan to hide up there, not daring to return to Hong Kong. Of course, they will say that it is not right to run away after breaking the law and that it is totally wrong to do so. However, this youngster has not yet been convicted but he has already fled, not daring to come back. Why will they choose to give up Hong Kong? Is it because the Chief Executive has done many things that made them feel hopeless about Hong Kong? If the Chief Executive said that she did not suppress the freedom of speech, I call on her to not forget that for the past six months, she has indirectly exploited various powers to create so much white terror, inducing fears among many Hong Kong people who, therefore, have to consider whether to leave or not, or put it more bluntly, they have to go into hiding or to lie low, in order to escape from Hong Kong, and of course, they may be emigrating elsewhere.

Many people are now applying for the British National (Overseas) ("BNO") passport. I heard today that application for BNO has topped the list of the most popular Google searches, rather than application for Home Ownership

Scheme units or public rental units. Under these circumstances, and as the people's livelihood and politics are closely related to each other, how should we look at this very phenomenon? Regarding the six elements that I have mentioned, let me repeat them once again—elderly people tend to be long-winded, for I am worried that she cannot hear me—These six elements are abuse of power, jeopardizing or going against public interest, perversion of justice, contempt of representative assemblies, lying, and giving false evidence. These six major elements are the necessary conditions for impeachment. Certainly, when we further our discussions, some people may ask whether three of these elements must exist or whether the absence of which three elements will not be accepted. No, this is not quite the case. Our intention is that based on these six elements, we will look at whether any of them exists and if so, whether it can constitute breach of law or dereliction of duty on her part according to the Basic Law.

Over a period of time in the past, obviously the Chief Executive has been following in the footsteps of a woman from a certain business group who vowed to give up the young people. It is because the Chief Executive and her people are all doing so that many young people have taken to the streets. I call on her to not reverse the cause and result, thinking that the young people should take most of the blame for causing this incident. In fact, the approach taken by the Chief Executive—probably she was told by those "up there" to do it—is to curb violence by violence. Then she reversed the cause and result and called a stag a horse, and this has made her give up the young people. These young people who have taken to the streets want to do something good for Hong Kong. But has the Chief Executive assisted us in seeking justice? Has she helped this Council perform its check and balance functions? Can she prove that she has not abused her powers and that she has exercised her powers properly to help Hong Kong in its development? Had she done a good job, a fiscal deficit would not have emerged. I call on her not to only point an accusing finger at us, criticizing us and blaming us for the economic downturn and the emergence of a fiscal deficit. She must not get it wrong. PARK Geun-hye of South Korea, Dilma ROUSSEFF of Brazil, and Bill CLINTON of the United States were all impeached and stepped down because of the various reasons cited by me. I hope that the Chief Executive will learn a lesson. Thank you, President.

MR GARY FAN (in Cantonese): Since the march of a million people on 9 June, the "anti-extradition to China" movement has gone on for nearly six months now. So far, not a single senior public officer has stepped down, nor has a single

lawbreaking police officer been brought to justice. That bears testimony to the downright hostility shown by the Government headed by Carrie LAM against its people. Emboldened by an evil triad—comprising public officials at its beck and call, pro-Government Members who rush to its defence in the legislature and the Police which hoard a massive arsenal of weapons, the Government feels free to take rash actions, turn its back on public opinion and suppress Hongkongers brutally. The crackdown in Admiralty on 12 June marked the slide of the Special Administrative Region ("SAR") Government towards authoritarian totalitarianism. Since Carrie LAM is the source of all such evils, I co-sponsor this motion under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law to demand the setting up of an independent investigation committee to investigate Carrie LAM for serious breach of law and dereliction of duty in relation to her push for the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill").

The first charge set out in the Schedule of the motion is disregard of mainstream opposing views and unrelentingly pushing through a highly controversial bill. In the course of pushing through the draconian "China extradition law", Carrie LAM exploited the Taiwan homicide case time and time again, seizing it as an excuse to aid her attempt to strip Hongkongers of their freedom from fear while treating all dissenting views with disdain. Assured by the fact that enough support had been garnered in the Legislative Council, she turned a deaf ear to the aspirations of 1 million people who took to the streets on 9 June, pressed relentlessly ahead with the resumption of the Second Reading debate on the Bill and suppressed at all costs those Hongkongers who mounted a protest outside the Legislative Council Complex on 12 June in a brutal crackdown.

Even with 2 million plus one citizens taking to the streets in protest again on 16 June and making the "five demands", which include a formal withdrawal—instead of a suspension—of the draconian "China extradition law" as well as retraction of the "riot" classification of the "12 June" protest, Carrie Lam did nothing but making an empty and half-hearted apology. It constituted dereliction of duty on her part by riding roughshod over public opinion with hypocrisy, arrogance, hubris and careless disregard for human life. No longer holding out any hope for Carrie LAM and the SAR Government, Hongkongers have since then decided to launch on a perennial struggle that has mushroomed throughout the territory, insisting on "Five demands, not one less."

The obstinacy of the governance team was apparent in the way the Taiwan homicide case was handled. The Hong Kong Government refused to cooperate with Taiwan which had requested the establishment of a mechanism for mutual legal assistance. After the withdrawal of the "China extradition bill", the SAR Government attempted to resolve the matter by voluntary surrender of the suspect while accusing Taiwan of political manoeuvring. It is in fact the SAR Government headed by Carrie LAM which has politicized the incident. It would not be the proper attitude adopted by one intent on seeing justice done to let the suspect surrender himself in Taiwan while withholding all legal assistance, including the provision of key statements and evidence possibly relevant to the case, as the SAR Government is prepared to do. It is a demonstration of the rule of man, not the rule of law, to have the suspect sent on his way to surrender without providing the relevant evidence. The presence of the suspect in Hong Kong to this day makes a complete mockery of the excuse, or pretext, of "upholding justice" constantly repeated by Carrie LAM. It also bears testimony again to the original intent of Carrie LAM of unrelentingly pushing through the draconian "China extradition law" and use justice as a pretext to strip 7 million Hongkongers of their freedom from fear, hence resulting in utter dissension and polarization of Hong Kong society.

The draconian law of extradition to China lays bare the true nature of the SAR Government—an authoritative regime that condones, particularly by Carrie LAM, the indiscriminate arrests and abuse of power by policemen. After the dispersal action carried out by the Police in the night of 9 June following the march of 1 million people and just before the resumption of Second Reading debate of the draconian law, the Police made searches, frisking and arrests on a massive scale throughout the territory, as if a curfew was in force. On the day of 12 June, the Police mounted a crackdown in Admiralty by firing guns, unleashing a hailstorm of tear gas rounds, rubber bullets and beanbag rounds and attacking, among others, protesters, students, reporters, first-aiders and foreigners head-on. In particular, those peaceful protesters participating in an assembly organized by the Civil Human Rights Front in front of the CITIC Tower were besieged by the Police and bombarded with tear gas rounds fired by policemen, which nearly caused a tragedy of stampede.

In the ensuing six months, particularly after the enactment of the Prohibition on Face Covering Regulation under the Emergency Regulations Ordinance by the Hong Kong Government in early October, such arbitrary crackdowns, as well as round-ups and attacks targeting ordinary citizens

perpetrated by the Police were extended to all 18 districts in Hong Kong. As the level of force used by the Police increased, so did the strength of resistance. That culminated in the shooting incident in Tsuen Wan on 1 October where TSANG Chi-kin, a secondary school student, was shot in the chest with a live round fired by a police officer. On 8 November, CHOW Tsz-lok, a student of The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology who fell from a building in Tsueng Kwan O, died after sustaining serious injuries. On 11 November, a traffic police officer fired a live round at a young person, rupturing the latter's spleen and part of his liver. And there were also the incidents in which students were besieged by the Police at the No. 2 Bridge of The Chinese University of Hong Kong and The Hong Kong Polytechnic University. It is evident that the mode of suppression employed in the "12 June" incident has become a matter of routine and a formula for shoring up the tyranny and muzzling dissent. Oppressive rule, under which even peaceful assemblies were forbidden by the Government, has become a part of the everyday life of Hongkongers. Carrie LAM and her Administration are the main culprits responsible for such a development in the situation. Meanwhile, the Beijing Government has misjudged public sentiment and aggravated the situation by blindly supporting Carrie LAM and relying on the Police Force to suppress Hongkongers.

On 6 August, the Hong Kong and Macao Affairs Office of the State Council sternly decreed that the violence must be stopped, disorder curbed and order restored in Hong Kong. At a time when the "21 July" incident, in which white-clad people attacked members of the public in Yuen Long, had happened barely a fortnight ago and Hongkongers' trust in the Police Force had plummeted, the Central Government actually designated the Police Force to resolve the problems. Confronted by Hongkongers' questions about and demand for comments on the allegations relating to the "21 July" incident and the Police being in cahoots with the triads, the Central Authorities chose the course of evasion, even dismissing those allegations as rumours, which was tantamount to condoning the tough stance held by Carrie LAM, shielding the Police Force from the ramifications of power abuse and encouraging thugs to target Hongkongers. It is evident in the ensuing developments that the political misjudgment of the Beijing Government has given rise to an ever-escalating cycle of suppression and resistance and, with the arbitrary arrests by the Police Force remaining unchecked and the SAR Government not being stopped from adding to the chaos, led to the dire consequence of expanding conflicts.

Emboldened by the blind backing of the Beijing Government to the SAR tyranny, the Police acted even more recklessly. In an audio recording of a meeting with members of the business sector, as revealed by Reuters in early September, Carrie LAM admitted that since she has nothing other than the 30 000 men and women in the Force, she has to take into account the Police assessment and reactions in whatever she does and give the Police more powers. An apology for the "21 July" incident given by Matthew CHEUNG, Chief Secretary for Administration, also provoked a fierce backlash from the Police Force. With the Communist Party of China and its proxies in Hong Kong acting in concert to sanction violence, the Police have become overbearing and increasingly blatant in their abuse of power. Animosity against the Hong Kong public has also become more common within the Police Force.

Under the reign of white terror and totalitarianism, Hongkongers have lost their faith in the SAR Government, are fiercely indignant over Carrie LAM's condoning of police brutality and call for the disbandment of the Police Force. The results of public opinion surveys show that over four fifths of the public think the Government should form an independent commission of inquiry vested with statutory powers of inquiry; over half of them rate their confidence in the Police Force at zero; over 60% of the respondents support a sweeping restructuring of the Police Force and over 70% of the public think Chief Executive Carrie LAM should take the blame and resign.

Since their "five demands" remain unanswered by the SAR Government, Hongkongers keep up the resistance. In an attempt to use livelihood issues as a diversion, Carrie LAM shifted the focus towards land and housing issues, while continuing to condone police brutality, which was a grave mistake. According to the results of the second follow-up survey on this year's Policy Address conducted by the Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute, people's satisfaction rating with the Policy Address is 23.2 marks only, which is 6.45 marks lower than the one registered in the survey conducted on the day when the Policy Address was delivered; the net satisfaction rate with the Policy Address is negative 66 percentage points, a further decrease of 19 percentage points from the results of the immediate survey, both figures being the lowest on record. These figures show that the absence of any response to the "five demands" in the Policy Address, a fact of which the public was fully aware, caused even more resentment and discontent among the public and provoked a greater backlash from them. The historic and crushing defeat suffered by the pro-establishment camp and pro-Government parties in the District Council Election on 24 November bore

testament to the awakening of ever more Hongkongers willing to stand up and say "No" to the SAR Government, the Central Government and pro-Government parties.

The sentiment and opinion of Hongkongers cannot be clearer: police brutality must be tackled without delay. In a letter to the members of the Hong Kong Bar Association in October, Chairman Philip DYKES pointed out clearly that the rule of law embraces the notion that all Government's acts must comply with the law and be subject to effective review and legal scrutiny. He stressed that the Police Force, as an executive arm of the Government equipped with powers to use firearms, need to act within the law. The rule of law requires that unlawful conduct of police officers must be prevented and, if occurring, be investigated and prosecuted. Any indication of unlawful acts within the Police Force being systematic, even condoned and sheltered by superiors, would be alarming to the rule of law. For there is nothing more corrosive to the rule of law than violence inflicted on Hongkongers, on members of the public by unaccountable state agents with no hopes for thorough investigations and checks.

Law enforcers defy the law by using weapons to inflict violence on members of the public without being subject to legal sanctions—such is the biggest reason for Hongkongers' loss of confidence in the rule of law. Nowadays, whenever Hongkongers join a rally, a march, or just step out of their homes, they will be greeted by the sight of groups of apparent police officers in uniform or plain clothes. Most of them cover their faces with masks. There are no service numbers or warrant cards for identification of them. They can stop and search Hongkongers anytime and take any person away. Particularly targeted are the disadvantaged, such as young students, young people, women and members of the ethnic minorities. More outrageous is that those members of the public who stay at home can still be subject to a sudden assault of tear gas canisters flying into their homes or the residue of tear gas poisoning the community.

Worse still, those members of the public meeting the misfortune of being arrested could be deprived of their basic rights. They could be assaulted, violated or denied permission to meet with lawyers or family during detention. By stepping up the suppression, the Police Force mean precisely to produce a chilling effect that would muzzle and silence hongkongers. It is infuriating to Hongkongers that the Police Force can inflict violence arbitrarily without checks.

The aforesaid acts, which violate international humanitarian standards, have been engineered, organized and mobilized by the Government headed by Carrie LAM with the tax paid by Hongkongers, as an all-out effort to subject Hongkongers to the reign of white terror. With Carrie LAM shielding the Police Force from any consequence of power abuse, the Legislative Council must fulfil its constitutional functions and exercise its powers conferred by the Basic Law by setting up an independent investigation committee to investigate the responsibility of Carrie LAM throughout the campaign of pushing through the draconian law of extradition to China and in what way has she taken part in condoning the unlawful acts of the Police Force, so that all members of the Hong Kong public would learn the truth and see justice done.

In closing, the "anti-extradition to China" movement has awakened many a Hongkonger to the full realization that the evil triad—comprising the Carrie LAM Administration, pro-Government parties and the Police on the rampage—is the biggest public enemy of Hong Kong society, and that the setting up of an independent investigation committee is but a baby step towards the restoration of justice. For the sake of all the brothers and sisters who have lost their freedom and even their lives fighting for the cause of the "anti-extradition to China" movement, Hongkongers will keep chanting aloud: "Five demands, not one less!"; "Restructure the Police Force now!"; "Down with Carrie LAM!".

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): On 9 June, 1 million people took to the streets to oppose the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill"). It has been almost six months now, and during this period more than 5 000 persons were arrested, with some of them being teachers, first aid workers, young people and ordinary residents. A reporter was shot blind; an unarmed student was almost shot dead. Some of the arrestees were hit by police batons on their heads and some suffered broken bones, broken arms and broken legs. Faced with this situation in the past half a year, the Carrie LAM Administration initially refused to withdraw the Bill, and then refused to respond to the "five demands." Carrie LAM kept accusing the rioters of causing the riots, but never made a serious effort to sort out the social conflicts created by her own hands, and this subsequently caused the pro-establishment camp to lose their seats in the District Council Election in a crumbling defeat. In this light, I always think that Ms Alice MAK hit the nail on the head when she lashed out at Carrie LAM, because it was really Carrie LAM who spread her trouble to the candidates in the

pro-establishment camp and caused them to lose in the election. However, I think Ms MAK should not heap curses from behind the crowds. If she wants to curse, she should do so in front of the crowds. Why be afraid? She can curse by all means with justice on her side.

Recently, we have seen two more words from the Carrie LAM Administration apart from "procrastination knack", and they are "arbitrary arrests", meaning no matter what, "better to arrest the wrong person than to let him go". From live broadcasts, we have seen repeatedly the police arresting passers-by who had done nothing on the roadside, or beating up a young man frantically with batons just because that he had pointed at them and faintly voiced grievances. Yesterday morning, we saw several students arrested in To Kwa Wan by persons suspected to be police officers, and we saw one policewoman sitting on the head of a girl student. But subsequently a police spokesman said it was the minimum force employed. Exactly because our incompetent Government's connivance at the Police Force, so they can make this kind of misrepresentations and outrageous remarks. As one can imagine, is this Government salvageable under the leadership and governance of Carrie LAM?

From what we see today, Carrie LAM wants to procrastinate as long as possible, in the hope that the further she can drag on, the people's grievances will subside naturally. But I wish to tell Carrie LAM, the result of the District Council Election has clearly, explicitly and undoubtedly reflected the people's opinion, which is that they are full of grievances and resentment against the Government. When exactly will the Carrie LAM Administration be able to face the reality? Last Wednesday, the United States Congress passed the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act, which has now become an American law. It is estimated that after this enactment in the United States, other countries will follow suit. In the past six months, police brutality, arbitrary arrests, the Government's disregard for public opinion, etc., have become not only the internal problems of Hong Kong, but also a humanitarian crisis attracting common attention in the international community, and all this is sufficient proof of how critical is the issue of human rights in Hong Kong. Even today, the Carrie LAM Administration still attempts to tackle the political predicament arising from the "China extradition bill" through the strategy of procrastination and police brutality. This approach is not only stupid, but also ineffective, and it all the more highlights Carrie LAM's ignorance of the people's sentiment.

"Five demands, not one less" has long been the consensus of the people. In June and July, various sectors of the community urged the Government to form an independent commission of inquiry, to look into the causes of the social disorder arising from the SAR Government's proposal of the "China extradition bill", as well as the issue of who should be held accountable. In particular, a point was made to investigate the Police's arbitrary arrests, abuse of power, and actions causing injuries in violation of rules, and to find out whether there were citizens who died or suffered injuries as a result of police brutality. But nowadays, many people think they can no longer believe that the forming of an independent commission of inquiry can reconstruct the true picture, because their trust in the Government falls continually through a succession of lowest points. Recently, an opinion poll conducted by The Chinese University of Hong Kong showed that half of the general public gave zero marks to the Police Force; and the poll also asked whether the Police Force should undergo large-scale reorganization, and found that nearly 70% of the people agreed. Public opinion is very clear—forming an independent commission of inquiry is not enough. In the light of this, how can the Government go on to deceive itself and others by proposing the forming of a review committee? Does it think that so long as the Police can go all out to arrest a large number of people, society will regain stability? Or does it think that making the Prohibition on Face Covering Regulation can scare the people and stop them from coming out to air their grievances? This view and attitude are just for deceiving oneself and others.

In fact, given the developments to date, the social discontent triggered by the "China extradition bill" has evolved from a political issue in the beginning to an issue of clashes between the Police and the people, or even an issue of "the people fighting against the people", the main reason being that the Carrie LAM Administration has lost autonomy in governance. As everyone knows, the Central Government has the final say, and the Carrie LAM Administration has always been a puppet of the Central Government. For this reason, she has little respect for the mechanism of this Council, nor any respect for Hong Kong people. At the same time, she employed the old trick of the Communist Party of China ("CPC") for dealing with the mass movements of different political stances to deal with Hong Kong issues, that is, "no concession, only repression". In fact, how can the protesters on the streets and even the ordinary people miss this point? Consequently, many protesters realized that the Government would not concede but repress, and so the last thing they could do is to use their deaths as admonishment. Hong Kong's young people are driven to despair by their own Government, and must express their grievances through deaths—this is most pathetic indeed.

I heard Mr MOK say in his speech yesterday that Carrie LAM was pitiful, for she wanted to resign but could not, for even a minor decision was restrained by CPC. But I think Mr MOK is too kind. I will not feel pity for a person who has devastated a whole generation of innocent youths, thousands upon thousands of them. Hong Kong people have suffered a lot from Carrie LAM and her government. One more day she sits in office, one more day Hong Kong people feel the pain. Actually, if she really wants to resign, how come she cannot do so? Unless she said someone pointed a gun at her, if not why can she not step down? The fact is simply that she loves the power that comes from her position.

Actually we all understand that because the SAR Government has lost its autonomy in governance and must rely on violent crackdown to solve problems that, it keeps giving the Police the mandate to use violence, but the most terrible thing is that, subsequently, this uncontrolled power is neither monitored nor checked and balanced. From what we have seen, police officers do not need to show their warrant cards, and when they are on duty they do not need to display their service numbers; they can willfully hurl insults at the people while performing duties on the street, and even yell at Members. However, all of these are small problems, not to be considered very serious. What is really serious is the brazen police-triad collusion against the people.

We believe Hong Kong people will never forget the terrible "21 July" incident. Apart from the "21 July" incident, we can see that people are scared when they go out for daily routines. Why? They are not afraid of the protesters; they are afraid of the "bad cops". Why? Because police officers can use pepper spray and fire tear gas rounds for no reasons. From what we have seen, this is exactly what happened at the scenes of The Chinese University of Hong Kong and The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, where the Police fired tear gas rounds like crazy persons. Even worse, they fired at the people time and again without issuing any warning, and arrested medical personnel, tied them up, and beat them. All these practices show that the entire Police Force and the Government have become frenzied, as if they wanted to destroy the entire Hong Kong.

How could the Government not know that Hong Kong people have no trust in China's legal system? Hong Kong people saw clearly various cases of abuse of public power by the Mainland Government when it falsely accused the ordinary people. What Hong Kong people fear is that they do not know when

they will become the next Simon CHENG, LEE Po, and GUI Minhai, forced to accept opaque and unfair trials, and then made to admit their crimes and make apologies in front of television cameras.

Knowing perfectly well that Hong Kong people do not trust China's legal system, the Carrie LAM Administration still introduced the Bill. It was a decision devoid of political judgment, one that has led to the catastrophic outcome today. It did not hesitate to turn Hong Kong into a police society and connive at the excessive force employed by the Police, making the Police feel secure in the knowledge that they have strong backing, so they can arbitrarily arrest and brutally beat the protesters, and show little respect even to Mr Jasper TSANG. Government officials would address up smartly to condemn the people as rioters, accusing them of creating the riots and asking them why they do not sever ties with the valiant protesters. But the Government itself has never grasped the true cause behind all this, namely it turning its back on popular will in the first place, making the people feel ashamed to stand on its side and rendering them prepared to support the protesters.

Since her planning to sell out Hong Kong and "send it to China" in the beginning of this year, every step taken by Carrie LAM has pushed Hong Kong to a situation beyond redemption. Actually, no one wants to see anyone sustain injuries in the clashes, be they policemen or protesters. But who is the culprit in the first place? It is Carrie LAM. Regrettably, so far we have not seen the slightest bruise on Carrie LAM, who knew nothing but hiding behind the Police to watch the people fight against the people, and showed no hesitation to ruin the future of a whole generation of youths in Hong Kong.

To the Hong Kong citizens who have sacrificed, suffered injuries, bled, lost their future, and experienced police brutality in the current movement and who have no way of redressing such injustices, only by stepping down can Carrie LAM compensate them for the crimes she committed in these days.

I think the SAR Government should not act like an ostrich, and I think it should face the reality and understand why the general public would cast it aside. If the Government wants to retrieve its prestige in governance, the only way out is to apologize to the public, reorganize the Police Force, and accede to the "five demands". And on top of all this, Carrie LAM must step down immediately.

President, I so submit.

MR KENNETH LEUNG (in Cantonese): President, there were media reports yesterday claiming that although Members in the pro-establishment camp had many grievances against the Carrie LAM Administration, they would vote with tears in their eyes against this motion initiated by all the Members from the pro-democracy camp in the Council. Their justification is that Carrie LAM did not break any law in the past several months, and that she indeed was performing the duties of the Chief Executive office. However, let us look at the wording of Article 73(9) of the Basic Law: "If a motion initiated jointly by one-fourth of all the members of the Legislative Council charges the Chief Executive ..."—that is, it just charges, and there is a *prima facie* case—"... with serious breach of law or dereliction of duty and if he or she refuses to resign ..."—it does not necessarily require a serious breach of law, and what we are discussing now is dereliction of duty. In that case, what is meant by dereliction of duty? What we say here is only dereliction of duty, not serious dereliction of duty.

Let us look at the definition of "dereliction of duty" by the Revised Mandarin Chinese Dictionary written by the Ministry of Education in Taiwan. It is "deficient in the discharge of one's duties." It is stated in the ancient literature that if a government official is deficient in the discharge of his duties, he must be punished. Let us also look at the interpretation of the word "dereliction" found in the Ziyi chapter in *The Book of Rites*. It is abuse or excess, meaning that abuse of power or excessive use of force is one kind of dereliction of duty. Furthermore, let us look at another ancient book, *Yi Zhou Shu*, for its explanation of dereliction. It means chaos, things mingled, at a loss when it must be decided what to do, and emergence of disorder. Therefore, the Government's abuse of power, its inability to decide what to do, and causing of disorder—all of these are nothing but dereliction of duty.

This motion was originally scheduled for discussion at the Council meeting on 10 July, but due to various reasons our meeting could not be held. I will be fair and skip all the incidents that took place after 10 July—incidents that aroused one's scorn. I will only look at the incidents that occurred from the beginning of the proposed legislative amendments to 10 July—this series of incidents has already constituted serious dereliction of duty.

To begin with, let us review the most important link of the whole incident, that is, the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill"). President, the Bill is undeniably the most controversial bill in the whole period from the day when Hong Kong was returned to China, for it involves two different jurisdictions, and

the Government wants to transfer residents in one jurisdiction to another for trial, and then to serve prison terms. This of course is a bill of enormous import. Regarding this, the Government has completely ignored the views of various sides.

First, the Government has not carried out a comprehensive consultation. Instead, the consultation it carried out lasted for only three weeks. Even very ordinary legislative amendments, such as those related to environmental protection or charges for waste, had undergone consultations lasting for several years, and indeed the relevant bills committees had carried out discussions for several months. Are Hong Kong people less important than waste? However, the consultation period for the Bill was only three weeks. Generally, there must be a three-month period at least for the consultation procedure, and after the consultation the Government has to consolidate the findings of the consultation into a report, which would be followed by legislative amendments, and this is the normal procedure. But has the Government done anything regarding the Bill? It has done nothing at all. Despite the demands from various stakeholders, the Government has done nothing. This is crime number one.

Crime number two is that the Government made a false proposition, which said that the Bill needed to pass through the Legislative Council before CHAN Tong-kai was released. This is absolutely a false proposition. In various jurisdictions around the world, I have not seen a bill that must be passed urgently because a sentence has been handed down by a law court. Is the Government using the Court under the judicial system to interfere in the legislative system? Is the executive meddling in the operation of the Legislative Council? The Government has shown total disregard for the Council's legislative power and autonomy. Why must the Bill be passed before October? What is the justification? This is crime number two.

Crime number three is that it bypassed the Legislative Council's Bills Committee in the process of legislation. Of course, we had two Bills Committees that paralleled one another in time and space, but one of them was indeed formed by totally unacceptable means and did not go through the normal procedure. We always hold that the Bills Committee chaired by Mr James TO was the lawful one. In this case, the Government bypassed the Bills Committee, submitted the Bill to the Legislative Council for resumption of the Second Reading debate, and hoped that the Bill could receive the Third Reading. This is brazen disregard for the function of the Legislative Council, and has also violated the Basic Law.

Alright, let us look again at the incidents that followed. President, as I said a while ago, I will be fair and only look at all the incidents that happened during the period from June to 10 July. On 9 June, the Civil Human Rights Front launched the third procession—President, the third march, to protest against the Bill. On that day, 1.03 million people took to the streets, marching from the Victoria Park to the Government Headquarters. The whole procession was scheduled to begin marching at 3:00 pm, but because there were too many people, it started out ahead of the schedule. The march ended at 10:00 pm, and was reportedly joined by 1.03 million people. What was the Government's response when so many people were against the Bill and 1.03 million people took to the streets? The Government issued a press release at 11:07 pm. What did it say? It said "... the march, though large, was generally peaceful and orderly." Actually, the meaning between lines of the Government was "the march, though large, was generally peaceful and orderly, and I don't give it a damn" because everyone was marching peacefully. Then, in the last paragraph of the press release the Government added an eye-catching sentence of about 20 words: "The Second Reading debate on the Bill will resume on 12 June."

After this announcement was broadcasted on the television, I heard outbursts of the same word from my neighbours on the left and right, though it was after 11:00 pm, in the still of the night. Thereafter, I received complaints from many friends in the civil service—I mean the civil service, Chief Secretary for Administration. This simply was not the normal way to handle the matter. With so many people having taken to the streets to oppose the Bill, why would the Chief Executive push for the Second and Third Readings? If this is not dereliction of duty, then what is it?

Thereafter, on 12 June, tens of thousands of people occupied Harcourt Road and Lung Wo Road. Of course, the assembly in the morning of 12 June was absolutely peaceful, but the Police suddenly used violence to crack down on it, and fired tear gas rounds at the entrance of CITIC Tower at the people who had already left the scene and entered CITIC Tower. The Legislative Council Secretariat announced on that day that the President of the Legislative Council had decided to cancel the Council meeting of 12 June. The postponement of the meeting was announced in the morning of that day. Thereafter, on 13 and 14 June, the Legislative Council Secretariat notified the pro-democracy Members that the meetings on 13 and 14 June had been cancelled. Why did they have to notify us through the Legislative Council Secretariat? Where had the

Government been on 12, 13 and 14 June? Went missing? It was completely dysfunctional. Where on earth had it been? What was it doing? What was in its mind? If this is not dereliction of duty, then what is it?

As the top leader of the SAR, the Chief Executive issued such a press release to everyone's surprise, and did not suspend or withdraw the Bill, thus missing a good opportunity for the first time. On 12 June, after such a big clash, she did not immediately suspend or withdraw the Bill. On 13 June, she had one opportunity; on 14 June, she had another. But she still did not come out to handle the matter. If this is not dereliction of duty, then what is it? I am not saying the Chief Executive has seriously breached the law; I am saying that she has been derelict of duty, she has abused her power, and she disregarded public will. On 15 June, the Government announced that it would suspend the legislative amendment, saying that it needed to communicate with society, while also stressing that it was not a withdrawal. What exactly was the Chief Executive thinking about? Did she want to stall with excuses? When the Chief Executive announced on 15 June that it was a suspension, not withdrawal, she missed another opportunity. What we are saying now is the fourth, or the fifth opportunity for the Chief Executive to withdraw the Bill, but she did not do that, in total disregard for public will.

What did the Chief Executive do when 2 million people took to the streets on 16 June? She just came out to say regrets to the people. The meaning of this "say regrets" probably is "I am sorry," not "I apologize." She did not say she would withdraw the Bill or handle the clashes between the Police and the people. She did not mention these things at all, and so she missed the opportunity again, and it was the fifth time.

On 1 July, clashes broke out everywhere outside the Legislative Council Complex, but the Police did not enforce the law, and consequently a group of people entered the Legislative Council Complex. Why did the Police not enforce the law at that time? After that, the Government shirked its responsibility by saying that they thought there were dangers. The Government possessed a police force of 30 000 people, but failed to properly protect the Legislative Council Complex. I can tell her that this is crime number seven, and that is, instead of properly protecting the Legislative Council Complex, she said some people had entered the Legislative Council Complex to inflict damages wantonly to the extent that the Legislative Council was unable to operate

normally. The President should also condemn the Police for not making a serious effort to protect the Legislative Council Complex. It strikes me as very strange indeed.

I do not need to say too much. The incidents that happened from 9 June or earlier to 1 July would constitute dereliction of duty under any standards or conditions. Therefore I hope Members in the pro-establishment camp can refrain from "tailgating" too close. I hope they will think for a while and ask themselves whether they should support this motion, because what we are saying is just the forming of an independent investigation committee, to be chaired by the Chief Justice of the Court of Final Appeal, and we have not said anything like she would necessarily be impeached. After the investigation committee has issued its report, it must pass through the process of discussion in the Legislative Council, and only when it is approved by a two-thirds majority of the Members can a motion on impeachment be proposed. Of course, I love to see a two-thirds majority of Members supporting a motion on impeachment next year.

The cases of abuse of power by the Police and the incidents of violence that happened after 1 July, as well as the divide in our society, economic losses, and the contempt and condemnation by the international community of Hong Kong, were caused by a government that was at a loss as to what to do, a government that did not listen to the people's opinions. It only has itself to blame for all these so-called losses.

With these remarks, President, I support this motion.

MR SHIU KA-CHUN (in Cantonese): President, I jointly initiated and support the motion moved by pro-democracy Members under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law seeking to form an independent investigation committee to investigate the charges against the Chief Executive for serious breach of law and dereliction of duty.

Chief Secretary for Administration Matthew CHEUNG emphasized the importance of dialogue in his speech, but how can any dialogue commence when the entire Government, including Carrie LAM, Teresa CHENG and John LEE, incites so much public anger? On what basis can dialogues be opened? What puts her in a position to sit down and hold a dialogue with us? Is it the 30 000-strong Police Force again?

President, as a social worker and a "peaceful, rational and non-violent" advocate of public good, I certainly support dialogues. Hongkongers used to support dialogues, too. No one wanted to resort to violence. However, it was the SAR Government and Carrie LAM who told Hongkongers before June that dialogue is useless. In June, 1 million and 2 million people respectively took to the streets peacefully to express their demands loud and clear. Yet, what was the outcome? Carrie LAM refused to withdraw the draconian law and give up her savage ambition. No wonder a line among the protesters' graffiti goes "You told me peaceful demonstrations are useless".

Public opinion polls clearly indicated that Hongkongers do not trust Carrie LAM and know clearly that the Government and the Police are the culprits of violence. If she is not convinced by public opinion polls, she should be convinced by the outcome of the latest District Council Election which clearly showed that most Hongkongers did not sever ties with the protesters, nor did they agree with the so-called "stopping violence and curbing disorder" avowed by the Government.

The motion seeks to investigate the charges against the Chief Executive for breach of law and dereliction of duty. I can list eight sins committed by Carrie LAM in the past six months. Her sins listed by Honourable colleagues today keep increasing. I think she is really sinful.

First, as the Chief Executive of SAR, Carrie LAM pushed through the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill") despite widespread controversies in society. I need not talk more about the damage caused by the draconian law to Hong Kong's "one country, two systems" and judicial system. Nevertheless, defying the strong opposition from various sectors and professions, and the 1 million people taking to the streets on 9 June, Carrie LAM insisted that the Second Reading debate on the Bill be resumed in the Legislative Council as scheduled. If not for the tens of thousands of people who assembled near the Legislative Council Complex on 12 June to protest and demand the withdrawal of the Bill, I believe the draconian law would have been passed under the blind support of pro-establishment Members.

Unfortunately, Carrie LAW still turned a blind eye to the public opinion and police brutality on that day. She even said later on that the people assembled there took part in riots, causing public anger to surge. Pushing through the draconian law is Carrie LAM's first sin.

Second, one week after that, 2 million people took to the streets as they were dissatisfied with Carrie LAM's "riot" classification, the arrests and charges made against the protesters, the Government's obstinacy, and tyrannical stance of putting people behind bars as a conclusion of the matter. They reached the social consensus of "five demands, not one less". The five demands include the withdrawal of the draconian law, ceasing arrests of protesters against the draconian law, retracting the "riot" classification, lifting prosecutions of arrested protesters against the Bill, and immediate implementation of dual universal suffrage.

Two million people took to the streets; more than 1.6 million people voted to say "No" to the Government; society is gravely divided; assemblies, demonstrations and strikes are incessant, but Carrie LAM has yet to give a positive response to the other four demands. The Government still insists that investigations against police brutality can be carried out through the Independent Police Complaints Council. It is still harbouring the 30 000 police officers. Its proposal to set up an Independent Review Committee instead of a statutory independent commission of inquiry is nothing but hypocritical rhetoric, just like playing with the words "suspended" and "dead" a few months ago. Everyone has grown bored of her same old trick. This is the second sin.

Third, the freedom of assembly of the people is protected by the Basic Law, yet the Police have repeatedly used disproportionate force to suppress demonstrations and public assemblies and fired tear gas rounds in legal processions and assemblies. Many Honourable colleagues mentioned 12 June—Secretary, that day was really a turning point—on 12 June, tear gas rounds were fired outside CITIC Tower, and some members of the public were trapped as a result. During a recent procession in Tsim Sha Tsui, the Police fired tear gas rounds, claiming that protesters had hurled smoke bombs. Repeated questions by the media about smoke bombs received no response. Many children and elderly persons were attacked by tear gas that day. The disproportionate force used by the Police nearly caused a stampede. Student rallies were often taken as unlawful assemblies. Demonstrations were often taken as riots regardless of how peaceful they were. Carrie LAM has turned a blind eye to the police suppression, refused to investigate the Police, continued to prosecute protesters and failed to protect people's right to assembly and procession. This is the third sin.

The fourth sin is that Carrie LAM, as the Chief Executive, did not hold herself accountable to the majority public and practised affinity differentiation to the extreme. The Government led by Carrie LAM constantly condemned violence of the protesters, yet she remained silent about the Police's refusal to display their warrant cards, assaults on the public and reporters with inappropriate force, conniving at the terrorist attack on 21 July, calling members of the public "cockroaches" with a Nazi tongue, and even criticizing senior public officers in violation of the Civil Service Code. Carrie LAM paid visits to pro-Government people who were injured, but did she say a word to those who were injured, beaten, sexually assaulted, arbitrarily detained by the Police and whose homes were hit by tear gas canisters? Carrie LAM has given up her conscience; conscience has also given up on Carrie LAM. This is the fourth sin.

