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MEMBERS' MOTIONS

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Council continues with the debate on the motion on "Reviewing the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme".

Secretary for Labour and Welfare, please speak.

MOTION ON "REVIEWING THE COMPREHENSIVE SOCIAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE SCHEME"

Continuation of debate on motion which was moved on 16 January 2019

SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Cantonese): President, once again, I would like to thank Mr SHIU Ka-chun for proposing the original motion as well as Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr AU Nok-hin for proposing amendments. Thirty-eight Members in total have spoken on this motion. They are all deeply concerned about enhancing the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance ("CSSA") Scheme and the cash assistance system.

As a number of Members spoken have requested the Government to allocate additional resource to assisting the disadvantaged groups, I would like to point out here that the Government and Members share the same goal. In recent years, we have made ambitious resource allocation to improve people's livelihood, so that all strata of society may share the fruits of economic growth. In this, the Government's commitment is clearly evident in the rapid increase in expenditure on cash assistance.

In 2018-2019, the estimated expenditure of the social security system is $55 billion which almost doubles that of six years ago. The relevant figure has not included the expenditure on the comprehensively enhanced Working Family Allowance ("WFA") launched in April 2018. The WFA Scheme has received applications from 50 000 households since its implementation nine months ago. The allowance disbursed is about $800 million, which is significantly higher than the amount before the enhancement.
The original motion of Mr SHIU Ka-chun and a number of Members have expressed concern about the determination mechanism of CSSA rates. As the Under Secretary for Labour and Welfare mentioned in the opening speech, the standard rates under CSSA are adjusted annually according to the Social Security Assistance Index of Prices ("SSAIP"). In the case of a household of four, the average monthly CSSA payment received is $15,182, which is approximately 30% higher than the amount received five years ago. Certainly, individual households may receive a higher amount depending on their situation.

Moreover, the Social Welfare Department ("SWD") will update the weighting system of SSAIP (i.e. the proportion of the relative expenditures of individual categories of goods and services covered by the Index) every five years to better reflect the expenditure patterns of CSSA recipients. The current adjustment mechanism is proven.

As for the rent allowance, a number of Members have expressed their views. In the past, the Government had expressed clearly that we had no intent to conduct an overall review of CSSA Scheme, but we will constantly and continuously examine the various arrangements under the Scheme and introduce targeted measures, and the rent allowance is a case in point. The Community Care Fund ("CCF") has introduced some subsidy items in the past few years for the so-called "actual rent exceeding MRA" cases, where a one-off subsidy will be provided to CSSA households living in rented private housing and paying a rent exceeding the maximum rent allowance under the CSSA Scheme.

In 2017, the subsidy was enhanced. We will keep watch on the implementation of this project and may consider regularizing the arrangement for enhanced rent allowance in future.

In respect of the arrangement for disregarded earnings, we have heard a lot of Members mention the arrangement for disregarded earnings. The objective of the arrangement is to encourage recipients with capability to work to find jobs and remain in employment so as to move towards self-reliance. Under the current arrangement, the first $800 of the monthly earnings from employment of the recipient is totally disregarded, while up to half of the next $3,400 of his/her earnings (i.e., $1,700) is also disregarded, adding up to a total disregarded earnings of $2,500 per month at the maximum.
To encourage CSSA recipients with disabilities to engage in employment, in October 2016, the Government introduced a three-year pilot scheme under CCF to raise the maximum level of disregarded earnings for CSSA recipients with disabilities by 60% from $2,500 to $4,000 per month. SWD will review the effectiveness of this pilot scheme in due course and consider the arrangement in the long run. As I expressed on other occasions some time ago, this may be one of the arrangements we need to review.

Some Members proposed allowing the elderly and persons with disabilities to apply for CSSA on an individual basis. At present, SWD requires that applicants living with their families should apply for CSSA on a household basis. This requirement is founded on the concept that families constitute the core units of our community, and members of the same family should render assistance and support to each other. When income earners of a family can take up the responsibility of supporting their family members who have no financial means, CSSA recipients should first use the financial resources of their family members to meet their basic needs. Under special circumstances, for example, when elderly applicants have a poor relationship with their family members, the Director of Social Welfare will consider such circumstances on a case-by-case basis and may allow an elderly person in need to apply for CSSA on his/her own.

Some Members hope the Government will further expand the portability arrangement for CSSA. I would like to take this opportunity to point out that the portability arrangement for the Social Security Allowance ("SSA") is only applicable to Guangdong and Fujian. The main reason is that there are more Hong Kong citizens residing in these two provinces. In terms of geographical proximity and community bonding, elderly persons residing in the two places may maintain a close tie with their relatives and friends in Hong Kong, which in gist means maintaining connection with Hong Kong. For this reasons, we consider it suitable to extend the portability arrangement to these two provinces. Yet, we have no plan to extend the arrangement to other provinces.

I believe Members must have noticed that we have been increasing the types of subsidy included in the portability arrangement, among which is the Old Age Living Allowance ("OALA"). In the Policy Address of 2018, we announced expanding the coverage of the portability arrangement for these two provinces to include OALA. With the official implementation of the measure, the three-tier social security for the elderly, including CSSA, OALA and the Old Age Allowance, can be collected in these two provinces.
In this debate, a number of Members have mentioned the definition of old age under the elderly CSSA. Many Members said that there had been no communication at all and that the authorities had never discussed the issue with Members. In fact, Members have talked about the developments of the issue in the debate. Regarding the arrangement of adjusting the eligibility age for elderly CSSA from 60 to 65, it is one of the series of social security measures announced in the Policy Address in January 2017. Other measures announced have already been implemented, and they include raising the asset limits for the Normal Old Age Living Allowance, introducing the Higher Old Age Living Allowance and implementing the Fujian Scheme, and so on.

In the same year, the Government presented papers to the Panel on Welfare Services of the Legislative Council to give a clear account of the relevant measures. As Members have also mentioned in the debate, in the past two years, the Government has on various occasions, including the meetings of the Panel on Welfare Services, repeatedly explained the justifications and arrangement for changing the eligibility age for elderly CSSA, and the account given at the time stated that the change would be implemented in the fourth quarter of 2018 the earliest. During the interim, we have had many opportunities of explaining and discussing the issue with Members. Hence, we can hardly accept the criticism that the authorities have not presented the relevant papers, and this is not a sudden change.

In the past couple of weeks, the Government has stressed on various occasions that the purpose of this change is not to cut public expenditure. We stressed that the change was introduced in consideration of the extended life expectancy of the population of Hong Kong and the gradual extension of retirement age to 65 or above in society, hoping the able-bodied, including CSSA recipients, may continue to contribute to society in their workplace. We hope to take this opportunity, and through the discussion today, to clarify certain misunderstandings circulating in the community concerning this arrangement.

I noticed there are reports saying that the arrangement will affect elderly CSSA recipients aged between 60 and 64, and some reports even claim that we will remove CSSA recipients aged between 60 and 64 from the CSSA system, which is untrue. SWD will make an exemption arrangement, grandfathering arrangement, to ensure that persons aged between 60 and 64 who are on elderly CSSA before 1 February 2019 will continue to receive the elderly CSSA rate. As for certain Members who said that we would remove this group of recipients from the system, we hope they will stop disseminating such incorrect messages
which may arouse anxieties among elderly CSSA recipients aged between 60 and 64. In gist, the benefits of these recipients will remain unaffected.

I also noticed the claim that under the new arrangement, people aged between 60 and 64 whose financial needs arise on or after 1 February this year will be facing a welfare "vacuum". A few Members have used this description, but this claim is incorrect.

I hope Members will note that although there is a difference in the amount receivable, these people may still receive CSSA payments. As for persons with disabilities or those in ill health, the amount of CSSA payments receivable will not be affected under the new arrangement. In other words, regardless of their age, be they 50, 40 or 63, they are still entitled to a rate higher than the amount receivable by an able-bodied recipient. As for new able-bodied applicants aged between 60 and 64, they will be granted the basic living protection as able-bodied adults under CSSA.

We will definitely encourage and assist them in moving towards self-reliance. Moreover, by means of inter-departmental cooperation and cooperation with organizations, the Government will provide more focused employment and retraining services to able-bodied CSSA recipients. Certainly, they will benefit from the disregarded earnings arrangement discussed just now.

Some Members mentioned the issue of Article 145 of the Basic Law. Since certain members of the public may apply for judicial review, it is inappropriate for me to give a detailed account here in this Chamber. Yet, I would like to remind Members to refer to the construction of Article 145 of the Basic Law given by the Final Court of Appeal several years ago. We are quite confident that the current arrangement is compliant with Article 145 of the Basic Law.

I believe Members all know that the life expectancy of the people of Hong Kong is increasing. When the CSSA Scheme, formerly known as the Public Assistance Scheme, was first introduced by the Government in 1971, the life expectancy at birth for male was 68 and that for female was 75. To date, the life expectancy at birth has increased to 88 for female and 82 for male. By 2066, the life expectancy for male will increase to 87 and that for female will increase to 93. I believe Members must have also noticed that the life expectancy at birth of the population of Hong Kong will be on a rising trend in the foreseeable future.
I recall watching a news report with former Member Selina CHOW in the Ante-Chamber of the former Legislative Council Building 20 years ago. The news reported a traffic accident involving a woman aged 50-odd, and it was written in the newspaper that "an old woman aged 50" was hit by a car. At that time, Mrs Selina CHOW said immediately that she must be careful when she crossed the road in future, lest she would be described as "an old woman". Do we still see descriptions like "an old man/woman aged 50" today? Will people still say that "it is rare for one to live up to 70 years"?

More often than not, we have some myths about age, and it was seen particularly in the debate yesterday.

For instance, Mr AU Nok-hin mentioned my participation in the cross-harbour swimming event. In fact, I encourage Mr AU Nok-hin to join the cross-harbour swimming event next year with other Members of the Legislative Council, including Mr Vincent CHENG and Mr Kenneth LEUNG. I believe if he practises hard, he can still take part in the cross-harbour swim at the age of 65, 75 or 85. A female senior of mine who is a dozen years older than me is still taking part in the cross-harbour swimming event now. Hence, Members should not put an equal sign between age and sports. Though statistics indicate that there will be a certain degree of discrepancy, it does not mean that a person's ability to do sports will change when a person reaches a certain age.

Second, in the discussion in this Chamber, Members should have a clear understanding of a concept, that is, the difference between manual labour and musculoskeletal disorders. From the angle of work injuries and occupational safety, the so-called musculoskeletal disorder is caused by improper repetitive movements at work or in daily life, and it does not mean that people engaging in manual labour will definitely suffer from musculoskeletal disorder. On the contrary, many people who have engaged in labour will have a younger body and look younger than people who do not labour.

Hence, it does mean that workers engaging in manual labour work will definitely have a higher rate of musculoskeletal disorder. Certainly, if the awareness of occupational safety is low, many job types will cause musculoskeletal disorder. The Labour and Welfare Bureau and the Labour Department will work harder in this aspect with a view to alleviating the concerns of occupational health relating to musculoskeletal disorder resulted from repetitive movements. Hence, Members do not have to confuse the two issues.
Moreover, in the debate yesterday, I heard many other comments, too. For instance, when Prof Joseph LEE spoke on the issue concerning people aged between 60 and 64, he turned to the case of an old woman aged 80 collecting cardboards in his next sentence. Dr Priscilla LEUNG also said that—yet I hope Members will pay attention to their wording in future—it is comparable to "grabbing rice from a beggar's bowl". I believe she did not mean it, yet I hope this kind of offensive language should be avoided. When Dr CHENG Chung-tai talked about the issue concerning people aged between 60 and 64, he talked about a 73-year-old security guard in following sentence. As for Dr KWOK Ka-ki, when he talked about the issue concerning people aged between 60 and 64, he mentioned a cleaning worker aged about 80 in the next sentence.

It is evident that Members are referring to people aged between 70 and 80 as elderly. More often than not, when Members mention persons aged between 60 and 64 in the debate, they will pin some labels, including depriving the benefits of the elderly. Such description and discussion of Members may lead to the misunderstanding that the authorities are cutting the benefits for elderly aged between 70 and 80, but we have no such intent and make no attempt to do so.

In fact, Members all understand this. I have mentioned this in the past, yet Members may not have paid attention to it. On 3 September last year, there was a news report about Russia raising the eligibility age for retirement benefits for male applicants from 60 to 65, and this triggered peaceful demonstrations in various places in the country. In Russia, the average life expectancy of male is 66.4 and that of female is 77.2. In Hong Kong, the average life expectancy of male is 82 and that of female is 88. Hence, it is not an easy task for Russia to postpone the relevant age from 60 to 65, for this is an unwelcomed policy.

This is only one of the examples. If Members check this up on Google or other search engines, they will see that it will arouse disputes if any country raises the eligibility age for retirement benefits. Even in cases where the average life expectancy of the place is far lower than that of Hong Kong, there will be problems. One of the examples is the case in the United Kingdom, where the extension of the eligibility age for retirement benefits from 65 to 67 and then gradually to 68 has triggered riots.
I hope Members will understand that even if this policy is not introduced to the legislature today but five years or 10 years later, we will still come under severe criticisms. Of course, Members are right in saying that many persons aged between 60 and 64 are incapable of working, and that their physical conditions may render them not be suitable for work. In fact, among the existing CSSA recipients aged between 55 and 59, nearly 70% of them are in ill health or with disabilities, and they will not be affected by the policy change. The present policy will only affect able-bodied recipients, who only account for 30% in the age group of 55 to 59.

We will strive to provide appropriate employment services to mature persons. The Labour Department ("LD") has implemented various measures, such as organizing large-scale job fairs for the elderly and the middle-aged and district-based job fairs on part-time employment, and establishing a dedicated webpage for mature job seekers, to facilitate their access to updated employment information and search for suitable job vacancies.

In September 2018, LD further enhanced and renamed the Employment Programme for the Middle-aged as the Employment Programme for the Elderly and Middle-aged. Under the programme, employers engaging mature job seekers aged 60 or above who have left the workforce or are unemployed are offered a monthly on-the-job training allowance of up to $4,000 per employee for a period of 6 to 12 months. Hopefully, this measure will further incentivize employers to employ mature persons.

Members may have heard some news claiming that there will be some changes in the Integrated Employment Assistance Programme for Self-reliance ("IEAPS") run by non-governmental organizations ("NGOs") commissioned by SWD. One of the focuses is hoping that—in about a decade ago, in a one-stop service centre in Tin Shui Wai, we coordinated LD with the Employees Retraining Board through IEAPS to provide services. Our focus is that all IEAPS will hopefully be implemented in future. Hence, though they may not provide services at the same location, we hope that the mode of operation will further realize the goal of providing one-stop services, helping job seekers who certainly include mature people to find employment.
As for the recent concerns expressed in the community about providing further support to CSSA recipients, including persons aged between 60 and 64, in employment and other aspects, we are prepared to continue to listen to specific proposals put forth by stakeholders.

I would like to reiterate that the change of the definition of elderly under the elderly CSSA from 60 to 65 is made in view of the improved life expectancy of the population of Hong Kong and the trend of extending the retirement age to 65 in society but not for the purpose of cutting public expenditure. Through this change, we hope to step up the efforts in providing relevant support, so that able-bodied persons aged between 60 and 64 may obtain a higher income from work and improve their livelihood. As for elderly CSSA recipients aged between 60 and 64 who are already on elderly CSSA before 1 February this year, they will not be affected.

Once again, I must stress that under the CSSA Scheme, all recipients with disabilities or in ill health, regardless of their age, be they below or above 60, will not be requested to work.

Many Members worry that this policy will have a "domino effect". If Members remember the chronology of the relevant developments, this policy decision was announced on 18 January 2017 when the Policy Address of 2017 was presented. Then, in June 2017, the formulation of the Elderly Services Programme Plan was completed and it was accepted by the Government later. The plan provided a thorough discussion on the age definitions for recipients of different elderly care services, and no change was proposed. Hence, the decision of not changing the age definition under elderly services came after the change of the eligibility age for elderly CSSA from 60 to 65. For this reason, it cannot be said that the present change will affect other policies on elderly services. Instead, it states clearly that despite the decision of change in the present policy, other elderly service initiatives will not change after thorough discussion and consideration. I hope Members will not use this justification to instil fear in the persons concerned.

Though we have no plan to conduct an overall review of the CSSA Scheme, we are prepared to listen to the specific approaches proposed by Members for improving the CSSA Scheme and explore ways to fine-tune the system. President, I so submit. Thank you, Honourable Members.
PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now call upon Dr Fernando CHEUNG to move his amendment.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr SHIU Ka-chun's motion be amended.

The amendment moved by Dr Fernando CHEUNG (See the marked-up version at Annex 1)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Dr Fernando CHEUNG to Mr SHIU Ka-chun's motion, be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Dr Fernando CHEUNG rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr Fernando CHEUNG 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 WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Martin LIAO and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr SHIU Ka-fai and Mr CHAN Chun-ying abstained.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Gary FAN, Mr AU Nok-hin and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan voted for the amendment.

Mr Michael TIEN abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 28 were present, 19 were in favour of the amendment, 2 against it and 6 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 29 were present, 28 were in favour of the
amendment and 1 abstained. Since the question was agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was passed.

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

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

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(No hands raised)

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

I order that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of the motion on "Reviewing the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme" or any amendments thereto, this Council do proceed to each of such divisions immediately after the division bell has been rung for one minute.
PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, as Dr Fernando CHEUNG's amendment has been passed, you may move your revised amendment.

MR LEUNG CHE-CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr SHIU Ka-chun's motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG be further amended by my revised amendment.

The further amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Che-cheung to the motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG (See the marked-up version at Annex 2)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That Mr LEUNG Che-cheung's amendment to Mr SHIU Ka-chun's motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr LEUNG Che-cheung rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Che-cheung has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

Functional Constituencies:

Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Martin LIAO and Mr SHIU Ka-fai abstained.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Gary FAN, Mr AU Nok-hin and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan voted for the amendment.

Mr Michael TIEN and Dr CHENG Chung-tai abstained.
THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 29 were present, 23 were in favour of the amendment, 1 against it and 4 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 29 were present, 27 were in favour of the amendment and 2 abstained. Since the question was agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, as the amendments of Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr LEUNG Che-cheung have been passed, you may move your revised amendment.

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr SHIU Ka-chun's motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr LEUNG Che-cheung be further amended by my revised amendment.

The further amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung to the motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr LEUNG Che-cheung (See the marked-up version at Annex 3)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung's amendment to Mr SHIU Ka-chun's motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr LEUNG Che-cheung be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)
Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr SHIU Ka-fai and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok and Mr CHAN Chun-ying abstained.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr KWOK
Wai-keung, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Gary FAN, Mr AU Nok-hin and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan voted for the amendment.

Mr Michael TIEN abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 29 were present, 17 were in favour of the amendment, 5 against it and 6 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 29 were present, 28 were in favour of the amendment and 1 abstained. Since the question was agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki, as the amendments of Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung have been passed, you may move your revised amendment.

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr SHIU Ka-chun's motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung be further amended by my revised amendment.

The further amendment moved by Dr KWOK Ka-ki to the motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung (See the marked-up version at Annex 4)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That Dr KWOK Ka-ki's amendment to Mr SHIU Ka-chun's motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung be passed.
PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you as stated. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Dr KWOK Ka-ki rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr SHIU Ka-fai and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.
Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok and Mr CHAN Chun-ying abstained.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Gary FAN, Mr AU Nok-hin and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan voted for the amendment.

Mr Michael TIEN abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 29 were present, 17 were in favour of the amendment, 6 against it and 5 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 29 were present, 28 were in favour of the amendment and 1 abstained. Since the question was agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr AU Nok-hin, as the amendments of Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung and Dr KWOK Ka-ki have been passed, you may move your revised amendment.
MR AU NOK-HIN (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr SHIU Ka-chun's motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung and Dr KWOK Ka-ki be further amended by my revised amendment.

The further amendment moved by Mr AU Nok-hin to the motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung and Dr KWOK Ka-ki (See the marked-up version at Annex 5)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That Mr AU Nok-hin's amendment to Mr SHIU Ka-chun's motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung and Dr KWOK Ka-ki be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr AU Nok-hin rose to claim a division.

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

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

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

Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Martin LIAO and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Frankie YICK and Mr SHIU Ka-fai abstained.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Gary FAN, Mr AU Nok-hin and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan voted for the amendment.

Mr Michael TIEN abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 29 were present, 22 were in favour of the amendment, 2 against it and 4 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 29 were present, 28 were in favour of the
amendment and 1 abstained. Since the question was agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr SHIU Ka-chun, you still have 53 seconds to reply. Then, the debate will come to a close.

MR SHIU KA-CHUN (in Cantonese): President, CSSA recipients have been aggrieved for 20 years. Twenty years ago in 1999 when the payment rates for able-bodied adult recipients were cut by the Government, LAW Chi-kwong, who was then a Member, opposed the reduction, claiming the move unjustified and tantamount to putting the cart before the horse. Twenty years down the line, however, LAW Chi-kong today stands on the side opposite to the egg, taking the lead to cut the CSSA rate. His reply just now was disappointing, bearing testimony to the fact that the Government always has the last word, doubly so for the rich and not at all for the poor. I thank again the five Members who have proposed amendments and the 32 Members who have spoken. I implore all Members to support my motion in an effort to speak up for the poor and right the wrong done to CSSA recipients.

By actually tightening the eligibility age for elderly CSSA, the Government is basically undermining the social security system. This Council is clear in its stance in demanding the immediate shelving of the measure to tighten the age requirement for elderly CSSA. Shelve immediately the measure to tighten the age requirement for elderly CSSA. Thank you. (The buzzer sounded)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr SHIU Ka-chun, please stop speaking.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Mr SHIU Ka-chun, as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr AU Nok-hin 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 SHIU Ka-chun rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr SHIU Ka-chun has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the motion as amended.

Mr Martin LIAO and Mr Tony TSE voted against the motion as amended.

Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Frankie YICK and Mr SHIU Ka-fai abstained.

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

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, Mr Paul TSE, Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Gary FAN, Mr AU Nok-hin and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan voted for the motion as amended.

Mr Michael TIEN abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 29 were present, 23 were in favour of the motion as amended, 2 against it and 3 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 29 were present, 28 were in favour of the motion as amended and 1 abstained. Since the question was agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the motion as amended was passed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Debate on motion with no legislative effect.

Motion on "Increasing housing supply in the short to medium term to rectify the problem of public housing shortage".

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

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

MOTION ON "INCREASING HOUSING SUPPLY IN THE SHORT TO MEDIUM TERM TO RECTIFY THE PROBLEM OF PUBLIC HOUSING SHORTAGE"

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): President, I move that the motion, as printed on the Agenda, be passed.
Honourable colleagues know what the motion on the Agenda is about, but members of the public now watching television or listening to the live broadcast may not have any idea. So I am reading it out: "That this Council urges the Government to adopt the following measures to increase public housing supply in the short to medium term: (1) to invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance for the massive resumption of brownfield sites and idle agricultural lands in the New Territories, so as to open up new development areas for housing construction purpose; (2) to fully resume the 172-hectare site of the Fanling Golf Course for developing housing and relevant ancillary facilities; (3) to conduct studies on converting the use of the site which has been reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland to public housing development; (4) to negotiate with the Central Government for releasing certain idle or under-utilized military sites in Hong Kong for housing development purpose; (5) to effect the participation of the Hong Kong Housing Authority in the 'Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid' under the Hong Kong Housing Society, and to discuss the scheme with the Hong Kong Housing Society with a view to allowing owners to let their entire flats, subject to a pro-rata sharing of their rental incomes with the Government—which simply means letting Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS") flats with premium unpaid—(6) to formulate redevelopment plans for aged public housing estates for the expeditious redevelopment of certain aged public housing estates with higher residual plot ratios, so as to increase the supply of public housing units; and (7) to use the land resumed by the Urban Renewal Authority for developing subsidized housing (e.g. the 'Starter Homes' Scheme for Hong Kong Residents)."

On the New Year's Eve of 2018, the Task Force on Land Supply ("Task Force") released the results of a 15-month public consultation exercise, and made eight key recommendations, including developing brownfield sites, the golf course and the East Lantau Metropolis. My original motion and the nine amendments concern a number of recommendations of the Task Force. Members from the Democratic Party and I will spell out our views on various measures to increase land supply.

As regards the press conference held by the Task Force and the brief response given by the Chief Executive a week later, it is worth noting that several episodes have left a deep impression on me, which may help us discern how Mrs LAM and her administration see the role of the Task Force. First, on the day of the press conference of the Task Force, Chairman Stanley WONG and Vice-chairman Greg WONG were virtually made to stand for an hour. Second,
at the press conference before the meeting of the Executive Council last week, Mrs LAM approved of the Task Force's recommendations relating to brownfield sites and reclamation. But when it came to the golf course, she said it would be subject to the consultation on the Review on Policy of Private Recreational Leases conducted by the Home Affairs Bureau, and added (I quote), "Whether to adopt the recommendations of the study should be considered in the interests of Hong Kong, which is the thing that a responsible government should do … it would be irresponsible for the Government to uncritically accept what it is told by every consultant." (unquote)

If members of the public who have kept an eye on the news link together such events as the aforesaid episodes, the recent measure to raise the eligibility age for elderly Comprehensive Social Security Assistance, the rationalization of traffic distribution among the three road harbour crossings, and the announcement of proposals like the half-baked Lantau Tomorrow programme in the Policy Address last year, they should be able to draw the conclusion that Mrs LAM and her team actually have a predetermined idea in mind. For an option that she thinks is correct, the public need only to choose whether to "take it or leave it". It is my further view that Mrs LAM thinks the Task Force serves only to endorse her position. That was why I already foretold months ago that the buck would be passed to Stanley WONG for failure, while the credit would go to Mrs Carrie LAM for success.

Mrs LAM certainly has a background as a dominant type of Administrative Officer. But I have a piece of advice for Mrs LAM. When handling public policies, particularly land and housing issues, such egotism will only provoke public anger, and a hasty approach will get her nowhere. To quote from Stanley WONG, no land option can be a "painless proposal". If Mrs LAM and her team still insist that the burden should only be borne by some people, or are still biased in favour of certain options, such as the golf course, how can she win public trust? How can she convince the community that she is looking out for public interests in her search for land? How will the affected parties, such as those who have had their lands resumed, readily concede?

Going back to my motion, President, the seven recommendations actually all seek to identify as much land as possible for housing construction or release more existing flats for rental purpose in the shortest possible time. Even if it is not a total solution to the housing problems plaguing the community, it can at least improve the existing atrocious living conditions. The Democratic Party
therefore holds that the short- and medium-term measures should focus on the existing developable sites. For example, we may consider the brownfield sites, the golf course and the site reserved for the Hong Kong Disneyland mentioned in the motion, requesting the Central Government to seriously examine the use of idle or grossly under-utilized military sites, or even developing those sites originally zoned for "Village Type Development".

President, Members may have repeatedly quoted the following data in the Chamber, but I think I should recap briefly. First, at the end of September 2018, there were about 150,000 general applications for public rental housing ("PRH"), with an average waiting time of 5.5 years, and there were 117,000 non-elderly one-person applications. Second, on the issue of subdivided units, according to the data of the 2016 Population By-census, there were at the time 93,000 subdivided units with about 210,000 persons living therein, and the per capita area of accommodation was 56.5 square feet, while the standard for PRH is 75 square feet. Third, there were about 261,000 applications for HOS flats in 2018, representing an over-subscription rate of around 58 times. Fourth, as estimated by the Government in the latest Long Term Housing Strategy Annual Progress Report 2018, even if the sites under planning can be delivered on time for housing development, only about 248,000 PRH flats can be provided, which still lags behind the supply target of 315,000 units by one third.

As far as we understand, apart from households on the PRH Waiting List, there are a large number of White Form applicants whose applications for HOS flats have been unsuccessful for many times. But the relevant statistics are not available as the Hong Kong Housing Authority has never conducted any such survey. This group of people also have continuing demand for housing, and policy-wise, the Government should actually introduce measures to increase the rate of success for them. But given the shortage of land in Hong Kong today, we just cannot get the best of both worlds. Allocation of flats for them will affect other applicants for HOS flats. After all, the root cause is still an acute shortage of supply.

In view of the aforesaid analysis and data, if Mrs LAM and her team still think that they can skip the development of the golf course and rely solely on reclamation or treating it as a panacea, they are being unresponsive to the pressing situation faced by members of the public. It would be unrealistic to have these people wait for 15 or 20 years before their housing issues can be addressed by the Lantau Tomorrow programme.
President, perhaps let me raise two more points which are relatively controversial. First, as estimated by Hong Kong 2030+, our overall land requirement would be about 4 800 hectares in the future. Even with the development of all existing projects, there would still be a shortfall of about 1 220 hectares. Hence, the focus should be placed on the existing developable sites, semi-developable sites, as well as brownfield sites and agricultural lands in the New Territories held by developers, which measure 760 hectares and 1 000 hectares respectively. The Democratic Party opines that even if only 30% to 40% (around 540 hectares to 700 hectares) of them can be secured for development under the new development area approach, it can solve at least half of the problems relating to housing supply.

Moreover, President, as regards military sites, I find it interesting that a number of amendment movers from the pro-establishment camp have deleted the fourth point that reads "to negotiate with the Central Government for releasing certain idle or under-utilized military sites in Hong Kong for housing development purpose" in my motion. I cannot but point out that my motion only suggests that we may negotiate with the Central Government. If the Central Government indicates that it still requires the military site, or that it is not in a position to give us details for reason of relatively complex and sensitive military purposes, but the site remains useful, then that will do. At the very least, Hong Kong people will think that the Central Government has considered the issue, and the SAR Government has also examined the issue with the Central Government or urged it to do so. Nevertheless, what is the point for them to delete that? Can we not even ask or request the Central Government to examine whether those sites no longer in use may be released for social development purpose?

Furthermore, in the past, the Central Government actually returned a few military sites no longer in use to Hong Kong. In other words, does it mean that we cannot negotiate with the Central Government, and can just wait and pray, hoping that it will suddenly realize that certain sites held by it are no longer in use and return them to us, but we must never initiate a request or question? What kind of attitude is that? We are facing major housing and social problems, and as stated by me earlier, I believe the Central Government is actually more concerned about the risk of social unrest posed by the problem of housing shortage in Hong Kong than the SAR Government is. In that case, why can we not request the Central Government to examine whether this can become one of the options to be studied? Or should we act as if nothing has happened and
refrain from raising any question or request to the Central Government in respect of the sites belonging to it, even if they no longer have any use? What kind of mentality is that?

The policy of "one country, two systems" is actually very simple. If we bring the predicament of Hong Kong to the attention of the Central Government, I just do not believe it will query our intention to raise the issue or whether we are exerting pressure on it. But then again, it may not necessarily be done openly. After we have made such a request to the Government, it may work out because we, including Members from the pro-establishment camp, now share the common view that the Central Government seems to think highly of Mrs Carrie LAM, who has the honour to walk side by side with President Mr XI. Since she has ample opportunities to have contact with President Mr XI, who is the Chairman of the Central Military Commission, she may as well raise this issue. Is that impossible? I really wonder what Honourable colleagues are thinking about.