The fifth sin is the most talked about one: "Not showing up on 21 July, beating people to death on 31 August, killing people with guns on 1 October". The "21 July" incident is another turning point in the social trauma. Gangsters went on a beating spree on 21 July. Worse still, the Government is suspected to have joined hands with gangsters to suppress protesters. Mobilizing gangsters is surely no big deal, is it? It has been seen overseas as well as in Hong Kong. Former Chief Executive LEUNG Chun-ying's dinner gathering has shown the intricate relationship between the Chief Executive and gangsters. At the district forum in Tin Shui Wai back in those days, gangsters were also mobilized to treat the protesters there to violence.

On 21 July, hundreds of suspected gangsters made a terrorist attack against the people in Yuen Long. They brutally beat up passengers on the West Rail indiscriminately, causing dozens of people to be blood-soaked. Media footage showed that a police car passed by and saw the white-clad people rallied, yet turned a blind eye to them and left. Police officers also left after arriving at the scene, completely ignoring the fact that the white-clad people were wielding offensive weapons. Police officers patted shoulders with the armed white-clad people and seemed quite friendly with them. They told reporters that they did not see any suspected persons participating in any violent activity. Only six persons have been arrested so far, which clearly demonstrated the cooperation between the Police and gangsters. Carrie LAM has turned a blind eye to this obvious cooperation between the Police and gangsters, thus no police officer has been held accountable thus far. The cooperation between the Police and gangsters has turned into cooperation among the Government, the Police and gangsters. Is this not dereliction of duty? Is this not grounds for impeaching her?

The sixth sin is the "31 August" incident in which the Police indiscriminately attacked MTR passengers who had not committed any unlawful acts. The Police used pepper spray and batons to attack powerless people, causing many to be blood-soaked. All reporters were chased away from Price Edward MTR station, raising a lot of suspicions about the incident. The Government has yet to investigate the details of the incident, or give an account of the casualties or disappearances of persons. Carrie LAM continued to condone police brutality and arbitrary arrests over the months. The power of the Police is unlimited and unrestrained. As a result, young people were almost killed with live rounds fired by two police officers in October and November respectively. The Police remained adamant that the guidelines on the use of force have been complied with, while Carrie LAM continued to turn a blind eye to the situation. The Police have not been held liable for ramming into protesters maliciously with a police car. Carrie LAM continued to turn a blind eye to the situation, condone and endorse police brutality. This is the sixth sin.

The seventh sin is that Carrie LAM subjected "one country, two systems" to unprecedented challenge. She pushed through the draconian law to "extradite Hong Kong people to China". Although the Bill was eventually withdrawn under pressure, the suppression of Hong Kong people's freedom of speech has never stopped. First, an airline was grounded by the Civil Aviation Administration of China. Then, a number of flight attendants were fired for posting on social media platforms and a senior manager was replaced, reigning over the aviation industry with white terror. Just recently, the Chief Economist and Strategist of a bank has been "resigned" as it was inappropriate for a Hongkonger to speak on behalf of the Chinese bank. The victim pointed out that the Chinese bank has changed its strategy in Hong Kong in that it will gradually stop recruiting local youths and the room for comments in Hong Kong will become increasingly narrow.

Moreover, the social media accounts of secondary school teachers were censored. People entering university campuses were arrested for participating in riots. Counselling services by social service organizations were taken as aiding protesters against extradition to China. Political censorship exists in education and social services, which indicates that white terror is spreading in various sectors in Hong Kong. But where was Carrie LAM? She went so far as to ask what freedom of Hongkongers has been undermined. What freedom of Hongkongers has been eroded? What was wrong with her? What she said was actually more unpleasant than swear words. Failing to protect the freedom of speech of the people is her seventh sin.

The last sin is undermining "one country, two systems" which is the cornerstone of Hong Kong. Since Carrie LAM took office, Hong Kong has been integrating more and more with the Mainland. It has become a Mainland city in the Greater Bay Area. Her attempt to push through the amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance has definitely undermined the rule of law in Hong Kong. On top of that, she has condoned the Returning Officer to disqualify candidates and deprive citizens of their right to stand in elections, unjustifiably labelling people with different political views as advocates of "Hong Kong independence". Her full-scale sabotage of "one country, two systems" has directly led to the passage of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act by the United States. We should not blame the Hongkongers who lobbied the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. Without Carrie LAM's active sabotage of "one country, two systems" and damage to the role of Hong Kong between China and Western countries, how could Hongkongers be in a position to lobby United States lawmakers? More countries may follow the lead of the United States. Carrie LAM truly deserves the title of "mother of mutual destruction".

Hong Kong is sinking rapidly. But I wish to point out that in Hong Kong, there are no rioters, only tyranny. The tyranny called a stag a horse, and Hongkongers can clearly hear it. For this reason, they came forth to resist the tyranny during these past six months. Demonstrations, strikes, the yellow economic circle, international linkage, refusal to sever ties, fighting on each in our own way are all for the five demands and for liberating Hong Kong. Hongkongers will not stop fighting as long as the goals are not reached. Hongkongers' slogan "Liberate Hong Kong, the revolution of our times" means restoring the original Hong Kong spirit. The rotten times called upon this generation to revolt. Carrie LAM has been playing deaf and mute in the past six months and destroyed the core values of Hong Kong. She has completely lost the trust of Hongkongers, and thus has no legitimacy in holding office as the Chief Executive. She governs Hong Kong with lies. One who starts with lies ends with self-deception. She has no legitimacy anymore in governing Hong Kong with lies. I have no reservation whatsoever about supporting the forming of an independent investigation committee under the Basic Law to investigate Carrie LAM. Democracy is not afraid of tear gas. Hong Kong is no longer the same. May glory be to Hong Kong.

MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): President, when the Chief Secretary is present this morning, let me tell him about a poll we conducted on Facebook this morning. The topic is the motion to impeach Carrie LAM, which can finally be discussed at this meeting of the Legislative Council. People are asked to give their opinions on the motion. In less than two hours after the commencement of the poll, over 20 000 Hong Kong citizens have voted. The result is very clear: 99% of those voted consider it necessary to impeach Carrie LAM.

In fact, it is not enough just to impeach Carrie LAM; she should step down immediately because, in fact, Hong Kong has got to such a state today truly thanks to Carrie LAM, the "mother of mutual destruction". She often says she has to do soul-searching, then what has come out of her introspection? Is the outcome of her introspection firing tear gas rounds, rubber bullets and even live rounds at people, students and comrades in arms?

President, we have put up with it for such a long time until we have the opportunity to discuss the motion. Hongkongers are simple, really very simple. Now, it seems that the entire Hong Kong is at fault but only Carrie LAM is not and the Hong Kong Police are not. All faults are somebody else's. Members are at fault, so are legal practitioners, medical practitioners and everyone else. The Police will host a press conference at 4:00 pm every day and point out what faults the protesters have made every day. But they say they have made no fault and some actions were unintentional. Police officers unintentionally pushed an old lady onto the ground, unintentionally shot a secondary student and unintentionally fired tear gas rounds at people participating in peaceful assemblies. Who has caused all this? Carrie LAM has been conniving at police brutality behind the scene. She is virtually the out-and-out "mother of mutual destruction".

President, it is straightforward as the facts are all laid before our noses. The Government now tells us to "stop violence, curb disorder and restore order". Should this "stop violence, curb disorder and restore order" come off the lips of Carrie LAM? XI Jinping gave her such an order. Does she think that XI Jinping is not aware of the disturbances in Hong Kong? Does she think that XI Jinping knows nothing? He gave Hong Kong to her to manage but under her management Hong Kong has turned into such a state. Chief Secretary, you and your colleagues just go and ask people on the streets. People's wishes are that she would quickly ... My tongue is usually more refined and cultured. I will not tell her to go to hell but she had better take the responsibility. Simply put, she

should hurriedly conduct an independent inquiry and then step down to honour her election pledge: "when the majority of people in Hong Kong consider me unfit for the office of Chief Executive, I ought to step down".

Carrie LAM made that remark, sharp and forceful, during her election campaign. And now? It has been almost half a year since the outbreak of the incident, and Hong Kong has spiralled into such a state, thanks to her, and she still got the nerve to pocket \$410,000 a month or more than \$5 million a year. I have not yet counted the handsome remunerations given to high-ranking government officials, which are all footed by taxpayers' money. Are you kidding me? Now, the Government still wants us to pass the pay rise proposal for the Police. President, it is truly ludicrous. How will the Finance Committee not filibuster until the end of time?

Coming back to the facts, now when you go and talk to people on the streets, every citizen is fully aware of what is happening in Hong Kong. The value of black versus white and right versus wrong as we learnt in childhood has vanished, and it is so infuriating really. Watching live broadcasts on the television, every person could see the Police beat students with batons and students in school uniforms being rounded up and arrested. People saw it and asked Carrie LAM to come out and redress the scale. However, it was ludicrous that when Matthew CHEUNG came out and made a humane statement, he was questioned in a way bordering on intimidation by police officers incalculable grades below him. Then, the Chief Secretary dared not speak. It was so really ludicrous that since when has the value of black versus white and right versus wrong in the society of Hong Kong been so distorted that making a humane statement will invite criticisms? How could it be?

The present problem is that if we were to stop violence and curb disorder, we ought to bring order out of chaos and punish those who have wronged. But to date, not a single police officer has been held responsible. Is there any? The police officer who drove a motorcycle into a crowd was only put on leave and then resumed duties. What sense does it make? At the core of the depression felt by many Hong Kong people is this question: Why does someone having committed wrongs need not be held responsible and called to accounts? Carrie LAM has not woken up—it is commonly known. In these few months, having been urged continuously, she only suspended the work of the legislative amendment at the beginning. Afterwards, she made it clear that the bill was dead and issued a written apology. At last, she grudgingly said "pardon me".

Now, she turned the "independent inquiry" into "independent review", thinking she could get away with it by giving us a counterfeit and pirated product. Stop kidding me!

As a matter of fact, Carrie LAM is "dead"—a description of her political career. She used to say she was "a good fighter" with a place reserved for her in heaven. I really wish to ask the Chief Secretary: Has that place in heaven been taken away? Does she still think that there is a place reserved for her in heaven? So ludicrous indeed. So many people bled, were injured and arrested, and lost their lives, and all of these were of Carrie LAM's own making! Even some Honourable colleagues from the pro-establishment camp are discontented with her. It is a fact, otherwise they would have constantly pressed the button to request to speak this morning and say how wonderful Carrie LAM is. This morning, I have only seen Mr LEUNG Che-cheung press the button, yet I do not know where he has gone then. It has been indeed torturous for them. After the District Council ("DC") Election, the pro-establishment camp has almost "burned together" with her. Public opinions are crystal clear. Of course, we respect the public opinions. Many people said the two camps won votes at the ratio of 6:4 in the election, while some even said the pro-establishment camp won more than 40% of the votes. Right, we would respect the polling results.

Nonetheless, to pose an honest question, these over 40% of voters should look at what Carrie LAM has done in the past period of time, which is simply too numerous to record and too "impressive". Every member of her clique and cabinet is a "superstar". How long has Teresa CHENG, the infamous "master of dislocation"—as in wrist dislocation—been hiding? As regards the amendment to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, she was virtually the commander of the establishment but she has been nowhere to be found. John LEE slurred his speech every time when he came to the Legislative Council. Whenever asked a question, he would read the reply from the script and never listen to what others said. Paul CHAN has just announced that a fiscal deficit has surfaced in Hong Kong. Judging by his tone, he seemed to be worried about the possible shrinking of public spending in the future. Chief Secretary, as the Treasury has a surplus, should the Government not expand public spending at this juncture to instill stability in public sentiment, instead of making open remarks as such? The Government can spend huge sums on small or big "white elephant" construction projects, but has no money to help the grass roots and the poor? Are you kidding?

We have a series of high-ranking officials in the Government who are earning handsome salaries and remunerations. I do not mean to give a "treat" to the Chief Secretary, who is not of good health, so as not to agitate him so much that he will spit blood. But the problem is that the Chief Secretary has to consider whether civilian officials or military officials are in charge now. Now it seems that military officials have overriding powers that they can neither be criticized nor admonished. Even Jesus Christ cannot chide them. In the past half a year, we have been living in such a society. People saw it for themselves and then would ask: In what ways can the Police be sanctioned for using violence? Even, at any rate, some police officers are also aware that Carrie LAM would put the entire Police Force on the spot to resolve political problems with the strength of the Police. Such a leader whose approval rating has dwindled to some 10 points honestly still has the face to remain in office. How outrageous. She ought to step down immediately. People have very simple requests, which are her stepping down and an independent inquiry. She should walk away after completing her historical mission, "retiring after achieving the merits". However, she clings to her official post and has not given us so far an account of what exactly she has planned to do. She is only capable of playing with words, saying that an independent review committee will be set up.

Carrie LAM is always one step or a few months behind the times when it comes to tackling issues. Frankly speaking, if, on the night of 9 June after a million people had taken to the streets, she came out and told us the legislative amendment would be suspended and even withdrawn, the many things that happened subsequently would not have happened. There would be no bloodshed, injuries, arrests or deaths. However, it is all too late now, and why did she do so in the first place? Because Carrie LAM was hell bent on her own way and shut her ears, completely disregarding the advice of people around her. She thought she is the only person in this world and the entire world revolves around her. Now exactly how many people have made meaningless sacrifices? I really wish to ask her if she can sleep well at night. She can continue to hypnotize herself that she is doing a good job and the Police have to be trusted to stop violence and curb disorder now. In fact, if the Police can have a direct dialogue with her, can she assume that she will be able to come out of Government House unscathed? Honestly, if the Police can speak their mind freely, I am certain that they would have already rained down curses on her head.

When did we start to feel furious switching on the television? When did we start to be unable to sleep at night? When did we start to curse when watching the news in the morning? Now, my father discusses politics with me

every day. He once made a most witty remark: so long as the five demands are not given responses, the curtain will not fall on the matters. Actually, it is a simple and straightforward notion. We have explained the five demands clearly and thoroughly. The Chief Secretary can also see that, and in the course of it, Chief Executive Carrie LAM has gradually become egotistic. She said she respects the freedom of the press, and that reporters should not be assaulted and the freedom of news coverage should be protected. However, a few days ago, in the National Constitution Day forum which saw her attendance, reporters from *Apple Daily* and Stand News were forbidden from entering the venue for news coverage.

I wish to tell everyone that such incidents will occur one after another. If there were no reporters, Hong Kong would have been dead already long ago. If there were no reporters who insisted on filming and covering conflicts occurring at the forefront of demonstrations or assemblies, we would have been dead already long ago. If the reporters had not insisted on filming, notwithstanding the incessant mockery and berating by the Police, Hong Kong would have been dead already long ago. Therefore, we have to thank the fourth estate and reporters. She said she respects the freedom of the press. It is just too ludicrous indeed. The fact right before our noses is that various sectors of Hong Kong have all pointed out that things have gone wrong. Then what should be done? In fact, Carrie LAM needs only to step down. Carrie LAM needs only to set up an independent commission of inquiry. Carrie LAM needs only to respond to the five demands. Such simple requests are written in the motion jointly initiated by us, 20-odd Members from the pro-democracy camp. I am really keen to find out if Members from the pro-establishment camp will speak or vote later on. They can certainly put in good words for Carrie LAM and say that she is not so bad. Just wait and see if they dare to say that. Now, the public sentiment is crystal clear. In the past, she often said there was a "silent majority" in Hong Kong. However, after the DC Election, the "silent majority" vanished. In fact, the so-called "silent majority" might have never existed at all; people are absolutely not silent. We are the perceptive majority.

Right now the facts are laid plain before our eyes. To really stop violence and curb disorder, the first task is to restrain police brutality and tell them to quit and not continue doing so. Do not give us the impression that military officials are in charge while civil officials do not even have the right to speak. I hope they will not lie through their teeth anymore; they will not lie through their teeth in the press conference hosted at 4:00 pm every day and think things are the way they said. I accompanied the old lady who had her head hit to consult a doctor.

At the time, she said she was very scared. I asked her what she was scared of and why she did not go to see a doctor as she had vomited several times. She replied that she was scared of being arrested by the Police. And what exactly had she done? She kneeled down and begged the Police for leniency as there were still students and people at the scene. She hoped the Police could slow down their actions, but was pushed to the ground by a police officer.

We have offered help to many people after the "31 August" incident. Among them, those who had personal experiences on the scene do not wish to recount what happened inside the station. At the time, some police officers threw punches at them without uttering a word. Was it the so-called minimum level of force permitted to be used? The "21 July" incident is like a scar of the Government. The Chief Secretary asked us to look ahead and not mention it again. He certainly does not want us to mention it again. How would he have the nerve to mention it again? On that day, after people had made a report to the Police, how long did it take the Police to arrive at the scene? In more than 30 minutes, almost close to 40 minutes, there was not a single policeman in sight. And the Chief Secretary still asked us not to mention it again. As a matter of fact, it is not about mentioning it, but about black versus white and right versus wrong. If the Government wants to untie the mental block among Hongkongers, it do justice to Hongkongers and speak the language of Hongkongers, instead of saying we had better look ahead and improve the economy while stopping violence and curbing disorder, and that those people were all rioters and everything they did was violence. I would step back hugely and consider those acts violence, but where did such violence come from and what were the reasons for them? Who are the Chief Executive and her team who have done such a poor job?

Today, each of us has 15 minutes to vent our grievances, but there are certainly countless things to chide about. President, next, I wish to ask the Secretary: When the Finance Committee considers the civil service pay adjustment later, will the item of pay rise for the Police Force be taken out? And will he insist that the various funding proposals for universities be withdrawn, as a way to punish various universities, hoping to sever ties with the entire young generation? He is laughable actually as even MAO Zedong knew that young people are our future. Yet, he almost wants to sever ties with the young people now. I ask them to think hard about this. Is it how they want to be government officials, run the Government and she acquitting herself as the Chief Executive?

President, the simple fact before our eyes is that if we want the disturbances stopped, the police brutality has to be restrained first. The next step is certainly to conduct an independent inquiry. And conducting an independent inquiry alone would not suffice. The five demands are clearly written. To date, we have not seen any police officer or high-ranking government official held accountable and step down. It is neat and comfy to be senior government officials, for they really have no knowledge of the people's hardships as their children are all studying abroad. But now things have changed to the opposite. As we can see, sanctions by foreign countries seem to be coming successively. However, if they feel aggrieved about why they would be sanctioned, I advise them to ask themselves this question. What has the Chief Executive, Carrie LAM, whom they support, done over the past period of time?

If the clock could be dialled back to 9 June and she came out to announce the suspension of the procedure for the legislative amendment, rather than insisting on introducing the Bill for Second Reading at the Legislative Council meeting on 12 June direct, the matter would have taken a considerably different course. Had it been the case, how would there be tear gas rounds fired by the Police on 12 June at the site of the assembly for which a letter of no objection had been granted, as well as the ensuing series of problems? The Police have so far fired over 10 000 rounds of tear gas, rubber bullets and live rounds. These numbers are based on facts. Let me tell them: Now people are all grumbling about how a government with such a low approval rating could be so thick-skinned as to continue to make thoughtless comments, claiming they have done nothing wrong. Did Carrie LAM say a place had been reserved for her in heaven? That place has already been withdrawn.

President, I so submit.

DR PIERRE CHAN (in Cantonese): President, this motion, jointly initiated by 25 Members and pinpointing the Chief Executive, was originally scheduled for debate at the meeting of 10 July, but December is with us now. In the period from June to December, the movement of opposition to the proposed legislative amendments, triggered by the Government's introduction of the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill"), should be considered unprecedented in scale, in the number of demonstrations, and in the number of protest assemblies.

When I responded to the 2019 Policy Address in October, I described the huge turmoil that arose from the proposed legislative amendments as "the political tsunami of the century." The social unrest and the serious clashes between the Police and the people have shown no signs of easing up. Social groups of different political views walked farther and farther away from one another, and our society has been torn apart more ferociously. Carrie LAM as the Chief Executive has a responsibility she cannot shirk.

In the past several months, not only was the Chief Executive unable to effectively mitigate the situation and mend ties, but her response to the aspirations in society was also "slow by several beats," coupled with her response failing to focus on the point at issue, and so what she did was to make things worse. Take the demand for withdrawal of the Bill as an example, more than 1 million people took to the streets on 9 June to demand for withdrawal of the Bill, but the Chief Executive did not "pause for a moment and think for a while". Not only that, she insisted on presenting the Bill to the Legislative Council in a few days (that is, 12 June) for Second Reading. Consequently, tens of thousands of people surrounded the Legislative Council Complex on that day, and serious clashes between the Police and the people broke out, while the meeting could not be held.

On 16 June, the Civil Human Rights Front claimed that 2 million people had taken to the streets to demand withdrawal of the Bill. When the Chief Executive responded on 24 June, she still said that she would only withdraw the notice on resumption of the Second Reading debate on the Bill, and refused to formally withdraw the Bill. Only in September did she express the willingness to formally withdraw the Bill. However, a small turmoil arose at that time, because her way of putting it was to "move a motion to withdraw," and so everyone spent half a night to figure out what she meant, and even I had to search for information. Only then late at night did the Government hastily issue a press release, which changed the wording to "announced the withdrawal." If after the march on 9 June—a "letter of no objection" had been issued and so it was a peaceful march—the Government was willing to announce withdrawal on 10 or 11 June, then all the incidents that happened in the past four or five months would not have happened, and would only be a dream of everyone. But this dream is still going on, probably very real, too. The clashes between the Police and the people have grown increasingly serious, resulting in the injuries of numerous protesters and citizens, as well as the arrests of more than one thousand people.

Many people think that the Government was late for two or three months in withdrawing the Bill, leading to continual deterioration of the situation, which is now difficult to wrap up.

When I responded to the Policy Address, I pointed out in particular that some demands underpinned by an enormous consensus in society, such as the forming of an independent commission of inquiry and holding senior government officials accountable, can calm the situation and reduce conflicts if met. But the Chief Executive has hitherto refused to respond to them directly even now, and this is one important reason for the people's constant grievances against the Chief Executive and the Government.

I have also pointed out in public that to stop violence and curb disorder, it is not necessary to apply the hard hand, it can be done by using the soft approach, because the tougher the method, the bigger the resistance it will induce.

In November, the Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute conducted two opinion polls, which showed that the Chief Executive's popularity ratings were lower than 20%; it was 19.5% and 19.7% respectively, the lowest in record for anyone who had held the Chief Executive office. Her net approval rates were -71.1% and -71.7% respectively, also the lowest in record, so she has become the most unpopular Chief Executive with the lowest popularity rating since the reunification.

Meanwhile, the result of the District Council ("DC") Election on 24 November has struck home a clear message, which is the people's strong dissatisfaction with the Government. In her response to the result of the DC Election, the Chief Executive said that she had noticed many analyses and interpretations in the community, that many people said the result of the DC Election was a reflection of the people's dissatisfaction with the current situation of society and its deep-rooted problems, and that surely the SAR Government would listen to the people's opinions with an open mind and carry out introspection seriously.

However, have the Chief Executive and the Government really listened to the people's opinions with an open mind? Have they learnt a lesson? Have they really done introspection? The answer is no. As they have done continuously, they do not address squarely the people's aspirations. After holding a "community dialogue" on 26 September, the Chief Executive again

wanted to disconnect with the people. When the people demanded the forming of an independent commission of inquiry to thoroughly investigate the whole incident, including the law enforcement by the Police—in fact I believe this does not just aim at the Police—she said she would refer to the United Kingdom's way of handling the 2011 disturbance, and form an independent review committee to look into the cause of the social disturbances in the past several months—this apparently is off focus again. Former Secretary for Transport and Housing Prof Anthony CHEUNG said this move by the Chief Executive is neither fish nor fowl, not helpful to stopping the disturbances. He thought the Chief Executive has underestimated the substantive conflicts in society.

Before the Chief Executive announced the withdrawal of the Bill, foreign media revealed in early September a recording believed to be the content of a closed-door meeting between the Chief Executive and the business community, in which she said she had caused huge havoc to Hong Kong and it was unforgivable, and that she would quit if she had a choice. Chief Executive Carrie LAM said in March 2017 in her election campaign that she would resign if the mainstream opinion of Hong Kong people render her unsuitable to serve as the Chief Executive, but the fact is not the case, as we can see.

President, we do not wish to see any more injuries and deaths resulting from the protests against the proposed legislative amendments, nor do we wish to see more arrests. I implore Chief Executive Carrie LAM and the Government to respond to and meet the aspirations of society as soon as possible. I so submit.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now suspend the meeting until 11:30 am.

10:50 am

Meeting suspended.

11:30 am

Council then resumed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, please speak.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): I guess such a scene like the present one seldom occurs in the Legislative Council. Perhaps the Chief Secretary has not seen it either. Only one Member speaks to him while the President chairs the meeting. The three of us are having a discussion here on whether the Legislative Council should be authorized to conduct an investigation led by the Chief Justice of the Court of Final Appeal ("CFA") regarding the impeachment of Chief Executive Carrie LAM in accordance with Article 73(9) of the Basic Law.

Many Members of the pro-establishment camp expressed a common viewpoint in their speeches—this is my conjecture, since I have heard this viewpoint from the media—they considered the Chief Executive really lousy. Carrie LAM has indeed done wrong. Over the past several months, she has been making mistakes, even causing them to suffer an overwhelming defeat in the District Council Election. However, according to them, the Chief Executive did not commit the acts mentioned in Article 73(9) of the Basic Law, the first one being serious breach of law and the second one, dereliction of duty. For this reason, they would reprimand the Chief Executive like we did, but they would vote against this motion because they have to be accountable to their supporters. On the one hand, they reprimanded the Chief Executive. Yet on the other hand, they held that she has not breached the law, so they should not support this motion.

President, I am making this speech in the hope that the people of Hong Kong will see clearly why I think there is serious breach of law and dereliction of duty on the part of Carrie LAM. It is because unless a clear explanation is given on how Carrie LAM has seriously breached the law and committed dereliction of duty, members of the public will not understand why it is necessary to conduct this independent investigation. If Honourable colleagues of the pro-establishment camp still vote against this important motion, they will have to pay a political price, the political price for not making an effort to "stop violence and curb disorder" as currently avowed by the Government.

As I have said, Carrie LAM has seriously breached the law. I would like to explain it in three points. To start with, please bear in mind that among the functions vested in the Chief Executive under Article 48 of the Basic Law, the one in Article 48(2) is "[t]o be responsible for the implementation of this Law and

other laws which, in accordance with this Law, apply in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region". That means the Chief Executive is in fact someone who is the most obliged to abide by the Basic Law. Oddly, the senior officials of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("SAR") Government often accuse members of the public of violating the Basic Law. They keep stating that any discussion about Hong Kong independence is in contravention of the Basic Law because Article 1 of the Basic Law reads, "The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region is an inalienable part of the People's Republic of China". Any discussion about "Hong Kong independence" is therefore in contravention of the Basic Law. They often accuse members of the public of violating the Basic Law, but they never review whether they themselves have engaged in similar violations. The core of the Basic Law, serving as the mini-constitution, precisely seeks to restrain those in power and protect the basic rights of the ordinary masses. This is exactly the spirit of the constitution. Hence, first of all, will Members please look at it carefully. According to Article 48(2) of the Basic Law, the Chief Executive is "responsible for the implementation of this Law". Her conduct must therefore be in full compliance with the Basic Law.

Hence, regarding her serious breach of law, the first point I wish to make is that she has seriously violated Article 43 of the Basic Law, which reads as follows: "The Chief Executive of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region shall be accountable to the Central People's Government and the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region in accordance with the provisions of this Law." Be accountable to the Central People's Government. The pro-Government Members on my left will certainly make such remarks. They would not even bother to browse through the Basic Law. They will simply follow whatever "Grandpa" says. Even for someone whose rank is as low as that of WANG Zhimin of the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("LOCPG"), no matter what he says, all of them will just nod in agreement. It cannot be wrong to strictly follow the Communist Party of China. However, this is only part of Article 43 of the Basic Law. The Chief Executive is accountable to not only the Central People's Government but also the Hong Kong SAR. This is the first crime I wish to pinpoint concerning Carrie LAM's serious breach of law. Without being accountable to the Hong Kong SAR, she has seriously violated Article 43 of the Basic Law.

The Chief Executive shall be responsible to the Hong Kong SAR. What does it mean? Actually, the Basic Law does not define this in detail. However,

taken literally, this provision cannot possibly mean that the head of SAR shall be accountable only to herself. If she shall be accountable only to herself, that means she needs not be accountable at all. By common sense, what does the Hong Kong SAR refer to? It refers to the community of all the people of Hong Kong. Telling from Carrie LAM's conduct since February this year, has she been accountable to the Hong Kong SAR, i.e. all the people of Hong Kong? This is the criterion for determining whether she has violated Article 43 which, in my opinion, she has failed to meet.

Just now various Members mentioned that no other Chief Executive was like Carrie LAM, in that in quite a number of opinion surveys, more than 70% of the respondents wanted her to resign. No other Chief Executive ever got a rating lower than that of Carrie LAM. During the Chief Executive Election campaign, Carrie LAM openly pledged that if most people considered her unfit to serve as Chief Executive, thus making her governance impossible, she would resign. This is a solemn pledge she made to the people of Hong Kong. Now she has broken her own pledge. She also neglects the public opinions clearly expressed by the people through the opinion surveys and the District Council Election recently held on 24 November. Hence, without being accountable to the Hong Kong SAR, she has violated Article 43 of the Basic Law.

As regards the second point, I think it should be even more readily comprehensible. Now Chief Executive Carrie LAM has seriously violated Article 22 of the Basic Law because this provision stipulates: "No department of the Central People's Government and no province, autonomous region, or municipality directly under the Central Government may interfere in the affairs which the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region administers on its own in accordance with this Law." President, since the furore that started in June, the overseas media has reported at least three times—three actually—including the report carried in the *Financial Times* on 14 July, as well as those by Reuters on 30 August and 2 September. All of them cited information from unknown sources at the senior level, alleging that firstly, Carrie LAM had long wished to withdraw the Amendment Bill on the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") but was stopped by HAN Zheng or someone of a higher rank. Secondly, Carrie LAM had in fact proposed resignation quite early. She did not want to be the Chief Executive any longer. She knew she had made a grave mistake and would be a sinner for eternity. She had dragged Hong Kong into a terrible state. She wanted to leave, but Beijing would not let her go.

President, if these reports of the overseas media are true, we should be able to see that be they officials in the Central Authorities or the petty officials in LOCPG, they keep violating Article 22 of the Basic Law, meddling in the affairs of Hong Kong. Does Article 22 only restrain officials in the Mainland ministries or Central Authorities? No. Being the Chief Executive, seeing that Article 22 of the Basic Law explicitly stipulates that no Mainland officials may interfere with Hong Kong's internal affairs, does she not have the duty to stop such interference? This is a duty of the Chief Executive spun off from Article 22 of the Basic Law. If she wished to withdraw the Bill as reported by the overseas media, she had the authority to do so. It was entirely a local affair. However, perhaps she was subsequently scolded by HAN Zheng, who said that if she dared withdraw it, there would be some unknown consequences. I wonder if she had been intimidated. Such being the case, she has directly violated Article 22 of the Basic Law. Leaving aside whether Beijing had instructed her to amend FOO, I expect the Chief Justice to investigate this for us.

The third provision of the Basic Law violated by Chief Executive Carrie LAM is Article 48(5), which states that the Chief Executive may report to the Central People's Government certain principal officials for appointment, including the Commissioner of Police. She may also "recommend to the Central People's Government the removal of the abovementioned officials". The Chief Executive saw that Secretary for Justice Teresa CHENG, Secretary for Security John LEE and former Commissioner of Police LO Wai-chung had repeatedly committed political mistakes or actually violated the law. We also saw that everyone in the Hong Kong Police Force had turned a blind eye to the breach of law by the police officers. Since June, the Police have arrested thousands of people. Many young people have lost their future, but not a single police officer has been arrested. Helplessly, we watched them beating up people, but they would not be arrested. The person-in-charge of the entire Police Force, i.e. the Commissioner of Police, needs not bear any responsibility. Neither does the Secretary for Security nor the Secretary for Justice. After all, the Chief Executive is responsible in this regard. Seeing that these officials have done wrong, she should exercise the power conferred on her by Article 48(5) of the Basic Law, i.e. "recommend to the Central People's Government the removal of the abovementioned officials", but she has not done so.

President, apart from the breach of law, the Chief Executive has the fault of dereliction of duty. What is the definition of "dereliction of duty"? I do not intend to cite any examples in the United States or the United Kingdom. I have

especially used Baidu, a search engine of China, to look up the actual meaning of "dereliction of duty" in the Mainland context. There I found four definitions, two of which I think are applicable to Carrie LAM's situation. The first one is the crime of abuse of power. It refers to deliberate overstepping of authority or nonfeasance by a functionary of a State organ, thus causing heavy losses to public money or property or the interests of the State and the people. The second one is the crime of negligence of duty. It refers to gross neglect of duty by a functionary of a State organ omitting to perform or incorrectly performing his duties, thus causing heavy losses to public money or property or the interests of the State and the people. From my casual citation of these definitions, we can already know that Carrie LAM has committed all of these crimes. In fact, she has the power to recommend to the Central People's Government the removal of LO Wai-chung and TANG Ping-keung from office one after another because seeing the police officers break the law, they have done nothing. Carrie LAM has the authority to remove them from office, but she has not discharged her duty. For this reason, she has committed dereliction of duty.

President, having violated three provisions of the Basic Law, Carrie LAM is obviously suspected of dereliction of duty. What we currently need is an independent investigation led by the Chief Justice of CFA. As a matter of fact, we have long requested the forming of an independent commission of inquiry. Today this motion can precisely empower us to set up one to investigate the most crucial part, i.e. has Beijing actually interfered with Hong Kong's internal affairs? How did the Chief Executive exercise or omit to exercise her power in this matter, thus dragging the people of Hong Kong into the present dire straits?

As we all know, the Congress of the United States is preparing for the impeachment of President Donald TRUMP. What we request is exactly the same kind of investigation to fully disclose to the people of Hong Kong such matters as with whom Carrie LAM has talked on the phone, to whom she has sent emails and what she has reported to the senior officials on the Mainland since February this year. I believe Carrie LAM also welcomes this approach because she is eager to get away and resign. In that case, let us lend her a helping hand. *(The buzzer sounded)*

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

DR CHENG CHUNG-TAI (in Cantonese): The motion under discussion now was moved under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law and calls for the setting up of an independent investigation committee to investigate the Chief Executive for alleged serious breaches of law and/or dereliction of duty. President, strictly speaking, I have forgotten this motion and the fact that I was one of the co-sponsors initiating it. It was not until I heard other Members mention the 25 pro-democracy members co-signing the sponsorship in their speeches just now that I finally took a look at the list and found my own name on it. Pray excuse me for having forgotten about it.

On second thought, though, there may be good reasons for my forgetting about it. It was in July that the disturbances arising from the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") emerged and reached its climax. In the legislature, there were still a number of agenda items pending before meetings were suspended. At that time, the legislature as well as our society had yet to see, as I put it, a complete meltdown of order as we are seeing today. I co-sponsored the motion because it makes sense basically. For the whole world—including the pro-establishment camp, I believe—was confounded by Carrie LAM's obstinacy in pushing through the FOO amendment then.

As we all know, the expected damage brought forth by the FOO amendment would seriously undermine the right of private ownership of property and human rights protection in Hong Kong. I do not think we should dwell on that point. It also beats me why the pro-establishment camp was vague on the subject at the outset, then, having slowly come to realize the problems, persuaded the Government to remove nine categories of commercial offenses, and then voiced in unison their scepticism about, even objection to, the amendment. Members may still recall in the last two weeks of June, the Executive Council, which had stopped conferring, were like a sinking ship abandoned by its Members en masse, who openly aired their scepticism about the legislative amendment exercise to the media, complaining that their misgivings had yet been assuaged. Simply put, we are now back to square one. So, why did Carrie LAM push for the FOO amendment? For the sake of resolving the surrender issue arising from the CHAN Tong-kai case?

Come to think about this. It would be inconceivable—presumably for those who have been watching the live broadcast of this Council or those members of the public who feel that Hong Kong has been turned on its head—if the events of the past six months were to go down in history as Hong Kong being

subjugated under the direct jurisdiction of the laws of the United States in consequence of the CHAN Tong-kai case. As in the incident of LIN Weixi, would we say that LIN Weixi was the cause of the incursion of the Qing troops—not the incursion of the Qing troops, but the invasion of China? That is inconceivable. We must understand why a single person, CHAN Tong-kai, has managed to reduce the century-old civilization of Hong Kong to ashes. Carrie LAM, for certain, is first and foremost to blame. Hence, it made perfect sense for me to co-sponsor the motion in July.

However, having contemplated the matter while sitting here this morning, I now find this motion much too easy on her. The appellation "Hong Kong butcher" would be apt on her in encapsulating the lawbreaking acts done by her in the last few months. In the last four months, there were suspicious cases of suicide or being suicided involving the disappearance of numerous persons under mysterious circumstances. There have been many cases these days that boggle people's minds. In terms of the powers of the Police and the use of excessive force by them, particularly since September, I am sure Honourable colleagues present here too could not fathom why on 11 November, a police officer would shoot at ordinary citizens at random for no apparent reason with his .38-calibre service revolver. We all wish to know why, buddy. Is a colour revolution being staged from inside the Government? You do know what I mean, do you not?

Then, after October, despite a visibly calmer atmosphere, the Police seemed unwilling to stop. A young man, who goes to the school where "Slow Beat" is an alumnus, was shot in his chest by a police officer and nearly killed. It was fortunate that the kid had a lucky escape. Before being rushed to hospital for emergency care, he said: "You cannot kill me with one shot." What a grim proclamation! The Government should not think that, with the conclusion of this motion or a possible landslide victory by the pro-democracy camp in the upcoming Legislative Council Election, the seeds of animosity it has sown over the last four months would wither. No. Those kids—as many of them are in fact not kids, I will not refer to them indiscriminately as young people; nor will I repeat time after time that we are doing it for the young people or students—those people who were trapped in The Hong Kong Polytechnic University attempted various means of escape, including crawling through sewers and abseiling down heights, according to media reports. I have no idea how many of them did so. You will see how they scorn this Government.

Hongkongers, who know only comfort and pampering, squeezed into an underground sewer infested with cockroaches and rats and crawled for an hour in escape, just to evade police beatings. Come to think about this. How horrendous would this animosity be. All that was of Carrie LAM's own making. Due to the lawbreaking acts she had done, she should go down in history simply as "Hong Kong butcher" and be punished by crucifixion. Just skip that crap about a place for her in heaven. As a person with no religion or faith, I do not bother to enter the fray.

As for whether there is dereliction of duty on her part, while I will not comment on her ability to lead Hong Kong, the internal workings of the Government and the pro-establishment camp are most inapt indeed. President, I mean no discrimination or insult against people with mental disorder, but are there actually tests for mental disorders in place within the Government? Are there mental and psychiatric check-ups for public officers annually? Over the last two months, all senior officials kept oscillating in their remarks. For instance, after criticizing the Junior Police Officers' Association and the Police, Chief Secretary for Administration Matthew CHEUNG immediately made a volte face, apologizing for saying too much. I assume their cognitive faculty is intact. Given my conviction about the cognitive acuity of the dozen of them, I can only conclude that he suffers from mental disorder.

The second one is Teresa CHENG. She was asked why she, after tripping in the United Kingdom, had to go to Beijing for treatment. She said that she must return to the country, and that the State had sent a plane for her. She said that she had sustained injuries from a fall, that her hand hurt badly, and that she would need a year for recuperation. That man whose lung was ruptured by a gunshot was discharged from hospital nine days later ... no, it was not his lung but his kidney that was ruptured by a bullet. While I should not draw such a comparison, but does she really suffer from mental disorder?

Paul CHAN is kind of weird, too. There is something about him that Members may have forgotten, but I recall some scenes which clearly suggested a power struggle. After Carrie LAM had formally announced the withdrawal of the Bill, he outrageously had the nerve to come forth to tell the media that cash handouts would be made and that four rounds of relief measures would be rolled out, but obviously there were already hints of those four rounds of relief measures in the beginning of the year and it was said that the Government was thinking

about making cash handouts. I am not saying that he is nuts but I would say that he is a jerk. Members have already forgotten it, right? I am particularly good at remembering gossips.

Carrie LAM has been taken to task for six months. I myself would call her the "Hong Kong butcher". She has been criticized for six months and in this Council yesterday, there a motion of impeachment was even proposed against her but she really caught us by surprise as she updated her Facebook status at midnight, saying that it was cold and telling people to put on more clothes. Everyone was rendered speechless and Chief Secretary, this had indeed sent a chill down my spine. She has been chided for six months and an impeachment motion was proposed against her just yesterday. Yet, she had the guts to not think about how to salvage her waning popularity and instead, she ultimately thought that she had better care about whether the elderly had dressed warmly. Are these people psychotic?

Now it comes the turn of WONG Kam-sing. Questions about tear gas were put to him, and he was asked to look into the environment in Hong Kong as the Secretary for the Environment; and I have not yet mentioned that inhaling and accumulating tear gas compounds for a long time may cause cancer. Mr CHAN Kin-por will be making a fortune this time around, for he is in the insurance business. Some people asked WONG Kam-sing about the issue of dioxin. He said that a main source of it was the burning of trash in open air. When he was asked whether dioxin would be released from by firing of tear gas rounds, he then talked about BBQ. What was in his mind?

As for Nicholas YANG, the other day many smart lampposts were destroyed in Kowloon Bay and he said that it was the darkest day for innovation and technology in Hong Kong. Members, he is mentally ill, is he not? What was he talking about?

Let me now jump to Kevin YEUNG. Some people asked him about the funding for The Hong Kong Polytechnic University for constructing a new building, which involves more than \$1 billion to be used for training health care personnel and nurses in optometry to complement the provision of health care manpower in the next five years. Why was this funding application pulled out by the Government for no reason? Of course, colleagues from the pan-democratic camp have questioned whether this is meant to punish the universities. I think they are simply not in their right mind. They are sick in

the head. Then what did Kevin YEUNG say? He said that he had no idea to what extent the library was damaged. What happened with these people? I am sure they are not suffering from dementia.

Right, let me now talk about the Secretary for Labour and Welfare, Dr LAW Chi-kwong—now I realized that he was the one who talked about BBQ—He was asked about the release of dioxin by the firing of tear gas rounds and he talked about BBQ. Who else? I should talk about all Secretaries of Department and Directors of Bureau.

John LEE. We all know that he is simply wonderful. It is fine that he speaks slowly. But when he was asked whether the Police had used excessive force, of course he said that there was a need for the Police to enforce the law, as all of his replies were given according to the model answers. But let us not forget that one day, the reporters asked him about the incident in which a police officer had his neck slashed in Kwun Tong, and as we all know, the policemen, the Police Force, and the Security Bureau as a whole are keen to lay a hand on the reporters. Then he even voiced it, saying that it was a bogus reporter who slashed the neck of the policeman. Is he crazy? He is psychotic.

Please give me a bit of time. Secretary for Transport and Housing, Frank CHAN. He was asked why the MTR Corporation Limited ("MTRCL") had always suspended its service for no reason. He said that the suspension of service by MTRCL did not constitute a failure to discharge its responsibility as stipulated in the Mass Transit Railway Ordinance. Why has MTRCL since become a constant target of the protesters? Because it provided conveyance for the Police, and it is really the "Communist Party's railway". MTRCL had allowed the Police to fire tear gas rounds like crazy and fire shots rashly inside MTR stations. It did not utter a word about it, nor did it protect the passengers and of course, everyone is angry. But he said "No", there is no question of MTRCL failing to discharge its responsibility under the Mass Transit Railway Ordinance. I am not going to talk about the others because some of them are already nowhere to be seen now. People like LAU Kong-wah have not said anything.

President, what I wish to say is that I have only given a brief account of the remarks made by Secretaries of Department and Directors of Bureau. I would say that they are sheer fantasies and utterly ridiculous. But from this we can imagine that the core of the governance of this Government ... Let me tell

Members that really, they are not suffering from dementia. I now withdraw my previous remarks. They are not incompetent, and this is not a question of whether one has a clear conscience. We should not draw too simple a conclusion on this, as there may be a new side of it that we really have never thought about. In fact, these people hold such enormous powers and such a lot of resources. Why do they not seriously face the responsibilities required of them as people with powers? Judging from what they have done, does it not show that they are really sick?

Lastly, I have only one minute left of my speaking time. I hope that all Hong Kong people will know that with the passage of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act in the United States, Hong Kong has stepped into the Wilderness only now, and to Hong Kong, it may even be the start of sufferings. Certainly, we have already suffered badly and perhaps the grass-roots people have already grown accustomed to sufferings and this is no big deal to them. But the situation will be more difficult from now on. Why? Because we now know that the Government is void and empty. We all want to know what exactly happened on several days. What happened on 12 June? What happened on 21 July? What happened on 31 August? Why did they fire shots everywhere on the street on 11 November? Who made those decisions? No one has given a response. Then you people asked how this should be resolved. Simple enough, I will show you a direction. Regarding the incident on 21 July, go arrest Dr Junius HO as the first step. Go get him to assist with the investigation. Why is he not approached? Chief Secretary, he was there attending the military parade!

I so submit.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): President, "9 June", "12 June", "16 June", "1 July", "21 July", "31 August", "29 September", "1 October", "5 October", "8 November", "11 November", "17 November", "24 November", these groups of numbers are all dates. I wonder how the Chief Secretary for Administration would feel when he hears of these numbers? Does he remember what these dates represent? But many Hongkongers will always remember these dates, just as we would remember 4 June, something we do not want to remember, but dare not forget, for the enmity is irreconcilable.

We have proposed this motion today to request the forming of an independent investigation committee to investigate the breaches of law and dereliction of duty committed by Chief Executive Carrie LAM in the past six months. The most serious consequence is her being impeached and stepping down. It is too mild for us to do so. Go out and ask Hongkongers.

Last time, I suggested the Chief Secretary to go to Central and listen to Hongkongers' voices during "lunch with you". The slogans have evolved from "no withdrawal, no dispersal", "five demands, not one less", "Hongkongers, add oil", "Hongkongers, resist" to "disband the police force", "Hongkongers, retaliate" and "dirty cops should see all their family members die" that people are now chanting. Yet, no one would chant "Carrie LAM, step down". "Carrie LAM, step down" is not one of the five demands, because this is too lenient to her, Hongkongers will never forgive her. The slogans chanted now are "Carrie LAM, go to hell" and "Carrie LAM, the murderer", and there are slogans even more unpleasant to the ears, but all of these are public opinions.

President, I can recall that a Member scolded Carrie LAM with the wording to the effect that she was "nothing but a useless bitch who should go to hell" during her "question and irrelevant answer session". Back then, some Members of the pro-establishment camp called on us to refrain from using such expressions in the legislature which were too emotional and irrational, but now, even Members of the pro-establishment camp would also want to swear at her, right? Members of the pro-establishment camp have also sworn at Carrie LAM. At this juncture, let alone stepping down, she cannot make up for the mistakes made, the damage done and the seeds of misfortune sown in Hong Kong even if she goes to hell for 10 times.

The findings of a public opinion poll conducted by The Chinese University of Hong Kong revealed that almost half (about 49.3%) of the public gave the SAR Government a zero score; whereas more than half (51.5%) of the public gave the Police a zero score. It is very difficult to get a zero score, but half of the people gave the Police a zero score. It cannot reflect the public grievances if we just demand Carrie LAM to step down. None of the political issues has ever been resolved in the past six months. Not only does Carrie LAM have to step down, the entire accountability team should step down as well. Chief Secretary, you had better take the lead to stand up and step down, and then stand on the opposite of Carrie LAM. You should at least do something for Hongkongers by acting as the last straw. Carrie LAM not only has not stepped down, but she

even introduced a new draconian law, the Prohibition on Face Covering Regulation. Just now Mr CHU Hoi-dick, holding the Basic Law in his hands, settled a score with Carrie LAM by pointing out which provisions of the Basic Law she has violated. Enacting the Prohibition on Face Covering Regulation is exactly a violation of the Basic Law. This is not our claim, but a ruling by the Court. Certainly, the Government has filed an appeal, and it can still refer the relevant provisions to the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress ("NPCSC") for interpretation eventually, such that she will not violate the Basic Law. Do you know that? Does Mr CHU Hoi-dick know that she will not violate the Basic Law? Because even if we file a case in court against her for violating the Basic Law, NPCSC will make an interpretation to protect her, such that she, in this way, will never violate the Basic Law.

Carrie LAM would add fuel to the fire at every critical moment whenever noticing that the public outrage seems to have cooled down a bit, therefore we call her the "mother of mutual destruction". The latest popularity rating of Carrie LAM has fallen below 20%, and we would then ask: How come her approval rate still stands at 19.7%? Because many in the pro-establishment camp also gave her a zero score or a score below the passing level actually. Nevertheless, the greatest concern of Hongkongers now is not her ratings. It might be somewhat useful if she had stepped down half a year ago, but so many things have happened over the past six months, such as white-clad people beating up members of the public on 21 July but the Police had disappeared; the terrorist attack by the Police at Prince Edward Station on 31 August; and then there were the shooting in the eye, the firing of live rounds in Tsuen Wan, Sai Wan Ho and Yau Ma Tei. There are also countless suspicious cases of jumping from heights and successive cases of floating corpses which have set a record in Hong Kong. It is really far too lenient to Carrie LAM if she merely has to step down.

Carrie LAM has always been criticized as doing "too little, too late" when delivering her job. She should have announced the withdrawal of the Bill on the very first day, but she had dragged it on for two months. We have all along been requesting the forming of an independent commission of inquiry, but she has now come up with an independent review committee to look into the causes of the social unrest, and it is learnt that its terms of reference do not include a review of the Police. By now, even if she is willing to set up an independent commission of inquiry, I dare not guarantee whether people would accept it even if the Chief Secretary goes to Central, because people are now demanding that the Police Force be disbanded.

With a disciplined force paying virtually no regard to discipline, and accountable officials having never been held accountable, none of the senior officials is innocent indeed, President. Officials who appear to have little relationship with politics have all revealed their true colours. For instance, Secretary for Food and Health Prof Sophia CHAN pointed out that there was no literature showing whether tear gas would release dioxins, and that the composition of tear gas rounds should not be disclosed to avoid affecting the deployment of the Police. Secretary for the Environment WONG Kam-sing claimed that burning of litter was the source of dioxins, whereas burning of vehicles and litter is the source in recent days. Secretary for Labour and Welfare Dr LAW Chi-kwong is even more awesome, for he said yesterday that the amount of dioxins released during barbeque was even more than that by tear gas rounds. A professional in chemistry challenged him immediately by proposing "let me inhale the smoke of barbeque for five hours and you inhale tear gas for two hours"—If the Chief Secretary advances such a theory later on, he can also try to inhale tear gas together. The Government should not treat Hongkongers as dead bodies or idiots. Dr LAW Chi-kwong even remarked yesterday that it was not up to the Police to decide where to fire tear gas rounds, for it was decided by those criminals. The tear gas rounds are held by the Police, who, if not the Police, can decide whether to fire them, when to fire them and how many rounds to fire? The police officers are armed with guns, but they again claimed that the decision to fire shots was not made by them but the rioters.

Speaking of firing shots, the problem of police brutality has become increasingly severe. Why? Police officers in the front line have certainly gone out of control, but the management of the Police Force and high-ranking government officials also have an unshirkable responsibility, as there is no longer any mechanism to impose checks and balances on the Police nowadays. They even dare not utter a single word of condemnation against the Police.

At around 7:00 am on 11 November when a general strike on three fronts was staged, an unarmed student was shot by a traffic police officer in Sai Wan Ho, ending up with his kidney ripped through and he even had part of his liver excised. We can see it from the video footage, why did that police officer raise his gun and point it at the person in a white shirt? This is totally in breach of the guidelines. A retired police officer called at my office, saying that even if a police officer is under threat, under normal circumstances, he should step back and issue a warning first, then try to use a baton, and he should fire a shot only

when his life is indeed threatened. Those people were unarmed, yet the police officers could still point their guns at them and even fired a shot in the end. They know the law but break the law, and it is an act of intentional killing.

I particularly hope that the Chief Secretary can give a response about this point: To my understanding, civil servants who have been arrested for participating in the struggles of the "anti-extradition to China" movement would be suspended from duty immediately even if they have not yet been convicted upon trial. They knew this even earlier than the head of department of the civil servants concerned. However, what are the consequences for the police officers who have violated the codes on the use of force and firearms by firing shots at unarmed people while not being subject to the threat of death? If the entire society is very angry, the police officers concerned would take vacation leave or take leave due to injury. Why are other civil servants suspected of breaking the law suspended from duty immediately? Only if the Government regards police officers as superior civil servants instead of ordinary civil servants. Seriously, now the Police would not be wrong, and no one can utter a single word of reproach against them. The Secretaries of Departments, Bureau Directors and the Chief Executive would never make any fair remarks. A journalist once asked—the Chief Secretary has to answer this question when he has time later—which salaried civil servants can scold people with swear words while on duty? When members of the public scold them, they would continue to swear at them. Which kind of civil servants can behave in this manner? They are "licensed" to do so. No one dares say a word about them, has the Chief Executive asked the Police not to use foul language? This is the Hong Kong Police Force.

The Hong Kong Police Force have used half a year to confound right and wrong, abuse power, make indiscriminate arrests and fire shots wantonly, not to mention that they have violated the guidelines, general orders as well as common practices. They virtually treat discipline as nothing. I also mentioned at a meeting of the Panel on Security that some police officers once challenged members of the public to a one-on-one fight, and we would write complaint letters for members of the public. Nowadays, police officers would say, "Come and grab my gun, do you want to assault police officers?" They can say anything. If we really have to complain about these situations, I believe there will be thousands of such cases. If we have to write complaint letters about such matters every day, we cannot finish it even if we work on a full-time basis, since the brutal acts of police officers nowadays are too numerous to name.

Two years ago, seven police officers beat up a member of the public in a dark corner, whereas Franklin CHU's extended arm attacked a member of the public passing by, and they were all sanctioned by the law. Today, dark corners are everywhere, and every police officer is more awesome than Franklin CHU but they are liable to no consequences. The pro-Government camp accused us of mentioning only the Police's faults, but not those of the protesters and rioters. I heard Mr Kenneth LAU say yesterday that none of the protesters had been convicted or sentenced to jail. But the fact is, people are arrested and convicted every day, with some of them having been put in jail and some others detained in Lai Chi Kok.

Yet, has any police officer been convicted? Has any police officer been sanctioned by the law? The Chief Secretary would say that we have a proven mechanism under which members of the public can lodge complaints with the Complaints Against Police Office ("CAPO"). If CAPO fails to deal with them, we still have the Independent Police Complaints Council ("IPCC") which will definitely do justice to the public. If Mr Abraham SHEK speaks later on, will he please enlighten us about the situation of IPCC. Can IPCC handle such situations? Even if an independent commission of inquiry is set up now, it cannot handle all the cases. Now, we should immediately arrest those lawbreaking police officers, bring them to trial by the court and bring them to justice. This is one of the means to "stop police brutality". When people see those police officers are sanctioned and that they have to bear the consequences, other frontline police officers will restrain themselves relatively, and members of the public will at least feel a bit more comfortable in their hearts.

Why is vigilantism so common? Because it is useless to report a case to the Police. The Police would set the assailants free but arrest those reporting the case instead. How would members of the public report a case then? They even dare not go to the hospital, so miserable! There are funds which help children who dare not go to the hospital for medical treatment after sustaining serious injuries from being beaten by batons. They have to receive magnetic resonance imaging scans, otherwise they might die in their sleep.

Carrie LAM has really done such a great service this time. She said she would unite Hong Kong and connect with the international community. Some fathers who used to be "blue ribbons" now even walk ahead of their daughters who are "yellow ribbons". They tell their daughters not to go out, and they, as their fathers, will go out for them. Why is there such a change? Two million people have taken to the streets unprecedentedly, the "peaceful, rational and

non-violent" protesters and the valiant protesters have achieved full reconciliation and now they would not sever ties with one another even in the event of a nuclear explosion. This "credit" should also go to Carrie LAM. Carrie LAM has indirectly assisted TSAI Ingwen in her electioneering campaign such that TSAI Ingwen will certainly win the election. She has assisted the United States in making ammunitions for the China-United States trade war, and inspired protesters in Indonesia, Catalonia, Chile and Lebanon to adopt our mode of struggle. The whole world has connected to resist Carrie LAM.

Lastly, I wish to relay to Carrie LAM the voice of a member of the public who told us not to call Carrie LAM the Chief Executive anymore. If we have to address her, call her "the culprit"; she is the chief culprit. She should not wait until we have passed this motion to form an independent commission of inquiry to investigate whether she has committed dereliction of duty and then step down. She should step down right away. Get lost!

IR DR LO WAI-KWOK (in Cantonese): President, we are now considering the motion jointly initiated by Mr Alvin YEUNG and 24 other non-pro-establishment Members under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law. First, we must have a full understanding of Article 73(9) of the Basic Law. This article stipulates that: "If a motion initiated jointly by one-fourth of all the members of the Legislative Council charges the Chief Executive with serious breach of law or dereliction of duty and if he or she refuses to resign, the Council may, after passing a motion for investigation, give a mandate to the Chief Justice of the Court of Final Appeal to form and chair an independent investigation committee. The committee shall be responsible for carrying out the investigation and reporting its findings to the Council. If the committee considers the evidence sufficient to substantiate such charges, the Council may pass a motion of impeachment by a two-thirds majority of all its members and report it to the Central People's Government for decision;".

President, this article of the Basic Law seeks to set out meticulous and stringent constitutional arrangements for the impeachment of the Chief Executive. Non-adherence to this important basis will bring about extremely strong repercussions in society with very grave consequences. President, the motion accuses Chief Executive Mrs Carrie LAM of serious breach of law and/or dereliction of duty, and lists in a schedule the so-called particulars. It is imperative that we grasp the essence of the matter and examine whether its judgments are appropriate and whether its arguments are compatible with the facts.

The 25 non-pro-establishment Members accuse Chief Executive Carrie LAM of disregarding mainstream opposing views and unrelentingly pushing through a highly controversial bill. Is this the objective fact in its entirety? The social disturbances caused by the controversy over the amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") have persisted to date, which is indeed regrettable and worrying. I believe all citizens who wish the society of Hong Kong to be stable and harmonious do not wish to see this, whether they originally supported or opposed the FOO amendment. To give the matter its fair deal, there are actually many areas that warrant review by the SAR Government since it launched the exercise of the FOO amendment. Although the original intent of the proposed amendments was to uphold justice and plug a loophole in law, the Government did not explain to and communicate with the citizens well. The amendment exercise was also conducted too hastily. This is an indisputable fact.

As we all know, the Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong ("BPA") has pointed out to the authorities many times the concerns and worries of various sectors of society about the legislative amendment. The SAR Government has also given responses and, more than once, agreed to making changes to the Bill. Unfortunately, various complicated factors, especially the overwhelming emergence of a great variety of negative propaganda making distorted false assertions about the legislative exercise has triggered very great controversies and even caused a social rift. As the situation continued to develop, the SAR Government announced on 15 June that the legislative exercise concerning FOO was suspended. Later, the Chief Executive clearly announced that "the bill is dead". On 4 September, she mentioned four actions, including formally withdrawing the FOO amendment.

It is true that various sectors of society may have different interpretations about whether the Chief Executive, in the course of dealing with the FOO amendment and responding to the social situation, may have failed to act with good timing, or even whether she has made mistakes in her political judgments. BPA has also made constructive criticisms on many occasions. However, it would not be entirely objective to say that the Chief Executive is guilty of serious breach of law or dereliction of duty. Mistakes and errors are not the same as breach of law or dereliction of duty.

The non-pro-establishment Members also accuse the Police of using excessive force to suppress peaceful assemblies during protest activities in June. Hong Kong is a place that upholds the rule of law. BPA respects the freedom and rights of Hong Kong citizens to hold peaceful assemblies and rationally express their views. Apparently, the protest processions during the day time of the two Sundays of 9 June and 16 June participated by huge numbers of citizens were peaceful and orderly. In fact, however, as early as during the procession on 9 June, outside the demonstration area of the Legislative Council Complex, there were incidents of violent charges at the cordon lines of the Legislative Council Complex. Some of the protesters also used rubbish bins, mills barriers and various kinds of objects to block main roads. They violently charged at the police cordon lines, resulting in several police officers and reporters being wounded.

On 12 June, violent incidents became more serious. Meetings of the Legislative Council were forced to be cancelled, and the whole Admiralty area was a scene of devastation. We saw clearly on the television screen that a large number of masked protesters used bricks, mills barriers and various kinds of objects to block roads, violently charged at police cordon lines and stormed the Legislative Council Complex. They even used bricks and metal bars to attack police officers. The police officers could only use force in defence to protect the Legislative Council Complex. These conflicts did result in citizens and police officers being unfortunately injured. It can be said to be a prelude or warming-up for the ever escalating violent incidents of the past several months.

The non-pro-establishment Members also accuse the SAR Government of intimidating protesters with disproportionate criminal charges. They even claim in the motion that, on 12 June 2019, most people protesting in the vicinity of the Legislative Council Complex were assembling peacefully without causing any severe damage to public or private properties or endangering other people's lives. They say the Police should not lay rioting charges against the arrested citizens. However, we have seen clearly on the television screen how, that day, protesters blocked roads, violently charged at police cordon lines and charged at the Legislative Council Complex, and even used bricks and metal bars to attack police officers. It is certainly reasonable that lawbreakers should bear the legal responsibilities. These violent attacks were serious criminal acts. All sectors of society should solemnly condemn such acts. Otherwise, the foundation for the rule of law in Hong Kong will be shaken or even crushed to pieces.

However, in order to reap political capital, the non-pro-establishment Members do not condemn and sever ties with the violent acts. On the contrary, they put all the responsibility and blame on the Government and the Police. The opposition camp continue to aggravate the social rift. They have been practically playing the role of instigators of violence. They obscure the facts, and confound cause and consequence, right and wrong, and black and white. Their behaviour is very much despicable. They directly or indirectly fool young people and students into participating in illegal activities and blatantly undermine the rule of law. Offenders will have their futures ruined when, one day, they are arrested for breaking the law. The evil minds of these violence instigators are outrageous.

In the past six months, the violent acts of extreme elements have continued to escalate and spread to all districts in Hong Kong, Kowloon and the New Territories. Violent acts have become crueller and more ferocious. Acts like blocking roads, criminal damages, arson, vandalizing railways and traffic facilities, attacking police officers and unlawfully punishing people by beating them up are committed almost everyday, and even horrifying incidents like cutting a man's neck with a blade, hurling bricks to kill and setting a human being on fire have all been attested. The maintenance of law and order by the Police has become more and more difficult. The Hong Kong economy has been dealt a heavy blow and the livelihood of the citizens greatly affected. The non-pro-establishment Members should be held responsible for all of these.

The motion cites the Chief Executive's inauguration oath to support the allegation that she has acted unconstitutionally. It also alleges that she has breached her oath. While the non-pro-establishment Members have cited the contents of the Chief Executive's oath, I have reasons to doubt whether they have seriously thought about the meaning of the oath in its entirety. The essence of the oath is that the Chief Executive must uphold the Basic Law of the Hong Kong SAR of the People's Republic of China. She must be loyal to the Hong Kong SAR, and she is also accountable to the Central People's Government. The radical protesters defy the Constitution of China. They want to secede and attempt in vain to undermine "one country, two systems". They use violence to wantonly undermine the rule of law in Hong Kong. It is the duty of the Chief Executive to enlist the help of the Police to strictly enforce the law. If there is misconduct in the course of law enforcement by police officers, there is recourse to the current system that deals with complaints and takes follow-up actions. Many cases in the past have shown that police officers acting in breach of the law would have to bear legal responsibilities like everyone else.

In the minds of the opposition camp, there is only "two systems", no "one country". They use the FOO amendment as a political chip. They made up lies like "being suicided" to create social rifts and stir up political conflicts. They cannot shirk their responsibilities for the deteriorating social situation and escalating violent acts in the past several months.

President, the pressing task now in Hong Kong is to stop violence and curb disorder. This is the duty of the SAR Government under the leadership of the Chief Executive. The citizens rely on the Hong Kong Police Force for strict law enforcement. They also rely on the Courts for fair and just judgments. Equally important is that, in order to restore social order as soon as possible, various sectors of Hong Kong society must, in solidarity, say "No" to violence and severe ties with the rioters. Attempts, motivated by political considerations, to use the mechanism for impeaching the Chief Executive to undermine the governance of the Government will only rip society further apart. I wonder whether this is to search for a way out for society to achieve reconciliation and return to peace, or to rip society further apart and lead Hong Kong into a dead alley? The answer to this question is obvious.

Of course, after stopping violence and curbing disorder, various sectors of society—including the SAR Government—must not forget the painful lessons and learn from them. They must not only review the social disturbances brought about by the controversy over the FOO amendment and earnestly learn from this experience and lesson. It is more important that they must also appreciate that this social unrest involves the explosion of various deep-rooted social conflicts, including land and housing supply lagging, for many years, behind the needs of society, the wide gap dividing the rich and the poor as a result of the imbalance in economic development, lack of upward movement opportunities for the young people, and the problem-ridden education system. All of these involve blunders of the SAR Government in administration over many years. This must be squarely addressed in the search for solutions.

With these remarks, President, I oppose the motion jointly initiated by Mr Alvin YEUNG and 24 other non-pro-establishment Members under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law.

MS STARRY LEE (in Cantonese): President, on 24 November, 2.94 million citizens participated in the District Council Election peacefully. Many comments and analyses have pointed out that, this time, electors have voted mainly to indicate their stance on the events that happened in the past six months. In spite of the long queues, members of the public have insisted on speaking out. The reason for this is very obvious. Disturbances arising from opposition to the proposed legislative amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") and to the Government have persisted and caused countless protests and conflicts, as well as hatred and vengeance. The District Council ("DC") Election has given a vent to public opinions.

It can be seen from the election results that the number of citizens dissatisfied with the Government has greatly increased. A turnout rate of 71% is a record high. More than 70% of the registered electors have come out to vote. It shows that besides the heightened willingness of newly registered electors to vote, many registered electors who did not vote in the past have also come out to vote because of the recent events. This turnout rate is indeed very much higher than the turnout rates of all past DC Elections. Even the turnout rates of Legislative Council Elections also lag far behind.

Although we have won a record-high number of votes this time, we must admit that the number of those who are dissatisfied with the Government and have not voted for us is also a record high. Nearly 60% of the voters have expressed through their ballots their dissatisfaction with the administration by the Government. In fact, even among the more than 40% of citizens who have voted to support us, there are many who are very dissatisfied with the performance of the Government. I have received a large number of messages from members and supporters of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong ("DAB") that criticize the Government of committing various kinds of mistakes and acting indecisively in dealing with the amendments of FOO. In dealing with the ensuing series of anti-government acts, including rioting, vandalizing, wounding people, blocking roads and arson attacks, the actions of the Government have also been very problematic and failed badly to meet citizens' expectation.

President, let me talk about the handling of the FOO amendment first. At the beginning of last year, after the occurrence of the homicide case in Taiwan, members of the victim's family approached us for assistance. We shared the family's feelings and pains and have since been assisting them, hoping that justice

would be done to the victim. In the meanwhile, we wrote to the SAR Government and the Chief Executive, urging the authorities to try to find a way to deal with this fugitive offender case under the framework of "one country, two systems" and to provide a legal basis and arrangements for cooperation between the police forces of the two places.

It must be stressed that the Government did not communicate with us on how to deal with the abovementioned case. And it also did not communicate with us while it was preparing to introduce the proposed amendments of FOO. We were informed by the Government of its decision to deal with the case by means of the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill") only one day before it was formally announced. We expressed support for the Bill because it would help to deal with the Taiwan homicide case and also plug a loophole in law. Therefore, the many smearing efforts accusing us of being in collusion with the Government and involved in taking forward the Bill are false allegations. They do not tally with the facts. They are completely groundless. They are political smearing.

On the contrary, after the introduction of the Bill, we received opinions from many citizens expressing worries about it. Regarding this matter, we met with the Secretary for Security, and the Chief Secretary, many times to relay the concerns of society and the business sector. We urged the authorities to step up the lobbying efforts and even narrow the application scope of the Bill and raise its prosecution threshold in response to the requests of various sectors of society.

The Government did, to a certain extent, respond to some of the requests. However, as the Chief Executive openly admitted on 9 July, the legislative amendment exercise of the Government "has failed completely". On the one hand, the Government did a very poor job in explaining its policy, causing society to harbour worries not founded on facts. On the other hand, the SAR Government dealt too rashly with a highly sensitive issue involving the legal systems of the Mainland and Hong Kong. The Government failed to make timely clarifications of various misgivings of the public and allowed a large volume of unsubstantiated fear-mongering messages to ferment. Some commentators played up the matter and alleged that the Bill could turn anyone into a fugitive. The Government remained not waken up to the alarm. It just continued to reiterate its stance, and allowed rumours to spread wider and wider, until finally the whole legislative exercise was distorted, given a simplified

interpretation and dubbed a "draconian China extradition law", making everybody feel unsafe. The "anti-extradition to China" movement sprouted from these fears and the people's trust in the SAR Government began to slip.

President, in the face of the tense social atmosphere and the rapidly deteriorating situation of confrontation, I openly said in June that our supporters would understand if the Chief Executive decided to announce the withdrawal of the Bill. We hoped that this would ease the social atmosphere. However, the Chief Executive did not timely heed this piece of advice. Not until 4 September (more than two months later) did she announce formally the withdrawal of the Bill. By then, the prestige of the Government in governance had slipped further and the rioters' acts had continued to escalate. The citizens were living in fear every day.

President, after the Government had announced the withdrawal of the Bill, actions to oppose the proposed legislative amendments should have come to a halt. However, it was absolutely not the actual situation. Acts against the proposed legislative amendments have now evolved into anti-police acts, anti-government acts and even acts against "one country, two systems". Originally peaceful and lawful protests have now given way to riots with extremely violent vandalistic acts. In the past half year, social order had come to the verge of collapse. Our supporters are greatly disappointed by the performance of the governance team of the SAR Government in dealing with these events.

Serious rioting incidents ensuing from the disturbances arising from the proposed legislative amendments have persisted for nearly half a year. Extreme violence has not only gone far beyond the movement of opposition to the proposed legislative amendments and the protesters' excuses of striving for the so-called "democracy" and "justice". We have also seen very many public facilities and innocent shops being vandalized. Very many innocent citizens have lost their freedom to go to school, to go to work, and to travel. They are constantly in fear of being subjected to "vigilante beating" if they speak their minds. The rioters' level of violence has continued to escalate. They are now using lethal weapons, in addition to extending the targets of their attacks. Innocent citizens are no longer safe. The rioters' evil acts are total defiance of the law, utterly contemptuous.

Persistent acts of radical violence seriously threaten the citizens' personal safety, freedom of speech and everyday life. This has dealt a heavy blow to the economic achievements and international reputation of Hong Kong, which have been attained with many years' efforts. Therefore, our supporters' biggest hope is that the Government will take more powerful and effective measures to restore public order and stop violence and curb disorder as soon as possible, so that the citizens will be able to live a normal life again. It must be noted that it is the duty of the Government to maintain social order and make commute safe for citizens.

Unfortunately, in the past half year, we have not seen the Government make any practical and effective plans to stop violence and curb disorder. Nor have we seen the Chief Executive's politically appointed team display enough determination and solidarity to lead the whole Government to stop violence and curb disorder. Although the Chief Secretary for Administration has said many times that, in the face of the disturbances arising from the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments, the governance team of the Government would, in solidarity, exert their best to protect the rule of law in Hong Kong and maintain social order, what have the citizens actually seen? They have only seen the governance team passively react to the changing circumstances. Many accountable officials—from Secretaries of Departments, Bureau Directors to Under Secretaries—have been completely out of sight. What effective efforts have they actually made to stop violence and curb disorder? In the case of some of these officials, I cannot even recall they have said anything in these six months. Other officials have been forced to respond only because they had the duty to do so. We can all see that the various government departments are not in solidarity. They have no coordination and do not line up as a team. Many citizens find that Hong Kong has almost been in a state of anarchy in the past months. The performance of the SAR Government in dealing with the crises has been very poor and the accountable team has hidden quietly in a corner. This has indeed made many citizens feel greatly disappointed. Many citizens can only ask what is it that the Government lacks. Is it determination? Is it ability? Or are there some other reasons?

First of all, Chief Secretary, you are the head of all government officials. The citizens expect you to be proactive and act positively. Now that the Chief Executive is in a weak position amid the disturbances arising from the legislative amendment exercise, as her most senior aide, you should take up the duty to

assume a commanding role in all government departments. Chief Secretary, do you remember being asked what you would do if roads were again blocked? You said you could do nothing except condemning such violent acts. Do you know how many citizens have complained to me about this? How angry they are about your reply! Chief Secretary, we do not want you to be so "passive". We want you to be "active". Why does the Government not try proactively to find ways to protect important public facilities from being vandalized by rioters? How can you have said that nothing could be done?

Next, the Secretary for Justice. She is the senior government official bearing the greatest responsibility for the proposed legislative amendment exercise. When the amendments were put forward for consideration, she was absent from many meetings of the Legislative Council, and was never in the front line to explain the legal viewpoints of the Government. Actually, in the past six months, we have also not seen the Secretary for Justice in the front line explaining the legal viewpoints of the Government and seriously responding to various concerns of the citizens in a down-to-earth manner.