Anyway, I do not think there is any plan that does not come with a painful option. This morning, I have come across news about Brexit, which is actually also a knotty issue. And now we are debating housing problems in the Chamber. The debate today may bring a hopeful future or may bring members of the public a helpless and hopeless future. I therefore think that on this critical issue that affects our next generation and the one that follows as well as the long-term development, we are obliged to make a tough decision and propose the best possible plan. In order that the Chief Executive can make a daring decision leaving aside all subjective wishes or even some politically-driven scrambles for interests, we should offer the best advice.

Mr James TO moved the following motion: (Translation)

"That, in the recently announced Long Term Housing Strategy, the Government has revised the new public and private housing supply in the 10-year period from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029 to a ratio of 7:3; however, due to inadequate supply of land for housing construction, it is anticipated that public housing supply in the short to medium term will fail to meet the expected target; in this connection, this Council urges the Government to adopt the following measures to increase public housing supply in the short to medium term:
(1) to invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance for the massive resumption of brownfield sites and idle agricultural lands in the New Territories, so as to open up new development areas for housing construction purpose;

(2) to fully resume the 172-hectare site of the Fanling Golf Course for developing housing and relevant ancillary facilities;

(3) to conduct studies on converting the use of the site which has been reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland to public housing development;

(4) to negotiate with the Central Government for releasing certain idle or under-utilized military sites in Hong Kong for housing development purpose;

(5) to effect the participation of the Hong Kong Housing Authority in the 'Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid' under the Hong Kong Housing Society, and to discuss the scheme with the Hong Kong Housing Society with a view to allowing owners to let their entire flats, subject to a pro-rata sharing of their rental incomes with the Government;

(6) to formulate redevelopment plans for aged public housing estates for the expeditious redevelopment of certain aged public housing estates with higher residual plot ratios, so as to increase the supply of public housing units; and

(7) to use the land resumed by the Urban Renewal Authority for developing subsidized housing (e.g. the 'Starter Homes' Scheme for Hong Kong Residents)."

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Mr James TO be passed.
PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Nine Members will move amendments to this motion. This Council will conduct a joint debate on the motion and the amendments.

I will call upon Members who will move the amendments to speak in the following order: Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Tony TSE, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Ms Alice MAK, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Gary FAN, Mr Wilson OR, Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Dr Junius HO, but they may not move their amendments at this stage.

IR DR LO WAI-KWOK (in Cantonese): President, the short supply of housing in Hong Kong tops the list of livelihood issues that are of concern to people from various strata. In the recently announced Long Term Housing Strategy, the Government set the housing supply target in the 10-year period from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029 at 450,000 units, and at the same time revised the ratio of public to private housing supply to 7:3. However, without flour, where will bread come from? If there is no proper planning of housing sites to ensure steady supply in the long term, any long-term housing strategy may merely turn out to be "drawing a cake to allay hunger". Given the acute shortage of land supply for housing, it is by no means easy for public housing supply to achieve the expected target in the short-to-medium term.

President, to resolve the problem of housing supply, it is necessary to make every effort to explore land. In this connection, various sectors in society must seek the greatest consensus and conduct proper planning to avoid the practice of "treating the head when there is a headache and treating the leg when there is an aching leg". In September 2017, the Chief Executive set up the Task Force on Land Supply ("the Task Force") to promote discussion in society on the overall land supply strategy and priorities of the relevant options and then make recommendations to the Government. The Task Force launched a public engagement exercise entitled "Land for Hong Kong: Our Home, Our Say" and submitted a report to the authorities at the end of last year. As pointed out by many members of the community, the efforts of the Task Force are worthy of recognition, but the Task Force set out different land supply options in the public engagement exercise like a "dim sum order form", oversimplifying the intricate land supply issue. Adverse consequences which might be brought by certain options would easily be overlooked. The resulting policy recommendations would inevitably be biased.
A most obvious case in point is that the report of the Task Force listed "alternative uses of sites under private recreational leases" as one of the three short-to-medium term options and considered "it is worthwhile for the Government to accord priority to studying and resuming the 32 hectares of land of the Fanling Golf Course to the east of Fan Kam Road under the partial option". However, this recommendation has aroused a great controversy. Many members of the community find the Fanling Golf Course unsuitable for housing development. The factors of consideration include the unique value of the golf course in such aspects as heritage, natural ecology, sports, tourism development, etc. Moreover, since 1959, international golf tournaments have been hosted annually in the Fanling Golf Course. Rash resumption of the golf course will certainly affect the development of golf sport in Hong Kong and Hong Kong's international image. Besides, according to the Preliminary Feasibility Study on Developing the New Territories North completed in February 2018 by the project consultant commissioned by the Planning Department and the Civil Engineering and Development Department, even if the whole golf course is resumed for development, the number of housing units which can be constructed will not be large. The actual operation will not be as easy as what is said in the community either. Full or partial reprovisioning of the site will take time. There is also the need to broaden transport infrastructure such as Fan Kam Road and even to relocate the aqueduct for conveying Dongjiang water. Hence, I think the Special Administrative Region ("SAR") Government should prudently consider various land supply options recommended by the Task Force from the overall interest of society. It is inappropriate to accept all of them in entirety.

Nevertheless, I believe we all agree with the view of the Task Force that the actual land shortage in Hong Kong is far more than 1200 hectares as estimated in "Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030", and the situation of land shortage in the short term is particularly dire. Concerning how to effectively find more land, society must hold rational discussion and reach the greatest consensus as soon as possible. In my view, before examining the pros and cons of different land supply options in depth, we should affirm two basic premises and principles. First, the SAR Government must expeditiously formulate an overall land development strategy with greater courage and commitment. It must adopt diversified planning proposals with a more pragmatic and convenient approach to increase land supply so as to build up a long-term land reserve for flexible adjustment of land supply. It must also formulate long-term infrastructure planning to expedite the planning of land suitable for residential purpose for constructing public, private and
subsidized housing. Moreover, while increasing housing supply, it is necessary to strike a balance between development and conservation. The overall development of the economy, people's livelihood and society, including the development of industries, culture and arts, recreational and sports facilities, transport networks and community facilities, also need to be considered to dovetail with Hong Kong's sustainable development in the long term.

President, the Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong and I have all along been concerned about the means to increase land supply to satisfy the needs for the development of Hong Kong economy and people's livelihood. We have made suggestions to the SAR Government for many times. The most recent example is our submission to the Chief Executive in September last year consisting of 30 recommendations in eight major domains involving development and exploration of land in respect of the subject of land supply mentioned in the Policy Address. We emphasized that the authorities must adopt diversified planning proposals, including proactively promoting reclamation at suitable sites outside the Victoria Harbour, speeding up the development of rock caverns and underground space, raising the plot ratio under specific conditions, revising land uses, expediting land resumption and redevelopment, and taking forward various expansion plans for new development areas and new towns. As regards specific proposals for the short, medium and long term, some of the contents can be seen in the amendment proposed by me.

Regarding policy initiatives in the short-to-medium term, we hold that the authorities should enhance the role of the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA") as a facilitator in urban redevelopment. The land resumed by URA can be used expeditiously for developing subsidized housing and to expedite the formulation of redevelopment plans for aged public housing estates while relaxing the plot ratios of urban sites can facilitate full utilization of land and increase housing supply. The authorities should also study further invocation of the Lands Resumption Ordinance to set up a flexible and transparent compensation mechanism and promote public-private partnership for expeditious resumption of brownfield sites and idle agricultural land in the New Territories, thereby opening up new development areas for the construction of housing. Besides, on the premise of protecting country parks, green belt areas of relatively low ecological value should be developed for the construction of housing. It is estimated that by rezoning only 3% (about 10 sq km) of the green belt areas, 270 000 housing units can be provided.
As regards the long-term development strategy, we hold that the authorities should consider afresh the construction of a railway between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun with a "supply-driven" mindset, so as to bring new impetus for further development of New Territories West and in turn develop the land along the railway for massive provision of new sites for residential, industrial and commercial purposes. Meanwhile, instead of remaining indecisive on the reclamation proposals for land creation and housing development presented in the Policy Address, the Government should put forth comprehensive and long-term reclamation planning and specific reclamation proposals, and present to the Legislative Council proposals for reclamation in areas such as the east of Lantau Island. It should also apply for funding for preliminary studies to commence the relevant reclamation plan expeditiously.

President, despite the urgent need to find more land for construction of more housing in Hong Kong, we must bear in mind not to recklessly catch at straws. For example, the original motion mentioned converting the use of the site reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland to public housing development. The Hong Kong Disneyland is an important tourist attraction and there is indeed the need to reserve land for its expansion and development. The proposal in the original motion on releasing certain military sites in Hong Kong for housing development is both unrealistic and unacceptable. According to Article 14 of the Basic Law, the Central People's Government shall be responsible for the defence of Hong Kong. This proposal in the original motion has obviously neglected the historical background of and specific arrangements for the reunification of Hong Kong, the sovereign right and legal basis of the country for stationing military forces in Hong Kong, and the relevant provisions of the Law of the People's Republic of China on Garrisoning the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

President, to effectively expand land supply, the authorities certainly should foster a consensus in society. At the same time, it needs to set up a high-level inter-departmental coordination mechanism to rationalize and strengthen the coordination of the duties and procedures of the relevant government departments in respect of land supply, with a view to expediting the process of increasing land supply.

With these remarks, President, I hope Honourable colleagues will support my amendment.
MR TONY TSE (in Cantonese): President, first, I thank Mr James TO for putting forth this Motion and affording this Council the opportunity to have another debate on the important topic of increasing housing supply. However, given my reservation to most of the seven suggestions about increasing housing supply in the short-to-medium term set out in the original motion, I have thus proposed an amendment.

As a start, in respect of developing brownfield sites and agricultural lands, the Task Force on Land Supply has pointed out in its report published at the end of last year that developing brownfield sites was the option with the greatest support among the public. The option of developing agricultural lands in the New Territories has also gained a fairly high level of support meanwhile. However, as indicated in the report, the development of brownfield sites or agricultural lands involve such complicated issues as land resumption and compensation, reaccommodation of the operations on brownfield sites and agricultural lands, as well as transportation and community facilities. It is not an option that will yield quick results. Nor can the resumption of swathes of brownfield sites or agricultural lands be achieved smoothly by relying solely on invoking the Lands Resumption Ordinance.

While I have incorporated in my amendment the idea of adopting a public-private partnership approach in the development of brownfield sites and agricultural lands, it does not mean that I find such an approach superior over mandatory resumption in all cases. I simply wish to float an additional option so that the Government can adopt the more effective model for a specific site or project, in a multi-pronged approach to expedite the identification of sites for housing construction.

Regarding the site of the Fanling golf course ("FGC"), I have, as a matter of fact, suggested that a study could be conducted to determine whether there are other better uses for the site. However, such a study must be objective and scientific, covering such issues as the impacts on the future development of golf as a sport in Hong Kong, how the historical buildings, old trees, graves of indigenous inhabitants inside FGC as well as the ecological problems would be handled. We should not bypass any planning studies, environmental and traffic impact assessments, etc., on the excuse of public support alone.

Many members of the public are concerned about environmental protection, conservation and transportation facilities, stressing that the statutory consultation procedures and requirements in respect of town planning and
environmental impact assessment must be properly observed when it comes to large-scale development project. In this connection, a double standard, where the proper procedures are ignored and an in-depth study denied, should not be applied on FGC.

On the site reserved for the second phase development of Disneyland, while I posed an oral question in this Council last year and expressed my frustration over the site being left idle under the sun for so long, I also think that with Hong Kong being a place where the rule of law reigns, the spirit of contract must be respected. Hence, I requested the Government to study whether it has the right for early resumption of the site. I also have reservations about developing public housing on the site as proposed in the original motion. First, there could be noise and air pollution problems, as pointed out in Mr CHU Hoi-dick's amendment. Second, in terms of transport and community facilities, unless links of railway and road between the Northwest New Territories, Lantau Island, the proposed artificial islands in the central waters and Hong Kong Island have been established with the implementation of the Lantau Tomorrow Vision, the site may not be suitable for high-density housing development.

Point 5 of the original motion proposes that the "Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid" be effected. While owners of Home Ownership Schemes ("HOS") flats are allowed to let part or a room of their flats under the government proposal, the original motion and some of the amendments propose a study on the possibility of letting entire flats. I cannot agree to such a suggestion. In my view, subsidized sale flats—whether under the Hong Kong Housing Society or the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA")—are in themselves a form of social benefit in which those in need are being subsidized for buying flats with public money from taxpayers. If the owners concerned have already secured proper accommodation—be it acquired or rented—elsewhere or emigrated, they are presumably capable of meeting their housing needs on their own without asking the Government and taxpayers for help. It stands to reason that, instead of being allowed to rent out entire subsidized sale flats and pocket the rentals, they should relinquish their flats so that those who are more in need can move in.

This is precisely the reasoning behind my proposal to establish a buyback mechanism for subsidized sale flats. At present, owners of subsidized sale flats—whether under HOS, the Green Form Subsidized Home Ownership Scheme, the "Starter Homes" Pilot Scheme for Hong Kong Residents, or the now
obsolete Sandwich Class Housing Scheme—can freely put their flats up for sale in the private market after paying the relevant premium at the end of the alienation restriction period. A flat sold in such a way represents a corresponding reduction in the total stock of subsidized sale flats. Hence, I suggest that newly constructed subsidized sale flats in future should be bought back by the Government and HA and resold to eligible households after refurbishment so that the supply of subsidized housing can be maintained.

Apart from the issue of supply, there is also the issue of fairness. It is currently more difficult to strike it lucky in a ballot draw for HOS flats than win the Mark Six Lottery. Allowing owners of subsidized sale flats to resell their units in private—whether doing so with the relevant premium fully paid or selling to Green Form or White Form applicants without paying the premium—will, in most cases enrich the original owners as a certain level of premium for winning the draw will inevitably be involved. With the prices of HOS flats being lowered to 52% of the market going rates, speculation on second-hand HOS flats would likely exacerbate. Those who strike it lucky in the ballot draw for subsidized sale flats would make even bigger profits when they resell their flats while those who do not would feel more indignant still. This should not be the way in which housing schemes subsidized by taxpayers turn out. As for what qualifies as a reasonable buyback rate, I initially propose a sum equivalent to the average appreciation of house prices over the relevant period on top of the purchase price, which would allow an original owner to make a reasonable return in asset appreciation. I hope Members will support such a principle of government buyback, specifics of which can be discussed in detail in the future.

Regarding the issue of fairness, I mentioned earlier that the balloting system of subsidized sale flats should be reformed so that those who are cursed with bad luck (i.e. having failed several times to win the draw) would have a higher chance of making the cut in future. Due to time constraint, I will explain the details of this proposal on other occasions and will not go into them now.

Another proposal in my amendment is to increase transitional housing on all fronts, including optimizing the use of, among others, idle government sites, vacant school premises, and the rooftops, storerooms and empty bays in existing public housing estates. Since similar suggestions have also been made in other amendments, I shall leave the explanation to other colleagues.
I now wish to focus my discussion on the proposal which calls for the Government to formulate measures for encouraging private landowners to convert idle agricultural lands into transitional housing. It is announced in the latest Policy Address that measures to revitalize industrial buildings will be relaunched and enhanced. Such measures include allowing the wholesale conversion or partial conversion of several floors of industrial buildings for transitional housing, which is an idea I support. That said, comparing with industrial buildings, many of the idle agricultural lands in private hands are more conveniently located. Backed by the right policies from the Government, these lands could, as a matter of fact, be more suitable and more readily and cheaply available for transitional housing construction. A multi-win situation could be achieved if the Government puts in place measures to facilitate the swift and legal construction of transitional housing by these landowners and requires them to hand over part of the units to the Government or HA for allocation to those in need, such as families being waitlisted for public housing for an extended period of time or those living in subdivided units and paying exorbitant rentals. I hope the Government can give serious consideration to this proposal.

I so submit, President, and hope that Members will support my amendment.

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): President, to start with, I would like to thank Mr James TO for moving this motion to provide us with the opportunity to discuss this topic which is of great concern of most HongKongers.

Dr LAW Chi-kwong talked about myths just now. It is very popular to talk about myths nowadays. Let us talk about the myths of Hong Kong as well. The Hong Kong Government has constantly claimed that there is insufficient land and the situation is very critical, such that it is necessary to construct two artificial islands with a total area of 1 700 hectares to solve the problem. Some people have raised that if land is not available in Hong Kong, with almost 210 000 people living in subdivided units and nearly 300 000 people inadequately housed, will the situation in Hong Kong be very dangerous? Is there an acute land shortage in Hong Kong?

The second myth involves the tragic character Stanley WONG, who was entrusted with an important tasked by Carrie LAM a few months ago to stage a "big show" for studying the long-term housing supply. Why is this a myth? Let me talk about the first myth of Stanley WONG. As we all know, Carrie
LAM served as the Secretary for Development for a long time before she took office—she was the predecessor of the Secretary's predecessor—and she also served as the Permanent Secretary. Being a "good fighter", she indicated back then her intention to deal with village houses with unauthorized building works in the New Territories and to amend the New Territories small house policy on indigenous inhabitants. She was rather familiar with the land and housing issues of Hong Kong. Yet, we say that she is trying to play dumb and pretends that she suddenly does not know how to handle the problems of the long-term housing supply, and hence she has to seek help from Stanley WONG.

The appearance of Stanley WONG was really a tragedy. He spent so much time arriving at some decisions after staging such a "big show", including returning the 172-hectare golf course to the public, handling the brownfields as soon as possible, and saying that he did not know how to comment on the reasons why the area of reclamation was increased from 1 000 hectares to 1 700 hectares. Carrie LAM has yet to make any response so far, but she then says that—I feel a chill down my spine when speaking of it now—would it not be very stupid for the Government to accept all the views received during the consultation. The Government is so lousy that they would accept whatever others say. What kind of attitude is it? Stanley WONG and his team held meetings with them day in and day out, but they do not know how to respond on an issue as simple as the handling of the golf course. What kind of Government is this? They always say that Hong Kong people are so miserable and that they lived in subdivided units when they were small. Hong Kong now possesses nearly 6 000 hectares of land, but it cannot be used.

Some community organizations have now pointed out that it is inaccurate for the Government to claim that 1 300 hectares of land is required. At least 1 500 hectares of brownfields are needed. They might have touched the sore spot of the Government, so the latter does not give a response first, saying that further studies are necessary. While 900 hectares of land—that is, almost 1 000 hectares of land—has been reserved for the construction of small houses, nearly 1 000 hectares of land is in the hands of the major landowners, and some 2 000 hectares of land has been set aside for use by the People's Liberation Army. There are still nearly 6 000 hectares of land in Hong Kong doing sunbath every day. However, the Government says that there is insufficient land and 1 700 hectares of land has to be reclaimed.
Second, the Government is very smart. When it talks about public rental housing ("PRH") in regard to housing supply, it is actually referring to the "Green Form Subsidized Home Ownership Scheme" ("GSH"). I recall that Carrie LAM—I forget whether it was before or after she took office—said in the newspaper that every PRH flat constructed would lead to a loss but every Home Ownership Scheme flat sold will bring a gain. Therefore, she now has to stage a "big show" for the sake of launching GSH. In fact, the Chief Executive is indeed very smart. It is a waste for her not going into business. When members of the public are waiting to be housed, she asks them to buy a flat. As long as people would buy a flat, she will supply it. Members of the public owe a debt after buying a flat and "play" the land policy with her, and then she will let people have a dwelling. Is her not extremely smart?

Third, the Government says that no land is available, but according to the analysis by Professor NG Mee-kam of The Chinese University of Hong Kong, there are more than 9,680 hectares of unplanned land in Hong Kong. In fact, the Secretary has no reason to say that he does not know Prof NG Mee-kam, and it is impossible that he does not know there are 9,680 hectares of unplanned land. However, he will certainly not put it forward, nor will he discuss with us as the Government and the property developers are all "playing" the high land price policy. The Secretary looks very miserable during land sales every quarter, saying that the Government has no land and only 2,000 or 3,000 units can be squeezed out. As we all know, the land at Kai Tak has not been sold out to date after the relocation of the airport. How ridiculous is this? There are so many people waiting for a flat in Hong Kong, but the land has not been sold out after 21 years. The Government has even pretended to construct a few more PRH buildings, as if it is an act of kindness. To put it bluntly, the Government is "playing" a game of land and property prices with all of us. When Prof NG Mee-kam explained the reasons for implementing reclamation, she remarked that when the colonial Government came to Hong Kong, it regarded the indigenous inhabitants as barbarians, thinking that it would be difficult to deal with them. Therefore, the Government did not discuss with them but carried out reclamation on its own as there were no other alternatives. It was the best way because they were afraid, and I believe it is also true and justifiable.

The Chief Executive is now the master of the house, but the problem does not lie in the indigenous inhabitants at present. The major landowners are the most vicious nowadays but she dare not touch them because these people, together with their subordinates and puppets, are all members of the Election
Committee for the election of the Chief Executive who have elected Carrie LAM. In view of this, we all know that there is a structural failure in Hong Kong. Now, half of the young people wish to leave Hong Kong if you ask them. According to the findings of a survey conducted by a university recently, young people have no hope at all. It is because they are aware of, and they also see through what the Government is doing. There are currently 210,000 people living in subdivided units, but the Government presents them with Lantau Tomorrow which will take 20 or 30 years. They are now in their twenties but will only be housed when they reach the age of 50, having to wait 20-odd years. Is it crazy?

The brownfields cannot be used. The landowners' houses and land cannot be used. The idle land cannot be used. The golf course cannot be used. The land for the New Territories inhabitants to build small houses cannot be used. Everything cannot be used, but we have to wait for Lantau Tomorrow which will not be realized until 20 or 30 years later. It should be "Catastrophe Tomorrow" instead. Therefore, would the Government please do not put on a show anymore. If it is acting for the good of the public, any land can be used. The tragic character Stanley WONG should also come out, but he is playing dumb, pretending that he has heard nothing, does not know how to respond and does not know how to make a response. What is wrong with it? With the 6,000 hectares of land currently on hand, together with the 9,680 hectares of unplanned land, the Government tells HongKongers that no land is available now. If you place your faith in the Government, you will be blind for sure. Yet, the most shameful is that many people are also playing dumb in this Chamber, pretending that they know nothing, standing on the side of the Government by giving Lantau Tomorrow an applause.

However, we all know that the expenditure involved in Lantau Tomorrow will anyway be expended as a "tribute" to somebody. The purchase of marine sand alone will cost hundreds of billions of dollars—the marine sand currently used at the airport also costs some $60 billion—many state-owned enterprises are waiting to reap this sum of money. If the Government decides to take this approach, continues to rest on its laurels and lies every day, it is destined to be cast aside by all HongKongers. I have said once just now, the Government is too fat even to put on their socks, but they say that they have no money to support those people aged 60 to 64. There is plenty of land in Hong Kong. The Government does not use any but says that no land is available. The public will know that.
The private treaty grant now under discussion is actually sheer fantasy. Constructing infrastructure with money out of the public coffers, and then wait for a bid from the other party. What is it if it is not a collusion between the Government and the business sector? The other party would only make a bid after the Government has paved the way for it, whereas the Town Planning Board comprises wholly of members of their clique. Faced with all of these, the Government is incapable of invoking the Land Resumption Ordinance. As a matter of fact, from 1997 to the present, the Government has invoked the Land Resumption Ordinance in 2001, 2002, 2008, 2011, 2014 and 2016—I am not going to cite such examples one by one—for the construction of PRH, residential care homes for the elderly, etc. It has been done for whatever purposes, but the Government says that it cannot be invoked arbitrarily. Of course, it should not be used arbitrarily. They are all tyrants, property developers are tyrants, and the indigenous inhabitants are also tyrants. Yet, the Government can bully those living in subdivided units and subdivided units in industrial buildings. While they have no money, the Government just wants to "claim their life when they are sick" and would only be satisfied by reaping even greater profits through launching GSH.

What a shameful Government it is. I so submit.

MS ALICE MAK (in Cantonese): President, the Government has just released the Long Term Housing Strategy Annual Progress Report 2018 which projected the 10-year total housing supply target at 460 000 units, and the public/private housing split will be revised for the first time to 70:30. The Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions ("FTU") welcomes the Government's acceptance of our ongoing petition for increasing the public housing ratio.

However, we can see that public housing supply could not reach the target in the past few years. A ratio adjustment will be of little help in increasing public housing production volume and alleviating the housing issue facing the grassroots in Hong Kong. This upward adjustment of the ratio to 70:30 announced in the Annual Progress Report signifies a higher demand of public housing in the next 10 years. At least some 33 000 units have to be built annually in order to meet the target. However, according to the Hong Kong Housing Authority, the estimated total public housing production in the next five years is some 97 000 units, that is, less than 20 000 units per year, which will fail
to meet even the original 60:40 target, let alone the 70:30. The waiting time for public housing, which is now over five years and in violation of the Government's three-year pledge, may be further prolonged every year in the future. Under these circumstances, the Government must step up its efforts in securing land, recovering the progress and ensuring people's right to housing. If some people still claim that there is no shortage of land in Hong Kong, I would ask them to stop dragging Hong Kong down. The land supply in Hong Kong is really insufficient. We have never had any land reserve, and thus never any stable land supply for housing. Both public or private housing are in shortage now. So, please do not deceive the public by claiming that there is no shortage of land in Hong Kong and that there is land on mountains. Do not tell jokes, please.

The Task Force on Land Supply has just proposed eight short, medium and long-term options. Now, the Government has to adopt a multi-pronged approach expeditiously with determination and commitment to launch several options concurrently. Instead of tackling the simple issues first before the difficult ones, several options should be carried forward concurrently because we can see from today's amendments that every option has its supporters and objectors. We do not have much time for further discussions and tackling the simple issues first before the difficult ones. Secretary, there is no such thing as tackling the simple issues first before the difficult ones, as all options are difficult. The Government should not evade difficulties. It should carry forward all the eight options and expose the lie of those claiming that there is no shortage of land in Hong Kong and that the Government simply dare not recover certain sites.

First, among the land supply options, the development of brownfield sites is most talked about. There are 1300 hectares of brownfield in Hong Kong and the development of brownfield sites is supported by the majority of the public. Therefore, we very much agree that the Government should speed up the development of brownfield sites through various measures, including the establishment of a brownfield database. The Government must establish a brownfield database, or else community groups will do so with a possibly inaccurate method. Therefore, the Government must establish a brownfield database providing clear data for the relocation of brownfield operations.

As regards violations of land use or unlawful occupation of government land on undeveloped brownfield sites, the Government must step up the inspection, impose heavier penalties and, when necessary, recover the brownfield
sites by invoking the Lands Resumption Ordinance. Nevertheless, many brownfield sites currently serve as back-up sites of the logistics industry. Therefore, the Transport and Housing Bureau has to handle not only housing construction, but also transport issues. Why are there so many brownfield sites in Hong Kong? As I have repeatedly said, the Government shot itself in the foot because there has never been any policy in respect of the logistics industry. Logistics operators had to move further and further away and ended up operating on brownfield sites. In order to recover the brownfield sites speedily, the Government must formulate a concrete long-term logistics policy and help relocate operators on the brownfield sites.

Furthermore, we opine that the development of private agricultural land in the New Territories under a public-private partnership approach is worth consideration, but penalties must be increased at the same time. There have been precedents for the public-private partnership approach as it was adopted in developing large-scale housing estates in new development areas before the reunification. However, when the developer under a public-private partnership fails to honour the development plan, it would often drag on for a long time or simply run away. To tackle that, we suggest establishing a penalty system in respect of idle agricultural land development under a public-private partnership approach. Of course, the penalties should not be in the form of fines as developers do not lack money. Instead, developers should be demanded to surrender land. If they fail to honour the development intention in one project, they should surrender another piece of land to the Government for development purpose. Only in this way will the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme be credible and transparent. Furthermore, please do not forget that agricultural lands do not belong to large developers or landowners only. Some farmers and villagers are practicing small-scale agriculture there too and their proper relocation also calls for discussion.

Thirdly, FTU has always supported the relocation of the Fanling golf course. As we have always said, the restored landfill in Tseung Kwan O cannot be used for housing construction. Perhaps the Government will come up with a way to do so in the future. For the time being, however, can the Fanling golf course be relocated in order to release more land for public housing construction? Of course, many would question about the road and transport planning if public housing is developed there, but frankly speaking, road and transport issues are there to be solved in developing public housing anywhere else. Hence, the
Government must show some vigour to solve the transport and road issues in the area so that the land of the Fanling golf course can be used for public housing construction expeditiously.

Moreover, the remarks of a Member earlier on are really ridiculous. He said some state-owned enterprises were longing for the reclamation because reclamation meant sand purchase. He really thinks state-owned enterprises are so pressed for cash that they are longing to make money out of Hong Kong. He called some people ignorant, yet he is actually the ignorant one. How can reclamation for artificial islands construction be understood as a way to sell marine sand by state-owned enterprises? Some other Members claimed that the construction of artificial islands served to facilitate wealthy Mainlanders to come to Hong Kong, which really baffled me. How will the artificial islands built on reclaimed land east of Lantau facilitate Mainlanders to come to Hong Kong? The High-Speed Rail and many ports can serve that purpose now. What have the construction of artificial islands to do with Mainlanders? Please do not treat people as fools.

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

We support reclamation for the construction of artificial islands because we believe Hong Kong needs a long-term and stable land reserve. Take Singapore as an example. Everyone admired the Housing Development Board ("HDB") flat policy in Singapore a few years back. What we do not know is that the supply of HDB flats is scarce and the price is high in recent years. Locals find HDB flats expensive and unaffordable. The popularity ratings of LEE Hsien-loong began to drop at the time and he only won by a nose in the last election. Subsequently, the reclamation project just completed provided land, and two golf courses were recovered during that period for infrastructure and housing development. With sufficient land for the implementation of housing initiatives, the housing issue in Singapore was solved.

On the contrary, there is no land reserve in Hong Kong. The Government has no choice but to accept any conditions laid down for land recovery. Only if the Government has an ample land reserve will it be in a position to bargain. The claim of certain people that there is no shortage of land in Hong Kong is not true. Please do not deceive others. The land supply in Hong Kong is
insufficient. An ample and stable land reserve is needed to solve the existing housing problem. Therefore, it is necessary to carry out reclamation and build artificial islands at an appropriate site.

In addition, I have to get across two points quickly in regard to using the Housing Reserve to support the Hong Kong Housing Society, the Hong Kong Housing Authority and the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA") in developing more public housing. Currently, URA initiates the development on some recovered land. We think the Government should subsidize URA to develop public housing on recovered land in urban areas.