As for the Security Bureau, it plays a crucial role in stopping violence and curbing disorder. After six months of disturbances, the minds of many citizens are filled with questions. Has the Bureau tracked down the key persons of the "big platform" behind the riots? Have they been arrested? Has the Bureau tracked down the fund providers. Have some important leads been found? The answers to all of these questions seem to be "No". This is why the riots are still persisting.

And then the Secretary for Education. As is widely known, many students who have taken to the streets are victims of incitement. Is there any way to make the students understand that they should not take part in unlawful acts? We also see that several universities have gone so far as to have turned into petrol bomb factories. What does the Secretary for Education say about this? He said that this is the responsibility of the university managements.

President, our supporters are extremely angry. They have voted for us, but it does not mean they are satisfied with the performance of the Government. Other Bureau Directors seem to be living in parallel space and time. As I rebuked him last time, Secretary for the Environment WONG Kam-sing was still embracing "Big Waste" on Facebook. He is still going to various environment

protection activities. Have other officials come forth to speak up for the Government? Have they put their heads together to find ways to lead the whole Government and the whole of Hong Kong to join hands and restore social order, stop violence and curb disorder? As for the Under Secretaries—sorry, I cannot recall any one of them saying a word in the past six months about the greatest crisis facing Hong Kong.

President, what have the citizens seen? They have seen that the responsibility to stop violence and curb disorder is shouldered solely by the 30 000 police officers. The accountable team of officials not only fail to effectively mobilize the whole Government to make joint efforts against violence, but are also each minding his own business and, fear-struck, hide, if they can, in a corner. Most importantly, as is well-known, the reason for so many citizens having taken to the streets to protest is that there are many unsubstantiated rumours on the Internet. Since the Bill was first rolled out, there have been plenty of such rumours, but the SAR Government does not seem to have any awareness, mechanisms, plans and actions to deal with them. Even now, the Government has still not made timely clarifications. Rumours and deceptive arguments remain rampant and continue to undermine the prestige of the SAR Government in governance. At the same time, the citizens' confidence in the governance of the Government continues to fall. Society has almost come to the point of not being able to tell black from white. As I just said, the Internet is full of many unsubstantiated messages and information. We can see that, very often, the Police are alone in making efforts at clarification. Where are the information officers of the Government? Why do they not help the Police deny the unsubstantiated messages and information? Why has the situation deteriorated to so bad a state?

Therefore, Chief Secretary, I must tell everyone that my supporters, whom I represent, are very dissatisfied with the performance of the Government, so far, in stopping violence and curbing disorder. The performance of the SAR Government and the accountable team in the past half year has indeed been very poor. They have not taken timely and appropriate actions to deal with the political issues. The Police are driven to work too hard, often caught in a no-win situation. As piggy in the middle, they have public grievances poured out at them and become targets of hatred. The Government has said that it would ensure that the elections would be fair. It has clearly failed to do this. Our supporters are also very disappointed about this.

President, in the face of social disturbances and disorder, and rampant violence, the citizens had hoped that the Policy Address published in October could, in the words of the Chief Executive, establish a new approach. They had also hoped that the Government could get off its high horse and learn from the lessons and reform society. But sorry, we do not find any new approaches or any new efforts in the Policy Address. We also cannot see the Administration focus on deep-rooted conflicts and try to resolve them. DAB's assessment of the Policy Address is "stuck in the same old rut". How will it be well received by the citizens?

President, in the face of the dynastic District Council Election results, we will humbly listen to the views of the citizens. As for the Government, it absolutely has a greater need to reflect and think. Because of the inadequate efforts of the Administration to explain its policies in the past several months and its repeated failures to seize opportunities, public grievances have not been effectively vented. People with ulterior motives are adding fuel to the flame, and government-public and police-public relations are in an unprecedentedly grave crisis. Public grievances are indeed very grave. Worrying developments include social rifts, the young people's distrust of the Government gradually turning into hatred, and instigation of radical persons to perform more radical—or even horrific—acts.

President, when President Xi Jinping was visiting Hong Kong officially on 1 July 2017, citing classical and literary sources, he said to the executive, legislature and Judiciary of the SAR Government: a valiant heart is eager to serve the country; a government official who shirks his responsibilities will live a shameful life; an army with officers and soldiers incited by the same spirit will win. I believe these three dicta are also beacons for the efforts at stopping violence and curbing disorder.

President, although we have many grievances against the Government, just because it fails to meet our high expectations. We earnestly hope it will make improvements. We think that invigilantly passing the impeachment motion at this difficult time of Hong Kong will bring about political chaos and probably cause social disturbances. If the Chief Executive is impeached, there will be a governance vacuum. Therefore, President, we hope that the SAR Government will seriously engage in introspection and conduct reviews, unite its teams and lead Hong Kong to make a fresh start.

President, I so submit.

MR LEUNG CHE-CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, this motion is proposed under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law. With regard to any invocation of an article of the Basic Law, I think we must be very careful. Especially, if we are to conduct an investigation of the top executive of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, we should very carefully consider whether there are grounds for the charges in question, and whether the grounds are sufficient.

The procedure to invoke Article 73(9) of the Basic Law involves four important steps. First, one-fourth of all Members of the Council jointly initiates a motion to charge the Chief Executive with serious breach of law or dereliction of duty. Second, after the Council has resolved to conduct an investigation, the Council may give a mandate to the Chief Justice of the Court of Final Appeal to assume the responsibility of forming an independent investigation committee. Third, the investigation committee, after conducting an investigation, reports its findings to the Council. If the report considers that there is sufficient evidence showing that the Chief Executive has seriously breached the law or has been derelict in her duties, and if passed by two-thirds of all Members of the Council, an impeachment motion may be proposed. Finally, the impeachment motion will be reported to the Central People's Government for decision. The motion jointly initiated by 25 Members today is the first step of this procedure.

In considering whether to support today's motion, my first and foremost consideration is whether the Chief Executive has indeed seriously breached the law or been derelict in her duties. Next, I will then consider whether it is necessary to conduct a special investigation. This motion is initiated because the Government has introduced the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019, usually referred to as amendments of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO"). In order to judge whether the Chief Executive has been in breach of law and derelict in her duties, we should consider her motives of taking forward the proposed legislative amendment exercise and whether she has been seriously negligent in dealing with social incidents. The original intent of the SAR Government, in proposing to amend FOO, was indeed to ensure that justice would be done, and that, in accordance with the pleads of the family members of the girl killed in the CHAN Tong-kai case, justice would be done to their dead daughter. At the same time, the legislative amendments were also aimed at preventing Hong Kong from becoming a haven for fugitive offenders to escape punishment. In the process, consultations were conducted and legislative procedures were followed

in accordance with provisions in law. The objectives of the Government were very simple. I do not see any dereliction in the procedures of the legislative amendment exercise.

Of course, in the process of conducting consultation and going through the legislative procedures for the amendments of FOO, and in its efforts to deal with and prevent continued deterioration of the social environment, the SAR Government has indeed not done well enough and has been unwise. First, the Government was not able to dispel the public's misgivings about the FOO amendments. The citizens were thus worried and harboured a sentiment of dissatisfaction. Besides, Hong Kong might also have enjoyed peace and comfort for a long time. The Government was not sensitive to the sentiments of dissatisfaction in society. It did not know how to resolve the crises and confrontations it faced. Social conflicts became more and more intense, until the nearly six months of riots and social disorder finally broke out. These riots and disturbances have continued to develop, through a very complicated process with many factors involved. The SAR Government, the Chief Executive and the general public have failed to see all this coming. My comment on the ability of the Government to feel the pulse and deal with social problems can only be one word: poor. Its performance has been most disappointing. I would say that the Government is detached from the public, not down to earth. However, this is a matter of ability and does not seem to have anything to do with breach of law or dereliction of duty.

Actually, this time, in dealing with the legislative amendment exercise, the Government has done a very poor job in three major aspects. First, the civil service has not worked as a team. The legislative amendment exercise was the responsibility of the Department of Justice and the Security Bureau. Other members of the team did not do their best to explain it to the citizens. Second, there was not enough dialogue with the citizens. Even after the outbreak of social disturbances, the Government organized only one so-called "Community Dialogue" session. The various Secretaries of Departments and Bureau Directors did not get in touch with the community to collect the citizens' views. Third, there have not been enough efforts to effectively stop violence and curb disorder. Especially, at the riot scenes, as the idiom goes, the troops will never come before the bandits have fled. Police officers arrive at the scene only after the vandalizing acts have been completed or when the conflicts are over. This gives one the impression that the Government does not have the ability to deal

with the violent incidents. It has even not arrested some of those who launched vigilante attacks on others. Chief Secretary, I remember that I asked at the last meeting whether government officials could take the lead to go to the road blockage scenes to remove the barricades. Without beating about the bush, you, Chief Secretary, answered that you would consider and think about this. However, now that even the Hong Kong Garrison of the People's Liberation Army has shown up, our Secretaries and Bureau Directors are still sitting in their offices. They have not gone to the scenes of vandalization to help to clean up and take the lead in solving problems in citizens' lives. Chief Secretary, this has now brought about the situation in which we would not be able to curb disorder even if we could stop violence.

The opposition Members accuse the Chief Executive of "disregard of mainstream opposing views and unrelentingly pushing through a highly controversial bill". The legislative amendment exercise did indeed lead to several large-scale processions in Hong Kong. Many citizens, for example, took to the streets to stage petitions. According to the statistics of the Police, the peak-period participation estimates for several large-scale possessions were as many as hundreds of thousands. However, there were then also organizations and citizens who supported the proposed legislative amendments. For example, according to the statistics published in June by the League for Safeguarding Justice and Supporting the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance Amendments, the number of people who put down their signatures in the streets and on the Internet in support of the FOO amendments also reached 700 000.

Actually, the views of the citizens who support the proposed legislative amendments were very simple. They agreed with the Government over its rationale for proposing the legislative amendments. They were opposed to allowing people who commit serious crimes in countries or regions that have not signed surrender of fugitive offenders agreements with Hong Kong to flee to Hong Kong to escape punishment. The aforementioned 700 000 people were strong public support for the proposed amendments of FOO. Faced with two strong conflicting public opinions, of course, the Government failed to take timely actions in response to solve the problem. Subsequently, on 12 June, violent protesters charged at the Legislative Council Complex ferociously. We can say that the Government has not done its job well, but it has not done evil intentionally.

The opposition Members also charge the Chief Executive with "use of excessive force to crack down on peaceful assembly". This is not the entire facts. Actually, for many years in the past, many peaceful assemblies and processions were organized. Each year, there were as many as 10 000 assemblies and processions. Did the Police need to deploy tear gas? On the contrary, the Police would be there to maintain order. At the peaceful demonstration in early June, the Police were also responsible for clearing the way for the procession and maintaining order. There was no conflict. On 12 June, however, there were scenes of violence. I was there then. I saw some rioters charge at the police cordon lines. Police officers who only wanted to protect the safety of the Legislative Council Complex and maintain order were attacked with bricks and metal rods. If the police officers had not adequately protected themselves, they might as well have been killed by the rioters. Some people say that these rioters were unarmed. I do not know why there are people who look with closed eyes and swear that crooked is straight and black is white. This is an insult to all Hong Kong citizens.

The opposition camp say that there are no rioters in Hong Kong and that the protesters are unarmed. However, what the citizens actually see is that violent protests are escalating all the time. They see rioters hurl bricks and petrol bombs, wound people with arrows, and even wound police officers by pouring erosive liquids at them. As Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok pointed out just now, they have even set a living man on fire. Whenever serious clashes between the Police and members of the public occur, the Civic Party, the Democratic Party and the opposition camp will immediately come out to condemn the Chief Executive and the Police. The problem is that there is now not a single day without rioters performing arson, road blocking and carrying out "vigilante beating"—unlawfully punishing and beating people who remove barricades, drivers who use their vehicles to make a living, and citizens holding a different political view. Citizens who came forth to speak out because their livelihood was affected were also beaten up and injured by the rioters. MTR trains are obstructed from running and several hundred sets of traffic lights have been damaged. These people's acts seriously affect citizens going to work or to school. I have seen elderly people taking their grandchildren to school affected in this manner. In fact, many citizens are affected by the damaged traffic lights. Yesterday, an elderly person was knocked down by a lorry and killed in Tin Shui Wai because a traffic light had been damaged. Because of the rioters' vandalizing acts, pedestrians have to compete with vehicles for the use of roads and put their lives at risk. Have the opposition Members said anything about the

various evil acts of the rioters and the traffic accidents caused by these acts? They not only remain silent, but also harbour such acts and choose to forget. They talk about democracy, but how can we have democracy? Of course, they will not bring us democracy. Therefore, although they have gained so much in the District Council Election, they will, in the long run, do harm to the rule of law and democracy in Hong Kong. They will sabotage the foundation of the democratic society we have taken years to build.

There are people who think that they can protest because the Government fails to deal with problems and because the behaviour of the Police is bad. Such protests are their own decisions. They should not vandalize the MTR facilities and shops to punish innocent citizens. They should not vent their anger on the citizens. I hope Members from the Civic Party and the Democratic Party will tell us why they can tolerate such violent and vandalizing acts when it comes to their turn to speak.

The Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong has always been opposed to all sorts of violence. We hope that all violent people will be punished. President, today's violent disturbances have been brought about by the proposed legislative amendments, but they are now no longer an internal matter to be dealt with solely by the SAR Government of Hong Kong. I just saw a newspaper advertisement today. Its contents are: "Congratulations to the Civic Party, the Democratic Party and the whole pan-democratic camp for having, in order to disgrace our country and bring disaster to Hong Kong, successfully fought for the passage of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act in the United States of America. This will be recorded in history and you will definitely not be forgotten. Hong Kong Citizens." The advertisement also says: "For hundreds and thousands of aeons, your evil deeds will haunt you." I believe these people's call for the United States to punish Hong Kong is like General WU Sangui inviting the Manchu forces to invade his own country. Will Hong Kong abandon its economy and future development just because of what these people have done? Here, I can tell these people: certainly no, we will continue to defend the prosperity and stability of Hong Kong.

President, I oppose this motion. I so submit.

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): President, I rise to speak in support of the impeachment of the Chief Executive for breaches of law and/dereliction of duty initiated by other pro-democracy Members and me under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law.

President, both yesterday and today, a number of Honourable colleagues actually explained what it meant by dereliction of duty, giving colleagues from the pro-establishment camp a better understanding of it. I do not understand why they still seem to not understand it today. I am not going to make any allusion to authoritative sources because many Honourable colleagues have cited the relevant explanations just now. Let me drive the point home concisely before giving my speech. I have specially looked it up on the website Baidu. Dereliction of duty generally refers to abuse of office, neglect of duties, grossly irresponsible acts, non-performance or sloppy performance of duties, favouritism and acceptance of advantages and other improper bribes by such public officers as State officials and civil servants, to the detriment of public property and the interests of the State and people. President, this point is crystal clear. Any normal person who has attained the kindergarten or primary level of education should be able to understand it. I hope Honourable colleagues from the pro-establishment camp can open up their ears and listen. If necessary, I can also let them have a look at the relevant documents.

President, according to Chapter IX of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the definition of the offence of dereliction of duty is clear. Dereliction of duty is divided into several categories, including abuse of office, neglect of duties as well as favouritism and graft. President, she has committed all of them. What is there to argue over? Does she have any sense of shame? Chief Secretary for Administration Matthew CHEUNG, who is present, may look at the two emoticons I am holding. Members of the public have particularly asked me to give them to Carrie LAM because during the election back then, Moustache TSANG ridiculed Carrie LAM, saying that the "angry" emoticons flooded up to her nose level. But sorry, they have now reached as high as 10 storeys, well over her head.

President, I do not know why the Chief Executive can be as shameless as that. If she has some sense of shame, she should be able to see that at the peak, as many as 80% of the people demanded that she step down. Even though a tug of war was ongoing, more than 70% of the people voted for the resignation of Carrie LAM. Does she have any remorse? President, Carrie LAM, the team of

senior officials, the pro-establishment camp and those who are still making such remarks today are all walking disasters to Hong Kong. Carrie LAM should step down of her own accord. Get lost!

President, we actually can drop the impeachment, so long as she steps down and assumes the responsibility, so long as her accountability team and the officials who caused the current big trouble, including John LEE and Teresa CHENG, step down to manifest political accountability, and so long as Hong Kong's social order is brought back to normal with things running in an orderly fashion. As the Chief Secretary for Administration of the LEUNG Chun-ying Administration, she dared accuse others of defying rules and regulations during the election. But it is she who is the rule-breaker flouting all the rules and regulations. Step down! We even have to debate it here. Does she have any remorse?

President, the walking disaster Carrie LAM has undermined the Basic Law, "one country, two systems" and the foundation of the rule of law of Hong Kong, attempting to mix river water with well water. Is that not evidence of dereliction of duty? What is left for colleagues from the pro-establishment camp to argue? Piggybacking on the Taiwan homicide case, she has introduced the draconian "China extradition law". It is an obvious attempt to piggyback on the case, and CHAN Tong-kai has been released from jail now. In the end, nothing can be done. She has all along refused to adopt other more effective and reasonable approaches, including a one-off negotiation with Taiwan and some legislative amendments relating to extraterritorial jurisdiction proposed by Mr Alvin YEUNG and me. While she has refused to adopt such approaches, what has she done? CHAN Tong-kai has been released from jail now. What is she doing? And what has she done? She has done nothing. Is that not an attempt to piggyback on the case? There are obviously other political ends. Can she still deny it? She has ruined the foundation of the rule of law, "one country, two systems" and the Basic Law of Hong Kong. Is that not evidence of dereliction of duty?

President, over the past six months or so, members of the public have had enough. As the main culprit and Chief Executive engaging in dereliction of duty, Carrie LAM turned a blind eye to the turnout of 1 million people expressing their views and saying "No" to the draconian "China extradition law" on 9 June. In the same evening, she issued a statement stating that the legislative amendment exercise would continue, which was echoed throughout the pro-establishment camp.

In the "12 June" incident of police brutality, the Police fired the first shot at innocent civilians, causing many injured, and one of them was even rendered blind. It is the greatest wound. Did she ask the Police to stop? Had she asked the Police to stop back then, things would not have degenerated into such a state today. Yet she did nothing.

Subsequently, the "15 June" incident saw martyr LEUNG, LEUNG Ling-kit—I must read out his name—become the first youngster who lost his life due to the "China extradition bill". Does the Government take pity on those people? How many more died subsequently? How many people are currently in custody, facing legal sanctions, indiscriminate prosecutions and arbitrary arrests? Have any wrongdoers, including the officials present and the Police, been held legally accountable? No. Is that fair? President, is that not dereliction of duty on the part of the Chief Executive?

She had one more chance on "16 June". That day saw a turnout of 2 million people taking to the streets. Yet, the Carrie LAM Administration remained apathetic and continued to push it through unrelentingly. The list went on, with escalating violence in the "1 July", "21 July" and "31 August" incidents. On 3 September, there came the boycott of classes by students who went back to school to form "Baltic human chains". What did it have to do with the Police? Why did they beat people? Why did they disperse people? Are they idiots? Is that not violence? Are Members from the pro-establishment camp blind? Is LEUNG Che-cheung blind? Does he need to do an eye check-up? Why do they not condemn police brutality? Do they not see police brutality?

President, there are many more examples to bear testimony to all the violent and vicious acts of the Police and the Government witnessed by members of the public over the past few months. The Chief Executive has remained silent, implying that she condones such acts, including unlimited "tear gas release". We have talked about violence just now. In the past four months or so, they let go those "blue ribbons" who assaulted others. Was anyone arrested or prosecuted? Those people were armed with knives, rods or folding stools, using all the 10 famous weapons to commit such acts as slashing people in the abdomen and chopping, to name but a few. Chief Secretary Matthew CHEUNG, was anyone arrested? What was the handling approach of the Police? They abused their powers, using pepper sprays on Members and the public, beating Members and the public with batons, as well as making arrests and laying charges arbitrarily. They even considered it wrong for students to go to school, and searched them at the entrance. What did they wish to find?

Yesterday, someone had her head sat on, and before that, someone also had his head stepped on. They broke people's upper limbs, beat people's legs with batons causing bone fractures and shot people in the eyes, causing them blind. They even said they would shoot people in the head. Justice has yet to be done for many a person who died for unknown reasons. If it unfortunately turns out that their deaths really have something to do with the current incident, the Government and Carrie LAM must be held responsible. President, the foregoing constitutes acts of dereliction of duty.

As clearly stipulated in Article 48(5) and (7) of the Basic Law, Carrie LAM must be held responsible for the prevailing chaotic situation in Hong Kong because apart from the introduction of the draconian "China extradition law" by her that plunged Hong Kong into a state of turmoil, the course of events also saw police brutality and officials running out of control, as mentioned by me just now. Also, Carrie LAM connived at police brutality and the irresponsible acts of officials, and did nothing about the governance failure of the Government and the collapse of the will to govern, leading to the current state of affairs. What has she done? Has she removed certain officials or recommend to the Central People's Government the removal of the responsible officials in accordance with Article 48 of the Basic Law? No. Violence has certainly been escalating now. Curbing disorder with police brutality has turned the current clashes into a state of answering violence with violence. President, has the Government attempted to do anything? None either.

President, I recall that seeing the passage of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act by the United States earlier, Carrie LAM still dared say that Hong Kong's freedom was not undermined, and that media organizations enjoyed freedom. Do media organizations really enjoy freedom? Media workers were beaten by the Police. The Chief Executive did not demand that the Police stop. Did she ask the former or incumbent Commissioner of the Police to act in accordance with the law? No. If she did, how would such things still happen when almost half a year had passed? Journalists were targeted, driven away, beaten up and treated to pepper spray, and Victor MALLET—I mention him on purpose because no one has done so—was kicked out because the forum hosted by him was an eyesore to the Government. Does Carrie LAM dare say that Hong Kong has freedom? It was only a few days ago when Carrie LAM attended the National Constitution Day forum that she boycotted those media organizations not on friendly terms with her. Can we say that we have freedom of speech and freedom of the press?

According to Carrie LAM, members of the public enjoy freedom of demonstration, of procession and of assembly. Is that so? We are now subjected to restrictions imposed by the draconian laws. Do Members know that applications must be made for holding processions and assemblies, which may even be refused? There is no freedom. Only a small number of events were permitted, but some of them were stopped halfway through, rendering all participants sitting ducks for arrests and battering.

She has also stated that Hong Kong has freedom of religion. Will she please ask the mosque about that first. President, when it comes to freedom, what infuriates Hong Kong people most now? It is the deprivation of our freedom from fear. A sense of fear has gripped every member of the public. Such fear is created by the Government, leaving our systems in tatters and causing every one of us to live in fear. Things will actually turn out fine as long as our society resumes normal, with order restored. President, who was the first one breaking the law now?

The Chief Secretary said yesterday that the responsibility actually lied with the people who protested. Have they waken up from their slumber? Are they still in a political coma? President, my Honourable colleague, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, asked him yesterday whether he had just returned from Mars. I think that is possible. That is why I wish to remind them that planet Earth is in peril because of them. Will they please go back to Mars? Will Carrie LAM please get lost and do no more harm to Hong Kong. It is only because she refuses to step down that we have to impeach her. Do colleagues from the pro-establishment camp not know that? Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok's earlier remark was ridiculous. I really feel sorry for colleagues from the pro-establishment camp, who sell their souls and integrity, and speak against their conscience. They are angrier than we are, with necks as thin as wicks. Yet, they must not vent their spleen as they need to bootlick the communists, biting the bullet and hanging in there. In a bid to fish for political gains, they have been backing police brutality, supporting acts of vigilantism by "blue ribbons", persistently attacking members of the public, continually undermining Hong Kong's social institutions, destroying "one country, two systems", eroding the foundation of the rule of law and supporting the draconian law. They are simply up to no good, and their acts are downright shameful. This is my rebuke to Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok.

Just now, the brazen-faced Ms Starry LEE even claimed that they had garnered widespread support in the elections. How dare Mr LEUNG Che-cheung say that he condemns violence? When the terrorist attack took place in Yuen Long on 21 July, where was Mr LEUNG Che-cheung? Did he condemn his friends from the gentry class? Did he say anything on 31 August? How dare he talk about condemnation here? Did he condemn the "blue ribbons" who had been assaulting others over the past few months? Where was he? What is the funniest part? He still dares mention the District Council elections. The elections have reflected that they have been spurned by the public. And they say they have garnered widespread public support? Are they still asleep? Why do they behave like that? Is that a disease? It is a political coma. It is as if they have lost their marbles and slipped into a coma.

President, I wish to sum up briefly in the last few minutes. In fact, as a habitual offender engaging in dereliction of duty with no integrity, Carrie LAM's acts over the past few months have come as no surprise to us. We may think about her track record, including the demolition of the "Wedding Card Street" and Queen's Pier when she was the Secretary for Development, and how she handled universal retirement protection. In fact, she is a scoundrel, who simply gets rid of what she dislikes and goes ahead with what she likes. And for the pledges she made, she will just talk the talk but not walk the talk afterwards.

President, every example cited by me just now is founded on facts. But strangely, perhaps being half-British or a frequent viewer of Dayo WONG's stand-up comedies, she sounds more sincere when she speaks in English. As reported by foreign correspondents, she told the business sector behind closed doors that she had wreaked an unforgivable havoc, plunging Hong Kong into a political crisis, and if she had a choice, she would rather quit, implying that it was difficult for her to quit. She also apologized with deep regret. But it is weird that Hong Kong people have never heard such deep regret or apology of any kind from her, as if we are living in a parallel universe. She may be more sincere when she speaks in English. It does not matter. Members of the public should be able to understand English. Will she please come forward to say a few words.

During the Chief Executive Election, Carrie LAM undertook that if she did not have the support from the public, she would be willing to step down of her own accord. There are currently 80% of the people who do not support her. She has only got a popularity rating of 19.7%, and I believe those 19.7% people are just like Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung and Ms Starry LEE

mentioned by me just now. While their necks are as thin as wicks, they dare not say "No" to the Chinese communist authoritarians, with no alternative but to bite the bullet and support her.

President, in the remaining dozens of seconds, I would like members of the public in Hong Kong to remember those people battered and abused over the past few months. Some of them, including student CHOW Tsz-lok, student CHAN Yin-lam and LEUNG Ling-kit, even lost their lives, with a young woman and a teacher both sustaining severe eye injuries. Innocent people have dedicated themselves to the movement one after another. Hence, the motion to impeach Carrie LAM must be passed. Thank you, President.

MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): Thank you, Mr LEUNG. I also wish to voice my support for this motion of forming an independent investigation committee to investigate the dereliction of duty by Carrie LAM and the pro-establishment camp. Moreover, an impeachment has to be made. The proposing of this motion is only a right and proper thing to do.

Just now, I heard two Members from DAB, namely, Ms Starry LEE and Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, speak and found that they are really consummate rascals. Ms Starry LEE's spoke as though she was reading out a piece of news report. It was so detached, quoting Carrie LAM as saying that she had not done a good enough job, that the lobbying had been inadequate and a complete failure, as though this had nothing to do with her. Moreover, she even wanted to shift the focus of attention by claiming that it was actually the rioters and the violence that brought about the undesirable situation. What does she want? The public knows. Members from DAB are part of the governing team and she is a Member of the Executive Council. When the Government proposed various policies and the amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO"), not only did she lend it her support, she also played a part in urging the Government to take actions. When it tried to pass this draconian "China extradition law", she also took the lead in hosting a press conference.

Today, does she want to pretend to have severed her ties with the Government? Is she trying to pretend that everything has been erased in one stroke and that they have done nothing wrong whatsoever, that it is all the Government's fault? Is this not the conduct of a consummate rascal? I wish to tell the pro-establishment camp, in particular, Members of DAB, that just like the Government, you are also foul grass growing out of the same foul ditch and "rats

dashing through the streets", and you still have the brazeness to pretend to have severed ties here? Why did I say they are pretending? Because she keeps blaming the Government for not doing a good enough job, but regarding this motion that seeks to investigate the Government for dereliction of duty, how are they going to vote? They will oppose it. They made it clear they would cast votes against it. We are not talking about impeachment but only an investigation to ascertain if there is dereliction of duty, but they do not even agree with this. Therefore, the public can see it very clearly, so they must not behave like rascals anymore, claiming that this matter has nothing to do with them.

Coming back to Carrie LAM, she is no longer qualified to serve as Hong Kong people's Chief Executive, she is not up to it. What has she done? Shoeorning the draconian "China extradition law" and now, a dreadful mistake has been made but she refuses to step down no matter how. She continues to condone the Police in beating up young people, allowing the Police to call Hong Kong people "cockroaches", maintaining the institutional violence of small-circle elections and hanging on to her power and office, and she continues to save Beijing's face. If Carrie LAM continues to do so, I have to tell her that she is actively making herself an enemy of the people and Hong Kong people will continue to regard her as an enemy, or "a rat dashing through the streets". Today, I have no qualms about humiliating her in the Chamber because she is worthless.

Just now, many Members of the pro-establishment camp talked about the need to stop violence and curb disorder, saying that the Government needs to do more. The whole regime under Carrie LAM said that the violence and the unrest had to stop and order had to be restored. I wish to tell Carrie LAM that there are no rioters; there is only tyranny. To stop the violence, please stop the violence inflicted by police officers, stop the violence of the people clad in white, who chop people up everywhere and stop the tyranny. A chant among Hong Kong people is, "No police officer seen on 21 July, people beaten dead on 31 August and people shot dead on 1 October". Stopping the violence and curbing the disorder is very simple. Will she please step down first.

The Government says it wants to restore order, so what kind of order does it want to restore? It is to restore tyranny, to continue to form the representative councils through such unfair electoral systems as small-circle elections, to retain functional constituencies and carry out bogus consultations every day. When is the wish of Hong Kong people ever respected? When meetings are held in the Legislative Council, be it Legislative Council meetings or those of committees,

for every moment and every minute, they are always held under the violence of the representative councils and the institution. In this light, when she said she wanted to restore order, did she mean to restore the kind of order in which Beijing will enable her and Beijing to get the greatest political benefits? Her talk about restoring order is really even more unpleasant to the ears than vulgarity.

The whole piece of draconian "China extradition law" has given rise to such great disturbances, so do they want to pretend that nothing whatsoever has happened? On 1 July, Hong Kong people charged into the Chamber of the Legislative Council and the message was precisely that they had to liberate this Chamber and tell the tyranny that Hong Kong people had put forward "the five demands, not one less". In view of this, does she think that she could end this matter as it is, that Hong Kong people could behave as if nothing has ever happened and that the situation a few years ago could be restored? I have to tell her that Hong Kong people have woken up. Hong Kong people know full well that without the monitoring and checks and balances of a democratic system, our freedoms are so fragile and Hong Kong can be pushed down an abyss by Carrie LAM alone together with a band of nondescript pro-establishment and pro-Government people. Hong Kong people know that without the monitoring of a democratic system, there will be absolute corruption, and the corruption will even propagate itself, rendering the territory beyond rescue. We also know that a non-democratic mechanism is not a self-healing mechanism because without the checks and balances exercised by members of the public, officials and the Police always think that they are correct and will always continue to push Hong Kong towards the abyss.

I remember clearly the three days and two nights in which I personally stayed in The Hong Kong Polytechnic University ("PolyU"). I will never forget what I saw and experienced there for the rest of my life. The night was long, the sounds of gunfire were incessant and there was no knowing what kinds of bullets were fired. Numerous young people were carried away continuously from the ground floor of PolyU to the podium, when some were bleeding, some were hit by tear gas rounds in the head or the chest, and some had swollen fingers because they were hit by tear gas canisters. They came to the podium crying, and I will never forget that for the rest of my life. A very large number of young people were hit by water cannons and came to the podium all drenched, complaining that their skin was burning and they were in great pain. They were in such great pain that they wanted to take off all of their clothes, leaving only their underwear on. The medics who were attending to their wounds and cleaning them all cried and all the volunteers and social workers also cried. That group of young people

kept moaning, saying they are in great pain, as though being burnt. I will remember these scenes forever. I will always remember the Police asking them to leave PolyU, saying that a safe exit would be provided to them and telling them to leave through that particular exit according to instructions. Consequently, I left together with a group of students via that exit, but how did we end up? We were shot at with tear gas rounds, Remingtons and god-knows-what bullets all the time, and they exploded right next to our ears. That group of volunteers, assistants, students and I lost our hearing for half an hour, could not see anything and coughed for half an hour, lying on the ground. Does the Chief Secretary for Administration know this? You go and look at what the Police did. On the one hand, the Police told people to leave, but on the other, they treated us to violence. I will remember these scenes forever.

Moreover, the Police besieged those students, threatening to charge them with rioting, thus forcing them to crawl through drainage tunnels, and it was such a dangerous thing to do! Those students who were shorter could not leave because the water level was too high and even those students of a taller build could not leave either because they were afraid of getting trapped in the sewers, so they dared not crawl into them. Some students even climbed down to highways by abseiling. I once saw a student fall from height and those who could not leave hugged and cried, telling those who could to be sure to get home safely, to run faster and to get home. Why treat our young people in such a way? I have to tell Carrie LAM, and the Chief Secretary for Administration also has to listen clearly, that I will remember these scenes forever.

We, as Members, would also say that, as public officers, those holding office as lawmakers must acquit themselves as decent human beings in the first place. To be a human being, one must have a conscience, stand upright with integrity and be a genuine being with flesh and blood. I now ask the Chief Secretary, various senior government officials and Carrie LAM: Before taking up office as senior government officials and the Chief Executive, were you decent human beings? You cannot even be considered humans. Every day, you lie to the citizens of Hong Kong, claiming that you have done nothing wrong. Every day, you say there is no problem with the Police, as well as the institution. But that is institutional violence. Has the Chief Secretary clearly heard this? It is institutional violence. Therefore, Hongkongers will cease to be docile subjects. Hongkongers will resist to the very end. Hence, I say this to Hongkongers here: In the face of the tyranny and hegemony, we will not give up. We will resist with our will, ballots and wisdom, even at the expense of our flesh. I have to tell the tyranny that I will fight you until the last moment.

Among the "five demands, not one less", will even the simple request for setting up an independent commission of inquiry not be acceded to? It is what the leftists, centrists and rights, across spectrum and strata, demanded the Government to do. Even the "blue ribbons" have made such a demand, have they not? If even an inquiry is not acceded to, does Hong Kong still have a way out? If even such a feasible, practical step to alleviate a bit of rage among Hongkongers will not be taken, tell me how can public resentment be allayed? You will only continue to plunge Hong Kong into the abyss of eternal doom.

Therefore, what is very ridiculous is that, here, the pro-establishment camp has talked about stopping violence and curbing disorder, criticized the Government and Chief Secretary for their deficiencies, the unresolved road blockades and the failure to arrest rioters. But the problem is that, if the Chief Secretary wishes for peace in society and for people not coming out in protests and demonstrations, he should first assume accountability by stepping down and acquit himself well. However, ironically, the pro-establishment camp continues to condone and shelter the Government and conspire with it. I have to say this one more time. The entire pro-establishment camp is "foul grass coming from the same foul vase" as the Government and Carrie LAM. Today, they have no claim to demanding that the Government does a better job and severing ties with the Government. Essentially, the entire pro-government and pro-establishment camps have jointly committed a disastrous mistake.

Lastly to wrap up, I would say that "five demands, no one less" for Hongkongers. We have to stop police brutality immediately and shake up the Police Force. We want Carrie LAM who has committed breach of law and dereliction of duty to step down immediately. As for the several officials in charge of and promoting the "China extradition bill", including Teresa CHENG and John LEE, will they please step down before they venture to make any remarks. Otherwise, they are not qualified to talk to Hongkongers, not qualified to speak in this Chamber, and not qualified nor worthy of still getting paid by Hongkongers. I often heard people chide the Police in the front line of demonstrations. They were so good in chiding the Police, asking them on what grounds the Police shot our children and beat us with their batons. All the gear worn by the Police is paid by public funds collected from citizens. If citizens do not pay, there will be no public funds. What will be left on them is nothing but their underpants. Their public powers are all conferred by us. The public funds are contributed by us. You use such public powers and public funds to bully the citizens and the children of Hongkongers, as well as beating up our

young people. Hongkongers will forever bear such a grudge and will persist until the end. If the Government wants to stop violence and curb disorder, will the Chief Secretary please take good heed of the advice tended by a number of pro-democratic Members today and engage in proper soul-searching. If Carrie LAM is still listening to our speeches being delivered inside the Council, I ask you to do some good soul-searching. You have already lost your place in heaven. You go to hell!

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now suspend the meeting until 2:30 pm.

1:26 pm

Meeting suspended.

2:30 pm

Council then resumed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr Helena WONG, please speak.