Besides, I must ask Under Secretary SO to note that, as the number of public residential units must meet relevant target, community facilities, parking spaces and elderly facilities in many public housing estates are inadequate as a result. The Government should consider making full use of underground space for facilities such as parking lots, so that more land can be freed up for public housing. Deputy President, actually I still have a lot to say about the land issue (The buzzer sounded) …

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms MAK, your speaking time is up.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, first of all, I thank Mr James TO for proposing this motion on "Increasing housing supply in the short to medium term to rectify the problem of public housing shortage". There has been a so-called big debate conducted on the land issue, the purpose of which is, as Dr KWOK Ka-ki has said, to create a myth that we are short of land, though LEUNG Chun-ying already took the lead to break this very myth many years ago. He has this famous line: There is no lack of land in Hong Kong but a lack of land planning. LEUNG Chun-ying is a surveyor by profession and he is professional in land surveying. While I neither share nor trust his views in other aspects, I basically believe this remark made by him because simply enough, 7% of our land is devoted for residential uses to house 7 million people. What he meant was: Is it true that there is a shortage of land in Hong Kong?

Who in Hong Kong are in possession of land? They are the major property developers and the Government. The Government is the largest landlord that owns most of the land and yet, it has come forth to complain about a
lack of land. Then it made available land bit by bit for auction on the principle of the highest bidder wins, resulting in the high land price policy. When the flour is expensive, it is only more so for the bread. Property developers and the Government have joined hands in this rip-off to make money together. A surplus is, therefore, recorded annually. The Government need not do anything. All it has to do is to continuously implement the high land price policy while the property developers make a fortune. This is what happens in Hong Kong and we still keep on complaining that land is lacking, that we are so desperate that reclamation is the way out, and that we need this Lantau Tomorrow to develop 1,700 hectares of land. But it would not be enough even if 1,700 hectares of land are made available. Honestly, it would not be enough no matter how much more there is, because the Government would take out land only bit by bit, and the highest bidder wins.

This consortium underpinned by collusion between business and the Government has been controlling Hongkongers over the last few decades. Even though the Government mentioned short-term land supply in the big debate on land, it is nevertheless saying now that 70% (i.e. 452 hectares) of land supply will be used for private housing development, whereas the remaining 30% will be used for developing other types of housing, namely, public rental housing ("PRH") units and Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS") units. As for the supply in the medium to long term, from 2026 to 2046, the Government will continue to allocate 70% (i.e. 552 hectares) of residential sites for private housing development and the remaining 30% (i.e. 228 hectares) for PRH units and HOS units. Worse still, now it seems that more and more PRH units are put up for sale. As we can see, that remark made by LEUNG Chun-ying has to be slightly revised in that there is no lack of land but a lack of land planning that reflects justice in Hong Kong.

The four major property developers, namely, CK Asset Holdings Limited, Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited, Henderson Land Development Company Limited and New World Development Company Limited, have in their hands a large quantity of land. They own a total of 978 hectares of brownfield sites and agricultural land altogether, and their land reserves have even outgrown that of the Government. Therefore, the Government should resume these brownfield sites and idle or fallow agricultural land under the Lands Resumption Ordinance ("the Ordinance"). Why should the Government not do so? Between 1 July 1997 and 31 December 2017, the Government resumed land under the Ordinance
in 145 public works projects and urban renewal projects. Over the past two decades there have been eight judicial review cases, none of which has succeeded. All these cases were defeated and the Government won all of them. The Government has expressed concern about invoking the Ordinance, but what is it concerned about? It is worried that its own interests would be affected and the interests of property developers compromised. The Government said that the Ordinance can be invoked only for a public purpose, or else it would face challenges from property developers. But obviously, a public purpose includes new town development, public housing development, development of public works programmes approved by the Government, and community facilities. All these are public purposes. The Ordinance even provides for the definition of "resumption for a public purpose", which includes "... any purpose of whatsoever description ... which the Chief Executive in Council may decide to be a public purpose". It means that the Government can provide a definition by itself. This is all written in the Ordinance and the Government says that it has misgivings about it. The Urban Renewal Authority has invoked the Ordinance for so many times before to resume the property titles of small owners and then these sites were provided for developing many lucrative projects in collaboration with property developers and this could still be taken as public purposes, and the Government says that it has misgivings about it. Do not fool us. If the Government is worried, it is worried only about losing this means to reap a profit.

As for the resumption of the Fanling Golf Course, we have talked about it so much that our lips are worn out. Stanley WONG, whom Dr KWOK Ka-ki referred to as a tragic character, has now suggested to resume a small part of it, i.e. 32 hectares of the old golf course. This should not have any effect on the rich but Carrie LAM said that she might not necessarily take on board this proposal. Had the Government not cleared people's houses in the vicinity, driven people away and eliminated their villages to make way for an enormous North East New Territories project affecting tens of thousands of households but behaved like the 2 000-odd wealthy members playing golf at the golf course which is untouchable, these controversies would not have been aroused. The Government has exactly demonstrated these large discrepancies. It would rather destroy homes and villages than touch the venue where the rich plays golf for fun. This is the reason why we are so keen about resuming the Fanling Golf Course.

The Government also talked about a land sharing scheme and that is a rip-off. Land sharing means that the Government provides public facilities,
foots the bill for all infrastructure costs and relaxes the floor area requirements. Then, the Government will only take back 60% to 70% of the additional floor area, while the remaining 30% to 40% will go to property developers, not to mention that the Government will provide infrastructure for them. So please tell me, who will benefit from it? Of course, the Government and property developers are joining hands to reap gains.

As for the site reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland, while the site for the first phase has yet to be fully utilized and the 60 hectares of land for the second phase have been "sunbathing" for nine years, the period for purchasing the site will expire only in 2020 and plans on the use of the site will not be made until then. I wonder for how many more years this site will have to be left there "sunbathing".

Military sites are untouchable. Currently there are 19 military sites in Hong Kong, occupying 2 700 hectares of land. Do they need such a lot of land? The per capita area used by the Hong Kong Garrison is 44 times that of the military personnel in Macao. Why do they need so much land? Can they not return even a small part of it? The stationing of a military force is purely meant to be a manifestation of sovereignty. Do they need so much land? According to an information paper of the Legislative Council, there are currently 8 000 to 10 000 members of the Hong Kong Garrison, meaning that every four members are using one hectare of land. Do we have too much land? Will building a few more large-scale barracks inspire a sense of security among the citizens of Hong Kong? So, all these sites can actually be made available for development.

Many old housing estates can also be redeveloped. For example, the Tai Hang Sai Estate with a history of over 50 years can, after redevelopment, provide more than 5 000 units. Currently it provides only 1 600 units and worse still, almost half of the units are vacant. For how many years has the Government been dragging its feet? Now the tenants have become old and frail, and as there are no lifts, they can only walk up the stairs in difficulty. Now there are more and more vacant units but the estate has remained right above the Shek Kip Mei MTR Station without anything being done to it. I wonder for how many more years the Government plans to do nothing about it. All these are valuable public resources and land that can absolutely be put to use. But the Government refuses to put them to use but proposes this Lantau Tomorrow which requires reclamation, saying that we are short of land. I call on the Government to give a
response to Liber Research Community and Prof NG Mee-kam, and I call on the Government to address squarely the fact that what Hong Kong lacks is land planning with justice, and do not fool Hong Kong people.

I so submit.

MR GARY FAN (in Cantonese): Deputy President, first of all, I thank Mr James TO for proposing this motion. Nine Members proposed amendments this time, which shows that we are very concerned about this big, old and difficult livelihood issue. Due to the time constraint, I am not able to comment on the original motion and all the amendments in 10 minutes. I will mainly focus on three key points in my amendment: impose a purchase restriction on people and corporate buyers from outside Hong Kong; reduce land hoarding by developers; and refrain from lowering the proportion of public rental housing. These measures will help increase supply and suppress demand, thus satisfy the housing and home ownership needs of Hong Kong households and grass roots.

Deputy President, in the four years since the promulgation of the Long Term Housing Strategy ("LTHS") in 2014 until 2017-2018, the average annual production volume of public housing by the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") and the Hong Kong Housing Society has been under 14 000 units, which significantly fell behind the annual supply target of 28 000 public housing units as set out in LTHS. As a result, the average waiting time for public housing allocation increased from 3.1 years in late September 2014 to 5.5 years in late September 2018. In the next five years, HA expects to provide an average of 19 500 public housing units annually. Even with the supply by other organizations included, the target in LTHS will be hard to meet.

Therefore, although the Government has proposed to raise the public/private split from 6:4 to 7:3 in the Long Term Housing Strategy Annual Progress Report 2018 and revised the supply target for public housing to 315 000 units for the next 10 years, we will realize that this target is unachievable simply by looking at the facts as well as past and current data on housing construction progress.

Deputy President, I think one of the cruxes of the housing issue in Hong Kong is that our residential market is open to the outside world. Due to
investment and speculation by capital outside Hong Kong, property prices and rents have surged to a level way beyond the affordability of Hong Kong people. I have noticed that the figure for miscellaneous factors was not adjusted in the demand projection in the report. What do miscellaneous factors represent? They include units occupied by households with mobile residents only, non-local students who may take up accommodation in Hong Kong, and buyers from outside Hong Kong who may purchase flats without channelling them back to the market. That means the majority of them represent the non-residential investment demands of non-local residents.

According to the report, the demand projection in the next 10 years based on "miscellaneous factors" is as high as 30 200 units; while the supply target for private housing in the next 10 years will be reduced to 135 000 units. In other words, in the new supply target projected by the Government, as high as 22.4% of private housing will serve to satisfy non-local and investment demands, rather than the needs of Hong Kong people. The figure presents an increase of five percentage points over the previous year, and that means one out of five private units will serve to satisfy the demand from outside Hong Kong or of investment, rather than to meet the housing and home ownership needs of Hong Kong people.

Financial Secretary Paul CHAN has once suggested in his blog to relax the ceiling for private residential mortgage loans. Although he later clarified that there was no timetable for reducing the harsh measures, his remarks have aroused concern about whether the Government attempts to boost the market as reducing the harsh measures will attract a large amount of capital outside Hong Kong to invest in real estate and fuel the property prices.

The Government should definitely not boost the market. For this reason, I proposed in my amendment that the Government should suppress the demands from outside Hong Kong by imposing a purchase restriction on residential units purchased by people and corporate buyers from outside Hong Kong. The Government may draw reference from the practices in other places, such as Australia and New Zealand, and forbid people and corporate buyers from outside Hong Kong to acquire and hold second-hand residential units, including subsidized sale flats with premiums paid, in order to separate local self-occupation needs from non-local investment demands. We should ensure that sufficient supply is in the market for Hong Kong citizens, Hong Kong permanent residents and Hong Kong people to choose from, rather than being
held by non-local people or corporate buyers over a long period of time for cashing in profit later on.

In Australia, where a purchase restriction is in place, property prices have come down from the peak in 2018. The property prices in Sydney and Melbourne in December 2018 dropped by 11.1% and 7.2% respectively compared with the same period in 2017. The overall property prices in Australia have dropped by 4.8%. This shows that a purchase restriction can effectively bring property prices back to a level affordable to local people. We should learn from that example. I call on government officials to ponder over it.

The second key point in my amendment is to reduce land hoarding by developers. It is estimated that private developers own more than 1,000 hectares of idle agricultural land in the New Territories. If all developed, the scale will be equivalent to three times the total area of the Kai Tak Development Area. Take a plot ratio of 3 and an average of 500 sq ft per unit as an example, more than 600,000 units can be built. Therefore, the Government should no longer tolerate long-term holding of agricultural land in the New Territories for which the developers have not any planning. It should establish a brownfield database, set a development priority and recover brownfield sites and agricultural land for public housing construction by invoking the Lands Resumption Ordinance. The introduction of idle land tax can also push developers to release hoarded land for housing construction in order to increase the supply. I also support the development of idle military sites and sites leased under private recreational leases, including the full resumption of the 172-hectare site of the Fanling Golf Course for housing and residential care homes for the elderly.

However, even if the Government recovers land for public housing construction, my concern is that it may still attempt to boost the market by putting up most of the units for sale but not for rent. With less units for rent, people on the waiting list of public rental housing ("PRH") have less chance of being allocated a unit, which indirectly compel Hong Kong people to purchase properties. Hence, the third key point in my amendment is that, while implementing the Home Ownership Scheme and the Green Form Subsidized Home Ownership Scheme, the Government should refrain from lowering the proportion of public rental housing in the overall public housing, so as to avoid further prolongation of the waiting time for public housing and expeditiously restore it to three years as solemnly promised.
Under the current public housing construction plan of HA, the figures of public housing for rent and for sale under the Green Form Subsidized Home Ownership Scheme are mixed together. I am worried that the Government may mix the two figures in order to gradually reduce the supply of PRH, lower the proportion of PRH, and thus prolong the waiting time. I have repeatedly raised this question at Panel meetings in the past without getting a response from the Government about the estimated annual supply of PRH and units under the Green Form Subsidized Home Ownership Scheme. Hence, my worries are not unfounded. Chief Executive Carrie LAM suggested in 2017 that the Government would cap the number of PRH supply at 800,000. Although she has never mentioned that again, the Government is indeed "drying up" PRH supply. For this reason, my amendment stresses that, while increasing the supply of public housing, the grass roots who have been on the PRH waiting list for years should not be sacrificed. The Government should give priority to the basic housing needs of those on the waiting list.

To sum up, the Government must strictly separate public and private markets and eradicate the practice of using housing as a speculative tool. Purchase restriction should be imposed in the private market on buyers outside Hong Kong in order to separate local self-occupation needs from non-local investment demands, so that property prices can return to a level affordable to Hong Kong people (The buzzer sounded) … Deputy President, I so submit.

**DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Mr FAN, your speaking time is up.

**MR WILSON OR** (in Cantonese): Deputy President, Hong Kong is short of land. To put it more accurately, it lacks land for development, especially land for housing. This point is already a consensus in society. According to the projection in "Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030" of the Planning Department, the shortfall of land is 1,200 hectares. However, if such factors as population ageing, increase in average living space per person, provision of additional community facilities and establishment of a land reserve are counted in, the actual shortage of land far exceeds 1,200 hectares. The imminent problem, in my opinion, is not only the shortage but also the urgency. According to the projection in the Long Term Housing Strategy mentioned in the original motion, the shortage of land for
public housing in Hong Kong in the next decade alone will involve 78 000 units. Hence, the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong ("DAB") holds that the Government should adopt a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply. It should not give up any land supply option supported by the public.

The Task Force on Land Supply ("the Task Force") published the result of the "grand debate on land supply" in time on New Year's Eve last year and recommended eight short-to-medium term and medium-to-long term land supply options in the light of the public views collected, including developing brownfield sites and tapping into private agricultural land reserve. DAB believes these two options are effective ways of "increasing housing supply in the short to medium term" as stated in the original motion. Yet the original motion did not touch on these two options. For this reason, we have added some points. Nevertheless, in our view, public support for the development of brownfield sites and private agricultural land reserve is only a starting point. The crux of whether land can be supplied in the short-to-medium term lies in the time when the Government can provide relevant policy support and realize such development.

It is not easy to achieve smooth resumption and redevelopment of brownfield sites. It is not as simply as drawing a circle on the map, driving a bulldozer into the site, levelling the land and then the construction of housing can start. Before the resumption of land, the Government must properly address the concerns of brownfield operators, who should be given the opportunity to continue with their operations and wage earners engaged in such operations can go on make a living. For this reason, my amendment requests the Government to expeditiously come up with a policy for accommodating brownfield operations—Deputy President, here comes the policy again—including reasonable compensation for business losses, as well as arrangements and support for the reprovisioning of business, so as to address public concerns.

Moreover, we propose tapping into private agricultural land reserve or developing private agricultural land under the public-private partnership approach. Before anything else, I need to emphasize that the public-private partnership approach proposed by us does not seek to replace the "new development areas" mentioned in point (1) in the original motion, or the conventional new town approach referred to in the past. On the contrary, the partnership approach advocated by us serves as another option in addition to the
development approach for new development areas. There is no conflict between the two at all.

However, we should be realistic. Let me cite the example of Kwu Tung North and Fanling North. I believe Members still remember that the relevant proposal was initially put forward in 1998, brought up again in 2008, and then a planning study was conducted. It was not until recently that funding and the accommodation policy was finalized. The whole process has spanned 20 years. But what is the situation today in 2019? Not even a piece of land has been resumed. Can new development areas really increase land supply in the short, medium and long term? I doubt it. The goal of increasing housing supply in the short-to-medium term is even harder to achieve.

Given the limitations in real life, is society willing to make consideration from more perspectives? The advantage of public-private partnership is that ownership is more centralized and the scale is smaller. The time needed for land resumption and development can thus be shortened. Housing supply can be attained in a shorter time when compared with developing new areas. The prime concern of members of the public at present can thus be addressed. But more importantly, while supporting this approach, we consider that public-private partnership should also uphold the principle of openness, fairness and transparency. For this reason, we suggest that the Government establish a "Public-Private Partnership Steering Committee" dedicated to vetting and approval work in respect of public-private partnership. The private sector can provide land while the Government can make complementary efforts to facilitate rezoning of land sites and release more land with potential for development, thereby increasing the overall housing supply. This is a feasible direction.

As regards whether the new development areas mentioned in the original motion can become the source of housing supply in the short-to-medium term, I think the crux lies in the matter of time. In our view, the previous new town development approach was one which could effectively provide large areas of land. During the process, the Government would usually invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance. This was a more commonly practice for land requisition, but during the process, there was no lack of choices for land exchange. A typical example was requisition of land from landowners by offering "exchange entitlement". There was even a precedent of new town development by reallocation of land after acquisition. If the Government could
adopt a flexible approach to acquire land for developing new towns in the past, it should not be rigid like an iron plate in opening up new development areas now, should it?

(The President resumed the Chair)

President, a few years ago, DAB already proposed releasing the potential supply of Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS") flats with premium unpaid. Hence, we have all along requested the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") to conditionally allow owners of HOS flats to lease out such flats. Although the proposal of sharing rental incomes in the original motion can increase the number of rental units and even bring extra revenue to the Government, I guess the grass roots may not be benefited. Certainly, as the original motion has clearly proposed participation of HA in the Letting Scheme of the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HKHS"), the target tenants should be families applying for public rental housing. But let us think about it. Under this proposal of sharing incomes, landlords, especially the unscrupulous ones, will certainly lease their flats at market rents or an higher rents. Otherwise, how can they share the incomes with the Government? The problem is, how can a grass-roots family afford to lease the whole flat at the market rent? This is hardly possible. How should we address this problem? I think we need to think carefully. Otherwise, in the end we will only get the same result as that of the relevant scheme of HKHS: a lukewarm response.

Under the proposal of social enterprises serving as subtenants as advanced by DAB, social enterprises, including non-profit-making bodies and welfare organizations, will act as intermediaries. They will rent flats from landlords and then allocate the flats to families with different needs according to the size of the flats. For example, a single flat can be sublet to two families or even three singletons. Our concept is similar to that of the Community Housing Movement currently launched by the Hong Kong Council of Social Service. The only difference is that the source of rental units we propose is HOS flats with premium unpaid. Both schemes have three merits. First, minority owners are more willing to lease their flats to social enterprises. At least they need not worry about getting no rents or running into "rogue tenants". They are even willing to lease their flats at a lower rent for charity. Second, to the grass-roots tenants, the rents set by the social enterprises are affordable and the lease period is steady.
Moreover, they can obtain other community support. Third, despite the need to co-let a flat, with the matching and coordination of the social enterprises, tenants may be provided with extra support in daily life, thus reducing conflict with other tenants. Owing to these reasons, we have amended point (5) in the original motion.

President, there are a total of nine amendments to the motion today, reflecting the great controversy of the issue. However, as stated by Stanley WONG, the Chairman of the Task Force, there is no more time or room for "self-will" in Hong Kong. By ruling out "self-will", it means not only that we cannot just choose one option and refuse to choose another. It also means we do not have time to haggle over options which are actually not one. One of them is military sites. The reason is already clearly explained in the report of the Task Force. I am not going to repeat it. Hence, DAB will not support the original motion, as well as all the amendments which have kept point (4) in the original motion.

Lastly, Ms MAK's amendment proposes converting some of the sites resumed by the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA") for the development of public housing. We also have reservations about this. Members may recall that in the past, the Legislative Council, regardless of political affiliations, has supported in-situ rehousing for owners of properties in old buildings and requested the "flat-for-flat" arrangement. However, if the projects of URA are indiscriminately converted to public housing, such owners will be unable to choose any housing unit after redevelopment owing to the asset threshold. The amendment will turn out to reduce the chance of owners of properties in old buildings to stay in the original community. We find this contradictory to the principle of in-situ rehousing advocated by us in the past.

President, I so submit.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): President, I thank Mr James TO for proposing this motion. Regrettably, the order of my amendment is near the bottom of the list and after many others', such as Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok's. Basically, if their amendments are passed, mine will not have to be put to vote, for I will then withdraw it. I cannot accept Members like Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok. At this time when the people of Hong Kong are in deep waters struggling with housing problem, they still desire to prolong the collusion between the
Government and the business sector. Be it in reclamation or development of brownfields, their heart and soul are fully dedicated to assisting the trades they represent and estate developers to continue to reap profit. They have no concern about the present situation in Hong Kong. They do not care which groups in the community are in dire straits. They will not ask what they can do for these people, nor, as the original motion mentioned, what assistance can we offer to them in the short-to-medium term.

First, as mentioned by Dr Fernando CHEUNG earlier on, I would like to cite the two observations mentioned in an article recently published by Prof NG Mee-kam of The Chinese University of Hong Kong. First, in examining the housing supply in Hong Kong, we should not overlook the existing situation that "the problem lies not in shortage but in unequal distribution". According to the right-hand side of the chart in my hand, which shows the situation of private housing, the total number of private permanent housing is 1 489 000 units and nearly 1 342 000 households are living in private housing units. There is a discrepancy of 147 000 units, accounting for 10% of the total number of units. This leads me to notice the comment of an economic analyst of a bank in Hong Kong that given the figures of private housing alone, the vacancy rate now announced by the Government is highly doubtful. Indeed, there are owners holding a large number of flats in Hong Kong for speculation, and we should think about ways to prompt them to sell these flats. This is the first observation of great importance.

The second important observation is that if there are 2-odd million households in Hong Kong, are Hong Kong citizens of these households all living in desperate plight? This is definitely not the case. Another observation from Prof NG Mee-kam is that we should examine the situation in the private market of Hong Kong. What is the situation of people now living in private housing? There are 800 000 households living in self-owned units and 450 000 households in rented units. We have to look at the rent they are paying. Among the households living in rented units, around 150 000 of them are paying rents of less than $6,000. In view of the rental market in Hong Kong, we can imagine that for units charging rent of less than $6,000, the living environment will be undesirable, and many of these households may be living in subdivided units. This figure tallies with the estimate of the Census and Statistics Department ("C&SD") on the number of subdivided units, which states that around 90 000 to 100 000-odd households are living in inadequate housing. Hence, the issue we are exploring is not that all the people of Hong Kong are facing desperate plights
in accommodation. We have to focus on the point that 100,000 to 150,000 households are caught in that kind of predicament. What do they need now? They need short term and immediate measures which can offer them assistance and alleviate their plights.

We have to alleviate their plights immediately, yet the Transport and Housing Bureau is telling us that there is a shortfall of public housing of nearly 5,000 units every year. The failure to construct sufficient number of public housing will result in an increasingly longer queue for public housing. Hence, an integral part of my amendment is about establishing a ladder for adequate housing. What is a ladder for adequate housing? It means that the Government should not spur these people to purchase their own flats under the Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme or the Starter Homes scheme. What they need is adequate housing. In respect of adequate housing, we notice that the current standard is too low. At present, many people are living in subdivided units where the living environment is very poor. Hence, in the planning of the ladder for adequate housing, we have to introduce another tier between subdivided units and public rental housing, adding one more tier for these people. Mr Tony TSE has also mentioned this, and now I bring it up again, and this is the tier of transitional housing.

As for transitional housing, the authorities should not merely consider the approach of commissioning the project to non-governmental organizations ("NGOs"), where the Development Bureau will allocate $1 billion to them and let them deal with the development on their own. This approach cannot cater for the needs of the 90,000 households mentioned by C&SD or the group of people who are paying rent below $6,000. The Government has to take up the work in this aspect.

Members will certainly ask how we can have the land for such development. Regarding the source of land supply, we must understand that the demand for land under discussion is short-term demand, and that the demand for land is most imminent within the next 10 years. A community organization in Hong Kong, the Liber Research Community, has made dedicated efforts to identify vacant Government sites and government sites under short-term tenancy for the Development Bureau and the Transport and Housing Bureau. These sites scatter across the territory in different districts and are located in urban areas rather than remote areas. They have found 300 hectares of such land. Moreover, according to another research which is also conducted by the Liber
Research Community, there are at least 1 000 hectares of brownfield sites which have not been included in any development plan. By combining these two types of land, that is the 300 hectares of vacant and short-term tenancy government sites and the brownfield sites—since Mr Wilson OR considers the use of military sites a very sensitive topic, I will not mention them for the time being—we will have over 1 000 hectares of land.

Moreover, according to the paper provided by the Task Force on Land Supply, there is a land shortfall of 1 200 hectares in Hong Kong in the long run. Among such shortfall, 800 hectares will arise before 2026. Hence, there is an urgent need for us to identify these sites before 2026. The two types of land which I mentioned just now, that is the 300 hectares of vacant and short-term tenancy government sites and the 1 000 hectares of brownfields, are issues we have to deal with in the short term. To whom should these sites be provided? First, if the construction of public rental housing cannot meet their demand timely, the authorities should provide transitional housing to this group of tenants who are living in predicament in Hong Kong.

Furthermore, the difference between my amendment and those proposed by a number of colleagues lies in the resumption of the golf course. I support the resumption, but under one condition. I think if the golf course is to be resumed, it should serve not only the purpose of increasing housing supply but also for reducing the sites to be resumed, particularly areas with active farmlands, under the North East New Territories development plan. Members can see that the entire area in Ma Shi Po Village in Fanling is mainly active farmland and includes a number of villages.

Back then, why would we propose resuming the Fanling Golf Course to replace the North East New Territories development plan? First, in the consultation of the Town Planning Board, over 40 000 people oppose the North East New Territories development plan and only seven people support it. The pro-democracy camp as a whole voted against the plan. Why does the Government refuse to resume a golf course serving the rich but force a group of villagers to move out, where farmlands in the New Territories will be damaged by the development plan? I think we should not deviate from this line of thought. Now, if we want the development of North East New Territories and the resumed golf course of 172 hectares at the same time, the urban development to be implemented in the Northern New Territories will exceed its capacity.
Hence, an alternative approach is to resume the golf course under the condition that land resumption in North East New Territories will be reduced significantly.

SECRETARY FOR DEVELOPMENT (in Cantonese): President, I thank Mr James TO for proposing the motion today, and the other nine Members for proposing the amendments.

It has long been the top priority for the current-term Government to supply Hong Kong with adequate land to meet the housing needs of the community while ensuring the availability of comprehensive community and ancillary facilities in support of balanced and sustainable development. The Government's policy on land supply is underpinned by a multi-pronged and sustained approach. Our determination to find and create land will not be shaken by short-term changes in the economic landscape or fluctuations in property prices.

As regards increase housing supply, in order to meet the 10-year housing supply target set out in the Long Term Housing Strategy, the Development Bureau and the Planning Department have been working closely with the Transport and Housing Bureau and the Housing Department to identify and provide suitable land to the Hong Kong Housing Authority or the Hong Kong Housing Society for developing public housing. Based on the latest projection, the total housing supply target for the next 10-year period from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029 is 450,000 units. With the adoption of a split of 70:30, the supply target for public housing is 315,000 units. It is indeed by no means easy to meet such a supply target. Hence, the Government will continue to step up its effort to increase land supply for public housing.

The Government will continue to increase land supply in the short-to-medium term through rezoning and suitably increasing the development density. Such projects can provide a total of more than 380,000 public and private residential units. The some 210 sites with housing development potential identified with strenuous effort over the past few years are the major source of supply in the short-to-medium term, capable of producing more than 310,000 housing units in total, over 70% of which are public housing. As at early this year, we have rezoned or commenced the rezoning of 70% of the sites, or 146 sites. Moreover, to further optimize the use of public housing sites, we
have relaxed the relevant policy to allow the domestic plot ratio for public housing sites by up to 30% where technically feasible, except those in the north of Hong Kong Island and Kowloon Peninsula, which are more densely populated, thereby optimizing land use and maximizing the supply of public housing units in the short-to-medium term.

On the other hand, to provide immediate relief, the Government converted nine private housing sites for public housing use last June, capable of producing about 11,000 public housing units in total. From 2013-2014 onward, the Government has actually converted 21 sites originally intended for private housing for public housing use. The Government will continue to keep the situation under review to determine the most suitable use of sites on a need basis. The Government currently has established procedures in the allocation of sites for public and private housing purposes when undergoing the site searching and planning process. In considering the housing types of individual housing sites, the Government has to take into account the holistic planning of the community, including the existing ratio of public and private housing in the concerned areas, the needs of public and private housing for community facilities, transport facilities and infrastructure facilities in the areas (such as water supplies, drainage, roads, etc.), and whether the location, area, and development scale of individual sites would be suitable for public housing development. At the same time, the Government also needs to take into account certain demands for private housing in society and continue to keep a certain number of sites for the Land Sale Programme in order to maintain a sustained and steady private housing land supply. Hence, not all sites originally intended for private housing use could be arbitrarily reallocated for public housing development.

In the medium to long term, we are now pressing ahead with various New Development Areas ("NDAs") and New Town Extension projects. These major development projects can provide more than 210,000 residential units in total, including about 130,000 public housing units. Among these projects, we obtained approval from the Town Planning Board last November to increase the number of public housing units in Kwu Tung North ("KTN") and Fanling North ("FLN") NDAs by 12,000 units through increasing the development density of individual public housing sites and enhancing site design, thereby raising the public housing split of the NDAs to approximately 70%. Together with other major railway property development projects, the housing supply in the medium to long term should be able to reach 230,000 units. We will also proactively
take forward a number of studies on reclamation of land, including the planning and engineering studies focused on the 1,000-hectare reclamation near Kau Yi Chau, for which we will seek funding from the Legislative Council later this year.

As pointed out in the Chief Executive's 2018 Policy Address, 70% of housing units on the Government's newly developed land would be for public housing, which is an overall target having holistically considered the newly developed land whereas the housing types of individual sites would depend on such factors as the location and availability of ancillary facilities in the vicinity. Apart from the aforesaid initiative to increase the ratio of public housing for suitable sites and projects, the Policy Address also suggested the construction of artificial islands under the Lantau Tomorrow Vision. 70% of the residential units produced on the land provided by reclamation would be for public housing. Taking the 1,000-hectare Kau Yi Chau artificial islands under the focus of the first-stage study as suggested by the Government as an example, 150,000 to 260,000 units could be built, 70% of which (i.e. 105,000 to 182,000 units) would be public housing. It is also pointed out in the Policy Address that DEVB will formulate feasible arrangements for the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme after drawing reference from the report submitted by the Task Force on Land Supply ("Task Force") at the end of last year, so as to unleash the development potential of private land for increasing the supply of public and private housing, including considering the provision of public housing with not less than 60% to 70% of the increased floor area.

As for the resumption of brownfield sites and agricultural lands for the development of NDAs with the statutory powers under the Lands Resumption Ordinance, it is something that the Government has been working hard on. We estimate that a total of about 500 hectares of private land within the boundary of a few major land development projects, which include Wang Chau Phase 1 Development, KTN/FLN NDA and Hung Shui Kiu ("HSK") NDA, will be resumed in the coming years. As for such NDAs as KTN/FLN, HSK and Yuen Long South, they also cover a total of about 340 hectares of brownfield sites. With such effort, we are able to rationalize the existing haphazard development of brownfield sites through comprehensive and holistic planning. Later on, we will seek funding from the Legislative Council for the resumption exercise and engineering infrastructure works in respect of the first phase development of the KTN and FLN NDAs. In this connection, the Government is grateful to the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council for approving the enhancements to the general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for the
Government's development clearance exercises last year, so that we are in a better position to cater for the needs of residents and operators who will soon be affected by major development projects. Looking ahead, we will also coordinate among relevant departments to advance the study on developing brownfield sites in New Territories North and initiate a study on the remaining some 700 hectares of scattered brownfield sites to identify those with greater development potential.

President, it is necessary to increase land supply if we are to eradicate the problem of public housing shortage. In fact, we currently lack not only housing sites but also space in support of various types of economic activities and the development of industries, as well as sites for the provision of a variety of community and infrastructure facilities. After the five-month public engagement exercise and 16 months of work, the Task Force submitted recommendations on the land supply strategy and land supply options to the Government at the end of last year. According to the Task Force, society in general recognizes the dire situation of land shortage and feels strongly about the need to tackle the situation without delay while preparing for rainy days. The Task Force also reckons that the actual additional land demand of Hong Kong should be significantly higher than the 1200 hectares as stated in the "Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030" earlier. The Government strongly endorses the observation of the Task Force that we must continue to adopt a multi-pronged approach to boost land supply considerably with an all-out effort in the future. Accordingly, the Task Force has tendered a series of recommendations, including eight land supply options worthy of priority studies and implementation, and enhancing the existing land supply strategy. The Government is carefully studying the various recommendations of the Task Force and consolidating the relevant information and will respond in due course.

President, I will listen carefully to the speeches of Members, and give a consolidated response and elaborate further later. The Under Secretary for Transport and Housing will now respond to issues relating to the housing policy stated in the motion.

Thank you, President.
UNDER SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Cantonese): President, first of all, I thank Mr James TO for proposing the motion today and nine Members for proposing their amendments. The Secretary for Development has just responded to matters relating to land supply and development. My speech, as follows, will focus on issues relating to the housing policy.

According to the "supply-led" and "flexible" principles of the Long Term Housing Strategy, we update the long-term housing demand projection annually and bring the achievement of the 10-year housing supply target forward by one year so that the Government can continually plan ahead on developing land and housing in order to meet the housing needs over the long term.

The Government published the Long Term Housing Strategy Annual Progress Report 2018 at the end of last year. The report was discussed at the meeting of the Panel on Housing of the Legislative Council held on 7 January this year. According to the latest projection, the total housing supply target for the next 10-year period (i.e. from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029) is 450,000 units. Given this supply target, the Government will revise the public/private split to 7:3 for the 10-year period starting from 2019-2020, i.e. the supply target for public housing will be 315,000 units and that for private housing will be 135,000 units.

In the light of the aforementioned supply target for public housing, as per the amount of land sites identified as of now, if all sites are smoothly delivered on time for housing development, it is estimated that 248,000 units of public housing can be constructed. This number represents 10,000 units more than the housing production of 237,000 units for the ten-year period starting from 2018-2019 announced last year. To achieve the aforementioned public housing supply target of 315,000 units in the 10-year period starting from 2019-2020, we must continue our endeavour to actively identify land for housing supply.

There are views that, despite the increase in the new supply target for public housing, the gap between the target and the estimated public housing production in the next 10 years will be further enlarged, thus rendering the targets set in the Long Term Housing Strategy seemingly without substantive meanings.

In this connection, I must make a clarification that the housing supply targets in the next 10 years are set, following the framework and methods formulated in the Long Term Housing Strategy, on the basis of the long-term housing demand projection made on objective data, instead of the current land and housing supply.
In formulating the supply targets, we have all along been reporting to society the estimated supply in an open and transparent manner and have been sending a clear message. Even if the shortfall in land supply persists, to meet the new targets, we must face the challenge and endeavour together to increase land supply, with a view to increasing housing supply in the next 10 years, particularly in the latter part of the 10-year period.

In the 2018 Policy Address, the Chief Executive states that the Government will allocate more land sites for public housing development and committed to allocating 70% of housing units on the Government's newly developed land to public housing development. As always, we will continue our efforts in identifying sites to increase land supply and housing production through a multi-pronged approach, which includes (i) speeding up land planning and site formation and construction; (ii) considering allocating more "spade-ready" sites for public housing development; and (iii) optimizing the development potential of each site where planning and infrastructure permit and without compromising the environmental quality to an unacceptable extent, with a view to increasing and speeding up supply of public housing.

Since it takes time to identify land for increasing housing supply, in addition to carrying out the long-term housing policy and measures, the Government will support and facilitate the implementation of various short-term initiatives on transitional housing to alleviate the hardship faced by families awaiting public rental housing ("PRH") and the inadequately housed.

The Task Force on Transitional Housing ("Task Force") under the Transport and Housing Bureau led by me seeks to provide coordinated support in consultation with relevant bureaux and departments for community initiatives on transitional housing, depending on the needs of individual projects. Such support includes offering advice on administrative or statutory procedures, as well as assistance in applying for funding.

The Task Force is currently assisting and facilitating a number of projects advocated by various non-governmental organizations, including the Community Housing Movement operated by the Hong Kong Council of Social Service and the Modular Social Housing scheme located on Nam Cheong Street in Sham Shui Po which is supported by the Hong Kong Community Care Fund.
To make better use of existing housing resources, the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HKHS") launched the Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid in September 2018, allowing eligible flat owners to sublet their rooms to targeted tenants without paying premium. The targeted tenants of the Scheme are family and elderly one-person applicants waitlisted for PRH for three years or more, as well as non-elderly one-person applicants waitlisted for six years or more. The Scheme aims to improve their living environment before PRH allocation. HKHS is reviewing the Scheme and collecting views from the public. The operational details will be fine-tuned as and when necessary.

At the suggestion of the 2018 Policy Address, the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") will consider joining the Scheme based on the actual implementation of the Scheme in the next few months. Owners of subsidized sale flats with premium unpaid will also be allowed to sublet their flats to needy families so that the living environment of more people waiting for PRH allocation can be improved.

There have been views that the Government may consider redeveloping aged PRH estates to increase the supply of PRH. In this regard, we have had considerable deliberations in the past. As explained in the Long Term Housing Strategy, while redevelopment may increase PRH supply over the long term, in the short run, it will immediately reduce the number of flats which can be allocated to those waiting for PRH because such flats will have to be used to rehouse tenants displaced by redevelopment instead of being allocated to PRH applicants. Even though redevelopment, when completed, will increase the supply of flats, it will take a few years and lengthen PRH applicants' waiting time as a result. Given the current—we stress current—high demand and long waiting time for PRH, it is not advisable to carry out massive redevelopment programmes.

Along with this strategy, HA will keep considering redevelopment on an estate-by-estate basis in accordance with the Refined Policy on Redevelopment of Aged PRH Estates formulated in 2011, with reference to four basic principles, viz structural conditions of buildings, cost-effectiveness of repair works, availability of suitable rehousing resources in the vicinity of the estates to be redeveloped and build-back potential upon redevelopment.
For aged PRH estates with no confirmed redevelopment plan, HA will continue to upkeep and improve the building conditions and also continue to implement various programmes and measures, including the Estate Improvement Programme, the Total Maintenance Scheme and lift modernization, so as to provide residents with a safe and comfortable living environment.

President, I hereby conclude my responses to the matters relating to the housing policy in the motion. After hearing the speeches to be made by various Members in the debate, I will make additional and further responses accordingly. Thank you, President.

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

Ms Tanya CHAN, please speak.

MS TANYA CHAN (in Cantonese): President, I would like to thank Mr James TO for proposing this motion to give us opportunity to discuss issues relating to housing supply in the short-to-medium term, and to do justice for the Task Force on Land Supply ("the Task Force"). I sometimes feel that the Government is very unsympathetic. The Task Force has made much effort even if there were no achievement, but the Chairman and Deputy Chairman had to stand in front of two easy-mount frames to present their report for more than an hour. How improper it is.

Next, I would like to talk about the manifesto of Carrie LAM, the Chief Executive. There are things we cannot forget even if we wanted to. In paragraph 5.7 of the manifesto entitled "We Connect", it is mentioned that a dedicated task force (that is, the Task Force on Land Supply) will be established, and the first task of developing land resources is to seek consensus. Interestingly, the Chief Executive is indeed rising up to challenges now. She turns a blind eye to the proposals on which consensus has been reached but insists on implementing those without a consensus. What is this? Is she going to break her promise?

Regarding land supply, the Chief Executive has already put forward all of the plans when delivering the 2018 Policy Address even though the Task Force has not yet published a report, thereby relegating the grand debate on land supply to a "big show", and Carrie LAM, the Chief Executive, is in fact the culprit who
has inflicted the damage. We can see that there are already inherent defects in the work of the Task Force, which include insufficient information and the failure to explain how the land reserve would be used and other detailed information. The questionnaire which looks like a dim sum order form has also confined the choice of the public. It is subject to much damage afterwards, which makes the situation even worse. As I have said, thanks should go to Carrie LAM and members of the Executive Council for coming out to express their views before the report was released.

First of all, let me talk about the Fanling Golf Course. I am not talking about being very angry or highly enthusiastic. I am referring to the Fanling Golf Course. President, this is somewhat related to your son as well. I have got in my hand the land lease of the Fanling Golf Course. In the first place, there is already a complete change in the nature of private recreational leases in the sense that they have been commercialized. Others who run a business, such as operating a restaurant or providing parking services, have to rent a place. Yet, these private clubs have now become venues for dining, massaging, playing mahjong and singing karaoke. Others who pay commercial rent in the market are really miserable. How much rent do they have to pay? To resume the site at Fanling Golf Course, only 12-months' notice is required before the expiry of the lease and no compensation would have to be made. The most important point is that the land is resumed for public purposes. Public housing is definitely a public purpose, so there is no need to make any compensation. In addition, the Task Force tells us that the time frame is 10 years. While the "10 Years Challenge" has now gone viral on Facebook, we can act in tandem with this "10 Years Challenge" and enable members of the public to have a dwelling place. Why can we not resume 32 hectares of land? I really do not understand.

The Government said immediately that it was impossible. Can business deals not be made? This should not be the case. Can open championships not be hosted? Please go back and do some homework. President, I believe your son would also know that the British Open Championship and many open championships are hosted in an 18-hole golf course, which is different from the current practice of the Fanling Golf Course in which open championships are hosted in three 18-hole golf courses. I had a debate with the convener of the Hong Kong Alliance of Golfers on the television. Do you know what he told me? He said the remaining area of the Golf Course—that is, the other two 18-hole courses—is used for parking vehicles of the television broadcasters. Why is it so interesting? An open championship is hosted once every year and
then the two 18-hole courses are occupied by vehicles of the television broadcasters, and they have all the say. President, what logic is this? Business deals cannot be made? If this is the case, all companies in Hong Kong will close down then. It is totally unreasonable.

Next, we come to reclamation. It is amazing; I think Carrie LAM is really amazing. She first gave the reclamation work at East Lantau a name in the Policy Address, giving it a nice name of Lantau Tomorrow. President, please take a look at the submissions if you have time, which is the one in my hand. We really need to discuss it. While there are quantitative and qualitative opinions, all of them are presented collectively in respect of reclamation, claiming that many respondents support reclamation outside the Victoria Harbour and at East Lantau. That said, let us look at it more clearly, okay? With regard to the quantitative opinions on reclamation outside the Victoria Harbour and developing the East Lantau Metropolis, 50% to 60% of the respondents support such options. In terms of qualitative opinions, however, 90% of the respondents are opposed to these options, resulting in a support rating of 7% only. Yet, these are not set out in the submissions that I have put up just now. Why are these not set out? I really do not understand, why can they not be honest?

On the other hand, Secretary Michael WONG mentioned the Land Resumption Ordinance earlier. In fact, apart from the handling of brownfields, the Ordinance can also be invoked for handling public-private collaboration land development projects. Just now, Secretary Michael WONG also said that the Ordinance has now been invoked for the North East New Territories New Development Areas. Yet, I wonder why Carrie LAM told us that it would take a long time and give rise to numerous lawsuits. It may take eight to 10 years but at least the Government has already started to do so.

President, speaking of "land sharing", it is about naming again. I wonder why it is given such a nice name. What is land sharing? They enjoy the land as all the money earned goes to their pocket. To what extent are the public involved in it? In fact, all of us have made much effort during the entire process of the grand debate on land supply, whereas members of the public have also provided opinions diligently. However, in the end, it was messed up by members of the Executive Council and the Chief Executive before the report was released. While we may not fully agree with what the Task Force proposes, a little respect should at least be accorded to them. The Government does not even possess such a basic common sense.
President, lastly, we are very surprised to know that when someone asked the Chief Executive after the report was published, she replied that it was not a responsible act to accept all of the recommendations indiscriminately. What else can I say? Whatever the others say, they will accept what they like and put aside what they dislike. What has the Task Force done wrong so that the Chairman and Deputy Chairman have to be kept standing up? Their term of office will expire after February. They have made much effort even though there is no achievement. The Chief Executive has been so unsympathetic in respect of the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance, whilst Secretary Dr LAW Chi-kwong has said that when we can live to 120 years old, being 60 years old is just being middle-aged. Why does he not say that when we can live to 180 years old, those aged 60 are just young people? Such remarks are totally illogical. The Task Force is very important to Hong Kong. Now, in regard to the short, medium and long term, 32 hectares of land is available at the Golf Course in the short-to-medium term alone. Why is it not used?

I so submit.

MR TOMMY CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, Hong Kong is undoubtedly in urgent need of increasing land and housing supplies. In the face of an average waiting time of 5.5 years for public housing, the Government proposes that the public/private split for the supply of new housing units over the next 10 years be adjusted to 7:3. While the Liberal Party finds such a proposal reasonable, we must state at the outset that this should apply to new supply of land alone and be subject to regular review. Once the shortage of public housing eases, the Administration should return the ratio of development to the present level, taking particular care not to overlook the demand for commercial sites.

Indeed, for development, a balance must be struck between the needs of various parties. Planning must not be done by skewing to one side, otherwise, healthy development would be hard to sustain in the community concerned, or society at large for that matter. This is precisely the problem with the original motion and that with most of the amendments.

Everyone is saying that housing construction must be expedited. Some may even demand the requisition and resumption of some lands already in use for other purposes, turning a blind eye to the crucial factor that land development must be underpinned by proper planning. This is not much different from the Government's "irrational land-grabbing spree" in various districts a few years
back, where lands—even those not suitable for constructing subsidized housing in respect of facilities—were resumed in a high-handed manner, which sparked resistance from members of the districts concerned.

One focus of today's debate is whether the site of the Fanling Golf Course ("FGC"), which bears a history of nearly 150 years, should be resumed. From the perspective of political correctness, it is certainly best to resume the site. However, the Liberal Party hopes that Members will refrain from lending their ears to only one side while simplifying the problem into a clash between the rich and the poor. Golf is not necessarily the preserve of the rich that excludes the poor. It can be seen from the analysis made by the Task Force on Land Supply ("the Task Force") in its report that, on the issue of whether the FGC site should be resumed, public opinions are polarized rather than overwhelmingly united, with some supporting the resumption and others opposing it.

The expiry of the relevant lease for FGC next year creates the illusion that the site could be available in the short term. In fact, environmental and traffic impact assessments must be conducted before land development. The two studies, lasting several years each, do not take place concurrently. Moreover, given the existence of quite a few ancestral graves in FGC, it cannot be ruled out that some descendants might apply for judicial reviews against the resumption decision on the ground of feng shui, which could easily drag on for decades. Hence, far from being what Members debate today as a short-to-medium term solution, the FGC site can take longer to come to fruition than creating land through reclamation. The Secretary can perhaps provide addition information in this respect in his reply later.

According to the information I have on hand, putting together an environmental impact assessment ("EIA") report is time-consuming. The feasibility study on a given project alone takes 55 months, not to mention consultations with, among others, the District Councils, the Panel on Environmental Affairs and the Public Works Subcommittee of the Legislative Council. Upon the completion of EIA, there is still the traffic assessment. By my calculation, the relevant procedures altogether take well over 10 years to complete. Will the FGC site be available for housing construction in the short term? No. Certainly, many people question the need to have three 18-hole golf courses in FGC. I have no answer to that, since I do not know how to play golf. Colleagues of the Civic Party, especially those in the legal profession, may have a better idea since they are more frequent golf players, whereas we members of the catering industry participate in the sport less often. President, I have lifted
a golf club only a dozen times in my entire life, for no other reason than officiating at opening ceremonies, in which only one stroke is required, with a club that I do not own.

FGC is the only venue in Hong Kong that is suitable for hosting the Hong Kong Open. As one of the few world-class sporting competitions being held in Hong Kong, this major international event is an annual draw for many overseas companies and athletes, with no lack of big spenders among them. Resumption of the site—even done in a partial manner—will strip FGC of its significance. Hence, quite a few foreign organizations and companies have tendered their submissions, urging the Administration to keep and treasure it. Indeed, we should also take these views into account, rather than focusing solely on the internal views of Hong Kong.

Many in Hong Kong have long criticized Hong Kong's education for a lack of diversity and failure to encourage children to participate in sports. It is extraordinary that Hong Kong boasts a golf course that meets international standards and serves as the main training ground for local players and junior athletes. Why giving it up easily? It should be noted that FGC, which is steeped in history, high in conservation value and world-renowned in the sporting scene, owes its cherished values not merely to the sedimentation of time, but also to the interlacing of its unique geographical setting and historical background which cannot be repeated. Even if a relocation is possible, the manpower and material resources involved would by no means be trivial. On the contrary, it is more pragmatic to preserve the golf course in its existing location along with its irreplaceable social values, which can complement the balanced development of the community in the district while avoiding the overconcentration of housing and aggravation of traffic load in Northern New Territories.

President, the Liberal Party does not rule out any potential means that can increase the supplies of land and housing, as long as they are reasonable and feasible. In respect of whether the Lands Resumption Ordinance should be invoked in resuming the brownfield sites and idle agricultural lands in the New Territories, while the Liberal Party certainly has no objection, the Government has all along exercised such power wherever possible. However, there are many difficulties in practical operation. For example, the relocation of traditional operations on brownfield sites, which has far-reaching implications, requires the alignment of many objective conditions. It is no less difficult than developing Lantau Island.
As for ways in which the large swathes of idle agricultural lands held by private developers can be released, while the Liberal Party has long held that it is best achieved by a public-private partnership approach, such a suggestion has sparked populist denunciations of collusion between business and the Government, thereby deterring the Administration from pressing ahead. The Liberal Party believes that, instead of taking these criticisms to heart, the Government should respond to them by adopting an open and transparent system in ensuring that the relevant development projects would gear mainly towards the construction of Home Ownership Scheme—even public rental housing—flats and proving to society that the partnership approach is a multi-win option.

To minimize disputes, the Liberal Party has already put forth a development mode of "infrastructure before housing construction". I am pleased to note that the Government and the Task Force both agree to this direction. I am convinced that by prioritizing infrastructure, certain districts in Hong Kong can be relieved of the traffic problems that have plagued them for years. It would also go some way to remove the constraints of developing new districts, not least by helping to reduce the objections of the residents in the districts.

The Liberal Party supports creating land through reclamation in areas outside the Victoria Harbour, especially the Lantau Tomorrow Vision, and hopes that the Government will commence the relevant study immediately. I so submit, President.

MR CHAN KIN-POR (in Cantonese): President, the Task Force on Land Supply ("the Task Force") submitted a report to the Chief Executive recently, recommending the Government to give priority to three short-to-medium-term and five medium-to-long-term options to increase land supply. According to the projection of the Task Force, the eight options will be able to provide a total of 3 200 hectares of land, although there will still be a shortfall in land supply in the short-to-medium term will still remain.

The report points out that, in the short-to-medium term, there will be a shortfall of 815 hectares until 2026. Even taken forward at full speed, the three short-to-medium-term options can provide 320 hectares only. In other words, even if the three recommendations, namely developing brownfield sites, private agricultural land and part of the golf course, are all implemented, there will still be a shortfall of 495 hectares in the short-to-medium term.
People who oppose reclamation keep saying that land supply will be sufficient if we focus on the development of brownfield sites and agricultural land. Yet, the report clearly indicates that there will still be a shortfall in land supply in the short-to-medium term even if these measures are taken forward at full speed. As stated in the report, although the development of brownfield sites receives the most support, society has underestimated the challenges and difficulties in developing brownfield sites. If compensation and relocation issues are not handled properly, brownfield development can hardly proceed. For example, the planning of Kwu Tung North/Fanling North new development area was launched a decade ago but land resumption has yet to start. Therefore, as pointed out by Mr Stanley WONG, Chairman of the Task Force, there is no single land supply option to eradicate the land shortage problem. The Government must adopt a multi-pronged approach and no option should be given up.

Moreover, according to the survey conducted by the Task Force, more and more members of the public understand the importance of the reclamation project to Hong Kong. Sixty-two percent of the questionnaire respondents and 58% of the telephone survey respondents supported the development of the East Lantau Metropolis. Among the options that can provide 1,200 hectares of land, the development of the East Lantau Metropolis received the support of 78% of the questionnaire respondents and 68% of the telephone survey respondents. I think the public are very smart as they understand that reclamation is the most effective way to solve the housing problem in the long run. With further explanations in detail by the Government on various issues, the public will better understand the truth of the matter and increasingly support the project.

Since the short-to-medium-term options cannot tackle the shortfall in the short-to-medium term, can we accelerate the supply in the medium-to-long term in the hope of compensating the shortfall in the short-to-medium term? A member of the Task Force with extensive experience in public policy tells me that it is possible if the Government is determined to accelerate the medium-to-long-term supply. The reclamation project under discussion now will take 13 to 14 years before the first batch of people may move in. However, if the Government proceeds with a breakthrough mindset and a new approach to overcome the cumbersome procedures, it can be shortened to eight to nine years before the first batch of residents may move in, and thus compensate the shortfall in the supply in the short-to-medium term.
That member of the Task Force points out that, in the case of the construction of the third runway taken up by the Hong Kong Airport Authority ("AA"), the reclamation is expected to take about six years, plus two to three years for the construction of the superstructure. It is estimated that the project will take eight to nine years in total to complete, far shorter than the Government's projection of 10 years merely for reclamation. Hence, we can replicate the example of success of AA so that Hong Kong people can be allocated a flat as soon as possible.

This member of the Task Force states that, given the current political environment, it is impossible to set up a reclamation authority. Nevertheless, we may consider handing the development right to existing public bodies, such as the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA"), the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HS") and Urban Renewal Authority ("URA"), upon the completion of development planning. HA can coordinate the development of public housing, the Home Ownership Scheme and the Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme, while HS and URA can coordinate the development of private and commercial buildings. They may work in partnership with the private sector and branch out their efforts to tap outside resources in order to accelerate the reclamation process. The time required for housing construction will definitely be shorter this way than being handled by the Government. There have been precedents for such arrangement. Apart from the experience of the third runway, the development of City One in Sha Tin is another example. Back then, the Government demarcated the seabed for four developers to conduct reclamation according to the Government's planning. Moreover, the construction of the new airport back then, from the proposal in 1989 to the official opening, took nine years only. All these examples that reclamation can actually be accelerated and does not have to drag on for so long.

Frankly speaking, I think these suggestions are really insightful and worth considering. There are big problems in the existing mechanism of housing construction. Some people say that it takes too long for the Government to finish the process from finding the flour to the bread being baked. It shows that the bread-baking machine has broken down, meaning that the land creation mechanism malfunctions. The Chief Executive replied to me that the Government is simplifying the approval procedures of several relevant departments, but does that mean the bread-baking machine has been fixed? I believe many problems are yet to be solved. In order to complete land
reclamation expeditiously so that the public can be allocated a flat as soon as possible, I very much agree with this proposal and hope the Government can look into it.

President, I have heard many people expressing admiration for the public housing system in Singapore, which truly achieves "housing for everyone". Hong Kong may not be able to achieve the level of Singapore's, but we can increase the supply of public housing substantially so that more people, in particular young people, may enjoy public housing. In order to achieve that, it is necessary to create a large piece of land by reclamation. We are envious of the Housing and Development Board flats in Singapore but oppose following their example in reclamation. This is totally unreasonable and asking for trouble.

The more the truth is debated, the clearer it will become. Reclamation is supported by the majority of the public. The next step is to study how to shorten the duration from 13 to 14 years to less than 10 years. Thirty years ago, the approval, reclamation and completion of the new airport took nine years only. Nowadays, with the advanced technology in reclamation and housing construction, the only reason for the project to drag on for so long must be the outdated procedures which the Government should really be determined to rectify.

I so submit.

MR CHRISTOPHER CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, Mr James TO proposes this motion in relation to increasing housing supply for our discussion after the Task Force on Land Supply ("the Task Force") submitted its final report to the Government, recommending a number of measures to identify land for housing development. I would like to lend my strong support to it.

We can see clearly the fierce competition for housing flats in the Home Ownership Scheme re-launched last year and the Urban Renewal Authority's "Starter Homes" Scheme for Hong Kong Residents, which is open for application recently. From the phenomenon that the younger generation, such as the "post-80s" and "post-90s", vies for subscription, we can see how keen the housing demand of Hong Kong people is, and how desperately they yearn for a comfortable home.
However, even the cleverest housewife cannot cook a meal without ingredients. We are now faced with an extremely acute problem of land shortage. The shortfall of 810 hectares in land supply faced by Hong Kong would not be solved even if the Government accepted all the three short-to-medium term options recommended by the Task Force, including the development of brownfield sites, tapping into private agricultural land reserve in the New Territories, and mandatory resumption of a small portion of the site at the Fanling Golf Course.

What is more, the waiting time for public rental housing exceeds five years, showing that it is a critical juncture for identifying land for housing development and we have to face it squarely. Therefore, I strongly agree to the meaning of the title the Task Force's final report that we must work together to strive for land supply with a multi-pronged approach. A multi-pronged approach allows us to buy time to address the long-term land demand in a proper manner. Working together is also very important. I noticed that people hold divergent views on various options after the report is published. For instance, it is feared that developing brownfield sites would undermine the development of some industries, whilst public-private collaboration in the development of agricultural land might be regarded as collusion between the Government and the business sector. If we do not set aside our prejudice and put words into action, we will only idle away our time and can accomplish nothing in the end. The problems of land and housing supply will hence become a dead knot which can never be untied.

Identifying land is definitely no easy task, and there may even be a myriad of obstacles. Therefore, we hope that the Chief Executive can, with tremendous courage, shoulder the historical mission of eradicating the problem of exorbitant property prices resulted from the scarcity of land and dense population in Hong Kong. An overall land development policy should be formulated as expeditiously as possible so that we can "decide and proceed after discussions".

Regarding measures in the short-to-medium term, I consider that the Government should raise the plot ratio appropriately in order to increase the volume of housing production of the land currently available for development, with a view to meeting the demand for housing and development, etc. Otherwise, it would seem that we do not know how to capitalize on the opportunities. It is simply a waste of time, which would lead to the aggravation of the land shortage crisis.
In addition, various Government departments should deal with the vacant or idle land and buildings in their possession proactively and efficiently. It should also take the initiative to hand them over for deployment and development at the central level. We can indeed see that quite a number of vacant industrial buildings and school premises, vacant Government buildings, as well as idle government land have been occupied or embezzled without permission. These precious land resources require adjustment and development by the Government to unleash their development potential.

President, I find it necessary to create land through reclamation in the medium to long run to ensure that there is sufficient land supply to cope with future planning and development. Therefore, I fully agree to and appreciate the Lantau Tomorrow programme put forward by Carrie LAM, the Chief Executive, in the Policy Address, which proposes to create 1 700 hectares of land through reclamation. The Chief Executive dares to be pragmatic and take the challenges of the land shortage problem that the Government has failed to solve over the past 20 years since the reunification. It fully demonstrates her courage and foresight.

Looking at the development in the Greater Bay Area and the neighbouring regions, reclamation is involved in most cases. In Shenzhen, which is located the closest to us, great changes have been witnessed over time and it has developed into the Silicon Valley of China. Reclamation in Macao has also promoted the buoyant development of its entertainment industry. Singapore, which is our competitor, is still carrying out large-scale reclamation works up till the present. It can be said that development can hardly be achieved without land, and it is also impossible to fully address the housing needs of the public. It is somewhat a pity that the Task Force has not been able to incorporate the Lantau Tomorrow programme in its consultation exercise. However, given that creating land through reclamation is generally supported by the public, the Chief Executive may step up the implementation of the first phase reclamation works under Lantau Tomorrow to avoid a disruption in land supply.

Lastly, as public-private collaboration for land development is well received by the public, and it is also one of the options that can provide land as soon as possible, the Government should not be afraid of being labelled. As long as a reasonable and transparent mechanism is put in place for public monitoring, it will certainly win the support of the public. This is the solution to the problem of housing shortage, and I hope that the Government will give it a serious thought.
With these remarks, President, I support the Government to identify land for housing development as soon as practicable so as to solve the problem of housing shortage.

PROF JOSEPH LEE (in Cantonese): President, the motion proposed by Mr James TO this time round can be considered timely because it is founded on the Policy Address, which has devoted many paragraphs to the issue of land supply, in addition to reclamation. Today, I read a newspaper report which says that there is a new approach or new direction in the development of North East New Territories. Apparently, this approach will enable headway or progress to be made in land supply in the future, up to 2030. We will not have reached 120 years old by then yet.

I find that the discussion of the motion this time round is focused mainly on the supply of residential flats. President, we all understand that nowadays, buying one's own property is something out of the reach of the public. Of course, after buying one's own property, one would soon spend their monthly income on it and become a member of the "jyut-gwong group" (in Cantonese, "jyut-gwong" may mean "moonlight" or "exhausted monthly") as many people in the community put it. The meaning of "jyut-gwong" in this context has nothing to do with the moonlight at night. It means that one's wage is spent at the end of every month because it is necessary to pay the mortgage instalments for one's flat, raise one's children and have some disposable money for oneself, so no money is left at all. What should one do, then? Regarding such a situation, some people may say that this is normal. This is what Hong Kong is like. In a capitalist society, if one has money, one buys one's own property and if one does not have money, one lives in public rental housing ("PRH"). However, the problem is that the waiting time for PRH is very long. I am also a member of the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") and the Under Secretary is also present. Members of the public have to wait a long time before they can move into PRH. Is that right? Such a situation is not conducive to solving the housing problem.