DR HELENA WONG (in Cantonese): President, I rise to speak in support of the motion jointly initiated by 25 pro-democracy Members of the Legislative Council under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law, charging Chief Executive Carrie LAM with serious breach of law and/or dereliction of duty, whereas she has refused to resign within a reasonable time, and this Council hereby gives a mandate to the Chief Justice of the Court of Final Appeal to form an independent investigation committee to investigate the alleged serious breaches of law and/or dereliction of duty and report its findings to this Council.

The Chief Secretary stated that this is a very solemn constitutional issue and, therefore, Members of the Legislative Council should not make such an allegation casually. Yet, I would like to remind the Chief Secretary that this falls within the power conferred on this Council by Article 73 of the Basic Law. As we all know, the Chief Executive is not elected by the people of Hong Kong

on a "one person, one vote" basis, and the entire accountability team is also not returned by election for the time being. In case of serious breach of law or dereliction of duty committed by the Chief Executive, this is the sole mechanism under which we can report to the Central People's Government for considering the removal of the Chief Executive after a detailed investigation.

President, why have we initiated condemnation of the Chief Executive for dereliction of duty? This is certainly not a hasty and frivolous decision. In fact, almost six months have passed since June, and every Hongkonger has most discerning eyes. We have witnessed that Hong Kong is seemingly in a state of anarchy or has descended into a police city, whereas it used to be an international city, a place where people can live in peace and work with contentment. Over the past six months or so, very serious clashes between the Police and members of the public have occurred successively. And then there were numerous mass struggles as well as large-scale processions and protests, among which some were peaceful, whereas violent acts took place on some occasions. Activities of resistance have even arisen in various districts. In fact, if this happens in other countries or regions, I believe an impeachment motion must have been proposed long ago, and there is no need to wait for six months before it is proposed. The Chief Secretary even called on Members not to support this motion here. Chief Secretary, you have been sitting here and listening to us from yesterday to today, I hope you can listen conscientiously to the justifications presented by Members.

Whilst we may not consider that Carrie LAM has committed serious breach of law, at least I do not have any direct evidence charging Carrie LAM with serious breach of law at this point of time, has Carrie LAM committed dereliction of duty? I believe she must have. What exactly is dereliction of duty? Members may look up the dictionary or do a Google search, and they will find dereliction of duty means committing serious misconduct when performing one's duties, including abuse of power or negligence of duty. Has Carrie LAM committed any serious misconduct when performing her duties in her capacity as the Chief Executive of Hong Kong? I believe all Hong Kong people can see that she definitely has. There are so many examples that we may not be able to finish citing them one by one in 15 minutes.

What actually are included in the acts of dereliction of duty committed by Carrie LAM? I believe her many acts of dereliction of duty at least include trying to bulldoze the draconian "China extradition law" against public opinions through this Council; allowing the accountability system for principal officials of

the Government to exist in name only with no one having been held accountable; not addressing political problems seriously in a bid to resolve them through political means but pushing the Police to stop violence and curb disorder instead, yet such attempts have further aggravated the situation. In addition, Carrie LAM also connives at the Police Force, with no one in the entire system of civil officials daring utter a word of criticism of the Police. For instance, Matthew CHEUNG once remarked that the Police might have handled the "21 July" incident improperly, after which he was immediately rebuked by the Junior Police Officers Association, and the Chief Secretary holed up then. I do not know what undertakings the Chief Secretary has made to them, or what criticisms they have made of the Chief Secretary during the closed meeting. As a matter of fact, it appears that the Police are subject to no regulation now and no one can restrain them. In fact, there are too many cases involving serious dereliction of duty, in which she has not properly done what she ought to as the Chief Executive.

Coming back to the draconian "China extradition law", it seems that Ms Starry LEE, Chairman of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong ("DAB"), intended to sever ties with the Government just now. She said, to this effect, "In fact, it has nothing to do with us. We just wanted to offer assistance in respect of this case, but the Government introduced this draconian law in the end without consulting us in advance." She will certainly say so because she is well aware that DAB has lost many seats in the District Councils, just like embracing a bomb to stand up for Carrie LAM now. But the truth is, we see that DAB does support this draconian "China extradition law". The problem is, the legislative amendment exercise has already brought about a lot of controversies in the Legislative Council. We hold that the Bill will undermine the principle of "one country, two systems" and break down the firewall segregating the judicial systems of China and Hong Kong. Nonetheless, have Carrie LAM, as the Chief Executive, and the Government ever listened to us when we put forth these views? John LEE acted like a tape recorder when attending meetings of the Legislative Council, and Teresa CHENG did so similarly. Throughout the entire incident, Carrie LAM has completely turned a deaf ear to public opinions. This definitely amounts to her negligence of duty as well, a grave mistake she made in performing her duties.

Since two Bills Committees on the Bill were formed in the Legislative Council, and then the Government saw a million people take to the streets in June, but Carrie LAM still insisted on presenting the Bill to the Legislative Council, whereas the President also approved the resumption of the Second

Reading debate on the Bill at a Council meeting directly without scrutiny by a bills committee, and a vote on the Bill was almost taken at a Council meeting. When a million people took to the streets in a peaceful procession, the Carrie LAM Administration could still ignore them and insisted on not withdrawing the Bill but proceeded to present it to the Legislative Council. Then 2 million people took to the streets, also in a very peaceful manner. I have participated in both occasions, witnessing the entire Hong Kong Island was thronged with members of the public very peacefully—some of them were holding their children in their arms, some pushing baby strollers and some in wheelchairs. What kind of government is it? How does Carrie LAM lead the Government while turning a deaf ear to public opinions? After that, they dragged their feet from June to October before this draconian law was officially withdrawn in this Chamber.

The Government did not listen to the people when they voiced their political views in a peaceful manner, so it missed the opportunity. Why were there the rioters as you people call them? They were forced to come out by the Government. We saw people storm the Legislative Council Complex and apply spray paint all over the place. It was clearly written on the wall. They questioned the Government for ignoring the peaceful demonstrations, so some people were forced to stage the unlawful protests described by you people. Of course, we do not wish to see those rioters, as you people call them, to emerge in Hong Kong. No one wishes to take to the streets to participate in resistance activities frequently, and no one wishes to take to the streets every Saturday and Sunday. They would even get themselves badly injured, some people may be arrested, and some may have to go to jail. They sacrifice their personal freedom, flesh, blood and sweat for the sake of challenging the Government. What kind of government is it indeed?

A government is despotic and autocratic if it does not listen to the views of the people, and this is precisely the government that the people have to oppose. If we are facing a government that does not listen to public opinions, being despotic and autocratic, it is then most reasonable for the people to take to the streets in resistance. Have they ever paid regard to peaceful demonstrations? They have not. Therefore, all the violent acts stemmed from a corrupt, despotic and autocratic government, and members of the public were forced to take to the streets. If such cases happen elsewhere, the government should have fallen from power, how could Carrie LAM still remain in office? Therefore, it is very obvious that she has committed negligence of duty and serious misconduct in performing her duties.

Second, the dereliction of duty by Carrie LAM involves the way she leads her governance team. We have the accountability system for principal officials, with three Secretaries of Departments and 10-odd Bureau Directors, but since TUNG Chee-hwa, Donald TSANG to the incumbent Carrie LAM Administration, the accountability system for principal officials has become a joke. Which officials have been held accountable for committing serious misconduct in performing their duties? I exposed the "lead-water" incident in 2015, that is, excess lead content was found in drinking water in public rental housing estates, with 11 housing estates and four major contractors involved. Has any official been held accountable in consequence? Has the then Director of Water Supplies been held accountable? Has the Director of Housing been held accountable? None of them has. Carrie LAM even awarded medals to them afterwards. Did she want to commend them for their contribution in letting members of the public drink lead water?

Now John LEE and Teresa CHENG have proposed this draconian "China extradition law" on behalf of the Government. They did not answer questions seriously every time when they attended our meetings, but kept repeating the Government's statement as if they were tape recorders. Is this what accountability means? It has been almost six months, why does John LEE still dare to come to the Legislative Council in such a cheeky manner? Why does Carrie LAM still have to harbour these officials? If such cases happen in Mainland China, officials who have committed breach of duty should have already been dismissed long ago—they also have the so-called accountability system nowadays under which they have to be accountable. Under the principle of "one country, two systems", how come Hong Kong officials having committed negligence of duty and made serious mistakes can all remain in office and receive a monthly salary of hundreds of thousands of dollars? No official has ever been held accountable. They have no sense of shame at all.

Carrie LAM must be held accountable for the various issues involved in the whole incident, as the "anti-extradition to China" movement lasting for almost half a year has plunged Hong Kong into a turmoil. The root cause is not the young people as suggested by you people, nor is it the education system. The problem lies in the faulty governance of the Government. Yet, the Government has all along evaded the problem, and it dares not admit its problematic governance, its reluctance to listen to public opinions in administration, and its failure to resolve political problems. But it only knows to resort to procrastination. Whilst a number of critical crises have arisen in Hong Kong over the recent months, it appears that the Government has become invisible.

Sometimes Carrie LAM seems to have disappeared and she would hide herself away for a period occasionally. From this we can see that the accountability system for principal officials exists in name only, having become a joke as no one has ever been held accountable.

Meanwhile, the support ratings of the government officials are all in red and below the passing grade. The support rating of Carrie LAM has been on a decline over these past few months. According to a report released by the Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute on 12 November, the support rating of Carrie LAM has fallen below 20 and stands at a mere 19.7. While 55% of the respondents gave Carrie LAM a zero score, more than half of Hong Kong people gave her a zero support rating when evaluating this Chief Executive of the SAR. If this happens elsewhere, a government without credibility and legitimacy, coupled with an underperforming governing team, should have stepped down long ago. In Hong Kong, however, they have not been held accountable and have antagonized all Hong Kong people. For this reason, her dereliction of duty on this front is also most apparent.

It is evident that the bigger problem rests with the Police Force. Carrie LAM shelters and connives at the Police, pushes them to the front line, thinking that the Police can stop violence and curb disorder by means of which the political problems can be resolved. Eventually, the entire Police Force have turned into an enemy against the people as they abuse their powers and use excessive force against the people of Hong Kong, thereby prompting Hong Kong to have tragically descended into a police city. Several millions of people in Hong Kong are being implicated now. For these reasons, Honourable Members should support the forming of an independent investigation committee to investigate the dereliction of duty of Carrie LAM.

MR CHAN KIN-POR (in Cantonese): President, I have listened to the speeches made by a number of Members from the opposition camp. Actually, despite their impassioned delivery, I may conclude them with two phrases: presenting the outcome as the causes and confounding right and wrong. Over the years, the opposition camp has been distorting and slurring the truth, pulling wool over the eyes of many members of the public. Many commentaries consider that the result of the District Council ("DC") Election held recently is a victory of propaganda of international calibre and fake news, which is the consequence of manipulation by social media and emotions in contemporary elections.

Regarding the DC Election this time around, among the 1.6 million electors voting for the opposition camp, I believe at least several hundred thousands of them do not support violence and they merely want to express their discontent with the Government and the Police. Throughout the movement of opposition to the proposed legislative amendments, the opposition force has been resorting to some super propaganda materials which are partly true yet partly false and extremely emotional, and many Hong Kong citizens who are kind and moderate have been changed profoundly. At the early stage, they exploited the fear of China among the people of Hong Kong to make the Government withdraw the Bill successfully. After that, they shifted the target to the Police, disregarding the fact that the Police are merely responding to the riots and that they are risking attacks by petrol bombs, bricks and arrows in performing their duties. Some members of the public were killed by stones hurled and set on fire. These people are subjected to vigilante attacks and suffer serious injuries because of their different political stances. Members have seen these cruel acts. Over 2 000 protesters and members of the public, as well as close to 500 police officers, have been injured and sent to hospitals since June. No one in Hong Kong would like to see these scenes.

Meanwhile, taking an overview of riots in various places around the world, the duration of riots in most of the places is shorter than that of Hong Kong, yet in individual places, there were deaths of a dozen to more than 200. Luckily, so far, no protester or rioter has died directly in the operations of the Police. Yet, some people are not happy with this. They then fabricated death cases, spreading rumours that six persons died in the Prince Edward Station. When the media exposed that those rumours were fabrications, they spread rumours about protesters being subjected to suicide or being raped, and they insisted that such incidents did happen even when family members of the victims have denied them. I wonder if they would know more about such cases than family members do. I really consider this strange.

Furthermore, there are rumours about armed police of the Mainland having mixed into the Police. I often tell them, if this situation really happens in Hong Kong—as far as I know, there are a large number of "yellow-ribbons" in various government departments and there are people of "faintly yellow" in the Police, so I do not believe no one will produce proof if armed police have mixed into the Police. I absolutely do not believe that. If any person really believes in those rumours, then Hong Kong is not a suitable place for them to live. If such lawless acts as Mainland armed police having mixed into the Police do occur, I really think that Hong Kong is no longer a suitable place to live.

Moreover, it is exasperating that many scenarios are comparable to episodes in movies. I have seen a scene which is particularly overwhelming. Two elderly people, an old man and an old woman of 80 to 90 years of age, tottering in a shaky manner, were led to a bridge, where they were filmed being taught what postures to take. They are too cruel to do so. These elderly people are already 80 to 90 years old. The old man could hardly stand steadily and his hands kept trembling. How can they be so hard-hearted to do that? People who escorted them in coming out are often found to be present at scenes of protests. In fact, this is merely the tip of the iceberg. Members should have seen these scenarios. If any people get caught, there will definitely be someone coming forward to help. They are very well organized. Some of them will be responsible for taking actions, others will do the support and someone will surely keep watch. I believe in the aforementioned case, at least five to six people were involved, where someone would be responsible for filming, someone would spur people to come forward and someone would make remedy in the aftermath. It is outrageous.

Regarding these cases of sheer fabrication, the public are so kind that they will believe them. Worse still, some people and the media with malicious intents will spread the false information widely, and certain Members of the Legislative Council will talk about these scenarios with an assertive tone in the legislature. Just now, a Member said that "a large group of people had died for unknown reasons". Does the Member have any evidence to support his remark? As a Member, he dares to say that "a large group of people had died for unknown reasons" in the legislature. What is he suggesting? I think they thrive on chaos. Yet, the greatest problem is that the public believe them firmly. They think that if even Members say so, these will not be fabrications and they have seen the footage after all.

In fact, I have tried my very best to explain to different people, yet many people are mono-perspective and blind to other perspectives. I often ask myself: How can I stop people from believing in this as if they are possessed? Yet, it is really very difficult. Do not consider it "fascinating" if Hong Kong continues to run this course. If all the people in Hong Kong are like this, the situation will be problematic. Even if they managed to secure the regime, there would still be problems. By then, Hong Kong would undergo inferiorization, and no one will desire to live in such a place.

If the Government and the Police are wrong, they definitely should admit their wrong, be investigated and rectify their wrong. Yet, if the Government cannot crack the smearing and alteration tactics used in the super propaganda, such fake news will continue to corrupt the minds of the public and provoke intense hatred and growing anger. Hong Kong will never have peace. I have reminded the Chief Secretary time and again that they should enhance their propaganda efforts, yet so far I have not seen any action taken by the authorities. He said a Member has done a good job. Yet, it does not help, for the authorities are not doing a good job. Hence, in my view, this is the Number One enemy. If the authorities can make the public truly understand the work of the Government, the difficulties it faces and the reasons preventing it from doing certain work, I think if only the Government could make the public understand all this, Hong Kong would not have come to the present situation, and I am certain that there will not be 1.6 million electors casting their votes in this manner.

In fact, I think the riots that occur today in society should not be attributed to any single party, for many people have to be held accountable, including people provoking and supporting the use of violence, and they should bear a significant share of the blame. I hope the public will calm down and do some thinking. The problems prevailing in Hong Kong are indeed caused by politicization, intimidation and demonization. Some time ago, the opposition camp tried "politicization and intimidation" in the case involving the co-location arrangement. Yet, they failed on that occasion, for the public did not believe them. Subsequently, the various kinds of scenarios demonized by them under the co-location arrangement have not arisen.

Regarding the allegation of the use of excessive force by the Police, I believe that many, or a small number of, police officers have resorted to excessive force in chaotic situations and this has made the public anxious. We have to handle these incidents solemnly in a focused manner and attribute accountability for such unlawful actions. Yet, we should not make sweeping generalizations. As in the case of violence in society, which is caused by the "black clad" accounting for a minority in society, will we consider that all peaceful protesters and people wearing masks belong to their group? No, we will not. In that case, why would the Police Force as a whole be blamed due to the conduct of a small group of police officers?

On the other hand, the violence used by the "black clad" in Hong Kong includes petrol bombs, arrows and bricks, and even bombs of massive destructive power that can kill people. All these weapons are lethal. If the Police do not apply appropriate force, they cannot stop protesters from using violence. Members should not present the outcome as the cause. If no riot occurs in society, how will the Police take actions and how will there be the so-called police brutality? Obviously, some people in the community are deliberately overstating the mistakes of the Police to an infinite extent while beautifying the violence of protesters unlimitedly. In fact, these are the tactics they often use in political struggles. They will take things to extremes, smear their opponents and raise alarmist talk continuously to the public. The public should look at all of these clearly.

Let me cite an example. Currently, they are keen on saying that tear gas and tear gas rounds are poisonous and harmful even though the Government has already clarified that the harm of tear gas is in no way comparable to the harm caused by the burning of shops and all kinds of items by protesters. Yet, they do not believe and keep saying that tear gas rounds are more poisonous. I will cite another example. At the meeting on that day, a Member asked why the Police had fired tear gas rounds near the hospital. Buddy, had not the rioters started the riot near the hospital, how would the hospital be affected? This is an apt example of how they are presenting the outcome as the cause. These examples abound indeed, as these scenarios occur throughout the day. Yet, I do not understand why the public would have missed that as if they are possessed. They can merely see the consequence but not the causes.

The motion today requests the setting up of an independent investigation committee to investigate the charges against the Chief Executive for serious breach of law or dereliction of duty. Looking at the four reasons, so to speak, put forth by the opposition camp, which include unrelentingly pushing through a highly controversial bill, using excessive force in crackdowns, initiating disproportionate criminal charges and causing a rift in society, no matter which perspective I take, these reasons are in my view nothing but political prosecution and accusations with exaggerated and false content. In handling the problem this time around, I think the Chief Executive and the Government team as a whole have merely been indecisive and failing to take action, yet the Chief Executive has done nothing breaching the law, and there is no evidence justifying their allegations of the Chief Executive. Hence, I think the motion proposed today is merely a political show, and hence I will not support it.

President, some people are now calling for disbanding the Police Force. Yet, who would maintain law and order if the Police Force were disbanded? Should the People's Liberation Army ("PLA") be called in to do the job? If we do not have the Police Force, we will merely be left with PLA. Hence, people who are really concerned about the interest of Hong Kong will not chant any slogan like that. We should support the Hong Kong Police Force to continue to enforce the law in a restrained, reasonable and rational manner, hoping that the incidents will subside as soon as possible so that society will return to order. This is the dearest wish of real Hongkongers and people who are sincerely concerned about Hong Kong. Police officers of Hong Kong have been bearing great pressure in the past couple of months, facing external criticisms and attacks, doxxing and harassment of their family members. At the same time, police officers have to carry heavy equipment and run around during their long hours of duty. Besides, they are anxious that they may be assassinated anytime. It is tiring both physically and psychologically. It is a cause of concern that police officers of Hong Kong will collapse sooner or later. By then, Hong Kong will be thrown into complete chaos, making the mobilization of PLA inevitable.

Nonetheless, I think it is true that the Police should give due regard to the impression they are conveying to the public in their handling of riots. I know that the new Commissioner for Police has just assumed office. I hope he will bring about new changes, a new culture and a new image, so that people will no longer have any excuse to smear the Police Force. I would like to point out that, more often than not, we can sense that the voices of certain police officers have already become coarse, meaning they have been making great effort to speak there. Certainly, I do not agree with the remarks of some police officers, such as those calling the public to back off, for those remarks are obviously emotional. What are the sources of such emotions? These are responses arising from long hours of duty and the perception that they are not being treated fairly.

Let me cite an example. If the police want the public to leave, they may tell the public: "Please go home, for I also want to go home to have time with my kids, to watch television and have dinner with them, rather than carrying out duties for over 20 hours like now. Will you please help the Police and all of us. I do not want to be your enemy. I come here because I have received notification of riots. Will you please help us and yourself and stop making troubles. To all of you, we are forced to fire tear gas or impose regulation. We want to do none of these. Will you please let us go home to have time with our kids. I am a Hongkonger. I have parents and siblings and I have a good family." If police officers talk to the public this way, I believe most people with

a conscience will back off voluntarily and stop disturbing the Police. In that case, police officers will not be provoked deliberately by people on scene, and their improper demeanor will not be recorded. Police officers should not fall into such traps.

It is easy for me to make these remarks here. Why? Because I have no pressure. Yet, I earnestly hope Honourable Members will understand that it is easy to make remarks here but it will be much more painful and dangerous at the scene. Some people will snatch the arrested persons, some will snatch guns and some will be filming the scenes. The pressure they faced on scene is completely different. It is easy for Members to play the onlookers here. Am I right? Yet, I have to tell all the police officers in Hong Kong that: First, many, many, many people support them. Second, for the sake of image, I hope that from now on, there will be a new Police Force led by a new Commissioner—I have seen what he has done, he can handle things in a wiser manner and he is more capable of dealing with all this. I hope the morale of the Police Force will not be weakened because of the inaction of their superior in the past. I hope they will have high morale and I hope they will and must persevere, so that Hong Kong will not need to rely on PLA to maintain law and order. Third, I wish to tell the public that: I hope the public would understand that police officers are also Hongkongers, and that a vast majority of police officers are working strenuously for long hours to provide services to Hong Kong, and they are performing their duties faithfully. Police officers have no enmity and hatred towards the public, they will not beat the public for no reason and they do so because they need to deal with the riots. Since they are under tremendous pressure, there may be areas where their performance is undesirable.

We hope that the Police Force will change from today onwards. We are looking forward to a new image of the Police Force, adopting a persuasive approach and using rational dialogue. Justice is in the people's hearts. I believe if the public can regard the Police Force as Hongkongers and friends, who are facing the issue of identifying solutions to the problems together, we will be like one Hong Kong. We have suffered serious harms and we are now in troubled waters, please stop trying to resort to violence to push further. I can say that in this incident in Hong Kong, "Success and failure are both determined by violence". With the developments so far, we have sustained substantial harms. I implore all of us to sit down. We all hope that we can return to our normal life. If the promotion of violence continues, we will come to a tragic end. The people of Hong Kong will be the ultimate victims. Thank you, President.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, pan-democratic Members have moved this motion under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law so that the Chief Justice of the Court of Final Appeal can form and chair an independent investigation committee to investigate the alleged serious breaches of law and/or dereliction of duty. It is about a solemn and serious allegation.

President, this motion is timely. The result of the earlier *de facto* referendum, namely the District Council Election held in all 18 districts of Hong Kong, is quite clear, showing that the people have spoken, and the people of Hong Kong have made a deafening voice. Moreover, they have the discerning eyes. The election has produced a landslide result. Moreover, the voter turnout rate was the highest ever, surpassing not only those of past District Council elections, but even those of past Legislative Council elections. Hong Kong has never seen such a high voter turnout rate ever since there was election. More than 70% of the voters cast their votes, and almost all eligible ones did that on the day. Therefore, we can never question the representativeness of the result.

This deafening voice reflects the level of opposition to the Government, its governance, and Carrie LAM, who just hid behind the Police and let the Police suppress the people with batons and guns, while other minions only shouted cheers or tried to explain. It is indisputable that the public see the case clearly. However, Carrie LAM was shameless enough to say before the Executive Council Meeting on Tuesday that the election reflected many voters' hope to express their dissatisfaction with violence through their votes.

Who could say that this election was about violence? Who could say that more voters cast their votes to support violence, as Carrie LAM put it? Absolutely not. She said a lot of people were against violence. However, the truth is that more people have voted for the opposite side of hers. Her argument is really distorting the facts. She violently distorted the referendum against the Government and police brutality into a fight between violence and non-violence. It is simply nonsense. Could we say that supporting the democrats having the "five demands" as their political platform to serve as District Council members is equivalent to supporting violence? I believe that most voters do not act that way. Carrie LAM and her regime have been trying to discredit the voters until this day. I would ask her not to disgrace herself.

On 29 November, the Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute published the latest popularity ratings of the Chief Executive and government officials. Carrie LAM's latest score was 19.7 points. The percentage of support for her to be the Chief Executive was 11% while the ratio against her was 82%, meaning 82% of respondents were against her as the Chief Executive and asked her to step down. Her net approval rate fell by one percentage point, down to -72%, which is a record low among all Chief Executives. This is the performance of Carrie LAM today.

She does not believe the polls, saying the results are fabricated by the democrats. Does she also think that the election result is also fabricated? The election result is indisputable. In a civilized and open society, the leader who faced these figures would have already stepped down, bowed and stepped down. They could not get rid of their guilt even if they died a hundred times. It is a pity that the Government is shameless. It not only continues to take power but also considers itself deserving a high position. It is still arrogant and distorting facts.

The audio recording of the Chief Executive's speech that leaked in September reflected her heartfelt words. I believe that the recording obtained by Reuters must have been leaked intentionally, otherwise how could they obtain the recording? I also believe that Carrie LAM also hoped that the public would understand her inner thoughts through the recording. Isn't she clear about that? She is actually very clear about it. Let me quote a part of her speech: "But for a chief executive to have caused this huge havoc to Hong Kong is unforgivable. It's just unforgivable. If I have a choice, the first thing is to quit, having made a deep apology, is to step down."

It turned out that she had known in September she had committed a heinous crime. She repeated twice that she wanted to go, "step down" and "quit". But why did she not quit in the end? The fact was that she could not quit because she had no right to resign as Chief Executive. Later, the Central Government and many social elites told her that the Chief Executive had no right to resign. She had no freedom to resign from this job at all.

She explained in the recording (I quote): "The room, the political room for the chief executive who, unfortunately, has to serve two masters by constitution, that is the Central People's Government and the people of Hong Kong, that political room for manoeuvring is very, very, very limited." This sentence has clearly explained why she cannot do anything. Not only was she unable to

resign, she could not even set up an independent commission of inquiry. There are so many things that she cannot achieve.

The reason lies in Article 43 of the Basic Law, which was just quoted by Mr CHU Hoi-dick. She has to serve two masters, and she has admitted this frankly. Article 43 of the Basic Law stipulates that she must be responsible to the Central People's Government and the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. According to Carrie LAM, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region refers to Hong Kong citizens. Mr CHU explained the logic of this motion and how Carrie LAM had violated the Basic Law and her dereliction of duty. I will not repeat them here. However, Carrie LAM's statement clearly reveals that she knew that she had committed a heinous crime. She also knows that despite her position as the Chief of Hong Kong, she cannot do anything in her position.

The Chief Secretary for Administration, who is present today, was also scolded by the chairman of the Junior Police Officers Association, "the rank and file association" in Mr KWOK's words. Even so, there was nothing he could do, because civilian officers could no longer control their armed counterparts. As the Chief Executive, Carrie LAM cannot control the overall situation, because she has to face the contradiction between the two masters. Many people have to face this contradiction today.

Theoretically, if the Central People's Government takes serving the people as its responsibility, it should be in contradiction with the people, because the needs of the people will be reflected in the governance of the government. What Hong Kong people now desire is the road that all advanced, open and democratic societies in the world will follow. The government is mandated by the people to govern. When its governance does not follow the will of the people, the people can change the government through their votes within the political framework of the election. Obviously, this is the basis of this interaction or relationship. If there is a conflict between the two parties, the people will exert their strength, and the strength of the people is higher than that of the government. The government only represents the people, and the Chief Executive is only the head of the entire government. She should serve the people of Hong Kong. However, when the Central People's Government conflicts with the people of Hong Kong, she chooses to assist the Central People's Government instead of Hong Kong people. She knew she had made this mistake, but she could not help it, because even her resignation had to be approved by the Central People's Government. She is really very miserable.

Carrie LAM has to face this choice, and each of us may also have to face this choice, because we also have different masters in different positions. Some people can divide themselves. For example, when he is in the church, God is the master; when he returns home, the family may be the master; and when he is at work, the boss is the master. Some people can divide themselves. They can be devout believers in the church, they can be model parents at home, and they can be completely loyal to their boss at work. His actions can be completely contradictory. For example, his job duties may bring great hardship to many people, but he is also a devout believer. Although some people can divide themselves, I hope that everyone should be consistent and coherent, not divided. As human beings, we should have conscience, and our own conscience should be our ultimate master.

However, Carrie LAM has made it clear to Hong Kong people in the past five or six months that her real master is the Central People's Government. Hong Kong's constitution, the Basic Law, stipulates that she serves two masters, but she has ultimately chosen the Central People's Government. This is due to a practical reason: Hong Kong citizens cannot take away the power in her hands, but the Central People's Government can do so at any time. It can also give her more power at any time. Hence, she behaves like a housemaid. This is exactly the problem with the power structure.

Miss NG Ngo-suet, a female student of The Chinese University of Hong Kong, states clearly in an open letter to Carrie LAM, "It is you who have the ability to make up for all your mistakes, it is you who have the power to set up a commission of inquiry, and it is you who should have been accountable to Hong Kong citizens. It so happens that citizens may achieve justice, and for many citizens, this is a sad and hateful fact. Establishing an independent, impartial and empowered commission of inquiry to rectify defects of the existing mechanism and allow justice to be achieved is not just the demand of mine. It is one of the five demands of many Hong Kong citizens. However, it is you who ignore such shortcomings of the mechanism, the lack of checks and balances on the Police Force, and abuse of violence by the Police ..." This is exactly the crux of the problem. "It is all because your position as the Chief Executive is not chosen by a fair, open and just universal suffrage. The source of your power does not come from the approval of Hong Kong citizens and you are not accountable to the people of Hong Kong." This explains the cause of all problems and is also the root cause of Hong Kong's current predicament.

Why did many citizens come out to vote? Why are there the "five demands"? Why do citizens still resist police brutality and even loudly call for revenge even though the Government has withdrawn amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance? Why is the dispute still not settled after the District Council Election? This is exactly the cause. The matter has not yet been resolved, and the citizens' political demands have not yet received a positive response from a fair and just government that is accountable to citizens. This is the core of the problem. Carrie LAM and her regime should no longer make excuses and pretexts.

As a person, Carrie LAM should be accountable to her conscience and be a real person. (*The buzzer sounded*)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHEUNG, please stop speaking.

DR CHIANG LAI-WAN (in Cantonese): President, some Members talked about who should be held accountable to their conscience. I really did not expect such words from Dr Fernando CHEUNG. Everyone knows that Carrie LAM is very good to Dr CHEUNG. He wants to fight for the rights of patients with rare diseases and hopes to get funding. He sought the help of Members of the pro-establishment camp. We immediately organized a small committee to fight for this matter. Dr CHEUNG led a group of patients with rare diseases to petition outside the Government Secretariat. The Chief Executive personally came out to meet them and then announced that \$500 million would be allocated for it.

This situation was very rare before, but it does not matter. From this we can see that the Chief Executive does respond to reasonable requests made by the sick and the opposition. Therefore, President, when Dr CHEUNG asks about who in the world is the best at distorting facts, and reversing right and wrong, the opposition Members of the Legislative Council of Hong Kong would be second to none. I have listened to the speeches of Members since yesterday. So far, everything has been turned upside down.

President, I will oppose the motion proposed by Mr Alvin YEUNG of the Civic Party and supported by a total of 25 opposition Members, to impeach the Chief Executive, because this motion requires the establishment of an independent investigation committee to investigate whether the Chief Executive

has had serious breach of law and/or dereliction of duty. Every one of them also said that the Chief Executive had breached the law and killed, and that she would not go to heaven but go to hell instead. After listening to Members' speeches for two days, I have finally heard one opposition Member willing to tell the truth, that is, Dr Helena WONG. She is very honest. She does not agree that the Chief Executive has breached the law. Even if the Chief Executive had done so, Dr WONG at least believes that there is no evidence to prove her guilt. We can see that Dr WONG still maintains her conscience.

However, President, the Members with conscience are still in the minority, only one out of the 20-plus of them. The remaining ones keep telling things that are fabricated. Some members of the public said to me, "Sister Ann, they won't fabricate facts, will they? In the face of television broadcast, airwaves, and Hong Kong citizens, are they not frightened of being arrested for fabricating facts?" Of course, they are not afraid. Dear citizens, this is the prerogative of Members of the Legislative Council. Even if I said that someone had done bad things, someone was a rapist, or a murderer, I did not commit a crime and would suffer no legal consequences. Therefore, they dare to talk nonsense. What they say cannot be believed, not to the least.

In his opening statement yesterday, Mr Alvin YEUNG said that Carrie LAM and the Government had wreaked havoc on Hong Kong. What did Carrie LAM destroy? What did Matthew CHEUNG destroy? Earlier, I saw that the Chief Secretary often went to the hospitals. Mr YEUNG said that the Chief Secretary caused damage. What was the damage done? I would like to ask Mr YEUNG to think clearly before asking, and everyone can see the damage. Who were blocking the roads? Who destroyed windows and shops? Who took down the railings? Who destroyed the Legislative Council Complex and took away its signboard? Who set fire to vehicles and citizens? Recently, someone helped clear the roadblocks in the street and was hit with a large iron manhole cover on the head for no reason. Fortunately, his skull was not broken and he was not killed; it was just an injury. I do not know how many stitches were sewn. It was an attempted murder. Why have these murderers not been arrested? Who have refused to sever ties with these rioters? They are the opposition Members of this Council, who have not severed ties with the rioters and still maintain or even protect those rioters.

Who is destroying Hong Kong? Who is the chief culprit? They say that it is because Carrie LAM refuses to agree to the "five demands" and therefore they will not give in. Speaking of the "five demands", Carrie LAM has stated

that she has withdrawn the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters (Amendment) Bill 2019. However, I really want to tell the people of Hong Kong the truth about some of these things.

In February last year, POON Hiu-wing was killed. The suspect admitted to the Police after returning to Hong Kong that he had committed the crime. The Government said that he could not be arrested. He was prosecuted for theft or other crimes and sentenced to more than one year in prison. At that time, the whole city was in an uproar and everyone was shocked. Why can a murderer not be arrested? It turns out that there is such a legal vacuum in Hong Kong. Will it happen that many Taiwanese come to Hong Kong to commit crimes and then flee back to Taiwan afterwards? Earlier, someone robbed a jewelry shop and took advantage of this loophole to return to Taiwan. We cannot arrest him because there is no extradition law in Hong Kong.

I would like opposition Members, who also have children, to ask themselves and answer honestly. What would Mr Alvin YEUNG do should his daughter be killed? Would he want justice to be done? He might also need someone to help understand the situation, right? Therefore, when the Chief Executive received a request for help from the deceased's parents, she naturally tried to find a solution. This is normal and she looked at what she could do in accordance with the existing laws. Many citizens do not know that the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance is actually existing legislation, not something new. The Chief Executive only saw that Taiwan was not included in the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, and because Taiwan is part of China, she suggested that Taiwan be included in the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance.

I would like to remind everyone of one thing which is very queer. When POON Hiu-wing's case happened, few of the many lawyers among Members of the democratic camp or opposition camp came out to tell the public how this matter should be resolved. In my memory, it seems that Mr James TO said a few words to the effect that the matter was difficult to resolve. Have other Members who are lawyers come out and suggested anything? No.

Are they not always carrying the banner of justice and the rule of law? Why do they not help provide a solution on this matter? None of them thought of a way for the Chief Executive until she proposed amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, and things became more paradoxical. We immediately pointed out to the Chief Executive that the use of this law to deal with this

incident might not be appropriate and could cause a big problem to Hong Kong people. We later consulted the business community and the social welfare sector. I even asked the media if they had any opinions. A media friend also told me that there might be problems in doing so. I also said that I would relay his opinion.

At that time, everyone was actively studying whether there would be any problems if the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance was amended. But have you noticed that no Member of the opposition camp proposed to amend the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance? Their first sentence was to withdraw the amendment bill. They said that the proposed amendments to the Ordinance were totally unfeasible and should be withdrawn directly. However, the proposed amendments to the Ordinance were made after careful study by a number of legal experts from across the Government. If Members of the opposition camp thought that there were problems, normally, they would propose amendments. But they said nothing and just asked for their withdrawal. Later, a large amount of propaganda appeared in the community, saying that even when a pork seller had a quarrel with other people, he would be sent to the Mainland for trial at any time. In fact, such propaganda should be considered defamation, fake news and fake publicity. However, they have done a great job in these tasks. They are really powerful, and the degree of falsehood dumbfounds everyone.

However, the Government has indeed been very slow in responding to the so-called one million people parade on 9 June ... I do not care whether there were 1 million, 500 000 or 300 000 people, but there were hundreds of thousands during the parade ... The Chief Executive did not say that the proposed amendments would be suspended. Instead, she said that they would continue to be taken forward. In fact, the Chief Executive was erroneous at that moment. I really wished that she had done more consultation or given more explanation to the general public. However, since the matter is over and it finally changed from "the amendment exercise is dead" to "withdrawal of the bill", they should have accepted it, shouldn't they?