(THE PRESIDENT'S DEPUTY, Ms Starry LEE, took the Chair)

In fact, I advanced the concept of housing rights two years ago. At that time, I discussed and analysed housing rights from the health perspective. I do not mean to encourage the public to buy properties but at least, the SAR
Government has the responsibility to protect the housing rights of the public as a whole, be it public housing or private housing. I will not be as idealistic as LEUNG Chun-ying and say how many square feet should be provided but basically, it must be healthy. What does "healthy" mean? At least, the living conditions should not be as bad as those of subdivided units where water and electricity supplies are unstable. Worse still, the living conditions and hygiene are also poor. As regards private housing, at present, "nano flats" are prevalent and people living in these units feel very cramped. If this goes on, at the least, mental problems will occur. If you belong to the "jyut-gwong group" and on top of that, you have bought a "nano flat", I do not think your mental health will be that good each month. Of course, it will not be as bad as having to suffer from depression. The concept of housing rights advanced by me has a bearing on health, so the Government should face this problem squarely.

If we look at the motion proposed by Mr James TO and the amendments proposed by other Members today, particularly those related to the resumption of brownfield sites, we will find that there are a large number of brownfield sites in North East New Territories and many other places in Hong Kong, as reported by the press today. If the Government really summons up its determination by invoking the Land Resumption Ordinance to undertake the work in this area, be it brownfield sites or idle agricultural lands, they can all be developed. Of course, I also notice that in the discussions on development, it has been mentioned that these brownfield sites are being used for various purposes, whereas the agricultural lands may have been hoarded by some major property developers. Again, there is collusion between Government and business. In fact, the Government's responsibility is to strike a balance between development or the need for land and the need for housing by using resumed brownfield sites properly when planning the long-term development of Hong Kong.

Frankly speaking, our generation will not live to 120 years old for sure. I do not know if the next generation has any likelihood of living to 120 years old. No matter what, we still need to have a flat or some accommodation. The Government has the responsibility to carry out long-term development and use the option of brownfield sites when carry out planning and development properly, instead of citing various excuses for inaction. As the Government, it must show commitment. I know that the current-term Government may think that its term lasts only five years. Only some three years are left now, so there is insufficient time. However, just like our Chief Executive, who has painted such a grand picture and talked about long-term development in the Policy Address, her
politically appointed officials or technocrats all have the responsibility to examine how brownfield sites can be dealt with and how the long-term supply of land can be secured. They have to ensure appropriate supplies of both PRH and private housing which are affordable to the public so that they can exercise their inherent housing rights. As regards whether they should acquire their own properties, this is their choice. However, this is the job that the Government has to do. Without land, how can housing be developed? Be it PRH or private housing, it is necessary for the Government to put in efforts for their development.

As regards the work of the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA"), Deputy President, I have to declare that I am also a board member of URA. In fact URA has been criticized that in the past, after resuming and redeveloping residential properties, URA sold them at high prices and as a result, the public could not afford them. That means URA used public funds to make profits and such a claim has been long-standing. I am not going to try to discuss or look into such a claim. In fact, the new mission of URA now, as set by the Chief Executive, is as follows: when URA tries to develop the resumed land at its disposal, there are 5Rs. But I am not going into the details since the subject matter today is not URA. However, one of the things is that after resuming the land in old areas and redeveloping buildings, can URA provide assistance to the Government in this regard by selling its units at reasonable prices? As I said just now, if members of the public have greater affordability or the means, their housing rights can be safeguarded. This is precisely the new role to be played by URA and it is also a desirable balancing role. Therefore, it has my total support.

However, the problem is that URA is not a public organization, so a balance has to be struck. Simply put, it must be self-financing. The Government has to ensure that URA will not suffer losses each time it puts its flats on sale. Even in the case of HA, if losses are recorded each time it puts its flats on sale, or only PRH is built but no Home Ownership Scheme units are put on sale, giving it no income, the Government has to cover the losses. The same is true of URA. I am not trying to defend it but if the Government wants to benefit URA's positioning to serve a balancing function, it must strike a balance in respect of URA's financial burden. This is what the Government should do.

As regards the discussion on the sale of Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS") units with premiums unpaid, this is a desirable measure but the deliberation has gone on for a long time and there are a lot of controversies such as how premiums
should be paid, how long should the period be set, and so on. All these are technical issues and I think that in principle, this measure can make the revolving door, in particular that of HOS units, revolve faster. That is to say, if I have an HOS unit and for various reasons, I already have the opportunity to live elsewhere or I can make my HOS unit available, this space should be used and the vacated unit can be occupied by other people, be they people with Green Form status or White Form status. This aspect can be discussed further but at least, the revolving door can spin more smoothly and efficiently. At present, HA is discussing a similar proposal. For example, we are discussing the proportion of Green Form applicants and White Form applicants. I have no intention to discuss here whether the proportion of Green Form applicants and White Form applicants should be 60:40—I am not talking about votes here—or it should be 50:50 but still, this is a desirable approach that can give the public hope. One controversial proposal is the development of the Fanling Golf Course. The Government proposed the development of only a few dozen hectares of land but what about the remaining land of over 100 hectares? A balance needs to be struck between the two.

In sum, in the Policy Address, the Chief Executive put forward the policy of focusing on home-ownership and I hope that it can be implemented. I also hope that Hong Kong people will have the opportunity to see the realization of their housing rights, be it by way of self-acquired residential properties or living in public housing. These more practical measures can allow the public or our next generation to enjoy their housing rights safely and continue to live in Hong Kong healthily. Thank you, Deputy President.

**DR PIERRE CHAN** (in Cantonese): Deputy President, in the Long Term Housing Strategy Annual Progress Report 2018 published by the Government recently, a key point is that the public/private split of housing supply will be revised from 6:4 to 7:3. It is indeed a good gesture to make, but the figures are a bit "inflated", for actually the Government has only undertaken to apply this ratio to new sites, not all the sites, while the categorization of the Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme as public rental housing ("PRH") somehow gives the impression that it is proposed to make up the number.

The three short-to-medium term options proposed by the Task Force on Land Supply ("the Task Force") are most clear. They include developing brownfield sites, tapping into private agricultural land reserve in the New
Territories, and alternative uses of sites under private recreational leases. The Task Force also pointed out that the present situation is pressing and that a multi-pronged approach must be adopted as there is no room for any of the options to be neglected. However, regarding the resumption of the Fanling Golf Course, the lease of which will soon expire, the Government has shown neither disapproval nor approval and this has given the public the feeling that the Government is shielding the rich and powerful. The close ties between the Hong Kong Government and major consortiums have over the years given cause for criticisms, and while the current term Government has repeatedly stressed that the housing issue is most important of all and put forward such slogans as "single site, multiple uses", it is, however, unwilling to touch the rich and powerful or the golf course which is traditionally an upper-class icon. As such, how can the public be blamed for unceasingly hurling criticisms and abuses at the Government, saying that the Government is detached from reality and turning a deaf ear to public opinions?

The Task Force has made it clear that there will be a shortage of at least 800 hectares of land in Hong Kong in the next eight years and even with the implementation of all the three short-to-medium term options proposed in the Report, there would not be sufficient land provided to make up for 50% of the land shortage. Under such urgent circumstances, the Task Force put forward the proposal of redeveloping 32 hectares of the Fanling Golf Course, which is actually just window dressing. If the Government plans to overthrow even this compromise proposal, it would absolutely go against the public wish, and public grievances would be set to explode again.

Public rental housing provides the grass roots with a roof over their heads, and it is imaginable that the public all the more wishes to have a ladder to home ownership and to this end, the Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS") is the first stop. Through working hard and when attaining an increase in their income, many grass-roots families living in PRH units have moved to HOS units and subsequently to self-owned private housing, and I am one of these examples. However, this ladder to home ownership has vanished into thin air after implementation of the moratorium on the development of HOS units as part of "SUEN's nine strokes" in 2002. According to the information of the Housing Department, the maximum income limit for one-person PRH units in 2018 is $11,540, and according to the General Household Survey of the Census and Statistics Department in 2017, the median monthly employment earnings was $15,000 for young people in the age group of 20 to 29, and $20,000 for those
aged 30 to 39, meaning that they were all ineligible for PRH units. These young people in the post 80s and post 90s generations can only rent expensive "nano units" or subdivided units, or continue to live with their families. Some time ago there were quite a lot of reports in the media about a serious lack of personal space for young people whether at work or in learning, and space is lacking even for them to make out with their partners, rendering their psychological and mental health affected in the long term and making it difficult for them to develop a sense of identity locally.

Moreover, according to the survey findings published by the Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies of The Chinese University of Hong Kong in 2019, among the 708 respondents, 51% of people aged 18 to 30 would like to leave Hong Kong. For what reasons do they plan to emigrate? For those people intending to emigrate, one of the answers mentioned by most people was "overcrowded living conditions" in Hong Kong, accounting for 25.7%, and for people who clearly stated a destination for emigration, the pull factor mentioned by most people was "ample living space", accounting for 35%. These findings are self-explanatory. The land problem has caused disappointment among Hongkongers, and the next generation does not wish to stay in Hong Kong for development.

The current term Government has often said that young people and housing are the key areas of policy administration but the situation has precisely reflected that there is basically no chance for upward mobility in Hong Kong, making it inevitable for the next generation to feel demoralized. Insofar as the housing policy is concerned, I have to emphasize that PRH units and HOS units must be developed in parallel before there is hope for the young people to live in peace and work with contentment. In particular, the continuity of the policy is the key to addressing the housing problem. Take the Urban Renewal Authority as an example. The image of it dedicating to developing luxurious residential apartments has already taken root in the hearts of the people. The Government should demonstrate the determination to change such public feeling. It must cease to use market price and the self-financing principle as the shield. Instead, it must impose more resale restrictions and provide more units at less expensive prices to alleviate the pressure on home buyers in the long term.

Today, a number of Members have put forward many measures. It is worthwhile for us to spend time studying each of these measures carefully and indeed, views are diverse on their details and feasibility, and a consensus may not
necessarily be reached. Having said that, the original intention of the motion is indisputable. I fully agree that the Government must demonstrate its resolution to rectify the mismatch in the housing policy. It must truly take a multi-pronged approach, rather than continuously shielding the interests of individual strata to the neglect of the grass roots and the next generation. I so submit.

MR KWOK WAI-KEUNG (in Cantonese): It is essential for the stability of a society that people can live and work in contentment. However, it is only getting more difficult to work and live in contentment in Hong Kong. According to the statistics of the Census and Statistics Department, 210,000 people are living in inadequate housing, i.e. subdivided units, and 30% of them are below 25 years old. They are paying high rents for housing units inadequately lit and poorly ventilated. Not only are they "pricey, tiny and cramped", they are also "frequented" by bedbugs and rats. Many families do not even have the option of using air-conditioning. May I ask: for young people aged below 25 and children living in such undesirable environment, what feeling or perception do they have about society? It is bound to be negative.

Deputy President, inadequate supply of land is common knowledge. Given the three-year target for allocation of public rental housing ("PRH"), the waiting time has exceeded five years and is just going to be longer—at least in the next five to 10 years. However, to date, there are still voices of dissent in society that obstruct in many ways the efforts to increase land supply, creating many difficulties for the related work. People have a good memory and should remember that in the past, when land sites were resumed for redevelopment or development, particularly land sites in the countryside, those opponents demanded no removal and no demolition. Also, they simply blindly opposed any reclamation works, regarding development of remote agricultural lands as a collusion between the Government and the business sector. Why did they have to make the Government's hands tied but at the same time asked for increasing land supply? After all, their actions have consequently restricted land supply. It is already a myth, and still they have to deceive themselves and others.

Such opponents often stress "brownfiled sites first, green belt sites later" to make good use of some developed land sites. It sounds agreeable in principle. However, judged by what happened in the past, the opponents have two totally different sets of standards for the use of developed land sites. When the Government made planning of new development areas, the opponents said no
removal and no demolition and that the residents, the woodwork factory or the sauce factory all had to be protected but not relocated. Nevertheless, as regards the existing operations on brownfield sites—in fact operations such as the logistics industry and the environmental protection industry provide for the livelihood of many grassroot workers—the opponents asked such operators to move out immediately and did not allow the latter to consider. Both were developed land sites. They said no removal and no demolition for one, while demanding immediate removal for the other. Needless to say, such a double standard has continued to create social divisions.

Deputy President, it is an undisputable fact that Hong Kong lacks land. The development of housing for people, elderly services and industries all require land. Developed land accounts for approximately 23% of the total area of Hong Kong. 7% of it is for residential use and country parks take up 40% of the total. Let us take a look at Singapore, which is known as the garden city. Countryside area accounts for 8% of the total area, developed land 54%, residential land 14%, exactly double the size of residential land in Hong Kong. However, the population of Singapore is only 5.6 million. No wonder Singapore has always outperformed Hong Kong with respect to housing, even though Singapore used to learn from Hong Kong in the past.

Deputy President, in the light of land shortage, we certainly need to find a solution. Identifying land sites warrants some give and take as we have to give some in order to take some. Without the development of green belt sites, what other land can we consider? Also, why is it unacceptable to consider reclamation in the central waters? Some people would raise the view that while reclamation is a long-term objective, land resumption is quicker and easier to implement. I used to think so. But let us look at the two good examples of the Kwu Tung North and Fanling North New Development Areas. Land resumption is still incomplete 12 years after the Government made the proposal. It is likely that it will take a longer time than reclamation. People must help us think about the answer for this question: who exactly causes delays in land resumption and increasing land supply? The Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions ("FTU") has all along been supporting reclamation in the central waters, precisely because of the difficulty in land resumption. We have an even greater need to think ahead and commence as soon as possible the study on the 1 000-hectare reclamation project in the central waters to prepare for the land reserve of Hong Kong.
Deputy President, some people, in an attempt to obstruct the Government's efforts in increasing land supply, have been incessantly making confusing and misleading comments. In addition to "brownfield sites first, green belt sites later", today Mr James TO has proposed the requisition of military sites, which we consider a gimmick. Since the colonial era, military sites in Hong Kong have been designated for military use, be it general training, shooting practice or provision of military facilities, which are all substantive purposes. Military sites are an essential provision in every country or region. The opposition camp has forcibly regarded land sites with clear and specific uses as some to be readily used and so there is no need to develop other land. Nonetheless, I believe people are capable of discerning if such a notion is true.

FTU is of the view that the prerequisite for the development of brownfield sites is the proper settlement of operators on such sites to avoid creating any impact on their employment because it will directly affect their family income. Moreover, we also propose the relocation of Fanling Golf Course to some restored landfills so that the golf course will continue to be available for people's access and such a developed land site can be put to optimal use. For this reason, we cannot support the amendments of Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok and Mr Tony TSE.

Deputy President, over the past 10 years and more, Hong Kong has been lacking comprehensive land planning and a stable land supply. Therefore, we consider that the Government must adopt a pragmatic attitude to solve the problem of land supply expeditiously and also make long-term planning. For some people who still want to obstruct the Government's efforts in increasing land supply, we express our regret, and for their (The buzzer sounded) …

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr KWOK, your speaking time is up.

MR KWOK WAI-KEUNG (in Cantonese): Thank you, Deputy President.

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, at present, property prices in Hong Kong have remained high and housing expenses have become the most pressing livelihood issue in recent years. Members of the grassroots who cannot move into public housing have no choice but to live in subdivided units. According to the public housing production for 2018-2019 to
2022-2023 announced by the Hong Kong Housing Authority, the annual productions of public rental housing and subsidised sale flats will both be lower than the annual average of 28,000 units proposed in the Long Term Housing Strategy ("LTHS"). In 2022-2023, there will only be 14,400 units, amounting to only half of the target set under LTHS. Meanwhile, the number of applications for public housing stands at 260,000, so the waiting time for applicants is in general as long as five and a half years, hitting yet another historical high and far exceeding the target of moving into public housing in three years set by the Government.

At present, the biggest problem with housing supply in Hong Kong is none other than an imbalance in public and private supply. The Government dare not take any measure that targets property developers or private developers. Not only has it dragged its feet in resuming the over 1,000 hectares of derelict agricultural lands hoarded by them in the New Territories, it is also unwilling to resume the Fanling Golf Course, which is rented to the powerful and privileged for their enjoyment at a giveaway rate. The tens of billion dollars of revenue from land sales each year is only spent on "white elephant" projects. As a result, the public have to endure repeated project cost overruns.

The Task Force on Land Supply ("the Task Force") submitted its final report to the Government at the end of last year. It points out the pressing problem of land shortage, which requires a multi-pronged approach and the expeditious implementation of all proposals. What is the reaction of the Chief Executive, Carrie LAM, to this? She only released a press release to thank the Task Force, saying that all the proposals in the report will be considered. Nonetheless, she also said that it might not be a responsible course of action to take everything on board. However, please consider this: Back then, the Government announced the establishment of the Task Force in high profile and with great fanfare, stressing the great importance attached to public opinion. However, after the Task Force had completed its report, the results derived by it were cold-shouldered. I believe that such a course of action taken by the Government is totally unreasonable and what it said beforehand and afterwards were also inconsistent. Ever since the Chief Executive, Carrie LAM, gave the green light to launching the Lantau Tomorrow Vision ("the Vision") involving 1,700 hectares of land, although she says that she attaches great importance to public opinion, how is public opinion like at present? It is that of opposition, so her words and actions have become inconsistent.
Deputy President, concerning the recommendations in the report of the Task Force, of course we do not necessarily agree with them completely. But many points therein are worth referring to. On short-term and medium-term proposals, the Task Force recommends that the Government should accord priority to the study and implementation of three options, including the development of brownfield sites, the resumption of private agricultural lands in the New Territories and using the sites for Private Recreational Leases for other purposes, including developing the Fanling Golf Course. These three options all received the support from more than half of the respondents. Among them, the support rate for the development of brownfield sites, at more than 80%, is the highest among the 18 options and the development of private agricultural lands in the New Territories also has a support rate of 60%.

Indeed, when compared with the large-scale reclamation project at eastern Lantau proposed by the Government after sidestepping the due process, the costs, technical requirements and environmental impact of these options are clearly lower. In fact, if we add together the 1,300 hectares of brownfield sites in the New Territories, 172 hectares of golf course and 169 hectares of private recreational lease sites held by private sports clubs, and invoke the Land Resumption Ordinance to resume at least 1,000 hectares of agricultural lands in the New Territories hoarded by private developers, the total area would far exceed the 1,700 hectares that can be obtained by implementing the Vision. If the 2,700 hectares of idle military sites and 300 hectares of idle government land are added to the total area, it will exceed 5,600 hectares and this area is more than three times the land that can be obtained by implementing the Vision.

Deputy President, in view of this, I believe the most important thing is that the Government should value the public opinion which has been set out clearly in the report. I hope the Government will be true to its word. In addition, I wish to raise one point, that is, even as the Government ramps up public housing production and speeds up the allocation of public housing to the grassroots, it should also provide regular subsidies to people who are not public housing residents to enable them to maintain their basic living conditions while waiting to move into public housing. In fact, I have expressed to the Government a number of times my hope that the "One-off Living Subsidy for Low-income Households Not Living in Public Housing and Not Receiving CSSA" can be reintroduced or regularised, and that monthly or quarterly subsidy on energy expenses can be issued to clients who cannot benefit from the Electricity Charges Relief Scheme, so that eligible applicants can receive the corresponding amount
of subsidy on energy expenses according to the number of family members. I hope the authorities can consider this seriously.

Meanwhile, I also hope that the Government can consider another issue, that is, the construction of interim or transitional housing, so that residents living in subdivided units at present do not have to face the problem of poor living conditions, hygiene and safety and they can lead stable lives and have safe accommodation. Deputy President, in sum, before carrying out any public consultation, the Government should shelve the reclamation proposal under the Vision immediately. In order to create more land, the Government should invoke the Land Resumption Ordinance, accord priority to the use of brownfield sites and lands hoarded by property developers in the New Territories and fully resume the facilities rented at preferential rates to the rich for pleasure and use them as the source of land for public housing and transitional housing. At the same time, rent and energy expense subsidies should be provided to private housing tenants waiting to move into public housing to ease the pressure of living on them. I hope the Government can make greater efforts in these areas.

Deputy President, I so submit.

**MS CLAUDIA MO** (in Cantonese): The Hong Kong Government is interesting. For a period in the past, whatever problem we raised, the authorities would give the same answer: There is a land supply problem in Hong Kong. It seems the authorities are using land shortage as an excuse so that it does not have to do anything about the problems. When we discuss the problem of land shortage and put forth lots of suggestions to deal with the problem, the authorities turn down these suggestions one by one except reclamation.

In fact, a few years ago, I heard someone who has now promoted to the rank of State leaders saying that Mainland visitors carried suitcases of cash to Hong Kong to buy flats. Why must they use cash? Come to think about it. The highest denomination of RMB currency is RMB 100, which means they have to carry a number of suitcases at the same time. Such practice cannot avoid the suspicion of money laundering. As a result, property prices in Hong Kong rank the top around the world. The international community considers this a strange phenomenon. What a pity to the people of Hong Kong who can neither afford buying private housing nor being allocated public rental housing. What can they do? The motion now under discussion tries to identify more sites to address the shortage of public rental housing in the short-to-medium term.
Let us look at the proposals therein. I thank Mr James TO for listing the areas of different types of land. We see that brownfield sites and vacant agricultural lands alone will provide 1300 hectares of land. With the resumption of the Fanling Golf Course, there will be 170 hectares of land. As for the Hong Kong Disneyland ("HKDL") site (the idle site), it is smaller, with an area of 54 hectares only. For military sites, the area is 2 700 hectares. These four types of sites add up to a total of more than 4 220 hectares. We are talking about 4 220 hectares of land, and the artificial island which Carrie LAM has made the final decision that it must be constructed by reclamation will only provide 1 700 hectares of land. Given these readily available sites before our eyes, why do the authorities not give priority to the handling of these sites? Why do the authorities insist on carrying out reclamation? This is really doubtful. Is it because of a political agenda or that we really have imminent demand for new sites? I hope Carry LAM will ask herself honestly about this and come forward to explain the case. She said in the past that Hong Kong citizens should be allocated public housing within the three-year wait. This remark of "being allocated public housing in three years" is an extremely solemn promise. Where has this promise been shelved now?

I now return to the brownfield sites and vacant agricultural land mentioned just now. In this connection, some gentry of the New Territories have made loud claims that if they are offered $200 billion to $300 billion, they can provide a large supply of land. After all, this is a matter of money. In connection with the Fanling Golf Course, Carrie LAM has been identified as a person suppressing the poor but fearing the rich. Since she dare not touch the Fanling Golf Course, repeated discussions will only end in futile. As for the site of HKDL, she merely says that the construction of housing is prohibited under the land lease and closes the discussion.

Now, Members dare to meddle in military sites. She immediately asserts that as ridiculous. She points out that under the Basic Law, Hong Kong only enjoys the so-called "high degree of autonomy" in issues other than defence and foreign affairs, and the use of military sites is obviously a matter of defence which should not be touched on. Hence, Carrie LAM will not touch these sites. This suggestion is then rejected. In this manner, she has rejected and put aside the various proposals, and she considers all these proposals meaningless. For this reason, we see that certain amendments are striving avidly to express support for reclamation, saying that reclamation is definitely a good and desirable solution. Is this true?
I will now talk about the vacant site of HKDL. That site has been left vacant or idle under the sun for nine years, and it is likely to be left vacant for another seven years. The authorities concerned say that study is now underway to identify possible uses. Back then, HKDL should not be built. The area of that site is comparable to that of the Victoria Park, which could have been used for the construction of public rental housing. Yet, "what if" questions do not exist in history and everything is too late now. However, beside HKDL, there is an idle site whose use is yet to be decided. I have an idea. If she worries that the rich will have no place to play golf, it will be uncalled for. In fact, there is a golf course opposite to Sai Kung and another in Deep Water Bay on the Hong Kong Island. Donald TSANG went to the golf course in Deep Water Bay to have dinner immediately after he was released from prison. The site of the Deep Water Bay golf course is large but no one has mentioned using it. Hence, she should now relocate the Fanling Golf Course to the vacant site at HKDL. Though that site is smaller, it is better than no space at all. If people must go for business talks, they can change the location and go there. This arrangement can release the 172 hectares of land of Fanling Golf Course. Is this proposal feasible? Will the authorities consider this?

Even if that site of HKDL cannot be used for housing, with the attitudes of the Carrie LAM administration showing "I have the final say" and "I am the law", the land lease can be amended. Though it is not allowed in the past, she may allow the Government to grant approval on the grounds of meeting social needs. After all, it depends on whether the Carrie LAM administration has the determination to face squarely and seriously the housing problem faced by the people of Hong Kong. Housing is absolutely a right and not welfare benefits. It is human rights. Thank you.

**MR JEFFREY LAM** (in Cantonese): Deputy President, everyone shares a common wish to have a comfortable home with their families. But in such a tiny place as Hong Kong, this essential requirement seems too much of a luxury to many. Over the past few years, while the SAR Government has made strenuous effort to identify lands for housing construction, land and housing supply will undeniably remain an enormous challenge for Hong Kong in the future.

We see that over the past few months, members of the public have in general responded positively to the reclamation plan titled Lantau Tomorrow Vision put forward by Chief Executive Mrs Carrie LAM in the Policy Address.
As shown by a survey conducted by the Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Centre commissioned by the Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong ("BPA") earlier, more than 60% of the respondents strongly agree or agree that reclamation in the east of Lantau is a means to increase land supply in Hong Kong. In fact, under the Lantau Tomorrow Vision programme, in addition to the provision of more than a thousand hectares of land for housing over 1 million people in Hong Kong, the newly formed land can also serve as Hong Kong's transport hub, linking Lantau, Tuen Mun and Hong Kong Island for the creation of a brand new core business district, thereby elevating Hong Kong to new heights of development. I urge the SAR Government to submit a funding proposal for preliminary studies on Lantau Tomorrow Vision to the Legislative Council as early as possible and expeditiously commence the reclamation plan.

Certainly, apart from reclamation, the Government should also adopt a multi-pronged approach to resolve the problem of insufficient supply of housing land. Mr James TO has proposed the formulation of redevelopment plans for aged public housing estates. In fact, BPA and I have also been advocating it for years. There are currently quite a number of aged estates across the territory, of which more than 20 old ones are aged over 40 years, while some are even aged some 50 to 60 years. I think the Government should expedite the implementation of such initiatives to cope with requests for in-situ rehousing on the one hand and help ease people's waiting time and demands for public rental housing ("PRH") on the other hand.

To address the problem of a serious lack of urban land, the Government should also study relaxing the plot ratios for urban residential as well as commercial and industrial sites. For example, Kowloon Tong currently consists mostly of cottage houses and villas. In fact, with the removal of the Kai Tak Airport years ago and a new development area at Kai Tak, it is now time to consider relaxing the plot ratios and restrictions on the number of floors.

I also agree that the development of agricultural lands and brownfield sites is an important option for resolving the housing problem. The Government may negotiate with various stakeholders in a flexible and reasonable manner, such as adopting the public-private partnership approach for development or resuming the land concerned under the established mechanism for public and commercial uses. This may include the development of new towns, construction of PRH and provision of such community facilities as schools, parks and hospitals. I hope the Government will not, on hearing public-private partnership, categorically
reject it due to concerns over criticisms of government-business collusion. In fact, I believe that as long as the compensation and removal arrangements are made in accordance with statutory procedures and mechanisms, with land premium payment made by developers under stringent procedures, social disputes can be reduced, resulting truly in an all-win situation for the Government, the business sector and the community.

As to Mr James TO's recommendation to fully resume the 172-hectare site of the Fanling Golf Course, I beg to differ, and I have to declare that I am a member of the Hong Kong Golf Club. Hong Kong is an international financial centre and events capital, and we are also a central city in the Greater Bay Area. Can we not even accommodate a world-class golf course? A number of experts and scholars have repeatedly reiterated the extremely high ecological and conservation values as well as historic significance of the golf course. If we are dead set on dismissing the value of existence of the golf course for the sake of winning applause, I will see it as an act by irresponsible politicos. Some even say that the golf course is reserved for the bigwigs, which is an even more outrageous misstatement. In fact, it is an indisputable fact that the golf course is getting more and more open, with the rate of usage by non-members reaching 45%.

Nor do I agree with converting the use of the site which has been reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland to public housing development. Hong Kong is a commercial city, and the site for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland is subject to land lease restrictions. We must respect the spirit of contract, refraining from arbitrarily changing a commercial agreement just because there are calls for housing construction in the community, which will otherwise scare off investors from coming to Hong Kong for development in the future.

I am even more opposed to rezoning any military site for housing development purpose because the use of military sites is a matter of national defence for which the Central Government and the Hong Kong Garrison have sole responsibility. And as repeatedly reiterated by the Government, none of the existing military sites of the Hong Kong Garrison is left idle. Since the reunification, the size and number of military sites held by the Hong Kong Garrison have actually been far smaller than those held by the former British Forces stationed in Hong Kong before the reunification.
In my view, Deputy President, in making recommendations, Members should put forward comprehensive, rational and feasible plans, instead of impulsive and unrealistic plans to the detriment of social harmony.

Deputy President, given the gravity of Hong Kong's housing problem, the creation of a large land reserve should brook no delay. Various sectors of the community must demonstrate determination, putting the overall interests of Hong Kong first while putting aside prejudices and political disputes, so that the work on identifying lands for housing construction may proceed smoothly.

Deputy President, I so submit.

MR SHIU KA-CHUN (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I now speak on Mr James TO's motion on "Increasing housing supply in the short to medium term to rectify the problem of public housing shortage". "Bullying the poor and being afraid of the rich without justice" has become the focal point of the motion this week. The earlier reform of the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance ("CSSA") Scheme was about the poor being bullied, since the CSSA Scheme has been bullying CSSA recipients and doing them injustice for 20 years. The relevant reform was supported by various Members. Mr James TO's motion is about "fearing the rich". I wonder how much support it will receive.

Given that Hong Kong is small but densely populated, we often hear the question, "Where comes the land?" Blindly adhering to the viewpoint on land shortage and sticking to the old planning concept of massive construction, the Government claims that removal of hills and reclamation are necessary to satisfy the current needs. But it makes no mention that the root causes of this problem are collusion between the Government and the business sector, monopolization of land and ownership, the everlasting small house policy, plenty of idle government land and brownfield sites not being developed, etc.

We should focus on the most fundamental problem in respect of social and power structures. We cannot allow the Government and developers to ruin any more land to consolidate their own privileges and interests. Hence, on the issue of the housing policy, the Government needs to consider two points. First, if the Government wishes to resolve the shortage of land supply, it should first take
back the leading role in land supply. Second, what Hong Kong lacks is not land but planning. Everyone is searching for land sites. Does everyone really wish to do so for the people of Hong Kong?

Before the Task Force on Land Supply ("the Task Force") released its report, Chief Executive Carrie LAM had already announced the reclamation projects under Lantau Tomorrow in the Policy Address in October 2018. Afterwards, the report of the Task Force supported the reclamation and housing project of East Lantau Metropolis. Sure enough, it is a report "passing things from the left hand to the right hand". The referee, assistant referees, the organizer and co-organizers, so to speak, are all on the Government's side. How can we match her? The Government seems even more justifiable to conduct reclamation to fulfil the integration plan of the Greater Bay Area as it has desired.

The first principle in planning is the need to enrich the existing environment. Actually, just around the corner, there is already an option, i.e. full resumption of the Fanling golf course ("FGC") for the purpose of housing development. Opinions in society on resumption of the golf course have gradually become unanimous. Such has been specifically conveyed in the report of the Task Force. After all, the question concerning the FGC site is not about land supply. Neither is it about whether Hong Kong, being an international city, should have a golf course. Instead, it is about land justice and social justice.

FGC is the land of Hong Kong people. It does not belong to the Hong Kong Golf Club or its members. Even though the Hong Kong Golf Club has now dragged in non-governmental organizations ("NGOs") and requested NGOs to express support for the club which has let them use its venue free of charge for holding many activities, I still have to point out that FGC is the land of Hong Kong people. It does not belong to the Hong Kong Golf Club or its members.

Our proposal on resumption of the FGC site does not mean we do not support this sport. It does not mean hatred against the rich. I merely wish to explore a possibility and seek a compromised solution satisfactorily for both parties to identify a site for relocating the golf course. In the past, it has been proposed in the community that Kau Sai Chau is a good site for the relocation. In fact, Fanling does not equate with golf course. They can be separate from each other. The Government should expeditiously identify a more suitable site for the golf course to resolve this dilemma.
The second principle in planning is implementation of the development direction of "brown before green and blue". That means developing brownfield sites which cannot be used for farming before considering country parks and reclamation. This should serve as the basis of land development. According to the study conducted by Liber Research Community on the present situation of brownfield, the total area of brownfield sites in Hong Kong has increased from 792 hectares in 1993 to 1,521 hectares in 2017, seeing an increase of 50% in 25 years. There is such a big "pie" right before our eyes, but the Government says it is necessary to identify sites for reclamation to seek a bigger "pie". How ridiculous!

Every time we speak on brownfield, the Government would act chicken, saying that brownfield sites are too fragmentary to produce the desired effect. Or it would resort to the pretext that if it invokes the Lands Resumption Ordinance, it would face judicial review.

The development of brownfield sites has its advantages. Most brownfield sites are at favourable locations where traffic is convenient, the land is relatively flat, and water and power supply are readily available. The Government often rashly equates "fragmentary" with "useless". However, as pointed out in the report "A Study on the Development Potential of Brownfield in the New Territories" released by Liber Research Community earlier, there are a large number of brownfield land clusters in Hong Kong, each covering at least two hectares—described as "fragmentary" by the Government—suitable for the development of village-type public housing of low to medium density. If we use only one third of such land, that means about 241 hectares of brownfield sites in the New Territories which have not been planned for development, it is already sufficient for the construction of 84,000 public housing units.

The Lands Resumption Ordinance (Cap. 124) has provided for the right of the Government to resume any land for public use and its obligation to make compensation. As a matter of fact, the Government has invoked the Ordinance to resume land quite a number of times, including the resumption of 5.6 hectares of agricultural land in Tuen Mun in 2014 for developing public housing. It was not challenged by any judicial review. Earlier on, the Government dared to ignore the possibility of judicial review filed by members of the community, insisted on rezoning green belt areas for the construction of private residential units and continued to invite tenders for land. Today, it says it is worried that there would be judicial review. It is in fact "moving the goalposts".
Deputy President, problems cannot be solved by the same level of thinking that created them. If we merely seek more land without establishing a vision or conducting long-term planning for the benefit of the people, it is impossible for our city to have sustainable development. In a nutshell, *(The buzzer sounded)* …

**DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Mr SHIU, your speaking time is up.

**MR SHIU KA-CHUN** (in Cantonese): … Deputy President, I so submit.

**MR JEREMY TAM** (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I rise to speak in support of Mr James TO's motion. Due to the limited speaking time, perhaps I can only speak on several points regarding the motion and respond to the remarks made by some Honourable Members just now. I hope to point out the deep-seated problems of land supply in Hong Kong.

In his motion, Mr TO urges the Government to conduct studies on converting the use of the site which has been reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland ("HKDL") to public housing development. In this connection, it is really a waste for a 60-hectare site to do sunbathing for a prolonged period of time. It is a monstrous waste of natural resources indeed. In fact, there has always been such an appeal in society as what Mr TO suggested just now. Earlier on, a Member also raised a question at a Council meeting, requesting the Government to give a concrete response on whether it had the intention to conduct the relevant studies. Certainly, I can probably predict how the Government would respond—just like a "human recorder"—by reiterating that before The Walt Disney Company ("TWDC") "exercises the Option for the Phase 2 site, the short-term uses of the site have to comply with various permitted uses as listed in the Deed of Restrictive Covenant ("DRC"), including recreational, sports and cultural facilities, etc., but not residential use", that is, development of public housing and transitional housing is not allowed, and the Government "has no intention to change the existing land use arrangements." Expressed in human tongue, this means that the site cannot be used due to restrictions in the terms of the DRC.
What is the DRC mentioned just now? In fact, it was signed with TWDC in December 1999. When the two parties entered into a joint venture to develop HKDL, a 60-hectare site to the east of HKDL was reserved for the second phase development. At the same time, the two parties also signed some DRCs for imposing restrictions on certain aspects such as the height and use of buildings at the sites near HKDL. This is to ensure that people in HKDL would not see the real world outside, so as to maintain the fantastic atmosphere of HKDL and keep the land uses of the surrounding sites in harmony with HKDL. It is this DRC which stipulates that the Phase 2 site cannot be used for housing development.

Nevertheless, by reading this DRC together with the reply previously made by the Government, we will come up with a question which is worth our deep thought: Is it true that this DRC cannot be slightly modified, not even to a minimal extent? The answer is no, actually. I wish to raise that TWDC signed a new agreement in respect of this DRC in 2017. What happened at that time? This is also an important issue that I have pointed out in the Legislative Council. Back then, the Government sought approval from the Legislative Council for a funding of $5.45 billion to support the Expansion and Development Plan at the Phase 1 site of the HKDL Resort. At that time, I discovered that under a particular part of the agreement, TWDC was required to agree to relax permanently the height restrictions in the DRC mentioned just now, including the area in the vicinity of Kau Yi Chau where reclamation has not been carried out, which is also the site selected for Lantau Tomorrow. The funding proposal was approved eventually, and the DRC was modified as well. It is evident that the Government can modify the DRC as and when necessary. Why does the Government propose Lantau Tomorrow? It is also aimed to carry out housing development. There is no difference between them as housing development is their common goal. Since the Government can modify the height restrictions in the DRC, following the same logic, why can the land use of this idle site not be altered?

I must say that some designs may be adopted on this site to cater for complementary arrangements. If it is worried that people in HKDL would notice it, we can think of some solutions. Shall we adopt some designs to make it invisible? Or can it be designed to fit in the atmosphere of HKDL? Shall we paint two mice on the outer walls of the transitional housing development? Are there any ways to achieve this? It can even be used as staff quarters of HKDL. When the staff members move to their new accommodation, their current dwelling places will then be released. Has it ever been considered? Being
employees of HKDL, they should fit in the atmosphere of HKDL very well. There should be no problem for them to live there. Perhaps we can request them to wear costumes of the cartoon characters of HKDL when they go out, and dress themselves as Mickey Mouse when they return to their quarters for rest. Is that okay? The problem is that land is not available, and the Government has to find a way out. I believe that TWDC is not as rigid as an iron plate, otherwise it would not have allowed the height restrictions in the vicinity of Kau Yi Chau be modified back then.

Next, I would like to respond in relation to the golf course mentioned by some Honourable Members a moment ago. I really cannot understand. Mr Tommy CHEUNG said that it was necessary to prepare environmental impact assessment ("EIA") reports and traffic assessment, etc., and it would take 50 months to prepare each report, and therefore housing development could only be kick-started after a decade. It is really shocking. I believe that the housing problem would be even more serious if the Government adopts such an approach for housing development. His saying seems to suggest that when a person breathes, his heart would not beat at the same time. In fact, the two functions can be performed simultaneously, right? The study reports which he mentioned just now can be prepared concurrently, right? Would he say that he would not breathe for a moment when his heart beats? This would not be the case. The approach currently adopted for housing production is also the same, with tasks such as preparing EIA reports, traffic assessment and plans, etc. being carried out at the same time as well. It is indeed shocking to learn that all tasks would be handled separately, and then say that it would take 10 years. In fact, we should not do the calculation in this way.

It is rather strange that some bigwigs insist on keeping this golf course. While they claim on their lips that they attach great importance to housing demand, when it comes to their interests, these bigwigs refuse to make the slightest concession. They even exaggerate on the time needed, suggesting that one cannot breathe and have heartbeats at the same time. I hope that Honourable colleagues would think carefully before they speak. Please do not resort to sophistry or distort the common sense completely.

I so submit.
MR YIU SI-WING (in Cantonese): Deputy President, the subject of the original motion is "Increasing housing supply in the short to medium term to rectify the problem of public housing shortage". How do we define "short to medium term"? According to government statistics, a public housing project generally takes about seven years from planning to completion, including three years for planning and design, half a year for tendering procedures, one year for foundation construction and two and a half years for superstructure construction. Even in urban areas where ancillary facilities are more readily available, a housing renewal project takes about eight years from land resumption to completion for occupancy. Therefore, "short to medium term measures" should be defined as measures that will bring results in five to 10 years.

The original motion proposed the resumption of brownfield sites. The process of land resumption, relocation, compensation negotiations, rezoning and disposing, installation of water and electricity supplies, increase of transport and other supporting facilities, and housing construction are expected to take more than 10 years. So, the option cannot be considered as a short-to-medium-term measure. The same applies to other options that require land resumption and rezoning, which can only be taken as medium-to-long-term measures.

The original motion points out that public housing supply in the short-to-medium term will fail to meet the expected target, yet the vast majority of the proposals focus on the medium-to-long term and relatively fewer on the short-to-medium term. This shows that solving the housing issue in Hong Kong in the short-to-medium term under resources constraints is not an easy task and the Government should step up its efforts.

Deputy President, as the supply of public housing cannot be increased in the short term, we can only tap into the existing resources in order to shorten the waiting time for public housing. Some effective or transitional measures should be introduced to help solve the housing problem of low-income households living in poor conditions. Some short-term measures in the Policy Address merit our support. First, under-occupation households whose family members are all aged 70 or above are allowed to enjoy lifetime full rent exemption upon their transfer to small units. There are 16 000 eligible under-occupation households according to estimation. If half of them can be freed up, more than 10 000 people will benefit from this initiative.
Second, I reckon that relaxing the lease requirements for industrial buildings and lowering the threshold for change of use are viable practices. The Government should provide sufficient incentives for conversion of industrial buildings to transitional housing for households on the public housing waiting list. For example, the Government may adjust the guidelines for the conversion of industrial buildings, simplify the application process, provide appropriate subsidies or even offer premium exemption in order to encourage owners to rent out their units at transitional housing rentals. Owners may rent their units out as they see fit after a specified period of time. Furthermore, the Government should make good use of vacant properties, such as vacant school premises or abandoned public housing units, by converting them into transitional housing. The above mentioned initiatives can free up many units with limited expenses to reduce the rental expenditures of some people on the public housing waiting list and the market's reliance on subdivided flats.

Of course, the key to solving the problem in the long run is still land supply. In regard to measures proposed in the original motion, my views are as follows. First, I have reservations about the proposal to fully resume the Fanling Golf Course for housing development. The Fanling Golf Course is a heritage site with over 100 years of history that accommodates more than 30,000 trees, including 160 probably ancient valuable trees and protected species, and a number of historical buildings and graveyards. It is of high ecological conservation value. The site also witnessed the development of golf locally and internationally as it has been the venue of the Hong Kong Open for nearly half a century. Some suggested relocation, but that means losing its historical and conservation significance. We should not sacrifice this historical site of Hong Kong simply because of improper use by the leasing organization. In comparison, I find developing periphery of country parks with no conservation value more viable. Indeed, the Fanling Golf Course is the subject of public criticism as it now, to a large extent, serves as a private club for wealthy people. The Government should rectify this unfair arrangement when renewing the lease in 2020.

The original motion also proposed to convert the site reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland to public housing. According to the agreement signed between the Government and The Walt Disney Company ("TWDC"), the latter has an option to purchase the site planned for the second phase development, with the right to extend twice for a period of five years each time upon expiry of the option in September 2020. To show its respect for the spirit of contract, the Government cannot resume the land and
change its use unilaterally, unless TWDC gives up the option to purchase. The
Government may certainly negotiate with TWDC, but I do not think that it would
be an easy task, considering that the party is an American enterprise. Even if the
negotiation is successful, the price to be paid will be high. I find this proposal
neither viable nor realistic as a measure to increase land supply in the
short-to-medium term.

The problem of land supply in Hong Kong is complicated. I think
reclamation in East Lantau is a relatively more thorough solution to land shortage
in the long run. The Government should formulate suitable plans and timetables
expeditiously for gradual implementation, so as to relieve the public from the
difficulties caused by land and housing shortage over the years.

Deputy President, I so submit.

MR AU NOK-HIN (in Cantonese): Deputy President, Mr YIU Si-wing
mentioned the reclamation proposal in East Lantau, which, as I can see, is not
included in the original motion of Mr James TO.

Pro-democracy Members have reservations about the reclamation proposal
simply because we have already put forward a number of measures for the
short-to-medium term. As Mr James TO said just now, as a series of
short-to-medium-term measures have been proposed, why must reclamation be
the priority? Why can we not explore these other proposals first? It seems that
the Government is turning down all the proposals put forward by society,
pro-democracy Members and Mr Stanley WONG, which caused him a great deal
of grievances. He has worked so hard to complete the report, but now everyone
calls him "the second Nelson CHOW". This is like a sequel to the Nelson
CHOW incident. He is the second community representative appointed by the
Government responsible for the big debate on land supply. However, upon the
completion of the report, it turned out that many people, including former
Member Jasper TSANG, predecessor of the Deputy President, have never heard
of the Government's intention to develop such a vast area in East Lantau. Under
such circumstances, how can society be convinced that the Government is sincere
and open to deal with various proposals to increase land supply?

Let us talk about a few comments made on this motion. I think some of
the comments on the Fanling Golf Course are ridiculous. In their responses to
the consultation, some trade associations and property developers indicated their
opposition to the resumption of the golf course on the grounds that they cannot negotiate business without the Fanling Golf Course. I find this most ridiculous. Why can they not negotiate business in Hong Kong without the Fanling Golf Course? Can they not do so in their offices? Why must they go to play golf by car, talk about their scores and commend each other's performance instead of negotiating business in a regular place? Do we do business with whoever with the highest score? Is that how it is? I do not think so. Even the Community Chest has to come forward and state that it did not support the resumption of the Fanling Golf Course, but the hidden underlying message is that it dare not offend the generous benefactors. Do I need to sing the song of SUN MA Sze-tsang: "Dear benefactors, would you be so kind as to give some land to Hong Kong people?"

The opposing views to the second proposal regarding Disneyland are equally ridiculous. As Legislative Council Members have always said, the agreement signed with Disney was unfair. I have to pick up phrases from Mr YIU: since the agreement has been signed, we have to be more pragmatic. The other party has an option to purchase. In any case, the expansion of the Hong Kong Disneyland will be completed in 2020. Disney is an American enterprise, so it will be hard for us to negotiate with them. I did not see this soft attitude from Members during the discussion on the China-US trade war. On the contrary, they often asked what was there to be afraid of with the United States. This is Mr LUK Chung-hung's favourite remark. Even we understand that the agreement is unfair with irreversible issues, we cannot deny the fact that Disneyland is sustaining losses year after year. I think The Walt Disney Company does not want to do a loss-making business. So it is by no means unreasonable for it to discuss other development direction with the Government. Second phase development of the Disneyland is not a must. I have been to the Disneyland and I personally think that many sites in Disneyland can be put into better use and second phase development is not a must. If we free up the site reserved for the second phase development and build a Disney housing estate, as proposed by Mr Jeremy TAM just now, we can name the buildings Donald Duck Building and Minnie Mouse Building with Mickey Mouse and Buzz Lightyear features, the existing demand for land supply can be solved, too.

I very much hope the Government will consider negotiating with The Walt Disney Company. We all know that this is a deadlock. They continue to incur losses while the site remains idle under the sun. Should we really negotiate with them? Carrie LAM is so strong that she could go to Beijing and came up with the three-tunnel proposal. What else is she not capable of?
I have only talked about two proposals. Members have mentioned many more just now. However, lastly, I would like to remind the Government that the land supply issue under discussion is actually man-made, as I have all along advocated. Is there really such a shortage of land in Hong Kong? I hope everyone will read the article by Prof YIU Chung-yim in Ming Pao a few days ago. He said, according to articles in different academic journals, shortage in land supply is a man-made issue. Ruijue PENG, William WHEATON, Gary WONG Wai-chung and HO Lok-sang all pointed out that land supply is an administrative action (The buzzer sounded) and nothing else.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr AU, your speaking time is up.

MR CHAN HAN-PAN (in Cantonese): Deputy President, in his speech, Mr AU Nok-hin seems to be saying that resuming the golf course is a cure-all for land and people's housing problems. But in fact, we should not miss the focus because it will also take a long time to resume the golf course. The North District Council's discussion has indicated its across-the-board opposition to housing construction at the golf course because of the residential developments to be carried out at such locations as Hung Shui Kiu, Yuen Long South, Kwu Tung North and Kam Tin South of Northwest New Territories ("NWNT"). Will the transport services in the whole NWNT be sufficient to cope with the additional housing production beyond the scope of planning? Certainly, I have to clarify that I am neutral towards the resumption of the golf course, and even find the proposal for partial resumption of the golf course acceptable. In my view, however, the remark that resuming the golf course is a cure-all for the housing problem has totally missed the focus and deviated from the truth.

In fact, the greatest constraint on housing construction in the whole NWNT is transport. I would like to invite the Secretary or other public officers to pay a visit to Yuen Long at weekends if possible, and they will know how it feels being stuck in a jam-packed place. When we drive there, we can find no parking space, not even double-parking is possible. Why? Because of the shortage of parking space and narrow roads in the district. There is simply a lack of supporting facilities in the surroundings to cope with the additional population growth. This is what happens now, let alone what will happen when hundreds of thousands of people move there under the current planning. Hence, I am pretty worried about the large-scale development to be carried out in NWNT
beyond the current scope of planning. I hope the Government will adopt a more comprehensive approach and take our advice about conducting a fourth comprehensive transport strategy study to map out the way forward for transport in Hong Kong in the face of future population growth.

Nevertheless, I agree with Mr AU Nok-hin on one point. He has pointed out that the land problem is man-made by nature. In fact, we have a considerable amount of frozen lands. What are those lands? Agricultural lands. Under the relevant planning, at the initial design stage, the six outline zoning plans have set out the agricultural, storage and other land uses across the territory. The outline zoning plans have expressly stipulated all land uses. No building is allowed on sites zoned for agricultural use, and even if no agricultural activity takes place, they can only be left idle for weeds to grow. In the past, a vast area of land in the New Territories of Hong Kong was used for such purposes as livestock rearing. With the introduction of the control requirements for livestock waste, however, the lands concerned have been left abandoned. They have actually been abandoned for 20 or even 30 years. For those lands which have not been put to use, has the Government considered ways to unleash their potentials or put them to use in its planning? The Government has no planning at all. So, is there no land available for use in Hong Kong? Actually, it is not true; it is something wrong with human planning.

Another issue is a recent topic of discussion in the community. It is about how to address the housing problem in the short term. Mr Wilson OR, Mr Vincent CHENG and I from the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong are particularly concerned about transitional housing. I am aware that the Government is now enlisting non-governmental organizations ("NGOs") in providing transitional housing on, for example, lands resumed by the Urban Renewal Authority in various districts. I certainly consider this recommendation feasible to implement. But I believe it will meet with more opposition in the urban areas which are more densely populated.

Meanwhile, some lands in the New Territories, such as those agricultural lands I mentioned just now, are privately owned. The Government can neither put them to use nor release them in planning. So, can the Government rack its brains? Since the Government now seeks to promote public-private partnership, can it build transitional housing on agricultural lands in the New Territories under a public-private partnership approach? If NGOs are allowed to build transitional housing on agricultural lands in collaboration with landlords of such lands in the
New Territories, those lands may be released or rezoned for use three years later. I believe they will be able to provide Hong Kong people with temporary, interim or even transitional housing. At present, those lands have basically been left idle for weeds to grow or even abandoned, and the Government needs only to provide infrastructure facilities there. In fact, there are many such lands adjacent to places like MTR stations or major public transport interchanges, so transport is basically not an issue. As for electricity, electricity supply is available in the New Territories, while drainage and sewage treatment may be the only tough issue, but I believe we can always find a solution. In other words, instead of searching for small land parcels for building transitional housing in the urban areas piece by piece, we may try to do so under a public-private partnership approach in the New Territories, thereby addressing the relevant issues more efficiently.

Another issue relating to land supply is urban renewal. As we all know, the progress of urban renewal has been extremely slow over the past decade, and Tsuen Wan has not even undergone any redevelopment over the past two decades. Many people have waited for redevelopment for two decades in vain. Why is redevelopment carried out in other districts, but not Tsuen Wan? Given that the plot ratio of Tsuen Wan after redevelopment is lower than that of the urban areas, redevelopment is not worthwhile. With the same amount of compensation to be paid for resumption of buildings, how would it possibly opt for redevelopment of those old districts with lower plot ratios, such as Tsuen Wan, instead of resuming buildings in the urban areas to produce more flats? Hence, I hope the Government will study ways to unleash the potentials of such lands, taking into account the presence of man-made problems. The Government should adopt the same plot ratios for Tsuen Wan and the urban areas so that people will, noting that the redevelopment value of Tsuen Wan is the same as that of the urban areas, welcome redevelopment in the district.

I think that overall, some problems are made-made, and in order to resolve them, we must not miss the focus. Deputy President, I so submit.

DR CHENG CHUNG-TAI (in Cantonese): Deputy President, with regard to the so-called shortage of public housing, or the problem concerning the entire housing policy, I hope that the Government will think about it in depth and stop making the housing policy of Hong Kong even weirder. Why do I say so? The first official paper tabled by the Government to the Legislative Council this
month is about discussions relating to the the Long Term Housing Strategy Steering Committee. In this paper, the definition of public housing is revised to be public rental housing ("PRH")/Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme ("GSH"), and this really makes PRH or public rental units for sale even weirder in our understanding. Why? First, from a perspective of the information obtained by the public on the production volume of public housing or the number of PRH units, this has obviously aroused suspicion that the Government seeks to fish in troubled waters and even deceive the public. The Government has revised the public housing ratio to a public/private split of 7:3. Everybody is happy about it, thinking that there will be an increase in the number of public housing units but the fact is that those are only private housing units with the quality of PRH units for sale to the public. It is obviously deceiving the public. This is similar to the "pay-for-blessings gangs" in that the buyers are told that they only have to pay a little more money and they can duly obtain a return. After calculation, however, it turns out that there is not any actual difference in the return. This is the first reason why it is neither fish nor fowl.

But more importantly, it will lead to a long-lasting trouble. In fact, the same also happened in the last few years of the colonial government in the run-up to 1997. Back then PRH units were put up for sale and that was the first step taken to make the public housing policy of Hong Kong neither fish nor fowl. Of course, some residents may not agree to this view. They think that when they are allocated PRH units and if they can buy their units at very low prices and live there for life, is that not very good? Those people with vested interests may hold this view. Nowadays, as we can see from these rental units put up for sale in various districts in Hong Kong and especially scattering across New Territories East and New Territories West, the problem is not purely one about whether there is a shortage of land. The problem is poor policy management by the Government who mixes up concepts. As a result, the housing policy implemented in reality is neither fish nor fowl.

For the whole morning up to the minute before I rose to speak, I was handling a case seeking assistance from me. There have been press reports on it and Members will know it if they read the news. The several days of power cut at Hei Wo House of Tai Wo Estate in Tai Po in New Territories East was reported in the press. Why? Deputy President, I have not digressed from the question, for that has to do with the management of PRH units and the public housing policy. The problem is not about a shortage or a shortfall. The problem is a downright deterioration of quality in Hong Kong. Tai Wo Estate is a housing
estate of the Housing Department ("HD") but as the units there have been made available for sale since a few years ago, the role of HD has changed to be an owner.

A few days ago, an accident unfortunately occurred at the switch room, resulting in the breaking down of the entire switch board of the building. Power supply thus became impossible, and there has been a power cut for three days. What has been done now? With the Lunar New Year approaching, it is impossible to place an urgent order for a new switch board, and there has been no electricity for three days. Of the 1,000 PRH households there, at least 200 or 300 are elderly households and they have to climb dozens of flights of stairs in order to go home. Weather is getting cold now and of course, the CLP Group was very good in arranging for the provision of two temporary switch boards. What is the result? The arrangement probably cannot fully meet the tenants' demand for power supply to resume normal completely. Now, the lifts are operating only intermittently, and three days have passed but power supply has yet to resume normal.

Some people may say that this is a question of electricity and what has it to do with the motion? Let us take a look at the role plays by HD. This concerns the public housing policy, and these units are public housing units, not to mention that this is a building of HD. But now, the residents have to negotiate with CLP directly on the provision of an additional switch board. What is more, they even have to turn to Members of this Council for assistance.

Some people may, of course, say that this is probably an individual case which merely reflects problems in the policy on public housing. Deputy President, it all boils down to the fundamental problem that I have just pointed out and that is, it is because of the Government's overall policy that the public housing policy in Hong Kong has become neither fish nor fowl. PRH and GSH will face the same problem alike in future. The Government will say that these PRH units, which have been sold to the public, should be under private management. But they were built by the Government, and Members would not have expected such big discrepancies in the quality of these housing units. After their completion, HD simply washed its hands off them and passed them to the owners for management. As a result, all the housing estates face these problems now. Leung King Estate and Tin King Estate in Tuen Mun, Tsing Yi, and even the New Territories East also have these problems. At the end of the day, we are made to deal with these problems left behind by the Government, and certainly
we are happy to deal with them for we feel that we are helping the residents. But the Government has made the policy neither fish nor fowl. Is it not deceiving the people?

In the final analysis, do not think that the shortage of public housing is purely a shortfall in number. In fact, as I have said, this is a question of poor management. On the other hand, the public may not have the means to afford housing in the market and this is why they have to enter the public housing network. If the problem is tackled by way of private housing or when it comes to the basic understanding of the statistics, does the Government have a full, detailed picture of the truth? For instance, Carrie LAM said in the middle of last year that a vacancy tax would be imposed. The public response is that this can effectively address the problem concerning the vacancy rate. But that is only a vacancy tax on first-hand properties. Furthermore, the Government actually has not looked into how many vacant private properties there are in Hong Kong …

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHENG, you have strayed too far and please come back to the question of this debate.

DR CHENG CHUNG-TAI (in Cantonese): Deputy President, the problem of a shortage in the context of the public housing policy is not about the adequacy of the provision of public housing units. The problem is why, under the overall housing policy, members of the public have to rely on public housing in their living or to meet the basic needs of living. Therefore, what we must ask is, in view of the various loopholes in general, does the Government have a full grasp of the actual situation in the market before drawing up the public housing policy? We cannot just look at the numbers of applications on the surface, or how many people have been provided with housing, and so on, for this can never resolve the problem. Those are only superficial numbers. In essence, it is the system that makes the market neither fish nor fowl.

Therefore, in respect of the two aspects that I have just pointed out, I urge the Secretary to seriously address the policy concerned, in order not to make it even weirder. (The buzzer sounded)
DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHENG, your speaking time is up.

MR MA FUNG-KWOK (in Cantonese): Deputy President, the Government has recently increased the proportion of public housing supply to address the aspirations of people, especially the young generation. However, if the supply of land is inadequate, I am afraid any adjustment to the numbers will only be lip service. Therefore, the Government must speed up its efforts in identifying land for housing production so as to ensure that the split of 7:3 in supply can be realized.

Many proposals on increasing land supply are made in the original motion and amendments today. Most of them merit our support in principle. For example, development of agricultural lands and brownfield sites in the New Territories, whether it is achieved by land resumption by virtue of the Land Resumption Ordinance or through public-private partnerships, merits immediate study and expeditious implementation. Planning for other measures, such as the participation of the Hong Kong Housing Authority in the Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid, expeditious redevelopment of aged public housing estates and increasing the plot ratios, should commence as soon as possible. However, apart from housing development, the Government needs to strike a balance among the demands for land arising from the overall development of the economy, people's livelihood and the community.

Housing development on land sites unfit for such purpose just means half of the result with double efforts while hindering other developments. Individual options proposed in the original motion and amendment are unsuitable for the use of housing. Taking vacant school premises as an example, there have been views in society that the Government should use such premises for the development of recreational and sports facilities. In 2018, in the member's motion "Developing venues and creating room to support the development of local culture, arts, recreations and sports" moved by me, I urged the Government to make better use of vacant school premises for cultural, arts or sports purposes. In fact, many vacant school premises are located in remote villages, lacking ancillary transport facilities to support large-scale housing development. As regards some school premises in urban areas, even if they were used for housing production, only single-block development could be carried out. As compared to the purposes of transitional or short-term housing, more significant social
benefits can be derived from using vacant school premises for meeting the spatial demand in terms of arts, recreation and sports, and elderly services, with a view to complementing inadequacies in past planning.

Moreover, it is inappropriate to use military sites for housing production. As the saying goes, "Armies are maintained for a thousand days to be used for one time." Even in peaceful and prosperous times now, we ought to stay vigilant for distress and disaster and maintain certain space in various districts for military use. Conversion of such sites into housing is irreversible. Therefore, the Special Administrative Region Government can discuss with the Central Government to release some space in the military sites for other short-term and compatible uses that are easily reversible, such as public services and recreation and sports. Such a practice may be worth more consideration.

About the development of Fanling Gold Course, as a representative of the sector, I need to declare my opposition. I have considerable reservation for even a partial development option. I must point out that it is never a desirable development mode to satisfy the demand for land at the expense of local sports development.

Deputy President, the Fanling Golf Course is the only venue qualified for international competitions in Hong Kong, as well as an important base for training local athletes. Professional golfers in the territory are endeavouring to strive for good results for Hong Kong. They include Tiffany CHAN, the first golfer to qualify for the Ladies Professional Golf Association Tour of the United States, the four golfers representing Hong Kong in the Hong Kong Open last year, namely Steven LAM, WONG Shuai Ming, Matthew CHEUNG and Jonathan LAI. Matthew CHEUNG even made it to the final, as well as Chloe CHAN and Virginie DING, who contested in the Hong Kong Ladies Open. Many Honourable colleagues have made attacks in their speeches that the golf course is a club for the bigwigs. I consider such a comment too sensational.

Some people opine that after the resumption of the Fanling Golf Course for housing production, another land site can be identified for the relocation of the golf course. But if there is land in Hong Kong, why not use it directly for housing production instead of expending numerous resources and efforts? What is the logic behind this? Some environmental protection groups are against reclamation and construction of housing on the periphery of country parks on the grounds of ecological protection. The resumption of the golf course,
however, will cause the removal of national first-class old trees and an impact on the habitats of rare insects. Do such effects not constitute destruction of the ecological environment?

Country parks make up 40% of the total area of Hong Kong, amounting to 44,000 hectares of land. Are they so sacred that they cannot be used? Merely 5% of the periphery already yields 2,200 hectares of land. Following the general housing production ratio, 316,000 units can be built to house 800,000 people. Of course, I do not mean to suggest that priority must be given to the development of the periphery of country parks. I just want to point out: Is it not a double standard when we would rather sacrifice sports development but are unwilling to make use of the periphery of country parks with lower ecological values for housing production?