However, they did not "accept it" but demanded that the charges against all arrested persons be dropped. However, these people have already been arrested. Do they ask the Chief Executive to interfere in justice? How can the charges be dropped? These should be discussed after the entire judicial process is completed, and the granting of pardon is another matter. According to the Basic Law, the Chief Executive does have the right to grant pardon, but she also needs

to wait until the entire judicial process is completed before making a decision. How can she decide now? Moreover, why should we ask for pardon? Those people might eventually be acquitted, and that would be fine, right?

Very often, it does not happen that the others will accept it when the Government has made its response. They put forward "five demands, not one less", including a demand that the incident should not be characterized as riots and the demand to establish a commission of inquiry. Actually, I also support the establishment of a commission of inquiry. President, I have heard many Members saying that many young people are being arrested all because of what Carrie LAM did. But is this the case? Some people say that six people were killed in the "31 August" incident at Prince Edward Station, and all of them died of broken necks. The case of CHAN Yin-lam, the 15-year-old female student whose body was found floating in the sea, is counted as the fault of the Police as well. There are also the case of Alex CHOW, a student of The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology who fell from a height and the allegation of a Chinese University of Hong Kong student being raped at a police station. Regarding the above matters, I think it is necessary to set up a commission of inquiry to prove the innocence of the Police.

Over the past decades, I have never heard about a policeman raping a person in the police station. Mr AU Nok-hin mentioned the rape incident just now as if he was the victim. We had better clarified the matter now instead of saying something casually in this Chamber. I find it normal to set up a commission of inquiry on the above mentioned incidents to prove the Police's innocence in those cases. The Chief Executive should discuss with the Police, but not limited to two or three top police officers only. She should listen to the opinions of the public. I think the Police have been wronged and stigmatized in those cases. Moreover, why are petrol bombs, breathing apparatus, telescopic sticks and other weapons found on so many primary and secondary school students after their arrests? Who gave them such weapons? All these should be investigated, right? Do the parents give them money for the purchases, or does someone pay them to buy such things, or does someone give those to them? This is not difficult to investigate because some people have already been arrested.

Their last demand calls for dual universal suffrage. Let us look back to 2015. Who opposed the proposal for dual universal suffrage at that time? It was they who opposed it by 28 votes. They said that they did not like the proposal at the time, saying that the proposal was not democratic. However, it

was our first step towards universal suffrage, but they eventually opposed it. President, like everyone else in Hong Kong, we are on the same boat and no one wants it to sink. Although the Chief Executive did have something to be desired in the whole matter and made some mistakes, I think we need a leader to lead us along. If we get rid of the leader today, Hong Kong will become more chaotic. Therefore, I oppose the motion of Mr Alvin YEUNG. (*The buzzer sounded*)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHIANG, please stop speaking immediately.

MR TONY TSE (in Cantonese): The subject of our debate today is a joint motion of 25 Members to impeach the Chief Executive under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law. After reviewing the information, I find that this is the third debate on a similar motion in this term of the Legislative Council. The previous two impeachment motions were directed at the former Chief Executive Mr LEUNG Chun-ying, and the present one is directed at the current Chief Executive Mrs Carrie LAM. The contents are related mainly to her performance in the storm arising from the amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance and the handling of the relevant large public events by the Police, etc.

Before discussing my voting position and rationale, let us first look clearly at the content of Article 73(9) of the Basic Law.

This provision can be divided roughly into four parts. The first part reads: "If a motion initiated jointly by one-fourth of all the members of the Legislative Council charges the Chief Executive with serious breach of law or dereliction of duty and if he or she refuses to resign, the Council may, after passing a motion for investigation, give a mandate to the Chief Justice of the Court of Final Appeal to form and chair an independent investigation committee." The second part reads: "The committee shall be responsible for carrying out the investigation and reporting its findings to the Council." The third part reads: "If the committee considers the evidence sufficient to substantiate such charges, the Council may pass a motion of impeachment by a two-thirds majority of all its members". The fourth part reads: "[A]nd report it to the Central People's Government for decision". To put it simply, all the procedures referred to in these four parts must be passed and all the conditions must be met before the Chief Executive can be successfully impeached.

What we are dealing with today is the procedure referred to in the first part of the Article. One point to note is that not every time when a quarter of the Members of this Council jointly move a motion to charge the Chief Executive with serious breach of law or dereliction of duty without resigning will the Chief Justice of the Court of Final Appeal ("CFA") automatically or necessarily establish an investigation committee. The relevant motion must be passed by the Legislative Council before the Chief Justice of CFA is entrusted to form an independent investigation committee for investigation. When Members consider whether they should support the relevant motion, I think the first consideration is whether the Chief Executive has committed any serious breach of law or dereliction of duty, or whether there is at least sufficient *prima facie* evidence that the Chief Executive has done so.

President, first of all, I would like to talk about serious breaches of law. The decision on whether a person has violated the law should not be made by Legislative Council Members. Instead, it should be left to the court for a ruling. In addition, we can certainly see if there is sufficient *prima facie* evidence to show that the Chief Executive may have committed serious breaches of law or dereliction of duty. In my opinion, the evidence and justifications for the four major allegations made in the impeachment motion against Chief Executive Carrie LAM are very weak. It can even be said that they target wrongly.

The first charge of the impeachment motion is about her "disregard of mainstream opposing views and unrelentingly pushing through a highly controversial bill". The amendment of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance is obviously highly controversial. Many citizens have raised objections, including dissatisfaction with the means and timing for introducing the amendments, but this does not constitute any serious breaches of law.

The second and third allegations are the "use of excessive force to crack down on peaceful assembly" and "intimidating protesters with disproportionate criminal charges". President, as a Vice-Chairman of the Independent Police Complaints Council ("IPCC"), I am engaged in handling complaint cases against the Police in connection with the storm arising from the amendments, as well as independent review of relevant police systems and guidelines. Therefore, I should not comment publicly on these two issues at this stage. Even if it is later confirmed that the Police have used excessive force in individual cases and involved non-compliance with instructions and regulations, they involve individual police officers only. No one should make a mountain out of a molehill by saying that it is the Chief Executive Carrie LAM who seriously

breached the law. As for the allegation about "intimidating protestors with disproportionate criminal charges", whether the charges were ultimately established, whether they were illegal, unreasonable or disproportionate, should be determined after a public trial in the court, not by the Chief Executive or the Police.

Regarding the fourth allegation about Chief Executive Carrie LAM "causing a rift in society", even if this is true, it is not a serious breach of law. Moreover, when it comes to causing a rift in society, some people think that the opposition is the originator, and they need to bear the largest part of the responsibility for the rift in Hong Kong society.

President, the second question is about dereliction of duty. What is dereliction of duty? The English text of the Basic Law uses "dereliction of duty" to mean failing to perform one's duty because of deliberate and serious negligence or recklessness.

The duties to be performed by the Chief Executive have been clearly listed in the Basic Law. The responsibilities of the Chief Executive include the accountability to the Central People's Government and the HKSAR at the same time. He or she must be honest and loyal to the public. He or she are also responsible for leading the SAR Government, signing bills and budgets passed by the Legislative Council, deciding government policies, issuing administrative orders, requesting the Central People's Government to appoint principal officials, and appointing and removing judges at all levels of courts and public officials in accordance with legal procedures. Among them, I think one of the most important duties of the Chief Executive is to implement the Basic Law and other laws applicable to the HKSAR in accordance with the Basic Law. This point is related to an allegation made in the impeachment motion that Chief Executive Carrie LAM failed to perform the relevant duties.

The impeachment motion says that the HKSAR Government and the Hong Kong Police Force led by Chief Executive Carrie LAM have infringed the public's freedom of assembly and speech protected by the Basic Law when handling the demonstrations of opposition to the proposed legislative amendments. Yes, the Basic Law stipulates that Hong Kong residents enjoy freedom of speech, assembly, procession, demonstration, etc. However, these freedoms and human rights are not completely unrestricted, and everyone must still act in accordance with the law.

When demonstrators commit acts against the law by using violence and seriously damaging the fundamental human rights and freedoms of other Hong Kong citizens, the Government and the Police must take actions to stop and penalize them in accordance with the law. If the Chief Executive failed to do so and allowed such violations of the law to go on, let the masked and black-clad rioters act under the banner of democracy, freedom, and human rights to wantonly undermine the rule of law and social order in Hong Kong and infringe the human rights and freedoms of other law-abiding citizens, and did not allow the Government and the Police to take measures to stop these atrocities, the Chief Executive would have really failed to fulfil her due responsibilities.

In fact, when viewed from another perspective, many citizens, including many Members from the pro-establishment camp and their supporters, are fairly dissatisfied with the Chief Executive's performance in implementing the Basic Law and other Hong Kong laws to stop violence and curb disorder.

They are dissatisfied with the Government's failure to effectively stop violence and curb disorder quickly, leaving large numbers of black-clad rioters to block roads, set fire, graffiti, throw bricks, hurl petrol bombs, smash traffic lights and shatter dissident shops. The rioters also unreasonably attacked media organizations and journalists who made fair and impartial reports but disagreed with their actions and words. They beat and seriously wounded the citizens who did not agree with their actions, and even poured inflammable liquid on someone and then set fire. They have also blocked the MTR, tunnels and the airport to prevent other citizens from going to work, to school and out to the streets, as well as stopping their tour or business trips.

For a while recently, the rioters occupied the campuses of many universities to commit vandalism, perform arson and produce thousands of petrol bombs. Almost all colleges and universities were forced to suspend classes. A large number of Mainland and overseas students were evacuated from Hong Kong collectively, and many parents also considered sending their children to study in other countries or regions. Hong Kong's achievements in higher education and innovation and scientific research development can be ruined at any time. What has the Government done about the situation? Why has the education and youth work in Hong Kong been done so badly?

In addition to protecting the citizens' right to march and demonstrate, the Basic Law also protects their freedom of travel and business, their freedom of expressing opinions, and their rights to private property, education and

employment. Why do these basic freedoms and rights seem to have disappeared suddenly in the past few months? Many citizens believe that the Government has failed to take effective measures and means in a timely manner to stop such illegal acts as the illegal rioters prevented them from going to work and school and destroyed stores and restaurants operating legally.

However, we understand that it is mainly the offenders themselves who should be responsible for the above mentioned breaches of the Basic Law and other Hong Kong laws. We should not put all the blame on the Police that are responsible for law enforcement, the Government or the Chief Executive. We also see that Chief Executive Carrie LAM does try to find ways and take measures to stop violence, curb disorder and strive to fulfil her due responsibilities as Chief Executive.

Of course, different people may have different opinions as to whether the measures taken by the Government are effective, adequate, immediate and appropriate. I personally think that the Government's measures are obviously inadequate and ineffective, but the Chief Executive has tried hard although she has not done well enough eventually. In the process, she may have made some poor or unwelcome decisions. You can question her ability or criticize her for not doing well as some necessary measures had not been taken. But I think her performance has not constituted dereliction of duty under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law. There is also insufficient *prima facie* evidence to support the allegations against Chief Executive Carrie LAM, saying that she ignored her duties deliberately.

Members from the opposition camp and even Members of the pro-establishment camp who are dissatisfied with Carrie LAM's performance in carrying out the Chief Executive's duties can openly criticize her, condemn her and demand her resignation, but they should not abuse the impeachment process of the Chief Executive, which is strictly prescribed in the Basic Law.

President, based on the above mentioned reasons and the relevant provisions of the Basic Law, I cannot support today's motion on impeaching the Chief Executive.

President, I so submit.

MR IP KIN-YUEN (in Cantonese): President, this motion, jointly moved by 25 Members belonging to the pro-democratic camp to impeach the Chief Executive under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law, was originally scheduled to be discussed at the Legislative Council meeting on 10 July. Yet the meeting could not be held then due to the storming of the Legislative Council Complex on 1 July. It was not until October that meetings resumed, but then the pro-establishment Members proceeded to filibuster by introducing bills and moving various motions, and so discussion on this motion by the Council could not take place until yesterday.

In my opinion, President, the problem with the Chief Executive has something to do with the English key word "legitimacy". The word has different versions of translation in Chinese, such as "合法性"(legality), "認受性"(credibility), "正當性"(legitimateness), etc. Suppose that we are now in, not Hong Kong, but a society under a democratic electoral system, the moving of such an impeachment motion would not have been required because the government in power would have collapsed and the impeachment process in the legislature would be utterly unnecessary should one or two million people out of the seven-million population of a society have taken to the streets to express their demands. What is most embarrassing at present? It is the fact that, while Chief Executive Mrs Carrie LAM and her Administration are still in power, their legitimacy has been questioned. As such, a serious crisis of governance has emerged in Hong Kong because the Chief Executive has lost her credibility in governing the city, and the people are living in a very turbulent society. This is what our current situation is like.

President, we did not take a negative attitude towards Chief Executive Mrs Carrie LAM right from the outset. Personally, at least, I acknowledge her for the importance she attaches to and her support for education (including the allocation of additional resources) after she assumed office. The truth is, we will recognize her efforts when she does the right thing. Nevertheless, we really cannot accept what has happened in the past six months since there have been actually plenty of opportunities throughout this six-month period for the Chief Executive to reverse the situation. It was a pity that she just missed the opportunity time after time, and "thanks" to her repeated misses that our society is left in today's situation.

The current social movement has lasted for as long as six months from 9 June up to the present, which is so rare in history. Initially in February, the Government announced that it would introduce the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019

("the Bill"), on which only 19 days were taken for the conduct of written consultation—there was actually an opportunity to prevent the matter from getting worse at this point—history would have been totally different had the Chief Executive spent a period longer than 19 days conducting consultation in a serious manner. However, why did the government complete the consultation after only 19 days then? The reason was that the Chief Executive was not aware of the fact that her entire Administration seemed to have great power but lacked sufficient legitimacy in reality. Given its "inherent deficiencies", what a government lacking sufficient legitimacy should do most is to ensure the conduct of adequate consultation so as to make up for the inherent deficiencies. The Hong Kong Bar Association, members of various professional sectors, governments or consuls of different places had raised many queries in this regard back then, while pro-democratic Members had put forward some alternative options, but it was a real shame that the Government had always ignored all the opposing voices.

By June, 1.03 million people took to the streets to protest, which could have marked another turning point in the incident involving the legislative amendment exercise, but unfortunately she missed the opportunity once again. Well, when 1.03 million people took to the streets, it was actually a reminder to the Government that its policy was not supported by the public. After the public procession had taken place, the Government simply indicated through its cold-hard statement: "The Second Reading debate on the Bill by the Legislative Council will resume on the 12th day of this month". Without responding to public opinion, she missed another opportunity to change the course of history.

Since then, there were still some opportunities for her to remedy the situation, say, there was a five-month period starting from 10 July (i.e. the date scheduled for the debate on this impeachment motion but the debate did not proceed accordingly) for her to do something, but regrettably, she missed the opportunity again. By the time the Government finally withdrew the Bill, it was already 9 June, that means it was late for three whole months ... Excuse me, it should be three months after 9 June that the Bill was withdrawn.

In short, she has missed opportunities many times and committed even more mistakes during this period. For example, as we can see, at least 2 603 people have been arrested, 1 300 were injured and 9 committed suicide. As of today, 6 000 people have been arrested and at least 2 600 injured. None of such should have happened, but unfortunately all have already happened.

Had Mrs Carrie LAM seriously responded to the five demands of the people taking part in public processions (including retracting the classification of protests as "riots", withdrawing the charges against protesters and setting up an independent commission of inquiry), it would have been possible to stop the situation from deteriorating as early as possible. Yet she just kept stalling, thus rendering it impossible to change the situation. At present, Mrs Carrie LAM ends up not being able to critically assess the situation in a timely manner since she missed every single opportunity that came by and allowed the situation to get worse. As things get worse, she said she could only rely on the Police, and this is precisely the second serious mistake she made.

According to the Government, the top priority now is to stop violence and curb disorder, and so they have to rely on the Police as a law enforcement agency. They are of the view that it is necessary to use force to resolve the problem, but is the use of force by the Police really a solution to the problem? I believe the situation would have been much better if the Police had been able to enforce the law in the strictly self-restraint manner that we knew of in the past. As can be seen, however, it was not the case over the past six months. What we saw were the scuffle at New Town Plaza in Sha Tin on 14 July, the attack by white-clad people in Yuen Long on 21 July, the Police's firing tear gas at a care home for the elderly on 28 July, and the incident in which Police Station Sergeant LAU Chat-kei pointed a shotgun at protesters on 30 July. The series of incidents occurred simply because the people of Hong Kong have been subjected to violence by the Police which triggered further anger among them. Not only was it difficult to allay public resentment, people became even more angry than before, thus causing some people in society to resort to violent means to protest. Of course, we do not support the use of violence, but the crux lies in how the Government allays such strong public resentment.

"Why, if no fire bomb had ever been hurled, did tear gas need to be fired?" Mr HO Kai-ming of the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions queried at the Council Meeting on the 20th of last month. Nevertheless, we must make clear the fact here: The hurling of the first-ever petrol bomb by the protesters took place on 5 August (two months after the "12 June" incident) due to a prolonged period of successive instances of police brutality in July. While the Police was unable to restrain its actions against protesters, Mrs Carrie LAM also failed to restrain the Police's actions as the Chief Executive, resulting in the spiraling of public anger which ultimately led to continued escalation of force by both sides.

I want to mention that a female police officer was seen sitting on a young girl student's back near her neck yesterday in To Kwa Wan. As a representative of the education sector, I am really shocked and annoyed at this because by doing so, the police officer might harm not only the girl's body but also her dignity. The Government must explain why this has been the case. Is this an instance of the so-called "minimum force"? Actually, it is not the first time we came across this as the Police has often been seen treating members of the public like this on other occasions. Whenever they do so, public resentment will increase, not to mention the fact that the subject involved this time is a student. In this connection, I hope the Police can provide us with a reasonable explanation.

The SAR Government has set the goal of "stopping violence and curbing disorder" in tackling the current social situation and the Central Government has also indicated that it is necessary to stop violence and curb disorder—actually, the very idea was initiated by the Central Government. We do not know whether the SAR Government and the Central Government came to this conclusion after discussion, but we must understand that the Government's decision to address the current problem with the approach of stopping violence and curbing disorder represents a serious misjudgment of the whole situation. "Violence" and "disorder" do exist, but they are only the "symptoms" and not the root causes of the "illness". What on earth is the real cause then? As a matter of fact, the problem stems from a series of blunders in policy implementation and a succession of instances of police brutality, which have triggered the outburst of public resentment. It is against the background of such intense public resentment that some people have taken a more violent approach to protest.

The current problem cannot be resolved by stopping violence and curbing disorder alone. It is more important to allay public resentment, which was the reason why I asked an urgent question in this Council a few weeks ago. Instead of relying on the Police to quell public anger by force, the Government must examine its problems with policy implementation and make improvements in response to public opinion so that public resentment can be genuinely allayed. Simply put, the entire government must undergo a "mindset overhaul" and dance to another tune.

During this particular period, how on earth did the Chief Executive discuss with or inform the Central Government of the actual situation in Hong Kong, and whether she has tried to explain it to the Central Government? Would it be possible that the Central Government made such a decision based on some biased

information obtained from different channels? As I have mentioned earlier, the Chief Executive plays a very important role because she is a bridge of communication between the Central Government and the people of Hong Kong. We must rely on her to communicate well with the Central Government so that the latter can understand the actual situation in Hong Kong and Hong Kong people's feelings as well. That way, the Central Government will be able to make correct judgments. Yet, the current situation is quite the opposite. I find it a real regret that the remarks by some local government officials were far from reality and have led to a major misjudgment by the Central Government. It is for this reason that the Police has become more fearless in its action to fuel public anger.

President, despite that public sentiment has slightly eased after the District Council Election, but that does not mean that people's anger was gone since their fury still remains. For example, assemblies like "Lunch with you" and those in other forms are still ongoing, which shows that public anger is still very strong.

President, the Chief Executive has a crucial role to play in resolving the current problems. It is imperative that the Chief Executive and her Administration show that they are running the Government in a responsible manner, but regrettably, we have yet to see any government official blame himself for such gross negligence or even step down so far. The Government must make improvements in this regard. Besides, as I have said at the beginning of my speech today, the term "legitimacy" contains the meaning of "credibility". As the Chief Executive of Hong Kong, Mrs Carrie LAM lacks the legitimacy given by universal suffrage in the first place; second, being in a sensitive position right at the junction that joins "one country" with "two systems", she must attach great importance to public opinion, that is, to make adequate consultation efforts while responding to the demands of the public. In addition to securing the Central Government's support, she must also safeguard "one country, two systems" by helping the Central Government grasp the truth about what Hong Kong people think and how they feel, and strive to defend (*The buzzer sounded*) ... the core values of Hong Kong.

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

MR HOLDEN CHOW (in Cantonese): President, what we are debating today is a motion jointly proposed by the opposition Members to charge the Chief Executive Carrie LAM with serious breaches of law and dereliction of duty.

President, let us look at the wording of the motion again. The allegations against the Chief Executive include "use of excessive force to crack down on peaceful assembly" and "intimidating protestors with disproportionate criminal charges". President, as far as the wording of the motion is concerned, even on the day of 12 June, we can see clearly that many demonstrators threw bricks and attacked the Police in many very violent ways on that day. They attacked the Police, forcing them to retreat to the front of the Legislative Council Complex. The scene of that day was clearly shown on the TV screen. Everyone clearly saw that the Police were harmed badly at the time and their lives were seriously threatened.

President, we can look back at the riots of the past six months. This is a situation where the people find it hard to live on. The severe riots over the past six months have affected not only social order but also the freedom of the citizens to go out. Basically, everyone is worried about their safety, and the general public still hope that the government can stop violence and curb disorder.

We have also seen that during the riots of the past six months, the rioters started with throwing bricks and then engaged in hurling increasing numbers of petrol bombs. Not only did they hurl petrol bombs, they also set fire. They threw petrol bombs into police stations, set fire everywhere, and even hurled petrol bombs at school buses carrying school children. All these have seriously threatened the lives of citizens. Some citizens were subject to vigilantism because of different political opinions, and one was even burned for this reason. His recovery is not as good as expected. An elderly cleaner was unfortunately killed by a brick-thrower. In addition to the scenes described just now, we saw that the rioters used bows and arrows in addition to hurling petrol bombs to setting fire. I think no one will consider such scenes peaceful rallies. How do we expect the Police to respond to these forces in the course of performing their duties? How should they respond? Should they have their arms folded? Everyone should know that this kind of harmful behavior threatens not only the lives of police officers on duty that day, but also those of ordinary citizens at any time.

Over the past period, we have also seen the neck of a police officer being cut, which is a case of murder. He was interviewed recently by an English press for his opinion. During the interview, he said that when he woke up, what worried him most was his family: his wife and the pair of children. Would they just lose their husband and father like that? Why don't we ask the rioter who cut the neck of the police officer that day: Has he ever thought that his behavior would cause a family to lose the husband and father, and would turn the police officer's family members into orphans and a widow? This was an irrational act indeed.

However, President, what I find even more tragic is that these irrational acts of force and harms to others have been understood, approved or condoned by some people in the society, which I entirely cannot understand.

Opposition Members sitting on the other side of ours not only failed to distance themselves from violence in the past six months but also tried to find some justifications to rationalize all such violence and attacks. As a Legislative Council Member and politician, we should guide some citizens and lead some public opinions. If they say that they have played this role, I will really clap my hands and agree. They have really played a role in leading the public in Hong Kong to accept all violence, find pretexts for all violence and rationalize it, even though Hong Kong society is being destroyed and people are being killed or injured. I cannot help asking, what is the responsibility of the opposition in this matter? We can see clearly. Of course, we can see that the opposition has even permeated many elements in its propaganda to incite hatred. Recently we read a headline that reads: "Hongkongers, retaliate!" What is this if it is not inciting hatred?

President, in no society or city will one agree that it is right to incite hatred, but it is the opposition Members who never get bored with such incitement. The opposition has reiterated that everything that happened in the last half year was due to the so-called indiscriminate arrests and excessive use of force against protesters by the Police. However, in each riot with escalating violence, the Police have a duty to perform their duties. The police officers on duty have to resort to force when the other party is using very strong weapons. As everyone knows, when the Police were compelled to use force to deal with the situation, many reporters at the scene, genuine or fake ones, just took pictures continuously with their cameras focusing at the Police. We may have missed many acts of the rioters. President, we have to ask again, is it fair?

So, if we say we do not want to see anyone being injured—and frankly, I do not want to see police officers and ordinary citizens being injured, nor do we want to see protesters suffer from injury—the best means is for them to stay away instead of taking part in the riots. Why do they keep using a single reason to request approval of their demands, and if there is no response, the violence will keep on escalating with more casualties inflicted? Frankly, I believe this is not fair to the demonstrators either because the young people are constantly called by various means to participate, and there are chances for them to get injured or even lose their lives at any time. This is not a correct approach.

President, in addition to the threat to lives and total loss of order in society over the past six months, Hong Kong's economy has suffered a lot. Those who suffer are not necessarily the middle class; more likely, they are the grassroots. Many employees of the retail and catering sectors have lost their jobs because of the current social turmoil. Many of them have to support their families. The government announced yesterday that the subsidy provided to each trainee under the "Love Upgrading Special Scheme" would be increased from \$4,000 to \$5,800. This is a response, but I believe it is not enough for many grassroots citizens who have to support their families. However, more importantly, everyone hopes that overall peace will be restored in our society with violence stopped and disorder curbed.

Today's motion charges the Chief Executive with serious breaches of law or dereliction of duty. President, we have to make it clear that many Hong Kong citizens now ... We have to admit that Chief Executive Carrie LAM has had a lot of shortcomings for half a year when dealing with her duty to stop violence and curb disorder. Many citizens think that she has failed or is unable to fully achieve the effects of stopping violence and curbing disorder, including many measures that have not been fully taken effectively. The simplest example is to coordinate the determination of various government departments to achieve the result. Not only should the police force be on the front line, other departments should support them as well. However, over the past six months, we have not seen much of this situation.

I raised a written question in the Legislative Council earlier, asking how many civil servants were involved in illegal riots, or how they would be punished and handled. The HKSAR Government told me that day that there were a total of 43 people. But how accurate is this number? Are there as few as 43 people

only? It may be the number of people who have been punished, but what exactly is the punishment? The reply they gave on that day was not clear.

As far as the overall arrangement to stop violence and curb disorder is concerned, we think there is inadequacy on the part of the Chief Executive, and we will make some criticisms and raise some requests to her. We ask her to make up her mind to do a good job in stopping violence and curbing disorder. This is the demand of the citizens on her. However, we do not agree with the allegations in the motion against the Chief Executive about the so-called serious breaches of law or dereliction of duty.

The reasons given above have stated my views on this motion. President, more importantly, Hong Kong society has been really affected over the past six months. We hope that the freedom of citizens to go out can be restored as soon as possible so that they really have freedom of speech. Why do I say that? It is because I am worrying about the possible vigilantism on me when I express my own political opinions. With such threat and terror spreading, I believe many people only hope that overall peace can be restored in our society.

Police officers face threats to their lives while they are on duty. I hope everyone can understand this situation. If they have done something bad, and I admit that there may be some circumstances in which some people think that the Police have not acted well enough, there is a mechanism to deal with them. Instead of tarring everyone with the same brush, we should be fair to the Police. The families of the police officers are also under great pressure, and they have also been "doxxed" and rejected. I hope that all Members present, and even opposition Members, may feel in their hearts that such situations should not occur. If everyone thinks that this should not be the case, I hope that they will show their conscience so that our society can restore overall peace as soon as possible. Do not keep using the reason that as the demands have not been met, all the violence can be understood and supported. If this continues, it will only affect the whole community and the next generation.

President, I so submit.

MR ABRAHAM SHEK (in Cantonese): President, I have listened attentively to the Chief Secretary's speech yesterday. He said that the incumbent Government had very good team spirit. But the Public Officers fled from the Chamber after

he spoke. I heard what he said, but I did not see the team spirit mentioned by him. I thank him for being here yesterday and today, and for listening attentively to what each and every Member has to say, regardless of whether they are supporting or opposing voices. But please, let Hong Kong people see the team spirit mentioned by him. This Government is not made up of Carrie LAM or the Chief Secretary alone. We want to see a government that can lead us out of the current predicament. I thank him for staying behind to listen to my speech.

MR ABRAHAM SHEK: President, there is a word for the status of affairs in Hong Kong. I have tried to find the word. I have got the word. Is that vandalism? Is that society divisiveness? Is it an illusion? Or is it a nightmare for those who lost in the recent District Council Election? Or is it a sweet dream for those who won the election and not knowing why they have won? But, finally I come to the conclusion that the word that I am going to use to describe the status of affairs in Hong Kong is the word "shambles". Our economy is in a shambles. Our society is in a shambles. Our Government is an omni-shambles.

For six excruciating months, people have been asking, "What is the endgame to this prolonged chaos?" If the Chief Executive has one in mind, simply it is not working. The last time I checked over 10 000 tear gas canisters have been fired and over 5 800 arrests were made. There is still no solution in the offing.

Yet, many of us do have our own endgames in mind. Mine is to stay put and make Hong Kong great again. Those with the ways and means and thinking the opposite sides are mapping out their individual exit plans. Some are voting not just with their feet but also their cash, equities and families. Singapore offshore accounts are sprouting like mushrooms after spring. We have warned the Government on this aspect, but it has taken a deaf ear.

Many middle-class parents' priority now is sending their kids to study abroad or to international schools. It is a sad state of affair. Why? It breaks their heart to see their children entering politics prematurely. It is sad and breaks their heart to see their children being arrested. It makes them sick to see our universities being vandalized and damaged. Who is going to pay the price?

These are all the reasons why they want to send their children overseas. I have seen this situation before 1997. I thought that was something never would happen but it is happening. Our Government must revert this trend before it becomes irreversible. There is nothing wrong with our education system. There is something wrong with us as legislators and administrators.

President, the people have spoken loud and clear in the District Council Election. There are many lessons to be learnt. Good or bad, and whatever it is, we have to accept them and find a way forward. However, as reflected by the Chief Secretary for Administration's speech to this Council yesterday, the Government is simply not listening. It is not something that we are used to. We thought that we speak, and you will listen a little; and we speak more, you will listen a little more. But this time, for six months, we speak, we spoke, and we speak again, but our spoken words were not listened.

There is nothing wrong with the rallying cry "止暴制亂" (stop violence; curb disorder). Yesterday you used it many times, "stop violence, curb disorder". Indeed, this has to be our immediate goal. The problem is, law enforcement aside, there must also be a political solution to get Hong Kong back on track. Our top officials' intransigence has placed the Police Force in an almost impossible position. I have been a member of IPCC (Independent Police Complaints Council), in the capacity of Vice-Chairman for six years, and I have never seen a thing like this happened. The Government's master plan, or more precisely, Chief Secretary, the lack of it, has only resulted in a spiral of violence.

Even if violence was somehow subsided or stopped and order restored, the deep-rooted social discontent would not disappear. Any lasting solution is bound to involve political give and take. That is why we are here. Nonetheless, our Chief Executive has simply remained aloof and uncompromising.

A roadmap to guide Hong Kong out of the quandary would entail the following four steps. We need a cloverleaf to direct the flow of boiling public sentiments so as to head off further collisions. What are those steps?

Step one: Thorough investigation, or whatever you call that. Our Chief Executive has proposed IPCC to examine the problems. I accept, but by God, do it.

Step two: Reshuffle at the top. It is because, like you, "孤軍作戰" (fighting all alone), and Carrie is lucky to have you by her side. But what has happened to the Executive Council? Have they been a good council to you? This is something that society needs an answer.

Step 3: Expedited dispensary of justice. A lot of people are criticizing our judicial system. I can assure you that there is nothing wrong with it. They are doing exactly what the Basic Law has stipulated them to do.

The last but not least of these four steps: Long-term reform. That, I leave it to you to decide what reforms.

I do not have the luxury of time ... President, you have asked me to think about how long I have to speak ... to enlarge on this thought today. I will share my two cents with colleagues later at the Motion of Thanks for the Chief Executive's Policy Address, if we are going to have one.

Let me stress at this point that we must adhere to the Basic Law as our guiding light. Any deviation from the letter or spirit of the mini-constitution would only lead us further astray.

President, the motion before us is to invoke Article 73(9) of the Basic Law to form an independent investigation committee to investigate the charges against the Chief Executive for serious breach of law and/or dereliction of duty. How could the offices of our Government be not here to at least show a form of defence to the leader? If my leader, President, like you being attacked, I would be there by your side. In time of crisis, it is only natural for the public to look up to the Chief Executive for hope and leadership. Unfortunately, both are in short supply.

The grim reality is, President, confidence in the Police is plummeting. Popularity of the Government is, unfortunately, at its lowest. And, yes, trust in the Chief Executive is nigh non-existent. I am very hard with my words. But those hard words are the truth and it cannot be changed. However misguided, insensitive or even ... I would not use the word "incompetent" or near to that ... the Chief Executive might have been, the fact is it does not amount to a breach of law.

There is also no evidence that there has been a serious dereliction of duty on her part. In fact, she has been busy exploring legislative and other avenues to empower the Police. She has also dished out several schemes to help the ailing industries. She has a heart for Hong Kong. She is by far the best of the lot that we have. I do not think the measures she put in are the right antidotes. Nonetheless, one cannot say she is not trying. What can you expect for a Chief Executive without the guidance and counsel of the most trusted lot? That is why I call for reshuffle at the top.

Let me remind the honourable sponsors of this motion. It was the Chief Executive's eagerness to fulfil her duty to address the Taiwan murder case that has led us into this political quagmire. But she has given an end to the issue. What we are now facing is totally different.

Many people have questioned the Chief Executive's ability, approach and attitude in governing Hong Kong. Many, including myself, hold her responsible. Why not? They are all responsible officials. Nonetheless, let me repeat, that does not constitute a breach of law or dereliction of duty.

The Chief Executive is due to pay her annual duty visit to Beijing in a week or so. I hope, after this last nasty six months, she is finally in a position to present to our President XI not just a workable plan to restore social harmony, but also a blueprint to reboot Hong Kong to where we were before May 2019.

President, I pray the Chief Executive will prove her critics wrong. By God, she must. I wish she could bring us such a pleasant surprise as an early Christmas gift for all of us in Hong Kong.

With this, I oppose the motion.

MR FRANKIE YICK (in Cantonese): President, the turmoil arising from the amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance has been going on for nearly half a year since June. It has pushed Hong Kong to an abyss of danger that we have never seen before. Demonstrations and conflicts in society are endless. Civilian-initiated processions, labour strike and class boycott, etc., have emerged one after another. As early as June, the HKSAR Government responded to the concerns of the community and announced that the legislative amendments were suspended. In fact, the amendment exercise could no longer continue since

then. In October, the Secretary for Security, Mr John LEE, officially announced the withdrawal of the relevant bill in the Legislative Council. But even so, the situation of extreme confrontation in society cannot be repaired. The conflicts have not subsided but intensified instead.

Hong Kong is a free, open and pluralistic society. It is normal for the public to have different opinions on social issues. The Liberal Party has always respected protesters who express their demands by peaceful and legal means. Unfortunately, however, a small number of them have resorted to illegal means. Over the past few months, demonstrations have turned violent, and the rioters' violence has escalated gradually from the initial peaceful marches in various districts to the hurling of petrol bombs, vigilante attacks, and sabotage of shops and railway systems and facilities. After the demonstrations, the streets were full of ravages, traffic lights and other facilities were severely damaged, and people and vehicles competed for roads from time to time, affecting the safety of drivers and other road users. The rioters try to undermine public order, threaten social tranquility and endanger the lives and properties of other citizens. These acts that go against the rule of law and challenge the bottom line of society would be severely condemned in any civilized society. The Police must take stringent enforcement actions and curb illegal and violent acts. The Liberal Party believes that the Hong Kong Police, one of the best police forces in Asia, is capable of bringing to justice any rioters who violate public order and ignore the law. Upholding the rule of law has actually been the cornerstone of Hong Kong's success for more than a century.

President, since the beginning of the demonstrations, the main arteries in various districts are often blocked by protesters. They take paralysing the traffic as a means of resistance, which has brought very serious impacts on the transportation industry, which rely heavily on road conditions. Some operators of taxis and public light buses have relayed to me that rioters are causing traffic jams. Many citizens have switched to the railways to avoid their schedules being affected. This has led to a 30% to 50% decline in the drivers' income. It happened that when the protesters blocked the road and the drivers got out of their cars to clear the roadblocks for the traffic to resume, many drivers were subject to vigilantism and were severely injured by the rioters on the scene. In addition, many taxis were smashed and minibuses burned. Faced with the destruction of their income-generating tools, the small business owners find it difficult to afford the costs of repairs or buying new ones. Their operation is badly affected and many drivers who have concerns about their personal safety

are afraid to go to work. The current situation has aggravated the existing shortage of professional drivers in Hong Kong. The overall carrying capacity of public transport services is affected, and commercial vehicles have to idle.

President, the logistics industry is also suffering greatly because of the road blockage caused by the protests. In addition to large-scale demonstrations, flash protests that cause traffic jams also occur frequently, and it is difficult for the industry and frontline drivers to predict road conditions. If a driver is unfortunate enough to encounter demonstrators blocking the road, the travel time will inevitably increase, and the delivery of the goods will therefore be delayed. The customer must be compensated for their loss, which will constitute an additional burden on the operation. At the same time, violent protests have caused a plummet in the number of visitors to Hong Kong, with the overall figure for November falling by more than 50% on a year-on-year basis. Tourism, retail, catering, and transportation-related industries are intertwined and no one can escape unscathed from the problem. When the market deteriorates, corporate procurement will decrease, and so will freight volumes, naturally.

President, according to the latest government data, the export of local goods fell by 7.1% in real terms in the third quarter. In October, the volume of goods dropped significantly by 10%. The situation is daunting. Logistics, supporting 180 000 employees, is one of the four pillar industries of Hong Kong. If the violent conflicts cannot be stopped, the logistics industry will continue to be hard hit, and the livelihood of the employees will be at stake.

Therefore, the Liberal Party believes that the government and the Police must quell the violence as soon as possible and get our society back on track. At present, Hong Kong's economy is facing adverse factors from both the inside and outside, such as social unrest, the China-United States trade friction, and the global economic slowdown. The quarterly economic contraction expanded to 3.2% in the third quarter and the year-on-year decline was 2.9%, which is the first year-on-year decline recorded since the financial crisis in 2009. Hong Kong's economy has clearly entered a recession, and all walks of life are facing severe challenges. It is believed that the tide of closures and layoffs will occur at any time. Our society must return to order as soon as possible so that the current HKSAR Government can focus on tackling economic problems, launch specific strategies as soon as possible, and take measures to prevent the negative effects of economic recession.

The turmoil arising from the amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance affects our society as a whole, and the HKSAR Government's explanation work on the amendment exercise has been indeed inadequate. In addition, the HKSAR Government has poor control over the process when implementing some policies. For example, it has plan to force a total ban on e-cigarettes and heated cigarettes, impose a vacancy tax on properties, and promote a franchise taxi policy which cannot improve the overall taxi service level but disrupts the operation of the industry instead. However, to be fair, the current HKSAR Government has been committed to improving people's livelihood and promoting Hong Kong's economic development since it took office. It has not only significantly increased land supply but also developed a diversified economy. It has also made contributions in several areas. Faced with the pressure from an economic downturn, the current HKSAR Government has also launched several rounds of relief measures. Although the measures are not comprehensive enough and there are some omissions, the response is timely as a whole. In the economic winter at present, it can at least help the industry solve some urgent needs. Therefore, the Liberal Party considers that it is not fair to base on a single political event to deny the overall governing achievements of Chief Executive Carrie LAM and the current HKSAR Government and accuse the Chief Executive of serious breaches of law and dereliction of duty.

Furthermore, dereliction of duty generally refers to abuse of power or malpractice for personal gains by public officials in performing their duties. But the motion alleges that the Chief Executive disregarded mainstream opposing views and unrelentingly pushing through a highly controversial bill, used excessive force to crack down on peaceful assembly, intimidated protesters with disproportionate criminal charges, and even caused a rift in society. I will not talk about whether these allegations are true, but at the very least, no abuse or favouritism is seen in these allegations, let alone breaches of law.

President, anyone involved in illegal activities needs to be brought to court and face legal sanctions. In October, the High Court's judicial review of the application requirement for assembly and procession clearly stated in its judgment that freedom of assembly is not an absolute right, and that relevant rights are restricted by law and subject to public order and the freedom and rights of others. Therefore, when demonstrations deviate from the original agreement, or even become violent and endanger public order, the Police need to exercise the powers conferred to them to enforce the law and respond in accordance with the

guidelines to protect the lives of citizens and their rights to private property. In the face of escalating violence, the Chief Executive and relevant authorities have tried to stop violence, curb disorder and maintain social stability, which is a responsible approach for Hong Kong.

President, it is undeniable that there are many structural contradictions in Hong Kong society which cover economic, political and social aspects. The relevant problems include insufficient land supply, difficulties for citizens to buy a home, homogeneity of the economy that affects young people's opportunities for upward mobility, imperfect population policies, the shortage of human resources, and the dilemma of talent mismatch. These problems are difficult to solve properly in a short period. The turmoil arising from the proposed legislative amendments has brought about the worst political crisis since the return of Hong Kong to China, which has not only weakened the prestige of the Hong Kong government but also endangered Hong Kong's political and economic development and positioning, undermined social stability and led to a severe rift in society. Our society is paying a heavy price for this political turmoil. At present, it is imperative to stop violence and curb disorder, stop all violent conflicts first, and let society return to peace. All sectors in the community can seek a way out on the basis of calmness, rationality and objectivity. Otherwise, Hong Kong will only continue to sink and completely lose its reputation as an international metropolis, with its future ruined by itself.

President, I so submit.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now suspend the meeting until 5:15 pm.

4:37 pm

Meeting suspended.

5:15 pm

Council then resumed.

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

MR JEFFREY LAM (in Cantonese): President, the demonstration storm caused by the opposition to the legislative amendments has lasted for six months. It is undeniable that the storm arising from the legislative amendments is the worst political crisis since Hong Kong's return to China. The incident evolved from the initial peaceful demonstrations to violent clashes in recent months, with radical elements wantonly disrupting social order and disregarding the safety of others' lives. For a long time, violent and illegal incidents took place in Hong Kong every week. They included arsons, road blockage, hurling of petrol bombs, destruction of MTR stations, and even vigilante of dissident demonstrators. There has been no peaceful day in society, with lots of people not daring to go out. I don't know if the worst days are over. As a person who loves Hong Kong, I certainly wish that the incident had come to an end. However, it takes two hands to clap. Peace cannot be achieved without joint efforts of all parties over a long time, but when it comes to destruction, only a handful of people are needed to do it. Looking back on the past six months, I think that the HKSAR Government and all walks of life could have done better in many ways.

Opposition Members today move a joint motion under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law to request the formation of an independent investigation committee to investigate the alleged serious breaches of law and dereliction of duty charged against the Chief Executive. The allegation is rather serious, and the reason they put forward is that the Chief Executive disregarded mainstream opposing views and unrelentingly pushed through a highly controversial bill, used excessive force to crack down on peaceful assembly, intimidated protesters with disproportionate criminal charges and caused a rift in society. I cannot agree with such descriptions.

The exercise to amend the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance has caused great controversy in society. When handling the disputes arising from the exercise, the HKSAR Government has underestimated the response of the society, and its grasp of changes in public emotions has much room for improvement. However, after the public had expressed their strong opposition to the amendments in the two major demonstrations, the HKSAR Government announced in as early as June that it had suspended the amendment exercise on the Ordinance. Of course, I understand that many citizens were dissatisfied with

the government's decision to suspend the amendment. Therefore, Chief Executive Carrie LAM also announced in July that "the amendment exercise is dead". She also admitted that social contradiction and disputes had arisen from the amendment exercise and the government would stop the related work, hoping that the community could calm down and get out of the predicament.

The HKSAR Government further announced on 4 September a number of measures in response to public opinions, including a formal withdrawal of the proposed amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance. A dialogue platform was established in the hope that differences could be resolved through communication. For various reasons, including the escalation of violence, the Government held only one dialogue session, but I don't think it is the fault of the Chief Executive or the HKSAR Government. It is difficult to continue the dialogue under the political environment at present.

Opposition Members allege that the Chief Executive has used excessive force to suppress peaceful assemblies and has intimidated protesters with disproportionate charges, which, in my opinion, are baseless allegations. The people of Hong Kong have nostalgia for several dates, including the "21 July" incident and the "31 August" incident. When reviewing the incidents calmly afterwards, we can see that the HKSAR Government and its departments (including the Police) could have handled the situation in a better way. Without the "21 July" incident, the "31 August" incident would not have taken place, let alone the horrible violence in these months. The HKSAR Government and the Police's handling of the "21 July" incident at Yuen Long Station did fall short of public expectations, including the time taken to dispatch police officers to the scene and immediate handling of the white-clad people. No one can deny the facts in this regard, but if one says the "21 July" incident was a collusion of the triad with the Police, I think it is too serious and lacks any factual basis.

As for the "31 August" incident at Prince Edward Station, I understand that many citizens wanted to uphold justice, and they believed that if there had been cases of people being killed, the Police had to investigate and take responsibility. However, everyone should calm down and think about it seriously. If someone is really dead, will their family members and friends keep silent? Are all relevant people killed? Will Hong Kong fall into such a situation? It is not true only young people and people who put their stance above everything will believe these fake pictures and news. In fact, some opposition Members have told me personally that there have been killings in Prince Edward Station. When it happens that even politicians and representatives of the public would say such

unfounded words, we can imagine how extensive and terrible such rumour has fermented.

At the end of last month, the FactWire News Agency released the results of an investigation, saying that out of 52 arrested persons at the Prince Edward Station that night, they successfully interviewed 47 people and consolidated their personal experiences with an attempt to reconstruct the situation inside the station that night. Six of the men who were injured during the arrest were widely circulated on the Internet as the suspected victims, but the reporter of FactWire successfully found the six men and verified the contents of the conversation with other arrested persons. It has been confirmed that they were all awake at the time when they were taken to a hospital or a police station. What does this prove? Some people maliciously smeared the police force and discredited the government. Wouldn't it be ridiculous if there were no killings at Prince Edward Station, but someone set up a funeral at Prince Edward Station and took the opportunity to incite hatred? Since it is not true, should the opposition Members still sensationalize these incidents?

Another point that must be made clear is that I strongly disagree with the allegations by the opposition Members that the HKSAR Government has used excessive force to crack down on peaceful assembly. They ignored serious illegal actions such as the violence, arson and road blockage that occurred on 12th June, and they often said that the demonstrators were conducting peaceful assemblies. I think this is also a distortion of the facts. Have the opposition Members present asked themselves conscientiously whether the radical demonstrators should have such crazy behaviour over the past few months, including arson, road blockages, beating up people and hurling petrol bombs? Each event was initially a peaceful assembly, and then there were violent attacks. Why do they not condemn the rioters and hold them accountable? When their people were beaten, they would make a loud noise, but when the dissidents were attacked, they turned a blind eye, and even closed their eyes. Is this the rule of law? If everyone holds double standards on violence, refuses to sever ties with violence, and even continues to harbour the offenders, the offenders will never know what is wrong and will only feel that they are heroes.

Most inexplicably, the opposition camp cites the Chief Executive's oath to criticize her as unconstitutional. Let us take a look at the oath, which reads, "I, Carrie LAM, swear that, in the office of Chief Executive of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, I will uphold

the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, bear allegiance to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and serve the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region conscientiously, dutifully, in full accordance with the law, honestly and with integrity, and be held accountable to the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region." According to her oath and the Basic Law, the Chief Executive is responsible to both the HKSAR and the Central Government. It is necessary for her to respect the two systems and the principle of one country. The HKSAR Government stops violence and riots in accordance with the law and supports police enforcement. This is something every government will do when it comes to violent attacks, and it is also what it should do. What has been unconstitutional in her approach in handling the situation over the past few months?

Finally, when it comes to the allegation that the Chief Executive has caused rift in society, I think that the chief culprits are the opposition camp in this respect. Over the past few months, they have been exchanging glances with foreign forces, cooperating with them internally and externally, provoking contradiction between Hong Kong and the Mainland with the slogan "Anti-extradition to China", selling fears among the local public to gain their own political capital, inciting social unrest, encouraging citizens to take to the streets, putting the blame on the government, calling the regime violent and killing, criticizing the government as blood thirsty and openly inviting foreign countries to intervene in Hong Kong affairs. This series of political operations by the opposition has an inescapable responsibility for the escalating situation in recent months, and violent demonstrations have also resulted in confrontation among different groups in society. I can't help but ask, who actually causes rift in society?

President, some opposition Members may think that there is no large forum (meaning no ultimate leaders) in this social movement. Therefore, even though they know that the "five demands" made by some members of the public cannot be achieved politically, they are unwilling to tell the truth to the protesters. In fact, one of the "five demands" is to require the HKSAR Government not to prosecute violent elements for participating in the riots and committing crimes of wanton destruction in various districts. This is simply a demand that no government can accept.

Of course, I fully agree that the Government could have done better, but this does not mean that the Chief Executive has had serious breaches of law or dereliction of duty. After this incident, Hong Kong people have learned an important lesson. Regardless of their standpoints, all sectors of society must reflect on how Hong Kong should go ahead. The Government must also work harder in assessing public sentiment and collecting public opinions. The world is changing, and the Government must not stick to its old rules. Nobody can deceive and anesthetize themselves any longer. If everyone still cherishes this place and believes that the rule of law should be upheld and our core values should be safeguarded, we must first put aside our differences, work together to end the demonstrations and turmoil that have lasted for nearly six months, and resolve the problem through communication. If we continue to hold the attitude of "burning together" and allow some people to wantonly undermine and trample on the rule of law in Hong Kong, our advantages will be weakened and our competitiveness will be gone forever so that every one of us can only beg for more blessings in the future.

President, I so submit.

MRS REGINA IP (in Cantonese): President, I speak on behalf of the New People's Party to oppose this motion which aims to impeach the Chief Executive. The motion accuses the Chief Executive of serious breaches of law or dereliction of duty on the grounds that she pushed through a highly controversial bill unrelentingly. There is no doubt that the bill on the surrender of fugitives and mutual legal assistance in criminal matters is controversial. However, is it unconstitutional? It is absolutely not unconstitutional as Article 95 of the Basic Law states clearly, "The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region may, through consultations and in accordance with law, maintain juridical relations with the judicial organs of other parts of the country, and they may render assistance to each other." The government's amendment bill to promote cooperation with other parts of the country in surrender of fugitives and mutual assistance in criminal justice is absolutely in line with the Constitution.

In fact, it is in line with the wishes of opposition Members. I took advantage of Ms Tanya CHAN's entry into the Chamber. Although Mr Charles Peter MOK and Mr Alvin YEUNG are leaving, I would like to remind them again that although Ms Tanya CHAN had not yet joined the Legislative Council that year, on 9 December 1998, I reiterated once that it was Mr Martin LEE who first proposed the following motion: "... this Council also urges the SAR Government

to expeditiously discuss and conclude an agreement with the Central People's Government, on the basis of internationally accepted principles, on rendition arrangements between the Mainland and the SAR, so as to restore the public's confidence in the SAR's judicial jurisdiction." Although the motion was not passed at that time, all the Members of the Democratic camp, including Mr James TO, Mr LEE Wing-tat, Mr Andrew CHENG, Miss Margaret NG and Miss Emily LAU supported it. Therefore, the pan-democrats know that it is constitutional and necessary to promote mutual criminal assistance and discuss the surrender of fugitive offenders with the Mainland and other parts of the country.

Of course, I later saw Mr Martin LEE refute me, saying that what they said was about surrendering on the basis of internationally accepted principles. Is the amendment bill currently proposed by the government not in line with internationally accepted principles? It merely expands the jurisdiction to Macau, Taiwan and the Mainland, and expands the areas of cooperation. It also meets international standards, such as dual criminality, no surrender on political grounds, and the surrendered person can also request a habeas corpus and apply for judicial review. All the requirements are there and in order. Later, the HKSAR Government further strengthened human rights protection by reducing the eligible crimes by nine major categories and increased the threshold to seven years or above. Have the opposition Members explained this to the public? They all pretended to be amnestic and told the public that this was a draconian law. In fact, this was the ordinance they initiated then. At that time, my supervisor Mrs Anson CHAN also clearly stated in the document I submitted to the Legislative Council that the Security Bureau was requested to proceed as soon as possible.

I have noticed in particular that the Government has made progress in various aspects in implementing this amendment bill. In addition to raising the threshold, the HKSAR Government also stated that the requesting party (the party requesting surrender) must agree that the surrendered person has a fair trial. I believe that the HKSAR Government has also been promised that the requesting party will not execute death penalty of the surrendered person, which is a great improvement over the arrangements I discussed with the Central Government in 1998. Therefore, I absolutely do not feel it is wrong to support the promotion of this bill, nor do I agree that it is promoting a draconian law. Of course, it has caused controversy. Thanks to you for shooting so many videos to deceive the public, saying that they are "meat on the chopping board", and then go to the housing estates to deceive grassroots citizens by lying to them shamelessly that

after passage of the bill, their units will be taken back. You may laugh, the most shameless ones who deny what you did then.

The Chief Executive's approach is inadequate, and she has criticized herself. I clearly remember that she said that her legislative exercise was a total failure. This, of course, included the means of promotion and publicity, and she was completely incapable of explaining the necessity and provisions of the Ordinance to the public. Secondly, she said that she did not have a good grasp of the social pulse and her political assessment was insufficient. I believe the Chief Secretary for Administration remembers what the Chief Executive said.

The Chief Executive has apologized twice, acknowledging that her performance was inadequate and did not meet the expectations of the public. The turmoil caused by the legislative amendment was the biggest political crisis since the reunification (not only for these 22 years, but since the early days of Hong Kong), the consequences are very serious and may destroy the efforts of several generations of Hong Kong people. The century-old foundation may be ruined at once, which is a very serious consequence.

Your good friend Mr LAM Cheuk-ting also made a fair statement by saying that the consequences of the amendment to promote the surrender of fugitives are incomparable to the National Security Bill that I promoted then. When I promoted the bill, many people went to the streets for demonstration, but their grievances were not purely on the legislation under Article 23 of the Basic Law. The causes included the death of nearly 300 people during the pandemic of SARS and negative equity problem. What about the citizens in that year? President, I believe you also remember as a Member then, the Chief Executive Mr TUNG Chee-hwa announced the suspension of the legislation exercise on 9 July. After I assumed responsibility by announcing my departure, the citizens dispersed and the society returned to peace. They had no other demands because the government had responded to them.

But today, the situation is different. There are many malicious elements. On the surface, they say that there is no big platform. In fact, there is a very sophisticated plot behind it. There is a global campaign to "bad-mouth" Hong Kong and hurt their own city. Those who were born in Hong Kong and whose salaries are paid by Hong Kong taxpayers have continued to "bad-mouth" Hong Kong in foreign countries.

The Civic Party formally wrote to the United States Congress on 2 September asking the United States to sanction Hong Kong. So, today I see some citizens who cannot stand their act say, "Congratulations! Congratulations to the Citizen Party for successfully inviting the United States to sanction Hong Kong!" Do you know the consequences of sanctioning Hong Kong? It is not as simple as sanctioning individuals. Sanctions are not a big deal for individuals. It is a trivial matter not going to the United States as they can sell their assets in the United States, but it is very harmful to Hong Kong. If Hong Kong is suppressed, we cannot become our country's innovation and technology hub. If the United States deploys the nuclear weapon, as what it is doing against Huawei now, by cutting off the financial ties with Hong Kong, the HKSAR will resume its former state as a fishing port. Do you know how much harm you have done to Hong Kong? How dare you accuse the government of causing a rift in society? Who is causing the rift the most? Who are trampling on our freedom and human rights?

On 24 November, the opposition parties won a landslide victory in the District Council Election. Why don't you "behave after making a fortune"? On 25 November, did the "Lunch with you" in Central proceed peacefully? Why was I, as a lady, surrounded with water splashed on me when I was there by myself? What would happen if it was not water but kerosene? Who is trampling on our freedom? Many friends and citizens around me tell me that their livelihood has been damaged, and their way of life has been ruined. They dare not express their opinions.

Not long ago, during a so-called rally in Kowloon, an innocent citizen was hit on his head with a manhole cover while clearing a roadblock in the street. Why is the opposition not condemning such a cruel act but finding minor faults with the Police? I am particularly angry that they even dare to raise the "12 June" incident for discussion. What happened on 12 June was that a group of illegal thugs surrounded the Legislative Council Complex. On 1 July, they even wreaked havoc in the Legislative Council Complex. These things cannot be tolerated anywhere in any foreign countries.

Recently, a United States Congressman Ted CRUZ came to Hong Kong. I was fortunate to have dinner with him. I cannot remember whether Alvin was there that night. Ted CRUZ was wearing black at that time, expressing his support for the black thugs in Hong Kong. When I saw this, I told him, "Do you know that Hong Kong is freer than the United States? Citizens can surround the Legislative Council Complex at any time, but very few people are prosecuted. We do not have a regulation that prohibits demonstrations outside the Legislative

Council Complex." But do you know what the United States is like? 81-year-old veteran actress Jane FONDA stood outside the Capitol Hill in Washington and demonstrated peacefully, but she was handcuffed and taken away, and charged with demonstrating outside the Capitol Hill. I admire this lady very much. She was sentenced to jail after three demonstrations. American law is very strict: three strikes and you are out. One will be jailed for the third offence.

In contrast, Hong Kong is freer than the United States and the United Kingdom. The movement of opposition to the proposed legislative amendments in Hong Kong has been going on for almost six months. The government has not forbidden the demonstrations, and the Police still issue letters of no objection. How about Britain? Eight days after the Extinction Rebellion against climate change in Britain, the United Kingdom said it could not endure the expenditure of £37 million on handling the protests, which is twice their spending on fighting crimes. It was intolerable, so no demonstration was allowed in the entire city of London. Is this the case in Hong Kong? How dare they say that the Government tramples on human rights and freedom? Now, it is they who support illegal elements and trample on the human rights and freedoms of citizens. Who causes the rift in society? It is they who refuse to sever ties with the rioters and refuse to condemn them. Therefore, this motion must not be supported, and I think we must take every opportunity to tell the public that they support the evil actions of the offenders.

President, do you know that I have just received an online message that the Police found 59 bottles of corrosive liquids at Shing Mun Reservoir in Tsuen Wan at 11:00 this morning? These may have been stolen from the laboratory of The Chinese University of Hong Kong. If these corrosive liquids are dumped into ponds or bombs are created, it will cause great harm to the community. Why does no one talk about that? About violence, they say that the Police use disproportionate violence. Why don't they say anything about such violence?

President, and Honourable opposition Members, have you taken a look at Festival Walk? Nowadays, the focus of the community is on The Hong Kong Polytechnic University and The Chinese University of Hong Kong. Do you know that City University of Hong Kong has also been damaged badly? Festival Walk has been destroyed and turned into a ghost town. Is this proportional? The opposition is against the amendment and they can protest. The government has responded to them and the bill has been withdrawn. Why are they constantly destroying Hong Kong and constantly asking foreign

countries to impose sanctions on Hong Kong? What is their intention? Or is it that they do not intend to oppose the amendment but to overthrow the government through violence so as to achieve their goal of ruling Hong Kong?

I want them to tell us in their response what their goals are. Such violence, the black violence in Hong Kong, and the security threat to us are totally disproportionate. Compared to 2003, when the bill was suspended rather than withdrawn, good and peaceful citizens returned home. Now, who is constantly inspiring them with such things as "Sing with you", "Lunch with you", "Block with you", and "Stuck with you"? Such things happen every day so that Hong Kong will never be peaceful, society can never be calm, and the economy is hard-hit? If this continues, Hong Kong's prosperity will be destroyed, and many overseas investors will leave.

At present, some ignorant young people in Hong Kong have been deceived onto the streets by the opposition camp. In fact, they will suffer the most because many investors are withdrawing their investments and the economy continues to shrink. In fact, those who get hurt the most are the ones who have listened to the calls of the opposition to go out and break the law as they have to face criminal responsibility. Therefore, I resolutely oppose their motion and call on opposition Members to ask themselves conscientiously: how will they face our next generation as what they do will hurt Hong Kong seriously?

President, I so submit.

MR CHEUNG KWOK-KWAN (in Cantonese): President, I think no one in Hong Kong could imagine today's chaotic situation half a year ago. Hong Kong was a safe and stable city in the past, and we took it for granted. But in today's Hong Kong, the safe and stable environment has disappeared. Killing and arson have now become a cruel reality that Hong Kong citizens need to accept in their daily life. One has to accept that killing and arson are normal when one lives in Hong Kong. Opposition Members will of course say that the government's administration should be responsible for today's situation. Apart from the government's responsibility, however, do politicians who oppose the government have responsibility too?

Over the past few months, I have often heard descriptions that glorify these violent acts and incidents, as well as very sensational words in this Council. We hear a lot of "facts", which are one-sided or even distorted. We often hear the

phrase: "Yellow and blue, a matter of political views; black and white, a matter of conscience." President, if everyone can really do that, it is not bad. However, the question is: do people who hang these words on their lips every day really do what they say? If so, why would someone use a knife to stab a police officer's neck? If it can be done, why would some people execute vigilante justice on some Hong Kong citizens who have dissident opinions or clear roadblocks? If these can be done, why do rioters ambush and attack some off-duty police officers near police stations?

"No rioters, only tyranny", "violence is sometimes a solution to the problem", "criminal records make the life more exciting" are all romantic slogans that push young people to the battlefield. Helplessly, young people will indeed believe these slogans and put them into action. As a result, some young people have to run away "in grass shoes".

Today, I heard a Member say, "Young people in Hong Kong have always had a good living environment. Why do they make themselves so hard as to run away in the harsh environment of the underground sewage?" Some people are bold enough to glorify the situation and describe the government as the party that harms the young people. In fact, they acted after hearing those political slogans and tried to escape from their criminal responsibility before being arrested by the Police. Why don't we clarify the facts and advise everyone not to do those illegal things instead of making some high-sounding and beautiful reasons in the Chamber to justify their crimes? Honourable opposition Members sitting gracefully here, how can you stand that, and do you feel ashamed?

The wording of today's motion moved jointly by 25 Members refers to the use of tear gas by the Police to crack down on peaceful assembly. President, in fact, what I see is that the rally in Hong Kong will dissipate peacefully if it is conducted peacefully. However, I see more cases in which the rally started peacefully but some people would make trouble later, and then the Police would have to intervene. Let me give an example. My District Councillor's office was damaged one day in early August. What happened that day? Someone applied for a peaceful rally in the park opposite my office. During the rally, of course everything was peaceful, but at the same time, I noticed that there were already a group of black-clad people rubbing their hands in preparation for something near the swimming pool next to the park. At the end of the rally, when the crowd started to disperse, someone came out to block the road, demolished the fence, and then destroyed my office.

In these cases, the opposition camp often asks the Police why they used tear gas. I would like to ask this question: When there are a large number of rioters, if the Police do not use tear gas, what weapon do you think is a more desirable one among the existing ones for the Police to choose? Is it really necessary to let the situation develop to the point where a police officer has to use a baton to deal with sharpened iron rods, or the police officer needs to fire live ammunition? What is meant to be proportional? The use of tear gas by the Police aims to separate two groups of people who have different opinions. In this regard, I hope that everyone is more fair-minded.

When everyone condemns the Police for using tear gas, do you remember that before tear gas was cast, the streets were full of petrol bombs? Some people caused disturbance and damaged properties, some blocked the roads, and some subjected others to vigilantism. Why don't we put all these scenes together and make fairer comments?

Today, I also hear some Members use very far-fetched reasons to evade and shirk responsibility, saying that vigilantism is applied because reporting to the Police is useless. He hopes to use this statement to completely remove the liability of vigilantism. I don't understand why he said that. What I see in vigilantism is that one dissident was ignited after being splashed with kerosene. The vigilantism I saw was that a citizen who cleared the roadblocks was attacked with manhole covers and went into coma immediately. What have these acts of vigilantism to do with his saying that reporting to the Police is useless?

Some people say that it is not guilty to practice vigilantism and vandalism. Is a shop with a background of Chinese capital guilty? Are the traffic lights guilty? Are the MTR stations guilty? What sin did the Smart Lampposts commit? Besides, what crimes have Mandarin-speaking friends in Hong Kong society committed? Why are they all subject to vigilantism?

Today, I heard a Member ask again why someone was arrested while freely entering and leaving the university. Is this true? What did we see happening at several universities? We saw that the campuses were occupied, destroyed, and some people even set up checkpoints at the gates of the campuses, resembling the situation of the "Taiping Heavenly Kingdom". Then, these people paralysed the Hung Hom Cross-Harbour Tunnel and Tolo Highway by taking advantage of the locations of the university campuses. There were weapon factories, bows and arrows, air guns and lethal weapons on the campuses. President, these situations

involved not only free entrance and exit of universities, but also the kind of scene that Hong Kong people have never imagined before.

Is it truly heinous for the Police to enter the shopping malls and universities to enforce the law? President, let us think from another angle. If the policemen entering a university or a mall are not trying to arrest those harboured by the opposition Members, but gangsters who entered the university or the mall and hid there after robbing a gold shop a few days ago, would we condemn the police officers who went into these places and arrested the gangsters? President, the law has never changed. What has changed is the standard of ethics and conduct of some people.

The United States has recently passed the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act, and some people from the opposition camp in Hong Kong have also said they would call on other countries to sanction Hong Kong. Are they helping Hong Kong out of its current predicament or merely trying to destroy Hong Kong gradually? Isn't this similar to the historical scenes in which Qing soldiers were led into the Ming territory and the armies of the Eight-Nation Alliance were led into China? I hope that those who often talk about conscience can do what they say.

I hope that Hong Kong can change back to our beloved Hong Kong. President, I so submit.

MR CHAN HAN-PAN (in Cantonese): President, Members of the opposition camp invoked Article 73 of the Basic Law today to set up an independent investigation committee to investigate the charges against the Chief Executive for serious breach of law and/or dereliction of duty, in an attempt to force the Chief Executive to step down.

A majority of Members belonging to the opposition camp accused the Chief Executive of having committed "seven crimes". Take for instance the two out of the "seven crimes" cited by Mr Kenneth LEUNG, one of which being the accusation against the Police for failing to do their utmost to protect the Legislative Council Complex, as a result, it suffered serious damage and no meeting could be held in it for a long period of time, while the other being the accusation against the Chief Executive for failing to do a good job, thus tarnishing Hong Kong's international image.

Actually, Mr Kenneth LEUNG comes from The Professionals Guild, but I do not understand why he is so fond of shooting himself in the foot, perhaps he is suffering from "selective amnesia". We recall how Mr Charles Peter MOK (Mr LEUNG's fellow member of The Professionals Guild), who had brought along with him a foreign media reporter, queried and scolded the police officers aloud when the Police entered the ground floor of the Legislative Council Complex on the day the incident took place. That day, the whole of Hong Kong saw how Mr Kenneth LEUNG displayed an act of sabre-rattling in front of the Police to give them a dressing down then. In fact, he drove away the Police in front of foreign media that day in a rather overbearing manner. Today, however, after the Legislative Council was vandalized, Mr Kenneth LEUNG has become so forgetful—or he just cannot remember what had happened before—and questioned why the Police had failed to protect the Legislative Council, that is to say, he always wins in any case.

Therefore, I hope that members of the public can remain clear-sighted. Who on earth had done something that served to tarnish the image of Hong Kong? Well, why does Mr LEUNG not ask the several Members sitting in front of him who have visited the United States and the United Kingdom, begging external forces to interfere in China's internal affairs? It was precisely these Members who asked the United States to pass a bill to sanction Hong Kong, playing a role in "transporting bullets" to the Sino-United States trade war. Hong Kong's image was tarnished precisely because of what they have done and they are the real perpetrators. In a word, this group of people from the opposition camp essentially acted as the spokesmen of external forces who placed Hong Kong on the knife-edge of the Sino-United States trade war. They completely ignored Hong Kong's interests and even betrayed Hong Kong. And so, as what was pointed out in an advertisement published on the front page of *Sing Tao Daily* today entitled "Congratulations to the Pan-democratic Camp from Hong Kong People": Congratulations to the Civic Party, the Democratic Party and the Pan-democratic Camp on their success in getting the United States to pass the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act which is meant to humiliate our country and subject Hong Kong to disasters, and "you will never be forgotten by history!"—you people, who humiliated our country and subjected Hong Kong to disasters, will never be forgotten by history!

As a matter of fact, there is still room for improvement concerning the way the Chief Executive dealt with the riots and it is inevitable for her to commit certain mistakes with which both the public and us are so displeased, but it is her being too naive and too silly that has made matters worse. Upon taking office,

she thought she could hold out an olive branch to the opposition camp to make peace, but she simply failed to realize how sinister they are in reality—they engage in business meant to humiliate our country and subject Hong Kong to disasters by collusion with the United States that merely brings home nothing but disasters.

Members of the opposition camp invoked Article 73 of the Basic Law today, accusing the Chief Executive of serious breach of law and/or dereliction of duty. Well, I have no intention of speaking favourably of the Chief Executive in her defence, but I wish to tell these Members this: The Chief Executive of Hong Kong is the Chief Executive of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, and whether she will stay in her current post or step down allows no intervention from any external forces, let alone those "spokesmen" of external forces. Hence, I will vote against this motion.

MR CHUNG KWOK-PAN (in Cantonese): President, I do not quite understand why Members from the non-establishment camp and those from the pan-democratic camp should move this motion today. As a matter of fact, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR") Government did not handle the chaotic situation properly in Hong Kong during this period of time. However, it has given them a landslide victory in the District Council Election. In other words, under this circumstance, the HKSAR Government has helped them to a certain extent. It should be Members from pro-establishment camp who should blame the Government, rather than those from the pan-democratic camp. If the HKSAR Government had handled this matter better, how would the Members from the pro-establishment camp fail in the District Council Election? Therefore, I do not agree that it is appropriate for them to move this motion today. On the contrary, it should be us who would condemn the Chief Executive.

President, every country expects local government officials to do a good job in local administration so that the territory can be peaceful instead of having riots everywhere. Six months have passed but the HKSAR Government's handling of the riots in Hong Kong seems to have not worked as there have been no signs of subsiding at the moment. I strongly disapprove of it. In fact, our country has been baffled very much by the United States, and the Sino-United States trade war has been raging. As such, the country must focus on the

international situation, especially the United States affairs. Hong Kong should have maintained a good environment to alleviate the country's worries. However, I feel that some of the actions of the HKSAR Government are making the situation more troublesome and chaotic.

First of all, the origin cause of the turmoil arising from the opposition to the proposed legislative amendments was the CHAN Tong-kai incident that took place in Taiwan. As for this murder case, Taiwan stated earlier that the two sides must discuss the matter carefully and that the fugitive could only be surrendered after proper arrangement had been made. Even though Chan Tong-kai has now been released from prison, and he is willing to surrender himself voluntarily, he cannot go to Taiwan yet. This problem arose obviously as early as May. Why did the HKSAR Government not properly negotiate with Taiwan on this case of surrender at that time?

This is not the biggest problem. The biggest problem is that the case has promoted the public sentiment of Taiwan to support TSAI Ingwen, who had no chance of being re-elected at all in the beginning. Her chances of election have soared now. It gives the Taiwan authorities a pretext to criticize the "one country, two systems" as impracticable, and allows the trend of "independence of Taiwan" to rise, which is the last thing the country would like to see. Now we can only hope that Taiwan's "vegetable seller" can catch up from behind, so that TSAI Ingwen cannot be re-elected in the Taiwan election.

Secondly, I think what troubles the country is that Hong Kong has always been an international city, and in the past few months it has attracted even more international attention. The newspaper headlines in almost all countries often cover the situation in Hong Kong and the content of the breaking news is mostly based on reports from Hong Kong. If you ask whether there are influences from international or foreign forces, the answer will surely be affirmative. How can there be none? International influence and international power, especially that of the United States, have always existed in Hong Kong. Throughout the entire process against the legislative amendment, the Government provided many excuses for the United States to interfere in Hong Kong. Such "ammunition" was provided to the United States by us. They enabled the United States to formulate the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act successfully. This is obviously a move to influence Hong Kong with international force, especially that of the United States.

In 2014, the United States also intentionally promoted the enactment of this Act. However, no excuses were available and so nothing could be done. At that time, Hong Kong was in peace and prosperity and therefore nothing happened. Why have they passed the Act within half a year through the fast track procedure? And why was the Act approved unanimously in both the Senate and the House of Representatives? What has the HKSAR Government done about this? What has the Hong Kong Economic and Trade Office in Washington DC done? Why was there no lobbying at all? This is an absolute failure. These tasks should be done in advance. What is the use arguing now after the passage of the Act, with which we can do nothing? However, this is an uncertain factor affecting Hong Kong and the future of the business sector.

I don't know when the HKSAR Government can truly stop the violence and curb disorder so that the situation can calm down. Many international investors have made it clear that they will not invest in Hong Kong or even hire university graduates from Hong Kong, which are all public facts. So, what will Hong Kong's future economic and investment environment become? In addition, the outflow of funds has also benefited our competitor Singapore. Our money and talent all flow to it, which will definitely affect the future development of the Greater Bay Area, especially under the present environment and situation. Many overseas scholars, professors and even students who come to Hong Kong for scientific researches at the universities are hesitating now. It is said that even students from Malaysia, the United States and other places, let alone those from Mainland China, have all left without looking back. Who else will carry out scientific researches for Hong Kong? In the future, we can only rely on local talents. Even though we have talents, they are not the ones in this field.