Deputy President, the proposal of partial development of the Fanling Golf Course made by the Task Force on Land Supply can cater for producing 4,600 flats only, which is absolutely just a drop in a bucket in terms of housing demand, but it is a heavy blow to the local golf sport. Broadening our vision to Asia, the total area of Hong Kong is 1,100 sq km and its population stands at 7.4 million whereas the size of Singapore is 720 sq km and its population 5.6 million. With a population density higher than Hong Kong, Singapore has at least 17 outdoor golf courses. The living condition in Singapore is much more desirable than that of Hong Kong too. Also, there are approximately 20 outdoor golf courses in Tokyo while Hong Kong has only six. Therefore, if Honourable colleagues of this Council consider the Fanling Golf Course not being put to optimal use, we have an even greater need to stand on the same front and jointly request the management of the course to allow for greater public access, so as to strengthen the promotion of golf as a sport to the public for the benefit of society, instead of sacrificing the scarce local venue and the local golf development.

As a matter of fact, following the gradual development of North East New Territories, as many high-rise residential and commercial buildings will be built in the vicinity, the Fanling Golf Course, with a high level of greening, can play the role of a green lung in the district as a buffer, in a fashion similar to the Victoria Park in Causeway Bay and Kowloon Park in Tsim Sha Tsui.

The land shortage in Hong Kong not only causes problems in housing, but also compresses the room for development for various trades and industries. Therefore, I hold that the Government should adopt a multi-pronged approach to
land development. Brownfield sites, idle agricultural lands, nearshore reclamation (including artificial islands) should be considered altogether. At the same time, consideration should also be made to cater for different social needs, including arts and culture, recreational and sports facilities and community facilities. I so submit.

MR KENNETH LAU (in Cantonese): Deputy President, today, we discuss the motion on "Increasing housing supply in the short-to-medium term to rectify the problem of public housing shortage" proposed by Mr James TO. The Chief Executive has said that housing issue is the top priority of the Government. Despite the continuous efforts of the last and current term Governments to seek land, housing supply is still unable to catch up with public demand. The average waiting time for public housing has passed five and a half years. It is indeed a pressing livelihood issue.

The original motion and the nine amendments put forward many proposals to increase land and housing supply in the short term. Due to time constraints, I cannot respond to them one by one. Here, I will focus on my views on the resumption of brownfield sites and the Fanling Golf Course.

The Task Force on Land Supply published a report on the last day of 2018, listing three options worthy of priority studies and implementation, namely developing brownfield sites, tapping into private agricultural land reserve in the New Territories and using sites under private recreational leases.

There are about 1,300 hectares of brownfield in the New Territories at present, most of which are private sites. The report of the Task Force points out that the public support prioritizing the development of brownfield sites as it can halt the continual damage on the environment inflicted by certain brownfield operations.

Here, I must say a few words for brownfield sites and brownfield operators. First of all, how did brownfield sites come about? In fact, most brownfield sites were agricultural land previously. In the 1960s and 1970s when developing the New Territories, the British Hong Kong Government built public facilities, such as reservoirs, parks, housing and tunnels. In the process, underground water was extracted, which caused the land to dry up and become unsuitable for agriculture. Such situations, coupled with the fact that Hong Kong's economy took off at that
time and agriculture was gradually declining, led to the abandonment of agricultural land which then turned into brownfield sites. Currently, brownfield operations include refrigerated warehouse for food, port back-up, container depots, recycling yards and storage of construction machinery and materials. Brownfield sites are the products of economic restructuring in Hong Kong. They exist because there is such a need in the market, so please do not demonize brownfield operators.

Deputy President, I do not oppose the resumption of brownfield sites for public housing. However, the crux of the question lies in how to relocate brownfield operations and seek operating space for them after the resumption of brownfield sites. It is impossible for some operations to move upstairs as they have large machinery to store. Brownfield operators are also worried that they will have to cease business as they are unable to afford the expensive rent after the relocation.

We must not smother the survival of existing operators because there is a need to build housing. Operators must be properly relocated before land resumption. The results of two studies on brownfield operations will be released shortly. I hope detailed data analysis and a proper relocation plan will be included.

Deputy President, I must first declare that I am a member of the Fanling Golf Club. The original motion proposed to fully resume the 172-hectare site of the Fanling Golf Course for housing development. On behalf of the Heung Yee Kuk, I express objection to this proposal. The Fanling Golf Course has more than 100 years of history. The Fanling Lodge and the clubhouse of the golf club, graded as Grade 1 and Grade 2 historic buildings respectively, are situated there. Many ancestral graves of indigenous inhabitants of the New Territories which can be traced back to Ming or Qing Dynasties are also located in the golf course and visited by descendants annually. Does resumption of the golf course mean destruction of historic buildings and ancestral graves?

Some Members say that golf is a game for the rich and the powerful, which might be true in the past. However, in recent years, the sport has become very popular around the world and more accessible to schools and grass-root students. The golf course serves to promote and popularize the sport, as the venue for international open championships as well as the training base of Hong Kong athletes. Even partial development will undermine its cultural and historical
values and purposes. Therefore, I hold that the Fanling Golf Course should be fully conserved and oppose Mr James TO's motion and any amendment proposing the development of the Fanling Golf Course.

Deputy President, we have held discussion on a number of ways to increase land supply. I believe the Government should not only solve the housing issue in the next five to 10 years but also build a liveable city that allows the public to live and age in peace and contentment. In order to achieve this goal, we must have the future in mind. The most effective solution that I can see for the time being is the reclamation development of the East Lantau Metropolis under the Lantau Tomorrow Vision proposed in the Policy Address.

Some Honourable colleagues oppose the large-scale reclamation project on the grounds that it would affect the marine ecology. They also demonize the Lantau Tomorrow Vision as a "white-elephant" project. As a matter of fact, 7 000 hectares of land in Hong Kong, that is one quarter of the developed area, were acquired through reclamation. Over the past decade, the reclamation process in Hong Kong has slowed down, dropping from 200 hectares annually in the 1980s and 1990s to 40 hectares annually after 2000, which led to the current shortage of land.

The construction of artificial islands near Kau Yi Chau and Hei Ling Chau is beneficial to the long-term development of Hong Kong as it can provide an additional 1 700 hectares of land supply for residential, leisure and commercial uses. The reclaimed land can provide 260 000 to 400 000 residential units, with 70% being public housing. That means 180 000 to 280 000 additional public housing units which will benefit the grass roots. I do not see any reasons for opposing the proposal.

The only request of the Heung Yee Kuk is that when implementing the entire Lantau Tomorrow Vision, traffic routes must pass through Mui Wo in order to address the traffic load issue and the needs of the residents in South Lantau and Mui Wo. The Government should table the reclamation plan to the Legislative Council expeditiously and launch the preliminary study so as to create a liveable space for the next generation through a multi-pronged approach.

Deputy President, I so submit.
MR WU CHI-WAI (in Cantonese): Deputy President, many Honourable colleagues said that the theme of debate today is about increasing land supply through a diversified and multi-pronged approach. It is not surprising that we have divergent views, but it is an interesting phenomenon that the pro-establishment camp has deliberately deleted the words "idle military sites". Please note that the proposal in Mr James TO's original motion is in fact to negotiate with the Central People's Government ("CPG") to study whether the relevant military sites can be released if they are underutilized. Yet, I am aware that Honourable colleagues from the pro-establishment camp have casually deleted this proposal in all of their amendments. When giving his speech, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok even indicated that what we proposed had defied the relevant requirements in the Basic Law and the Law of the People's Republic of China on the Garrisoning of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("Garrison Law"). In the meantime, I would like to advise Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok to look up the Garrison Law. Article 13 of the Garrison Law stipulates that any land used by the Hong Kong Garrison for military purposes, when approved by CPG to be no longer needed for defence purposes, shall be turned over without compensation to the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region for disposal.

In other words, if the military sites are indeed left idle and underutilized, the Hong Kong Government can in fact negotiate with CPG. If it is said that not even negotiation is allowed, I find this double standard unimaginably queer. We often say that the land supply is so tight and hope to identify land through a multi-pronged approach, if we cannot negotiate with CPG on the disposal of the military sites in their hands, have we exhausted all the means, when mere negotiation is impossible? Naturally this will give rise to the biggest doubt. In view of this, I really wish to ask all those Honourable colleagues who have deleted this proposal made by Mr James TO, why is it even impossible to initiate negotiation and consult with CPG on whether such military sites can be released for housing development in Hong Kong? What are the reasons for that?

Second, I would like to respond in relation to the site at the Hong Kong Disneyland ("HKDL"). Our view is that the Phase 2 Site of HKDL, with a total area of 60 hectares, is doing sunbathing now and there is no plan for it up till 2025 but how it will be developed is an unknown. Let us take a look at the contract signed between the Walt Disney Company ("TWDC") and the Government. If my memory serves me right, TWDC can extend the option
unconditionally for five years in 2019, but if TWDC intends to seek a further extension in 2025, such an extension will only be granted if the attendance of HKDL reaches a specific level.

That is to say, this 60-hectare site will merely be doing sunbathing during the six-year period from 2019 to 2025. Certainly, the Government is really powerful to say that the site will be used as a flower-themed garden. However, with regard to the land demand for various aspects in society nowadays, should a flower-themed garden be accorded top priority? If the answer is no, should it be the responsibility of the Government to negotiate appropriately with TWDC on making good use of this 60-hectare site of which basic site formation works have already been completed? If transitional housing is developed on this site, the volume of housing production on a 60-hectare site would be rather impressive even if a plot ratio of 1.5 or 1, or an efficiency ratio of 70% is applied in the calculation. At least 10 000 transitional housing units can be provided on the assumption that the area of each unit is 300 sq ft. Will the Government be able to facilitate the process of turnover with this site?

At present, there are more than 200 000 applicants on the Public Rental Housing ("PRH") Waiting List, among whom more than 100 000 might be living in subdivided units. If the Government possesses such a large site but does not put it into good use, saying that the public interest of Hong Kong is best served by turning the site into a flower-themed garden. Is it justified to say so? Instead of making good use of a site readily available, the Government has then indicated that reclamation must be carried out in Hong Kong, and the public can live in high-quality housing after 15 years. Does it make sense? The Government refuses to adopt a short-term tool which is currently available but sell to us the proposal of reclamation. Hong Kong as a whole ... Just as what Honourable colleagues said earlier: Do not worry, the land created through reclamation can provide how many tens of thousands of housing units. One may say, "I shall let you be the emperor in the future", right? But the crux of the issue lies in how to solve the most pressing problems. How is the Government going to address them?

In addition, it is very interesting that they have also deleted another proposal made by the Democratic Party, but I cannot see the reason. The proposal is that the rental incomes of Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS") flats with unpaid premium should be shared with the Government. That is to say,
owners of HOS flats should be allowed to rent out their flats on the premise that the rental incomes will be shared with the Government on a pro-rata basis with regard to the proportion of premium unpaid. We have also added the condition that the owners of HOS flats must have lived in their flats for at least 20 years, a time by which there should have already been some changes in the whole family. I guess that the original policy objectives of a public policy might have been achieved after 20 years. Yet, would it be mutually beneficial if the owners can share their rental incomes with the Government effectively after 20 years, rendering the relevant flats the source of supply in the rental market? Would it be a win-win situation?

I make this proposal for some reasons. First of all, this would only allow the 300,000 HOS flats with unpaid premium which have been frozen due to the policy to be rented out. Second, this would not be as complicated as the approach adopted by Government under which non-governmental organizations ("NGOs") have to be engaged for carrying out various tasks such as matching. None of these conditions are required. It is because the rental value will drop naturally if there is abundant supply in the market, rendering the exercise less complicated as there is no need to engage NGOs for management of this and that, which would lead to a waste of time. Lastly and most importantly, I would like to respond to the saying by some Honourable colleagues that this proposal would give rise to double benefit. If I were the owner of an HOS flat holding 60% of the title, I could only use the flat for self-occupation and was not allowed to earn 60% of the rental income. Considering from the perspective of private property rights, is this fair to me? It is of course unfair. Therefore, I consider it the most reasonable approach. I will not be as generous as the Hong Kong Housing Society, which does not require the owners to share their rental incomes but then adopts a very complicated approach. I would rather adopt the practice of sharing the rental incomes with a view to increasing the supply of rental units on the whole by allowing HOS flats to be put in the market for lease. According to our evaluation, there are more than 300,000 HOS flats at present, and assuming that less than 10% of them will be rented out, the supply of flats would be 20,000 units per year. While the Government has to buy time, it also needs to make room for itself.

Lastly, I would like to make a response on redevelopment of PRH. It is a fact that redevelopment of PRH will reduce the supply of PRH in the short term. We all understand it. Yet, why can redevelopment not be carried out in respect
of PRH units and PRH communities with development potential? Why are there no such plans? I wonder if Honourable colleagues remember that the redevelopment of Pak Tin Estate, which is only 32 years of age, has been carried out precisely due to its development potential. The Government should explore and identify from this perspective PRH estates suitable for redevelopment (The buzzer sounded) …

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WU, your speaking time is up.

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

DR JUNIUS HO (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I thank Mr James TO for proposing this motion on "Increasing housing supply in the short-to-medium term to rectify the problem of public housing shortage". Hong Kong is a small but densely populated place. Work on land creation is slow and the construction of residential units is seriously lagging behind the demand. As a result of the inadequate supply of flats, property prices remain high and are seriously beyond the affordability of members of the public. Today, this problem has evolved into a social problem. The inadequate supply of land not only affects the supply of public housing but also impedes the economic development of Hong Kong. Recently, the Government has announced the Long Term Housing Strategy ("LTHS"), proposing the construction of 450 000 residential units in the next 10 years. However, several hundred thousand of people are still waiting for public rental housing and the general waiting time is 5.5 years. Against this background, proposals in LTHS are after all long-term solutions that fail to address the imminent demand.

The plights of living in undesirable housing of the 110 000 to 120 000 people have not been addressed. In my view, to these disadvantaged tenants, particularly those living in subdivided units, a five-day wait is already too long, not to mention a wait of five years. They are really living in dire straits. Hence, some time ago, I put forth to the Secretary for Transport and Housing, Frank CHAN, proposals to improve and utilize the 27 sq km of land taken out of the frontier closed area, particularly the area in San Tin/ Lok Ma Chau. I hope that the Government will consider launching land resumption swiftly to convert the sites of 40 hectares, mainly used for open storage, carparks or fish ponds at
present, into residential sites for the construction of transitional housing, so as to improve the living condition of tenants of subdivided units and people waiting for public rental housing as soon as possible.

(THE PRESIDENT resumed the Chair)

If the Government is determined to release this 0.4 square kilometres of land, that is, the 40 hectares of land mentioned just now, each hectare of land may be used for the construction of a few transitional housing blocks of four storeys each, providing an estimate of 1 600 units. These flats will be of 15 sq m in average for household of one to two persons. Under this circumstance, the Government should take the lead to implement the arrangement. An area of 15 square metres is very small, yet on the premise of providing transitional housing, it will be better than their existing living environment where two to three persons crowd in a unit of less than 12 sq m and the rent is exorbitant. If the Government will introduce this temporary measure, it will be a great mercy and blessing to them. This is not a solution in the long run, for as it is called, it is merely transitional housing. Yet, this can alleviate the plights of tenants living in poor environment during their wait for public rental housing, as well as the grievance in the community. In the long run, it will have positive and healthy effect to society.

If the Government is willing to adopt this proposal, each hectare of land will accommodate 3 000 persons, and it requires only 40 hectares of land to meet the housing need of around 120 000 persons accurately. About the expenditure incurred, since it is transitional housing, a unit price of $500 will be sufficient for the construction of a decent flat. As for the expenditure incurred for land resumption, it will be around $200 million per hectare, and a site of 40 hectares will merely cost $8 billion to $10 billion. Members should bear in mind that in land resumption, the price may be relatively expensive if the purchase is made today, and it may be cheaper tomorrow. Yet, in the long run, this practice may allow the Government to build up a land reserve.

If the Government is truly willing to deal with the 40 hectares of land, the authorities have enough funds to do so now. Recently, there are extensive reports that the Government will record fiscal surplus this year. Though not to the degree that the Treasury would be flooded with money, it will amount to tens
of billions of dollars. If we know how to spend the money and are determined to do so, with the wisdom that two heads are better than one, we can always find more solutions than problems.

Moreover, the Government should drum up the resolve to amend the existing Lands Resumption Ordinance ("the Ordinance"). At present, the uses of resumed land are very limited. For instance, these sites can only be used for the construction of roads and public housing, and so on. Yet, I believe that with changes and improvement in society, as well as the introduction of a bewildering array of development projects, the existing requirements under the Ordinance stipulating that resumed land can only be used for the construction of roads, bridges and public housing lack the flexibility to address the needs in society.

If we are determined to amend and invoke the Ordinance, brownfield sites and vacant agricultural land can be resumed for creating new development areas for housing. The authorities may also examine the reintroduction of the Letter B as a compensation proposal to land owners. Some time ago, in the report submitted to the Government, the Task Force on Land Supply ("Task Force") recommends the implementation of eight land supply options. Three of the options will be for housing construction in the short-to-medium term and the other five options will be for medium to long term, adding to a total of 3,235 hectares of land. Among these options, the development of brownfield sites is generally supported by the public. However, this option which seems easy on paper is definitely not an easily accessible and immediate solution. Under this circumstance, we should also give regard to the needs of the trades concerned. They need to use these brownfield sites as their economic and operation bases. If we neglect their needs, we will create other problems despite the satisfaction of housing demand. If we merely focus on housing construction, we are denying the important economic functions these trades are fulfilling.

Hence, I suggest that in addition to considering the resumption of brownfield sites for housing development, the Government should examine the re-introduction of the Letter B to provide reasonable compensation to owners of brownfield sites and other sites, allowing them to use the exchange entitlement to cooperate with the Government or private estate developers in developing works projects or logistics projects. This can ensure the continuous economic development of Hong Kong and ease the resistance to land requisition and resumption proposals put forward by the Government.
At the same time, I think the Government should consider relaxing the requirements on plot ratio and land use for the superstructure of cargo handling quays, encouraging and allowing the trades and developers to use the site for more ambitious industrial, logistic and housing development as well as other purposes. The Government should also give priority to holders of Letter B in participating in those development plans, and thus creating a multi-win situation.

President, there is a Chinese saying, "Goods rotate fast like a wheel", which means business is booming and economy is thriving and flourishing. If the Government accepts the aforementioned proposal, not only will the supply of housing in the long, medium and short term be solved, the practical needs and importance of operators running business in brownfield sites will also be addressed.

President, I also recommend that the Government act decisively in continual construction of public housing and subsidized housing in Tai O. At the same time, the Government must improve the transport in Tai O and build roads to reduce the distance between Tai O and Tung Chung, thereby shortening the time for residents of Tai O to access various services, particularly health care services, provided in urban areas. No matter how, the benefits brought forth by the development of West Lantau will come quicker and be more practical than the development of East Lantau.

President, regarding the request of certain Members and opinions in the community on the resumption of the Fanling Golf Course for public housing construction, I express opposition. I would like to declare here that I have applied for the membership of the Hong Kong Golf Club for over 20 years. I notice that society is changing. In fact, I oppose the request for three reasons. First, conservation should be done properly. Second, the environmental quality of Hong Kong community as a whole should be enhanced. Third, promoting the popularization of golf should be the focus.

If Members still think that golf is the game of the rich, they are wrong. Golf is no longer the game for the privileged class. In many places overseas, many people in the middle class are playing golf. A walk on the green pasture with good companions in the enjoyment of beautiful scenery is the kind of quality life we should strive for. President, it is easier to destroy than to create, whereas conservation is even more difficult. At hearing the proposals put forth by
Members this time around, I believe the Development Bureau should have gained some insights in the supply of housing in the long, medium and short term. If the Secretary for Development is interested in listening to the details of my proposal, I am willing to exchange ideas with him.

President, I so submit.

MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, Dr Junius HO said just now that we have to promote the popularization of golf. How dare he make such a remark, and I am really impressed. In the past when we discussed the promotion of the sports policy in Hong Kong, why did he not put forward this view? When it is necessary to defend some vested interests, there will be no lack of excuses.

President, I speak in support of Mr James TO's original motion which calls on the Government to expeditiously respond to public aspirations by increasing housing supply in the short-to-medium term. After the big debate on land supply, members of the public already know what to say, and they can tell eloquently that the Government should invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance, utilize the existing brownfield sites and resume the entire Fanling Golf Course, using sites that can be made available immediately for developing public housing.

But today, I all the more wish to discuss with Members several important concepts in the land debate, for I find that the Government has not clearly explained them to the public and these concepts can be easily confused in the discussions in society. These concepts include the concept of land reserve, and particularly when many Members have seized the opportunity of this meeting to champion for the development of artificial islands, or the Secretary may also do the same later. I would like to discuss the concept of land reserve. Also, I wish to discuss the concepts about land being actually made available to become supply and land supplied becoming supply of housing. In fact, there is connection among these concepts. It is not the case that flour can turn into bread in one go.

When we look at land in Hong Kong, certainly the problem is not with scarcity but with uneven distribution. Property prices are on the high side because of a drastic fall in land supply, not necessarily because of insufficient land reserve. The Government and the Task Force on Land Supply have,
intentionally or unintentionally, confused two concepts, namely, reducing the sale of land and having a shortage of land. At least they have failed to notice that the reduction of land supply in the past was not entirely the result of a land shortage or an ineffective land sale mechanism. Instead, it was the result of man-made adjustments made by the Government to its policy in history. Therefore, if it is simply said that developing artificial islands can increase our land reserves and subsequently enhance the Government's bargaining power and by then, and there will certainly be a supply of land, and as a result, cheaper housing can certainly be provided in no time, does it not show that the objective is wrong or the problem is simplified, which will lead to a waste of time and delays?

Therefore, the first salient point is whether an increase in land reserves is equivalent to an increase in land supply. Almost all land in Hong Kong belongs to the Hong Kong. Land supply can be controlled and even monopolized by the Government. Excluding land that has been sold, the Government still owns over three thirds of land. Coupled with the fact that the Government relies heavily on the land-related revenue which accounts for about 20% of the total government revenue, the so-called high land price policy is actually made possible only with a reduction of land supply through administrative manipulation by the Government.

A number of studies have pointed out that a drastic fall in land supply happened twice in Hong Kong, and I have talked about this before. During the period after the signing of the Sino-British Joint Declaration in 1985 and the handover of Hong Kong in 1997, usually an average of 20 hectares to 30 hectares of land were sold annually in Hong Kong, whereas between 2001 and 2009, the average quantity of land sold was less than 10 hectares, and after the SARS outbreak in 2003, a moratorium on land sale was even implemented due to unsatisfactory returns from land sale. On the other hand, the Task Force on Land Supply also stated that between 1995 and 2005, the Government had increased the area of built-up land by 6 000 hectares but land supply during this period was the lowest in 34 years. This reflects that an increase in land reserves does not directly mean that the Government will increase the supply of land, and the pace in supplying land to become housing supply is controlled solely by the Government. Such being the case, we should ask: Is an increase in land supply equivalent to an increase in housing supply?

Just now I said that the same happened twice before and in both of these cases, the Government had, by administrative measures and by imposing its will, suppressed the supply of land, and after the developers acquired the land, they
could, by hook or by crook, slow down the pace of development or the progress of the sale of properties. In this way, they could hoard a large stock of housing and this, in turn, enabled them to control the supply of private housing. From this we can see that regarding the strategy of increasing land supply to increase housing supply, can it be a direct and effective solution to the problem? I think it is worth in-depth consideration.

In other words, regarding the view shared by the Task Force on Land Supply and the Government that a substantial increase in land reserves can boost the supply of housing and even increase the bargaining power of the Government, I think they have not considered the following two points: First, the main reason for insufficient land supply in the past was that the Government reduced supply for other purposes, such as increasing government revenue, to create the scenario that there was a lack of land. So the reason may not necessarily be a shortage of land. Second, while an increase in land supply cannot promptly increase the supply of housing, will it, on the contrary, provide the developers with more leeway to reap profits? This is my query to the Secretary.

We have seen previously that the supply of housing did not increase despite an increase of 6 000 hectares of land in the built-up area. Worse still, the supply of housing even decreased because the Government, though in possession of land, did not take out land. Such being the case, and going back to this debate today, regarding the solution to the housing problem, I think we may as well take out land direct from the existing land reserves of the Government for housing development, rather than making a big detour of developing artificial islands by reclamation at a thousand billion dollars and then selling the land for housing development. For how long will we have to wait? The proposal to develop artificial islands can at most only help increase the land reserves of the Government but does it bear a direct relation to the supply of housing?

Comparing with the seven pragmatic proposals in the short-to-medium term proposed by Mr James TO in this motion today, the development of artificial islands may be a proposal which is farther away and cannot practically (The buzzer sounded) solve the problem. Therefore …

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr HUI, please stop speaking.
MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): President, I would like to respond to the motion proposed by Mr James TO today with four bizarre, incomprehensible phenomena.

First, Hong Kong is one of the most densely populated cities in the world and yet, there are three golf courses for the enjoyment of the rich, the biggest being the Fanling Golf Course which occupies 172 hectares of land. But it is not the case that you can become a member so long as you have the money to pay for the membership fee, for you have to queue up for it. While here are more calls in the community for resumption of this golf course than those supporting its retention, the Task Force on Land Supply ("the Task Force") only proposed to resume some 30 hectares of the site. It even pointed out that many factors would have to be taken into consideration if the remaining 100-odd hectares of land were to be put to use. In fact, this proposal made by the Task Force is just verbal tactics. It suggest that the Government resume some 30 hectares of the site but keep the rest for the enjoyment of the rich eternally. However, these rich and powerful people who are members of the golf sector, so to speak, are even opposed to the resumption of these 30-odd hectares of land on the ground that this would affect Hong Kong's international image. Tell me which will affect Hong Kong's international image more, with over 200 000 people living in subdivided units or with them not being able to play golf or take part in tournaments? They may as well go to the Bay Area where there is a vast expanse of land.

The second bizarre phenomenon is that in explaining the short-to-medium term options to provide additional land supply, the Task Force did not mention a single word on the option of utilizing idle military sites, and I already have taken into account the overall situation in suggesting "utilizing" instead of "resuming" these sites. In Hong Kong where property prices are among the highest in the world, there are more than 2 700 hectares of military sites, some of which are even situated in urban centres. Many people have the feeling that most of these sites occupied by the People's Liberation Army ("PLA") seem to be always quiet without any people there, but PLA say that these sites are "for defence needs" and when this is stated as the reason, nobody dares to question it.

I have with me a photograph taken in January which is given to me by a local resident. He said that although the barrack in Kowloon Tong is surrounded by bushes and there are enclosures erected around it, he could see a bit of the
inside of it by looking down from a double-decker bus. This white structure in
the photograph is left behind by the British army to PLA and it was originally a
warehouse for keeping military materials. After the onslaught of typhoon
Mangkhut, the white gate of this structure was destroyed by the wind, leaving an
opening of at least a few metres tall, and the gate has not yet been fixed for the
whole month. If the Kowloon Tong barrack is really serving important defence
purposes all the time, why it happens that the gate has yet to be repaired several
months after it was broken? Why does the warehouse seem to be empty without
anything inside? In fact, when we raised this point, we only wanted to briefly
make some enquiries but it seemed to be a crime even if we asked about it. If
you ask "Pikachu", not "Pikachu" but John LEE Ka-chiu, Secretary John LEE
would tell you that you have bad intentions in saying that the military sites are
left idle and then he would tell you that these sites are not left idle.

The third point that I wish to discuss is that we should ensure against abuse
of the precious housing resources. Some time ago I received views conveyed by
some local residents that some people and households applying for public rental
housing ("PRH") units actually own properties outside Hong Kong but have not
made declarations accordingly. I, therefore, proposed a motion in the Panel on
Housing demanding that checks be stepped up on whether people and households
applying for PRH units have declared their ownership of properties outside Hong
Kong, and the motion was passed by a majority of votes. I uploaded the motion
onto Facebook and received thousands of "likes" and hundreds of "shares" in just
a few hours, and I found that many people were also aware that some people
seemed to have properties in the Mainland. In fact, I believe the Government
has the ability to conduct checks on the applications and it is also duty-bound to
do so. If heavy punishment can be imposed on people who concealed
information and failed to make truthful declarations on their ownership of
properties outside Hong Kong ... Actually all people who abused public housing
resources should be heavily punished. While we often say that the problem is
not with scarcity but with uneven distribution, I think the problem is more serious
with unfairness. If rules can be strictly enforced, public housing resources can
be increased and public grievances can also be reduced. Having said that, apart
from dealing with the supply, it is indeed necessary to do something to control the
demand, too.

Just now I said that I had created a Facebook post demanding actions
against PRH applicants who own properties outside Hong Kong. Someone
made a rather radical comment in response. He said, "Actually there is no need
to make such a fuss. Simply abolish the quota of 150 and everything will be fixed." This remark is a bit radical, but when we discuss the housing problem, apart from increasing supply and when supply cannot be increased instantly, it is imperative to control the demand effectively. As Hong Kong is one of the most densely populated cities, it is irresponsible to allow 150 One-way Permit holders to come in every day and create a never-ending inflow of population. I am not asking the Government to reduce or increase this quota. I am asking the Government to practically take back the power to vet and approve entry for immigration of One-way Permit holders, in order that the progress of approving applications for settlement in Hong Kong can be adjusted in the light of the population needs or the pace of housing supply in Hong Kong. This is the fairest suggestion to make. But why are the authorities so adamant in refusing to do so, not even willing to discuss it? Last week we could have discussed this issue, and I hope there will be another chance in future. With the never-ending inflow of 150 Mainlanders into Hong Kong every day, the Government can carry out large-scale reclamation works and rationalize Lantau Tomorrow. Why must we carry out reclamation for the development of Lantau Tomorrow? Some pro-establishment Members said earlier that Lantau Tomorrow is developed not for the new arrivals but for Hongkongers. We should really do some calculations then to see if this is really the case.

However, I would like to share with Members a map displayed in a document of the Shenzhen Municipal Government. It turns out that the Chinese Government has long planned to develop a second express rail link connecting with the East Lantau town centre direct. By then, Lantau Tomorrow will be the second boundary control point for co-location arrangement, facilitating the integration or synchronized development of Shenzhen and Hong Kong and by then, they can come to Hong Kong and return to their hometowns, and how delightful it would be.

In the final analysis, however, with regard to the existing four bizarre phenomena of the Government, namely, protecting the rich and powerful, doing nothing to control population, creating a spurious illusion of having a lack of land supply, and refusing to implement measures capable of achieving results in the short-to-medium term, they are unfair to members of the public and therefore, we must point out these acts of the Government that have been deceiving the people and depriving public coffers. *(The buzzer sounded)*
MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): President, first, I thank Mr James TO for putting forth this motion and providing us with an opportunity today to discuss the issue of housing supply in the short-to-medium term. I find the speech by Dr Junius HO—Dr Junius HO again—just now most striking. When talking about the Fanling golf course ("FGC"), he painted us this picture of people strolling on green grassland in the company of others and declared that this is the quality of living to which the public should aspire. Picture this: Strolling on green grassland in the company of Dr Junius HO—what bliss indeed!