In my opinion, how to deal eventually with the Chief Executive does not depend on the impeachment motion of the Legislative Council. It depends on the decision of Central leaders. Therefore, I believe that they will decide the future development of Hong Kong ultimately. I firmly believe that Central leaders consider Hong Kong a very valuable place, otherwise the People's Liberation Army ("PLA") would have already been dispatched. It is actually very simple should the Central People's Government be resolved to stop the violence. Since the PLA is already stationed in Kowloon Tong, Tsim Sha Tsui and Shek Kong, it can be dispatched very easily, faster than picking up bricks. However, the Central People's Government does not do so because it cherishes

Hong Kong and hopes that the HKSAR Government can handle the situation on its own. However, after half a year, I do not see how the HKSAR Government is capable of dealing with it.

Of course, the protesters have made some demands, but the so-called five demands are not entirely acceptable. However, I think some of them can be considered. First, the amendment proposal has been withdrawn. Second, regarding the demand for the establishment of an independent commission of inquiry, the Government has indicated that it will establish a review committee. Regardless of whether it is called a "commission of inquiry" or a "review committee", I think this is just a difference in name, and the most important thing is its content. As long as the final content is really acceptable to the public, its name does not matter.

The last point is to restart the political reform. I don't think this is very likely in the short term, and it must be approved by the Central People's Government. However, the proposal for political reform can be discussed first while negotiations and consultations may also restart. This is not difficult to achieve, and it is acceptable to all parties. Only by doing so can Hong Kong's political environment and situation calm down. This cannot be achieved by such measures as "handing out cash" or "giving away candies". I do not wish to have the fifth round of "giving out candies" or the sixth round of bailout measures, because this means that the situation in Hong Kong has not improved. We do not want to receive such money either. We only hope that we can restart Hong Kong's economic momentum, become self-reliant, and continue to strive for economic success. I believe this will not be difficult to achieve. Basically, Hong Kong has good strength and foundation. As long as all issues are settled, there will be great room for rebound.

Therefore, President, I think this motion is not very useful, but the most important thing is that the Secretary does listen to our opinion about how we can really make Hong Kong good. Thank you, President, I so submit.

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

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): President, first of all, I wish to thank Mr Alvin YEUNG for proposing this impeachment motion by exercising the constitutional powers conferred by Article 73(9) of the Basic Law. Just now I heard Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan speak his mind, which is something some pro-establishment Members dare not do in this Chamber. That is to say, it is Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong ("DAB"), who has risen to speak just now, who is the most suitable person to propose the impeachment motion today.

Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan questioned us why we have proposed the impeachment motion. It seems that he has not woken up yet. I really do not understand that. I thought that DAB would have woken up after witnessing the total combined number of District Council ("DC") seats won by DAB and the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions ("FTU") was even fewer than that of the Civic Party. But much to everyone's surprise, people like Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan and Mr CHAN Han-pan have not woken up at all. They still do not have any ideas about why they have lost in the election. Why?

At first I did not understand, but now I understand. I should thank Mrs Regina IP for reminding me of that. It is because even we ask the pro-establishment camp to ask themselves honestly—just now Mrs Regina IP advised us to ask ourselves honestly—I also wish to advise Mrs Regina IP that she had better ask herself honestly and see why she was surrounded by people who scolded her on her way to lunch in Central instead of welcoming and greeting her?

Why did the public participating in "Lunch with you" surround her and scolded her? It was because Mrs Regina IP had antagonized many people. Does she understand that? Does she know why her political party is on the brink of demise after losing more than 20 seats, a loss of all seats. Is she not aware of that even now? Why was she surrounded by people on her way to lunch in Central while Mr Alvin YEUNG and I would not be surrounded and scolded by people on our way to lunch in Central? Does she really not understand the reason why all of the candidates of her party have lost their seats in the DC Election? Actually, as Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan has said just now, she should be the one to propose this motion to impeach Carrie LAM.

Nevertheless, she might have thought that she had to bear a major part of the responsibility. Why should Mrs Regina IP and DAB bear a major part of the responsibility? We all remember that DAB was the originator of the "China extradition bill", which made the proposal in collusion with the Government, while Mrs Regina IP was the one who spared no effort to promote the amendment of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO"). She has made numerous remarks. Let us recap what Mrs Regina IP said on 3 June. She said that the reason why some people were afraid of the "China extradition bill" was that they feared their husbands had mistresses on the Mainland. We should not forget what she has said. I wish to tell Mrs Regina IP that Hong Kong people will not forget these remarks she has made. Her Chief Executive ambition would be a pipe dream. It is because there are many shortcomings in her life. Long before that, I did not understand how she could have used such mean and harsh words. I thought that she lacked love in her life. I was not sure. But it turns out that she also lacks common sense in her life. The term common sense is nothing common at all, and I am sure that Mrs Regina IP lacks that sense. It was because those remarks made by her on 3 June have triggered 1 million people to take to the street. But the Government refused to withdraw the amendment to FOO and claimed that it would only be suspended. The Bill was only withdrawn after it was suspended for several months. Why has Mrs Regina IP not proposed a motion to impeach the Chief Executive and we were forced to do so later? Actually, Mrs Regina IP should be the most suitable person to propose this motion.

Just now she criticized us for always finding fault with the Police, but in what way do the people of Hong Kong always find fault with the Police? When a few hundred white-clad people attacked Hong Kong people at Yuen Long MTR Station on 21 July, we were only asking for Police presence. At that time, two police officers were seen walking away from the train station; should we be criticized for being faultfinding? After Mrs Regina IP made such remarks, it was understandable for so many people to surround and scold her on her way to lunch in Central. Does Mrs Regina IP understand that? How can she run for the office of Chief Executive? She will never succeed in that election. She should not feel good when she sees the misery of Carrie LAM and the fact that Carrie LAM is scolded by the whole world. However, I wish to remind her that she should not think she stands any chance to win the next Chief Executive election. Sorry, she stands no chance to win the office of Chief Executive at all.

It is because she has no common sense at all; she is too irrational; she does not listen to public opinion, and she does not understand the reason why people chastise her.

Just now she said that it was us who had contributed to the passage of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act ("the Act") in the United States. In fact, we should thank Mrs Regina IP for the passage of the Act this time around, and we should also thank DAB for proposing the amendment to FOO. Just now Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan said that we have provided the United States Congress with enough ammunition for the passage of the Act, and Mrs Regina IP boasted that let her be the target of the sanction; at most she could not travel to the United States and would sell all her assets in the United States. In spite of Mrs Regina IP's generosity, I wonder if the Commissioner of Police is that generous, and I do not know if Secretary for Security John LEE is that generous that they will refrain themselves from travelling to the United States or not to send their children to study in the United States, as well as to give up all their assets in overseas countries. I have no idea if Mrs Regina IP intends to embrace the Greater Bay Area in her remaining life and will not go abroad?

I remember that Mrs Regina IP participated in our duty visit to the United States in August. I would not say that it was a very pleasant journey lasting a week, because I found it rather difficult to communicate with Mrs Regina IP as there was a huge gap between us. Nevertheless, I believed that since Mrs Regina IP joined us in the United States duty visit, she should understand that Hong Kong as an international city, needed to communicate with the rest of the world, and we should explain to the world what was happening in Hong Kong. She might adhere to her own views and we could stick to ours, it was quite balanced because the pro-establishment camp and the pro-democracy camp had their respective representatives—actually the pro-establishment camp had also invited DAB Members to join the duty visit. Unfortunately they did not accept the invitation. Since Mrs Regina IP knew that we were visiting the United States and she knew that Hong Kong needed to lobby internationally, then why should she put the blame on other people now? If she had a point, she should have tried to convince the Members of the House of Representatives and Senators of the United States Congress not to pass the Act during our duty visit and tell them Hong Kong people did not need the passage of the Act by the United States Congress. If she had put forward a reasonable argument, other people would have listened to her advice. The Members of the United States

Congress did not listen to her advice for the following reasons: first, her speech was too lousy. Second, ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Dennis KWOK, I have to remind you that this Council is debating the motion moved under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law, which charges against the Chief Executive for serious breach of law and/or dereliction of duty. Please come back to the subject of this motion debate.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): President, I am trying to explain why the Civic Party has proposed this impeachment motion, and actually it was Mrs Regina IP, DAB and pro-establishment Members that should have proposed this motion. President, because just now ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I have to remind you that you have spoken for almost eight minutes, but instead of focusing on the Chief Executive, your argument has just focused on another Member.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): No, I have been trying to respond to what Mrs Regina IP's seemingly strong argument just now that we had contributed to the passage of the Act by the United States Congress. I will respond to the ostensible logic of Mrs Regina IP. It is because she said just now that we as a group of Members were the ones who had contributed to the passage of the Act. In fact she was also there but she was just unable to convince others. Now she put the blame on us and accused us of contributing to the passage of the Act.

As a matter of fact, she should reflect on herself why others had not taken her advice? If the facts and reasons presented by her were crystal clear, supporting her allegation that all the black-clad people were rioters who had brought Hong Kong to the present sorry pass, the Members of the United States Congress would have accepted all of her views? For that reason, she should consider the question carefully as to why the international community refused to accept their views. Why did hundreds of people surround her when she was on her way to lunch in Central? Why has her political party lost all of the seats in the DC Election? She needs to think carefully, and after careful consideration, she can vote in favour of this impeachment motion.

President, if Mrs Regina IP, Members of DAB and FTU can think clearly, they will vote in favour of this motion in a determined way because it was the Government led by Carrie LAM that had brought them to such a sorry pass. Since Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan has lost his seat, he should understand the popular views and public opinions. DAB has also lost a majority of its seats, but it seems that they do not understand the reason why they have lost those seats. If the public see that you are willing to show your conscience ... actually deep in your mind, you really want to vote in favour of this motion which condemns the Chief Executive. I know that you want to support this impeachment motion very much. In your mind, you hate this Government and the degree of your hate cannot be higher. But you cannot pluck your courage to vote for the motion. We should be more honest and be courageous enough to make the right decision.

In fact, if the impeachment motion were proposed by you, I believe that your grounds would be stronger than ours. However, you refused to propose it and you also refused to discuss the issues concerning police brutality. Mrs Regina IP said that we always found faults with the Police. She had better join the "Lunch with you" in Central tomorrow to see if people will embrace you or chastise you.

For that reason, it is rather simple. Today Mr Alvin YEUNG proposes this motion and the reason is rather straightforward. I remember when I just assumed my office as a Member, my first task was to move the motion to impeach LEUNG Chun-ying. The impeachment motion was triggered by his lies, unauthorized building works and so on. Actually, in comparison, my grounds then were weaker than those of Mr Alvin YEUNG this time around. Over the past few months, the Chief Executive has shown a dereliction of duty, a total disregard of the safety of the public and she had damaged Hong Kong. Her remarks always hurt the hearts of Hong Kong people. She even said that young people in Hong Kong "have no stake in society". As a matter of fact, how can pro-establishment Members forget all these remarks after listening to them? Pro-establishment Members have suffered heavy defeat in the DC Election because of her. Please wake up and you just act according to public wishes by voting in favour of the motion, and public wishes have already been shown clearly. Pro-establishment Members, please wake up. It is only right to vote in favour of this motion.

President, I so submit.

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

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): President, today's motion is jointly moved by 25 pro-democratic Members. What has happened in Hong Kong in the past few months is obvious, but many Members from the pro-establishment camp are still dreaming today.

Mr Dennis KWOK has just asked whether Mrs Regina IP lacks love. I do not know if she does, but I am sure she lacks votes. Whether it was the District Council Election, in which the New People's Party did not win a single seat, or the Chief Executive Election she participated in, she lacked votes. As far as we can see, she lacks votes. However, her lack of votes was not because people did not like her or target her, but because she represented the royalists that attached to the Government's despotic power, and was willing to be the Government's minion that pushed unrelentingly the amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO").

Members who have spoken just now should not forget ... Do not say that the amendments to FOO are not relevant to them. They are really interesting. A Member from the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong ("DAB") who is also a Member of the Executive Council has defended the amendments to FOO all along. They can even be regarded as the chief culprits who have brought Hong Kong to such a sorry pass, but they dare to say that the Government's decision has nothing to do with them and they have never agreed. DAB is really bold enough.

I do not know how many Members of the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions ("FTU") have spoken. Perhaps I happened to be absent while they were speaking. For a period of time after many things happened, many Hong Kong people scolded the Government spontaneously. Of course, Ms Alice MAK can be described as a leader. She not only did so, but also scolded the Chief Executive with "spontaneous foul language". I believe that many Hong Kong people today want to blame the Government and Carrie LAM. Have Members of FTU reflected on themselves? A few months have passed and they still shirk their responsibilities by criticizing vociferously the rioters' behaviour, such as that on 12 June. The same happened to the representatives of the business community. Who were most worried about the amendment to FOO at the time? They were the business representatives. Otherwise, certain provisions of the bill would not have been deleted in the end. For example, even if someone commits a bribery crime, there is no need for "extradition to China". But why? Because

their own interests are involved; even the business community does not have confidence in the legal system in Mainland China. Since then, the Government has made concessions to ensure that the amendments to FOO would be passed. As a result, all Members of the pro-establishment party supported them, leading to today's situation.

However, it seems that they want to distance themselves from what has happened today, saying that the matter has nothing to do with the Chief Executive. I believe that the Members who scolded the Chief Executive in their speeches just now will oppose the establishment of an independent commission of inquiry and the kicking away of the Carrie LAM regime. In many overseas places, if the local election results are so one-sided, local officials will simply step down for the sake of accountability and even resign collectively. However, officials under the accountability system in Hong Kong need not resign because they are "exempt officials". If you borrow money from a bank or purchase a fitness package, you will find that the contract always contains an exemption clause of unknown content. I believe that these officials in Hong Kong must have signed similar exemption clauses, so that they can become "exempt officials" today. Throughout this period, no official needs to be held accountable. What is more, not only officials are exempted, all police officers are exempted. This is what makes people feel strange.

Over the past few months, nearly 6 000 people have been arrested. They come from different social strata and age groups, and some of them are professionals. Why do they take to the streets? Is it interesting? Is it fun? President, they fight with their lives. At present, no officials are held responsible for this social unrest, but all those who are responsible, including those participating in the demonstrations, are all imprisoned. What about police officers? Have any police officers been arrested over these months? Do any police officers need to go to jail? No. I believe that the police officers involved in the Seven Policemen Case that happened a few years ago are now really uneasy and feel that they were born on wrong dates or in pity. This is because the police officers at present need not be responsible for their actions now. The seven policemen who only "stretched their limbs" slightly ended like this. They may not know how to face their families when they return home. They may say to their children, "Dad didn't actually do anything wrong, we are merely the pioneers of this 'movement'. If a few years earlier" ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Jeremy TAM, I remind you that the case you are referring to is a case pending trial. Members should try to avoid referring to cases pending in court.

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): Yes, thank you for your reminder. I leave these several police officers alone for the time being.

Over the past few months ... Everyone has seen that a police officer rammed his motorcycle into a crowd of people, but the Police have publicly argued that he was just moving through the crowd. Did the Police think he was skating on rollers and interspersed with the crowd? He hit a crowd on a motorcycle! Hong Kong citizens cannot accept these lies, but similar lies have been extended from the Chief Executive to her police force. However, not only have they failed to face the matter squarely, even the Government has completely given up the concept of administration or governance.

The Chief Secretary in front of us earlier stated publicly that if there was anything unsatisfactory in the Police's handling of the situation, he could apologize on behalf of them. These remarks were quite normal and perhaps the most normal remarks from an official under the accountability system over the past few months. However, the official who spoke these normal remarks was actually condemned by the Police's frontline or the most junior police officers—I should not say the most junior. Listed by ranks, the police officer with the highest rank in the Rank and File is the Station Sergeant, above whom are the Inspector, Superintendent, Commissioner of Police, and then the Secretary for Security. Matthew CHEUNG is their superior. It was really amazing that their subordinates said publicly that the Chief Secretary could not represent them. However, Carrie LAM had not shown disapproval of such rebellious behaviour openly, the Chief Secretary Matthew CHEUNG even stated publicly that he had done wrong and apologized for that. I really do not know if he has apologized to frontline police officers when he returned to the office.

All these things are abnormal and allow all Hong Kong citizens to see that the Government has lost its governance ideas. Why do you say this? Carrie LAM has already admitted that she wants to resign, but we are just helping her set

out. She said she would like to resign if she had a choice. That being the case, let us give her a hand! This will save her pain. At present, in addition to her hard life, Hong Kong people are living a hard life too. Over the past few months, who among Hong Kong people has not felt hard? Who among Hong Kong people in different positions feels that Hong Kong has been normal over the past few months? Why has no one ever been held responsible? The Hong Kong people are actually very simple. They only demand that someone should apologize, be responsible, and step down. This is the simplest demand.

If the Chief Executive had been willing to withdraw the amendments to FOO on 12 June, the predicament today would not have arisen at all. One million people took to the streets and she disregarded them; "2 million plus one" people took to the streets and she disregarded them. How many people have died in the process? How many people will face the pain of long years in prison? How many young people will lose their future and lose their eyes? What has the Government done during this time? No, it only procrastinates. It only says that there are violent incidents, the demonstrators are rioters and they want the Police to arrest them all. The Government does not care how the Police arrest them, even if the Police kill them. You can never imagine that the Government has fallen so low.

You may have noticed that during the period before and after the District Council Election, Hong Kong was relatively peaceful. Why? Because no Hong Kong people wanted to see Hong Kong so turbulent. They hoped to express public opinion in a quantified manner with their votes in the most peaceful and rational way through the electoral system recognized by the HKSAR Government. How has the Government responded since 24 November? Carrie LAM just said a lot of nonsense that the election results were not directed at the Government. If not, why is this happening? DAB used to have more than 100 District Council seats, but now there are only some 20 left. Who could have imagined the result? The election results are the strongest and most powerful voice, letting the world and the HKSAR Government know that Hong Kong people are not satisfied with Carrie LAM now, and they insist on the "five demands". Is this clear? Is it not peaceful enough?

The Chief Executive says that citizens should express their views in peaceful ways and should not resort to violence. In fact, Hong Kong people have already tried to express their opinions in this way: 1 million people took to the streets and she disregarded them; 2 million people took to the streets and she disregarded them. Now, the pan-democratic party has won 86% of the District Council seats, and she still disregards them. Is this the most peaceful way? Has she responded? In the end, the result is still the same. The Government approves assemblies, but then arranges for the Police to fire tear gas rounds on them. If so, everyone will surely resist. She then criticizes everyone for being rioters and using violence. Who makes this? Did the Government have no chance to admit its mistakes? Did the Government have no chance to respond to the "five demands"? Why would she rather die than establish an independent commission of inquiry? Because the Government is afraid of the Police. It knows that no one else would support this weak Government. The pro-establishment camp also express their dissatisfaction with the Government today. If they have free will, I believe they will also ask the Chief Executive to step down today, because the Chief Executive has put them in such a miserable state.

Just now Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan said that the motion should have been moved by them. This is correct, and it would be most appropriate if they moved a motion. They have always supported the Government and they have to support the Government blindly. No matter how the Government makes a mistake, they will support it; no matter how the Police beat the Hong Kong people, they will also firmly support it. However, what results did they get? What results does Mrs Regina IP have? The entire New People's Party won zero seats. How can the HKSAR Government face them? As officials continue to earn high salaries in their posts, how many District Council members will face unemployment? Therefore, I think it is most appropriate for them to move the motion.

They often say that the Police are just performing their duties. Have they figured it out? Of course, there is no problem with the Police performing their duties. Anyone who breaks the law should be arrested, but they should not take the law into their own hands. When has Hong Kong become like this? In that case, there is no need for a court in Hong Kong. When someone is arrested, the Police will serve as a judge. The Police would face no consequence even if they

have beaten up the arrested people or deprived them of their personal freedom. How dare she say that Hong Kong is a very free place? Now, we have to be very careful in saying a word every day. Inside the Government, it is reported that there is an employee in the Chief Secretary's office ... I do not know if he has been fired.

Citizens must apply and be selected before they can become police officers. They are required to be trained, bear arms while on duty, and protected by law. However, they cannot say that since protesters can attack police officers, they can also attack the protesters. This cannot be accepted because protesters need not be selected and trained, and they can be on the streets whenever they want. In view of such inequality, a police officer cannot behave like a child—fighting back once being beaten. They should obey orders from their superior officers and restrain their actions. However, the Government is useless; it ignores the situation, and just wants to ... As the Government knows that it has done something wrong, it deploys the Police to "stop violence and curb disorder". However, it is obvious to all that frontline police officers are now out of control.

Carrie LAM has had many opportunities, but she did not cherish them. When she regrets every time that she acted too late the last time, she keeps doing wrong things. When she goes on like that, I really do not know if it will take 10 000 years before she finds that she has done something wrong again today. She has not made good use of the remaining room to face the public and respond to the "five demands, not one less".

This is the mainstream voice of the Hong Kong people, and we have expressed it in the most peaceful way. I ask her not to disregard such voice.

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now call upon the Chief Secretary for Administration to speak again.

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION (in Cantonese): President, as I said in my opening remarks, raising a motion of impeachment under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law is a very serious matter, not a political tool or political operation to be used at will. Members must have solid evidence and sufficient ground which prove the Chief Executive has committed "serious breach of law" or "dereliction of duty" before raising such a motion. I have listened carefully to the speeches made by more than 30 Members in the nearly 10-hour debate. Now, I will focus my response on a few points in their speeches.

First of all, when conducting the legislative amendment exercise regarding the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, the SAR Government aimed only at fighting for justice and improving the mechanism in criminal and juridical assistance matters in Hong Kong, but not at carrying out any kind of political mission definitely. The Government, like many people, is upset about the conflicts and disputes arising in the Hong Kong society over the legislative amendment. This certainly is not what the Government would like to see.

The Secretary for Security formally announced the withdrawal of the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 in the Legislative Council meeting held on 23 October, drawing to a complete close this legislative amendment exercise which has generated widespread controversies. The misgivings of the people should have been utterly dispelled.

The SAR Government has also learnt the lesson and now receives criticisms from the people in a most sincere and humble manner. For the sake of Hong Kong's future, we will conduct dialogues to reinforce our communications with various sectors. The Chief Executive and her political accountability team will continue to hold dialogues with people from all walks of life, with different political stances and backgrounds, in order to jointly examine long-standing political, economic and social issues, for instance housing and land supply, the wealth gap, social justice, opportunities for the young, and even public engagement in policy decisions and so on. Together they will seek answers and viable solutions so that this home where we Hong Kong people live and work as one will change for the better.

In Hong Kong, people undoubtedly enjoy the freedom of peaceful assembly, procession and demonstration in accordance with law. In the last five years, Hong Kong has altogether held about 44 000 public assemblies and about

6 000 public processions, meaning that on average 27 public activities of various scales took place in a day. The Police have all along been dealing with public assemblies, processions and demonstrations in a fair, just and impartial manner in accordance with the law. In the last five months or so, social disputes persisted incessantly and among the more than 900 public assemblies and processions which had taken place, many regrettably turned into incidents of violence in the end. Moreover, these acts of violence are getting increasingly radical and are now pushing Hong Kong towards the verge of a very dangerous situation. Such extremely violent illegal acts have so far inflicted injury to more than 2 600 people, of which 470 are police officers. Many districts in the territory have been affected by the premeditated and planned illegal activities carried out by masked rioters. When the above situations come up, the Police must act decisively to restore public order and public safety as quickly as possible and to bring the law-breaking rioters to justice.

As a matter of fact, there is no need for the Police Force to enforce the law if not for the radical rioters' blatant acts which boldly challenge the rule of law and deliberately disrupt calmness in the community. In a reversal of cause and effect as well as right and wrong, some people keep on making all sorts of exaggerations out of the Police Force's law enforcement practices and performances in relation to certain individuals but leave out altogether how rioters took the offensive by trampling the law riotously, provoking police officers, charging at cordon lines and disrupting the community intentionally.

President, the Police have strict 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. The rule of law is among the core values of we Hongkongers and the obligation of respecting the rule of law should be collectively assumed by everyone in the whole community. I hope all of us can take action to safeguard the rule of law as a core value.

The SAR Government holds that complaints made against the Police's enforcement actions should be addressed by the existing police complaints system, rather than by an independent commission of inquiry separately set up. The existing police complaints system has clear legal basis and is subject to effective and independent supervision. The Independent Police Complaints Council ("IPCC") has launched an examination of large-scale public activities taken place since 9 June, including the corresponding actions adopted by the

Police. The objectives of the examination are to ascertain the facts, assess the handling by the Police and make recommendations for improvement. The scope spans the series of incidents happened on 12 June and thereafter, which are the issues of concern raised in this motion.

IPCC has also established an international expert panel to help with its work. The content and recommendations of the IPCC report will be made public. We expect the report will be ready for submission to the Chief Executive very soon, maybe by early next month; and it will be made public simultaneously. The SAR Government has undertaken to follow up with the recommendations made by the report seriously.

President, some Members criticized the Government's setting up of an independent review committee in their speeches, accusing it as a kind of hypocritical rhetoric. This remark is completely wrong. In fact, if we still remember, the Chief Executive suggested on 4 September four concrete actions with a view to breaking the impasse in Hong Kong. One of them is to invite community leaders, professionals and academics to independently examine and review society's deep-seated problems, to identify the deficiencies and to advise the Government on finding solutions. The setting up of an independent review committee in a way is a reference drawn from the British Government's handling of a large-scale local riot in 2011. It aims at genuinely examining the underlying causes and aftermath of the social incidents happened in the last few months, so as to avoid repeating the mistakes and to reinforce social coherence. The relevant preparatory work is now underway and we are looking forward to good progress.

The work of the independent review committee and that of IPCC are arguably complementary. Why do I say so? IPCC focuses on the actions taken up by the Police and this independent review committee will identify the facts and seek the truth in a macro and comprehensive manner. It can be said that this is a committee which helps us decide how to develop Hong Kong properly in the future, and avoid the recurrence of similar incidents.

President, facing the acute situation, the Government team under the leadership of the Chief Executive stays united; it makes concerted efforts to strive to stop violence and curb disorder, maintain the normal operation of society, and step up the Government's effective coordination of relevant actions. I personally chair an interdepartmental action task force which coordinates the work of

various departments in monitoring, responding to, following up on the situations, as well as in disseminating information and dispelling rumours, so as to ensure responses are quickly made and measures are even more effective. I would also like to emphasis here that the Chief Executive and the entire political accountability team remain steadfast and committed to the good governance of Hong Kong.

President, the incidents happened in these five months or so have left every Hongkonger feeling shocked, heart-broken, anxious and hurt. We admit that the response made by the SAR Government has not been able to quieten grievances in the community and there is much room for improvement in our governance. However, is it true that violence, disruption of order, and actions that challenge "one country, two systems" are actually capable of breaking the current impasse and changing Hong Kong for the better? More importantly, the Chief Executive has neither breached the law nor been derelict in her duty. Hence, it is entirely groundless to raise this motion.

The most crucial task ahead of us is stopping violence, safeguarding the rule of law and resuming order. The Government will enforce the law strictly and resolutely with regard to all illegal and violent acts. At the same time, the SAR Government implores all social sectors to engage in conversations but not in confrontations, let go of divergences, so as to bring changes to the community. The Chief Executive and the political accountability team will continue to adopt a sincere, practical and humble attitude and to uphold the people-based principle, with a view to building a better Hong Kong with all of you.

Here, I would also like to earnestly urge all the pan-democratic Members to be upfront in severing ties with violence, so as to restore tranquility to Hong Kong.

I so submit. I earnestly implore all Members to negative the motion jointly initiated by 25 pan-democratic Members and moved by Mr Alvin YEUNG. Thank you, President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now call upon Mr Alvin YEUNG to reply. Then, the debate will come to a close.

MR ALVIN YEUNG (in Cantonese): President, first of all I wish to thank 35 Members, irrespective of the political parties they belong to, for speaking on this motion.

President, we 25 Members from the pro-democratic camp move this motion to impeach the Chief Executive, but the royalists are determined to defend her. The royalists suffered heavy defeat in last month's District Council Election, the obduracy and incompetence of Carrie LAM were the key factors contributing to the defeat. At the beginning, the royalists were under the command of the Chief Executive, and they worked as one to push forward the "China extradition bill". It can be said that they were taken for a ride on a pirate ship. Unfortunately, even though 240 pro-establishment District Councils Members failed to get re-elected in the District Council Election, Carrie LAM still comfortably occupies the Government House. In the face of governance blunders on the part of the Government, top government officials have chosen to dodge their responsibilities and shift them to their subordinates.

President, it is the misjudgment of public opinion by those in power which has brought Hong Kong to the present state. They would rather deceive themselves than face squarely the fact that Hong Kong people are the ones who long for freedom, democracy and justice. Many of Hong Kong's major trading partners already urged the Government not to introduce the amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance at the early stage. Hong Kong people also warned the Government not to do so. But the Chief Executive still insisted on pushing forward the bill by hypnotizing herself that she was always right. Unfortunately, on the eve of "24 November (DC Election)", those in power were still obsessed with their own judgment and were still misled by their own fake news and they had even misled the Central Government.

President, after a landslide defeat in the District Council Election, Carrie LAM reluctantly announced that an independent Review Committee would be set up—just now the Secretary also tried to convince Hong Kong people that the committee would review the causes of the protests and what improvement should the Government make. After six months, the Chief Executive still sticks to needless duplication and tries to put on a show by asking what can be done to make improvement. Yet Hong Kong people have already told you the answer. The current problem is, this meretricious committee has no statutory power to summon witnesses, thus it cannot probe into police brutality and bring policemen

who have violated the rules to justice. How can this review committee and the toothless tiger—the Independent Police Complaints Council, convince Hong Kong people and the rest of the world?

President, I have to remind officials who are present in this Chamber that the approval rating of your boss is only 19.7. You are under a person whose popular approval rating and legitimacy is basically zero, so on what basis would you defend her?

President, unfortunately, the most terrifying part of the story is that in order to defend the Government in whatever circumstances, pro-establishment Members have continued to defend the amendment to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance which has caused the landslide defeat in the election, and keep on saying that they have nothing to do with that.

President, I wish to make a point and that is, the royalists keep on emphasizing that today's young people—as at today nearly 6 000 people have been arrested, including young people and the youngest is only 11 years old—the royalists keep on emphasizing that these young people have been misled. Actually, have they ever talked to these arrestees and the young people in the street and tried to understand what is on their minds? You have not done that because you are not down to earth. The most worrying thing is that in spite of your defeat, you remain out of touch with reality. You are the ones in power because you make the decision for Hong Kong. But have you ever tried to understand what they need?

Even if we assume that all the people in the street are misled by the pro-democratic camp, what have you done to rectify that? Have you ever tried to get to the root of the problem and salvage them from the abyss of suffering? You have not even tried. Is it because you are incompetent and heartless, or you simply know that but you just pretend that you are ignorant?

President, today's Hong Kong is certainly not the one that we know. It is overwhelmed by a build-up of difficulties and anxieties. Today's Hong Kong is also not the Hong Kong which was eagerly looked forward to by Hong Kong people when the Sino-British Joint Declaration was signed in 1984. Today's Hong Kong has been brought about by this group of officials and the royalists.

What we need now is an opportunity for Hong Kong to be reborn and to start anew. And the first step—certainly this is not the last step—must be the stepping down of Carrie LAM. If she is still reluctant to leave, the Legislative Council may give her a hand.

Just now some pro-establishment Members said that the fate of Carrie LAM would not be decided by Hong Kong people. I cannot help but ask, if that is true, what is the use of Article 73 of the Basic Law? Why should the article be written down in the Basic Law when it was promulgated on 4 April 1990? We are vested with the power but we cannot use it; we can see the problem but we cannot deal with it. We can see that the Chief Executive is still in power even though she can no longer function effectively. If we do not deal with her and let her stay in office, it is tantamount to keeping some rotten food in the refrigerator, the stench of the rotten food will ruin all the stuff in the fridge. This is what we see in Hong Kong now, and the royalists are the accomplices.

President, a man surnamed QIN, a top scorer in the imperial examination in the Qing Dynasty, wrote a poem when he visited the Mausoleum of General YUE Fei: "Ever since the Song Dynasty, people feel ashamed of being named Gui, I feel ashamed of bearing the surname QIN when paying tribute to the General at his tomb."

President, back to the 2019 Hong Kong, what is depicted in the poem applies to Hong Kong now. I met two parents whose children are studying in primary schools. One night, the daughter of one of them cried when she got home. The mother asked what had happened to her and what had made her cry? The daughter said that she was called "Carrie LAM" at her school ...

(Mr CHAN Chi-chuen spoke aloud in his seat)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, please stop speaking aloud in your seat. This is the third time you have spoken aloud in your seat. The Council meeting is in progress right now, please let Mr Alvin YEUNG carry on with his speech.

MR ALVIN YEUNG (in Cantonese): President, the point I wish to make is, this little girl's name is not Carrie, and her surname is not LAM either. However, she was called "Carrie LAM" in school and she felt it an insult. Another parent's son also cried when he got home. The father asked him the reason for that and he said he was called "dirty cop" at his school by some schoolmates.

President, what exactly is going on now? Why our Chief Executive's name has become a tool for small children to insult each other. In the past, many young people had the aspiration of becoming a policeman, but now it is a shame, a humiliation and an insult to be called a policeman, why? This is not something out of the blue, but has been building up slowly over the past six months. All of the aforementioned took place under the noses of many senior officials while they were exercising their powers but they had been indifferent to them.

President, such indifference or the fact they knew something wrong but did not dare to point it out, to tackle it is the problem faced by Hong Kong nowadays.

President, I wish to conclude my speech with the following remarks in English.

MR ALVIN YEUNG: This is the sixth month of protests in Hong Kong. Many foreign friends asked me, why couldn't Hong Kong resolve the situation by sitting down and start negotiating? Right, it was not a bad idea, we all knew it, but the Government has demonstrated a general unwillingness to even acknowledge citizens.

Since 9 June, the Government has published over 300 press releases about the protests, many of them involve condemnation of protesters. Just now, the Chief Secretary repeated that the protests caused chaos, and so the Government must take necessary measures to restore order. He did not say it aloud, but what he meant was the Government would continue to instruct brutal crackdown of protests. We must not forget on 9 June, 1 million citizens demonstrated peacefully against the extradition bill. That very night, the Government said the extradition bill would be submitted to this Council as scheduled. It was only on 12 June, when thousands of people took over the highway junction just outside this Council in protest, that the Government finally decided to suspend the bill several days after. This is a Government that unfortunately registers only to

relatively immoderate ways of expression, and its response is always to shut down opposition.

In September, a so-called "dialogue" became Carrie LAM's new favourite word, but that was really just a word, nothing more. She came out from a town hall meeting once, but acceded to none of the citizens' demands. Her primary goal was to convince participants she was not wrong, not with her wit, tact or sincerity, but with her power and apathy. The attempt to negotiate was, frankly, very much feigned, and that makes the whole pretence of dialogue all the more insulting. Next month in October, she invoked emergency powers to enact a mask ban, a new law to restrain protests, no consultation and no democratic process. That is probably a clear sign she does not actually want to talk.

Under Carrie LAM, increasingly we do not feel safe to express our views, knowing that the consequence might be batons, tear gas, or worse, rubber bullets right through our heads. This is a city we call home, but could not recognize anymore. Carrie LAM could not understand we are a society of free people. We aspire to greater well-being than just material success, and we do not concede our freedom and dignity easily. Her failure to acknowledge this fundamental element of the Hong Kong society reflects her inability to govern our city properly and effectively. As such, the 25 of us are demanding her to step down, and universal suffrage be implemented immediately, so Hong Kong can elect a new leader that truly represents the people's will.

MR ALVIN YEUNG (in Cantonese): President, I hereby urge my colleagues in the Legislative Council to summon their courage—in particular the courage to curse and berate Carrie LAM behind closed doors—to vote for this motion and unseat Carrie LAM so that Hong Kong will have a turning point. I so submit.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Before I put the question, I wish to remind Members that the passage of the motion shall require a majority of each of the two groups of Members, that is, those returned by functional constituencies and those returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, who are present.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Mr Alvin YEUNG be passed. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr Alvin YEUNG rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Alvin YEUNG has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for five minutes.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Pierre CHAN and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the motion.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON

Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan, Mr Kenneth LAU and Mr Tony TSE voted against the motion.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Gary FAN and Mr AU Nok-hin voted for the motion.

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

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 33 were present, 10 were in favour of the motion and 22 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 30 were present, 16 were in favour of the motion and 14 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was negatived.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): As the motion has been negatived, the procedure under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law is terminated.

NEXT MEETING

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now adjourn the Council until 11:00 am on Wednesday, 11 December 2019.

Adjourned accordingly at 7:02 pm.