However, members of the public must first contend with the same old problem of lacking a place to live and the means to attain home ownership. As the saying goes, "Improve upon yourself first, then manage your family, then govern your state; thereby bringing justice and virtue to the world." It is often said that people in this city cannot see a future, precisely because many members of the generations born in the 1980s and 1990s fail to find a place to live and are thus pinning their hope on the Government to come up quickly with ways to help them. Hence, today's debate focuses on measures in the short-to-medium term. FGC, which covers 172 hectares, is one of the options that can address our pressing needs. Members seem to agree on this as well. Mr James TO's motion set out another option for Members' discussion: military sites. Are military sites really untouchable? Consider today's Lai Kok Estate, Lai On Estate and the like. These ex-barracks have accommodated many residents after the change in land use. We ask no more than a review on those military sites being left idle for ages in the hope of optimizing land use. What is wrong with that?

To put it straight, at a time when the land supply is supposedly limited, we must find ways to give more hope to the residents in this city. Returning to the question of the debate, I wonder whether the Secretary present today are really at his wits' end in respect of measures for increasing housing supply in the short term. With resolve and boldness, it is in fact achievable. For instance, before the presentation of last year's Budget, we along with some members of the arts and cultural sector proposed to the Government the establishment of a $1 billion-fund to refurbish vacant school premises for use by the arts and cultural
sector. This proposal, which was built from scratch at the beginning and beset by empty talks for a while, is now fully fleshed out and, if everything goes smoothly, set for a debate and a vote in the Finance Committee next Friday. What does this tell us? It tells us that the crux lies in whether the Government has genuine resolve and boldness in identifying idle sites and available premises in Hong Kong for transitional housing construction, getting as many units built and helping as many families as possible. By adopting such an attitude, the Government should have no problem in increasing housing supply in the short term. What we are afraid of is the Government's lacking resolve to do so.

However, as we have discussed in another panel, why does the Government not set up a dedicated fund for social housing? Why does it not come up with ways to optimize the use of sites being left idle under the sun, and the moon as well, and make them available for habitation in the short term, thereby alleviating the pressing needs of some members of the public who would otherwise have to live in horrible environments in their wait for public housing and the bid for home ownership? This is where the importance of transitional housing lies.

There are suggestions that the Community Care Fund ("CCF") be used. It has funded the modular housing project on Nam Cheong Street in Sham Shui Po. As a member of the Commission on Poverty, I often tell the Government that it should be responsible for providing the resources for and pressing ahead with housing projects, and that the resolution for the short-term supply should come first while the issue of supply in the medium term can afford more detailed discussions. But the Government has turned a deaf ear to this. Dear Members, there is absolutely no direction in the Government's housing strategies.

Do Members know what the housing policy of Singapore is like? The housing policy of Singapore strives to let everyone own a piece of Singapore as a way to cultivate in their people a sense of belonging to the city and to the nation. This policy enables them to attain home ownership, grow roots there and see a future. In fact, Singapore's housing policy of building Housing and Development Board flats was initially copied from the public housing policy of Hong Kong. But they have undeniably surpassed us by doing a better job and offering public housing units that are more spacious than ours.
That being the case, we should reflect on our failings and do better from now on. That brings us back to the same old question: Where does the land come from? Mr James TO's motion has set it out clearly: from the FGC site, which is already a consensus. I have no time for strolling on green grassland in the company of Dr Junius HO. I respect and admire this vision of green grassland, even amenable to realize this vision with him in a place more beautiful still. That said, the housing problem, as a matter of great urgency, must be resolved first. The resumption of the FGC site, while not being a cure-all, can go some way to ease the pain.

As we all know, the waiting time for public rental housing ("PRH") is getting longer and longer these days, lengthening from the initial three years to over five years at the moment. Even if there were no more new applications for PRH from this moment on, it is uncertain for how long it would take to accommodate the existing applicants on the waiting list of PRH. This is a fact. Hence, it is crucial to come up with ways to increase housing supply in the short-to-medium term.

Apart from FGC and military sites, many other means are put forth in Mr James TO's motion, to which, I am sure, other colleagues would have something to add later on. We are convinced that if the Government truly strives for a better housing policy, the public will see it. Hence, as I questioned just now, will the Government launch a dedicated fund for social housing or transitional housing, or try again to come up with other workable ways?

What is workable, and what is not? Members should be aware of the roll-out of the "Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid" by the Hong Kong Housing Society not long ago. Judging from the figures so far, the Scheme is not very popular and seemingly not quite workable. That said, it is good that the Administration has the tenacity to experiment—an attitude that I admire—for the public are very interested to learn what measures the Administration has to ensure adequate housing for all. The situation is indeed bleak. The Panel on Welfare Services, which I chair, has to address the issue of subdivided units every year. Far from living in a bubble, Members appreciate, and may even have witnessed, the miserable state of those households living in subdivided units, whose plight was highlighted by quite a few Members just now. Despite the incessant wrangles and debates, we fail to come up with a resolution.
Secretary, I ask today for no more than an increase in housing supply in the short term. I hope the Secretary or the relevant Policy Bureau—the Transport and Housing Bureau, perhaps—would show more boldness, tenacity to experiment and readiness for action, as in the case of the $1 billion-fund for refurbishing vacant school premises I cited just now. Instead of asking the authorities to conjure up some 300,000 flats immediately, I ask only that they at least formulate a time table, a visionary map—not the green grassland variety, but one with habitable homes.

I so submit.

MR LAM CHEUK-TING (in Cantonese): President, last week I went to a tenement building in my District Council constituency, Shek Wu Hui, and paid visits to families living in subdivided units. I visited a single-parent mother and her one-year-old daughter in her arms. I could not enter her subdivided unit because even though I could stand inside it, I would bump into her furniture and other objects if I just turned around. There were a lot of things in the unit. On the right there were an induction cooker and a rice cooker. Right in the front there was a rather dilapidated washroom. On the left there was a bunk bed and there were things all over the upper bunk. After visiting her, my feeling was that when there are people living in these appalling conditions in such an affluent city as Hong Kong, it is actually very saddening to Hongkongers and also a disgrace to Hong Kong.

Some members of the business sector or the pro-establishment camp say that the golf course is very important and that it must not be resumed for this would affect the golf sport and also affect them in making business deals, and so on. While I think that they will indeed be affected and I cannot say that there will be no impact at all, we have to balance the interests of society as a whole. The housing problem is the most important issue relating to the people's livelihood in Hong Kong now. The pro-establishment camp and the business sector always say that the pro-democracy camp cares only about politics to the detriment of the people's livelihood and the economy, so why do you turn your back on the most important issue relating to the people's livelihood? You say that you cannot make any business deals without the golf course and by this logic, does it mean that when you cannot make any business deals, companies will close down, in which case the public will be out of job and hence do not have money to
pay for the rent of subdivided units and ultimately even have to sleep on the streets? Is this logical? Is it that when you can make business deals, reap more profits and take on more workers, the public can then continuously pay the rent of subdivided units? And, as the Financial Secretary is most adept at running subdivided units, does it mean that his business will then thrive? Is that the case?

A few years ago, I wrote an article entitled "Playing golf is a preferred option while people's homes are at stake". For the sake of the North East New Territories development project, the homes of many villagers for decades have to be resumed for development in public interest and in the overall interest of society, according to the Government. This, we understand. But when it comes to the golf course just opposite these villagers' homes, you say that it is where you hang out with friends on the green green grass to enjoy the beautiful scenery of the golf course, and while you say that the homes of the people for decades should be given up, not an inch can be budged regarding the golf course where you go once or twice a month. Can this be considered reasonable? If we have space as much as that in the United States, you can go wherever you like to develop a golf course. But Hong Kong is a small place and this golf course has already enjoyed the privilege of paying a very low land premium for more than a century, and is that still not enough? Do they want to make it eternal, absolutely not allowing one blade of its grass be touched? Is that what they want? I think the Government should show its determination and promote the "one-hour living circle" to the industrial and commercial sectors. As it is now very convenient to travel by the Express Rail Link ("XRL"), the Government should suggest to them that they could travel by XRL to the Mainland to play golf. The Mainland is such a vast country with abundant resources, is it not?

President, the second point is that even if the golf course will be resumed, it does not mean that the Government can develop housing there and the problem will thus be solved. The transport problem is very serious in the North District, and with the ensuing North East New Territories development, some 200,000 people will be moving to live there. If the golf course will also be resumed for development, there will be an additional population of hundreds of thousand people. Congestion in the entire North District is already a most pressing problem, and the transport problem in New Territories East is very serious. Therefore, the Government must improve the transport facilities before taking forward development projects. It should ensure sufficient capacity for the
residents to use public transport to travel within the district or to the urban area before arranging for people to move in. It should not keep arranging for people to move in but did not build more roads until inadequacy is identified, just as what it did in the past, or else there would be big troubles.

On the other hand, President, when it comes to military sites, actually Mr James TO has used most proper wordings by proposing to negotiate with the Central Government. He only proposes negotiation or reporting to the Central Government for approval on releasing certain idle or underutilized military sites in Hong Kong for housing development purposes. I do not know what the Central Government thinks about it. Let me talk about what I think. I think the Garrison actually does not need to use such a large quantity of land, though I understand why the Central Government has to take up so many military sites in Hong Kong. Why? Because they are worried about people advocating Hong Kong independence, right? So, as I often say, why does the military base have to be set up at the urban centre of the Tamar Site? The purpose is to enable the Central Government to deploy its army, infantry only, in three minutes to occupy the Government Headquarters, the Office of the Chief Executive, the Legislative Council Complex and the Court of Final Appeal. They can rush there in three minutes and take over all these places. So how can it be possible for any Hong Kong independence to be advocated in Hong Kong? You must be kidding. No one can leave through the entrance in three minutes.

So, with due respect, Mr TO, it is really difficult to report to the Central Government for approval on releasing these military sites disregarding whether they are situated at prime sites or not. If we take an overview around the world, in which major cities do we find a military base located right beside the government headquarters and the legislature? I think Hong Kong is one of these few cities.

**MS CHAN HOI-YAN** (in Cantonese): Hong Kong people are now generally faced with the situation that their accommodation is getting more and more expensive but smaller and smaller. Families who have bought a home have to struggle to repay mortgage loans every month, while those who are preparing to buy a flat can only afford some "nano flats" even though they have striven hard to save up a sufficient sum of money as down payment. In these "nano flats", one may walk from the toilet to the bed in less than 10 steps and it is no different from living in a subdivided unit. As for the grass-roots families waiting for public
rental housing ("PRH") allocation, it can even be said that they see no hope. Why? It is because the waiting time for PRH is getting longer and longer. While the average waiting time is 5.5 years at present, it is expected that the figure will certainly exceed 5.5 years in the future. The progress of PRH construction by the Government is lagging far behind. Members of the public, whether they are renting subdivided units or private residential units, are struggling to pay high rents, whereas many residents of subdivided units are even faced with the risk of being evicted at any time as they have not signed any tenancy agreement.

Though I have only been elected as a Member of the Legislative Council for just a while, I have already received a number of requests for assistance during such a short time. The dwelling places of these assistance seekers will be resumed before the Lunar New Year in the absence of any tenancy agreement to impose regulations on the subdivided units they rent. What can they do? No one can help them. We can only help them to join the queue for PRH so that they can continue to wait for a PRH unit, but there is no other way to support households living in subdivided units.

In the face of the housing predicament at present, no matter whether we are talking about the supply target under the Long Term Housing Strategy which would be reviewed annually, or about the Task Force on Land Supply which has just completed its report, I think the relevant targets and recommendations are drawn up in response to the housing needs in the medium to long term, which would do no help to ease the long-standing housing problem in the short run. In view of this, I consider that the authorities should set clear targets and formulate short-term and immediate countermeasures as soon as possible, so as to meet the housing needs of Hong Kong people.

While we keep on discussing ways to identify sites for PRH construction, naturally we must try every means to construct PRH. Yet, what we are arguing or discussing are all measures for the medium to long term. In fact, we must come up with some immediate and short-term measures to help households living in subdivided units or members of the public struggling to pay high rents who are caught in dire straits right now.

It is an indisputable fact that there has been a prolonged shortage in the supply of public housing. In the face of the current situation that the supply of public housing lags far behind the demand, I find it necessary for the Government
to formulate measures or policies in respect of transitional housing beyond the existing mechanism, that is, "speeding up PRH construction" which is often reiterated by the authorities, so as to address the pressing housing needs of the grassroots.

I have to emphasize that for some time in the past, the authorities have attempted to construct public housing by "sticking in a pin wherever there is room", a situation which I consider definitely undesirable. Such an approach would affect the resource allocation in the original community and exert additional pressure on the existing community services. It would also inflict an impact on the existing planning of the community, including bringing additional burden on the traffic of the original district. Land resources available for improving the existing community services would also be reduced, thereby affecting the ancillary facilities and support for the residents in the long run.

I consider that the formulation of a transitional housing policy is exactly one of the means to respond to the current housing predicament faced by Hong Kong people. Such means include establishing a site selection mechanism, consulting the community and conducting detailed studies, as well as defining the land use of existing sites in the short-to-medium term. For instance, the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA") has now acquired some old buildings in urban areas. However, there will normally be a rather long lead time before redevelopment is carried out, ranging from at least three to four years to as long as more than 10 years. The structural conditions of many of these buildings, I mean the buildings that URA has already acquired and are pending for redevelopment, are very good before demolition takes place. I think the Government should consider allocating resources to convert these old buildings pending redevelopment and lease them out at a low rent to people who have been waiting for PRH for more than three years. These people are in fact eligible for PRH, but the Government fails to allocate them with a PRH flat, such that they have to struggle to pay high rents. They can only wait in vain while seeing at the same time that we are arguing for measures for the medium to long term, making them extremely disappointed.

President, it is a very important responsibility of the Government to assist members of the public in improving their quality of living. Earlier on, I had the opportunity to meet the Financial Secretary, so I went straight to suggest that he should earmark a dedicated funding in this year's Budget to help identify more sites for the provision of transitional housing. In addition, on the understanding
that the financial resources of URA is limited at present, we should explore whether additional resources can be provided to URA in the form of a dedicated funding, hoping that they can expedite the inspection and refurbishment of such buildings to increase the supply of transitional housing in the short run.

I understand that the authorities are implementing arrangements to provide transitional housing by relaxing the regulations in respect of industrial buildings or providing temporary housing units through certain organizations. However, the number of units supplied as revealed by the Government is relatively small at present. Therefore, we must devise some measures to alleviate the hardship of these people immediately.

In view of this, I would like to take this opportunity to ask the Government to think it over for families which have been waiting for PRH for more than three years. Apart from allowing them to wait for transitional housing, can the Government consider afresh providing them with rent allowance and conducting feasibility studies on implementing tenancy control in respect of subdivided units or cubicle apartments, so as to help them through administrative measures as soon as possible?

In fact, I think the key to taking forward the entire housing policy lies in whether the various government departments are bold and resolved enough. I very much hope that all departments can listen to the views of the public and Members by adopting a multi-pronged approach and mindset, instead of being confined by administrative mindset or policies. We should explore more feasible measures with a pluralistic and open attitude to address squarely the dire housing problem that Hong Kong people are now facing.

I so submit. Thank you, President.
waiting time for over 150 000 public housing applications is 5.5 years. Not only has this led to serious deterioration in the quality of life of the public, even the economic growth and social stability of Hong Kong have been adversely affected.

The root cause of the housing problem is land shortage. In view of this, the SAR Government has been implementing a streamlined land supply strategy in recent years by proposing such measures as carrying out reclamation outside the Victoria Harbour, developing caverns, making optimal use of brownfield sites, and so on. However, the intricate network of interests and complicated and prolonged land resumption and compensation processes have made the task of land development very slow and difficult.

The motion proposed by Mr James TO today seeks to increase the supply of public housing through short-term and medium-term measures. I believe no one would object to such an aim. However, among the seven measures put forward in the motion, apart from the measure in point (5) related to the "Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid", the others are all conceptual topics that have been raised repeatedly in recent years but they are not operable in the short or medium terms. Some of these measures will even encounter such challenges as compensation claims, lawsuits, environmental assessments, and so on, and some of the measures have been studied by the SAR Government for years without the slightest progress being made. It can thus be seen that there is no fast-track in solving the problem of land shortage in Hong Kong.

President, the Government has made it clear that when planning for new housing supply in the future, the ratio of public housing to private housing will be 7:3. If we can follow the measure of segregating public housing and private housing into two markets adopted by the Singaporean Government, we can expect to see more distinct housing ladders for the Hong Kong public in the future. In fact, however, the land reserve in Hong Kong, including the land for some of the countermeasures mentioned in the motion today, is overwhelmingly concentrated in the New Territories. In the British-Hong Kong era, the Government believed that it was no easy task to discuss with the indigenous residents about the ownership of a large amount of land, so it could only carry out reclamation continually to create new towns to dovetail with Hong Kong's development. At the same time, it introduced the New Territories small house policy to appease the affected indigenous residents of the New Territories.
However, up to now, no fundamental change in the situation can be seen and it can even be said that the situation has become more complicated. Apart from the intricate web of interests involved in the use of land by many indigenous residents, various types of people hoarding land and non-indigenous villagers not wishing to see any large-scale development are also involved. It is therefore felt that finding land is often a time-consuming business getting nowhere that should best be avoided. Since the asking prices of land are high and the costs of development are also quite high, property prices are driven up continually.

The Policy Address last year proposed a multi-pronged approach comprising measures such as the Lantau Tomorrow Vision, the development of brownfield sites in the New Territories, the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme, the revitalisation of industrial buildings, streamlining control, and so on. However, the only fundamental way out is to reclaim large areas of land from the sea to bring about a breakthrough in supply and build a modern urban area. Reclaiming land from the sea will make it possible to take the greatest degree of initiative and aggression and strive to solve the housing problem of Hong Kong people in about 10 to 15 years' time.

Over the years, Hong Kong has gained experience from reclaiming a total of 7,000 hectares of land from the sea, so the reclamation techniques and safety are beyond doubt. Let me reiterate one point: In creating an artificial island by reclamation, only one environmental assessment, one transport planning and one lawsuit are necessary, so it is double output with half input. However, if the hundreds of residential buildings on the artificial island are built on agricultural lands in the New Territories, brownfield sites and golf course, with 10 blocks built here and eight blocks elsewhere, it will be necessary to deal with dozens and even over 100 environment assessment reports, lawsuits and transport planning. These will be long-drawn-out exercises that will slow down the pace of housing construction, with double input for half output.

Although it is said that extensive reclamation is the most thorough way to resolve land shortage in Hong Kong, if the SAR Government wants to take forward this blueprint in the future, it has to lobby for greater support. For example, although the ecological sensitivity of the central waters is lower, it is still necessary to carry out stringent environment assessments in earnest and adopt new technical measures to reduce the impact to a minimum. Meanwhile, the details of the proposal and planning design should be worked out and the long-term housing strategy should be refined so that housing supply, in particular
the supply of public housing, can materialize and reach its intended users for the public and younger generation to see hope. In addition, it is also necessary to work out the details of the relevant financial arrangements by setting the total amount of investment in the project and the amounts to be borne each year clearly, so as to give the public and the Legislative Council a proper account.

President, it is believed that it will take time to turn the countermeasures proposed in the motion today from concepts into operable proposals, so they cannot solve the problem of land and housing supply in the short term. Instead, Hong Kong should put the long-term feasible solutions into action immediately and implement them as soon as possible so that the proposal can turn from a long-term one into a medium-term or short-term one after a few years. Otherwise, on the problem of an inadequate supply of housing, the situation of having discussions without making decisions will recur all the time, thus seriously affecting Hong Kong's long-term development and the public's quality of life.

President, I so submit.

MR HOLDEN CHOW (in Cantonese): President, on the subject of increasing housing supply in the short-to-medium term, Mr Vincent CHENG from the Democratic Alliance for the Progress and Betterment of Hong Kong ("DAB") has all along been proposing the increase in transitional housing and has even pitched to the Government some ideas or options to increase land supply, hoping that they can be considered. For example, he has proposed stringent rental control on subdivided units as a way to deal with the housing problem in the short-to-medium term so as to alleviate the burden of the grass roots.

President, the housing problem is basically the greatest concern to all people in Hong Kong at present. DAB has previously conducted a survey about issues of concern to the people. Results of the survey indicate that the housing problem has remained the issue that people are most concerned with. I believe that the ultimate solution to this problems still hinges on the Government's determination to implement long-term solutions to achieve a massive land supply. In this connection, I do not believe that the Government has never contemplated any means. Taking the development of the North East New Territories as an example, the land resumption work which has spanned so many years is still progressing very slowly. Honourable colleagues may have taken note of an
announcement in the calendar of the Legislative Council that discussion on the
main works of the new development areas in the North East New Territories will
be held at the meeting of the Panel on Development next week. I have to point
out that such works cannot commence until several years have been wasted and in
the interim, I have seen much ups and downs. Therefore, the provision of a
large area of land can only be efficiently achieved through land formation by
reclamation to solve the problem of housing shortage.

President, the construction of artificial islands in the central waters
proposed by the Government recently, i.e. the Lantau Tomorrow Vision, is indeed
nothing new. We had discussions on the subject in the Islands District Council
long ago. Despite the considerable controversy in society aroused by such a
concept, I just wish to take this opportunity to express that sometimes the
opposition camp may mislead people with some alarming numbers to make them
think that the related works entail astronomical cost. Exactly how is the related
costs, which have been suggested by some people as $1,000 billion, calculated?
Very accurate numbers may not be available now. To be fair, we should not
make judgment until the Government has made serious calculations and provided
us with accurate numbers.

Hong Kong needs to move forward in respect of livelihood issues, and to
do so, I believe the Government needs the determination to solve the housing
problem. And to truly and completely solve this problem, I consider a massive
land supply essential and the solution to it is inevitably land formation by
reclamation. In my view, the Government should handle people's worries arisen
during the course of land formation by reclamation, including environmental and
cost concerns which are understandably people's considerable concerns. But we
cannot solely veto and disallow any reclamation works to the extent that even the
most basic study cannot commence. I find it unjustified.

President, in the final analysis, the problem of housing supply or property
prices in Hong Kong can only be approached and truly tackled from land supply.
I hope the general public can understand that land formation by reclamation is
definitely essential for the land problem to be resolutely dealt with. Of course,
other methods will be carried out concurrently, but we cannot reject land
formation by reclamation.

President, I so submit.
MR CHAN HAK-KAN (in Cantonese): President, the housing problem in Hong Kong has arisen not only over the last couple of years. In fact, it has troubled society for several decades. It is just because the problem has become pronounced in the past 10 or eight years with soaring property prices and scarcity of land supply. The Governments or the Chief Executives of the previous two terms all strove to solve this problem but it seems that they could not shorten the queue for public housing shorter to attain the target of allocating public housing in three years. Nor could they bring about any gradual downward adjustment in private property prices. It is an "old, big and hard" problem indeed.

Today, many Honourable colleagues have put forward many short-term, medium-term and long-term proposals. I agree with their concerns and ways to deal with the problems. However, I wish to point out that as we rattle on in the legislature, many members of the public living in cubicles find the days dragging on like years. We must put forward some simple and instantly effective proposals to save them from deep water.

When I was small, I was also a new arrival. Although I was not really living in a cubicle, I was sheltered in a room rented from a landlady. I slept on a bunk bed. When I had to do homework in the daytime, I set up a folding table. I believe that many Hong Kong people did the same. After two to three decades of development, however, given the great prosperity of Hong Kong society, can we still tolerate this kind of living environment now, which may even be worse than two to three decades ago. For this reason, it is useless to engage in empty talks; some practical efforts should be made as soon as possible.

I agree very much with the proposals in the motion today. As some Honourable colleagues say, more transitional housing should be built as soon as possible and this is most important. Recently, a friend took me on a visit of some transitional housing. I wish to take this opportunity to point out to the Secretary why transitional housing is so effective and urgently needed.

It is a scheme known as the Lok Sin Tong Social Housing Scheme, operated by the charitable organization the Lok Sin Tong Benevolent Society Kowloon (Lok Sin Tong). But I will first talk about the circumstances of a beneficiary family. It consists of a couple with two children. One of them has learning disabilities and mild autism. The family used to rent a cubicle. Since the child concerned cannot express himself, he cried in the cubicle frequently and of course, his neighbours found this very annoying and scolded him frequently, so
the mother was subjected to very great emotional disturbance and stress. She even told me that she once contemplated taking her two children to the rooftop and ending their lives. Fortunately, with the help of Lok Sin Tong, which was also lucky to have the support of "Uncle Four", who rented the old buildings acquired by him to Lok Sin Tong at $1. People in need can move into the buildings by paying relatively low rentals after Lok Sin Tong had renovated them.

Certainly, a new environment of 300 sq ft is not that spacious but at any rate, one has one's own space. The upside is that, apart from making life more comfortable, this is actually beneficial to the children and the family. After moving into their new home, their financial situation is relatively not so tight. After consultations with a doctor, it was found that the child concerned had learning disabilities and autism as I mentioned just now. After treatment, the child has basically recovered now. Improvements can be seen in his study, homework and life when compared to the time he lived in a subdivided unit and his mother is not as stressed as before. Therefore, the living environment not only affects one's quality of life, it also has great impact on the entire family and even their life. Had they not come across this housing scheme, we might have read about yet another family tragedy in the newspaper a few days ago.

In view of this, while we are rattling on about whether reclamations should be carried out or what measures should be taken, is there any way to provide some instant "cough syrup"—the Secretary is coughing now—to temporarily relieve the public's cough, as these organizations have done? However, it is actually not enough to rely on these organizations alone. If we look at the figures, we will see that Lok Sin Tong can provide only 80 units, just like a drop in the ocean. If we rely on these organizations alone, it will surely be impossible to deal with more cases. I can see that many other charitable organizations in the community are working hard together but how can the existing and urgent housing problem be solved?

My colleagues have prepared some information for me. It shows that the Government's application procedures for handling translational housing are rather complicated and tedious. At times, even these organizations do not know how to fill the forms and have to hire professionals to help them. By establishing so many guard posts, of course, home safety or structural safety can be ensured. To people waiting to move into public housing or wanting to solve their housing problems, however, I think such procedures really amount to nit-picking.
view of this, since Honourable colleagues in the legislature all consider the housing problem so important and I have given Members an example just now to apprise them of the situation, I hope we can set aside our differences to enable the Government to provide more transitional housing in the short term or expedite the supply of public housing as soon as possible. I also think that on land supply, we should not remain at the stage of having disputes.

Thank you, President.

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): President, both Members' motions under our debate today happen to concern the rationality of social resource distribution. It demonstrates the characteristic of the Special Administrative Region Government, which is caring for the rich and ignoring the poor, allocating resources in an unfair manner, adopting double standards and being biased for the rich and powerful.

During Members' debate just now, we can see that many Honourable colleagues of the pro-establishment camp, whom I cannot say have completely defended the Government, practice it selectively. Regarding certain options, such as the golf course, military sites, public-private partnership, etc., they concurred with a fanfare that such items should be addressed, but actually, they have acted in the same style as Chief Executive Carrie LAM. Now the Chief Executive is most famous not for being a "good fighter" but being a "great liar" and "good at fooling people". Why do I say so? Because she has already become a recidivist of bogus consultation. It is the second time she has done so. Pursuant to the earlier study on universal retirement protection, this time it is the same. The conclusion drawn is that if she likes an item, she will do it. For example, Lantau Tomorrow and public-private partnership can jump the queue and be carried out first. For those items she does not like, such as the golf course and military sites which we have all along proposed, they will even be deleted during the process. We have made many suggestions, such as land resumption and replacement of public-private partnership by the new development area ("NDA") model, but she did not listen at all. She has added that one has to make a choice regarding these matters. It is not a must to listen to public opinions, and it is not a must to accept these proposals. What a waste of breath!
President, what is the crux of the entire motion debate? Actually, the situation of Hong Kong is indeed like what Mr CHAN Hak-kan said. Hong Kong lacks land and housing. I thank Mr James TO for proposing this motion today. His motion has given the right focus. We should stop talking about the remote policy, although we do need to formulate a long-term policy, but how should the current pressing need be resolved? The prevailing problem is yet to be resolved. Mr CHAN Hak-kan has spoken a lot, reminding me of something. What he said is most correct. In fact, we should stop making flowery talk. We should say something practical. Yet regrettably, just now many Honourable colleagues of the pro-establishment camp were merely making flowery talk. What is the most practical proposal? Mr James TO has already put it forward. It is the resumption of the golf course site. Why do Members still stand in the way? President, the lease of the golf course will expire in 2020. The President's son seems to be one of the leaders, too. I know many Honourable colleagues here are its members. I saw that most of them did not declare interest in their speeches. I need to give credit to Mr Junius HO. He has declared interest. The other Honourable colleagues did not, but they came to the defence of the Government. Some Members claim they did declare interest. I might have omitted them, sorry. We can check it on the video record. Anyway, not all the Members have declared interest, but never mind. As long as they talk with reasons, it will do. But what reasons did they furnish? If what Mr CHAN Hak-kan said is the fact, then we should support resumption of the golf course by the Government. The lease of the golf course will expire in 2020. No one owes anyone anything. The golf course has already used the land on lease for more than a century. That is Government land. When it is due, it should be resumed. This is not a trick on them or injustice to them. This is based on public interest and needs.

As regards arguments about environmental protection or ancillary facilities on the roads, they are jokes. Why are they jokes? Because such reasons cannot stand at all. Moreover, these so-called reasons are self-contradictory in their speeches. Some Honourable colleagues say there are old trees. The place has an ecological value and there are historical buildings. For this reason, it should not be resumed. But we simply need to conserve the place to resolve this problem. There is planning in Hong Kong. Honourable colleagues with a background of planning work also advanced such reasons just now. Do they not have no such knowledge? There is planning in Hong Kong. All the 100-odd old and valuable trees can be left intact with the place designated as a green area.
or a park. Why can the 172 hectares of NDA not be handled in this way? Similarly, we can refrain from demolishing the two historical buildings and turn them into museums. We can work in this way, can we not? When Honourable colleagues speak, can they disclose everything instead of telling part of the truth only? Some Honourable colleagues say the relevant development requires environmental impact assessment and consultation, and submission of a proposal to the Town Planning Board, as well as construction of roads and infrastructure, so on and so forth. Buddy, any development area warrants such work. Is such work needed only in this place? Why do they propose public-private partnership? Is such work not required under public-private partnership? President, did that piece of land suddenly emerge from underground? What they say is really ridiculous. The two arguments advanced by them are also contradictory to each other.

Moreover, President, what is the demerit of public-private partnership? We were just speaking on this point. Secretary Michael WONG should know it very well. Why did Mr James TO propose opening up NDAs through land resumption? Because this approach has been proven effective in the past. The Government has also said so itself, and today it still works in this way. For example, the development of Hung Shui Kiu, Yuen Long South and North East New Territories has been carried out in this way. This is the most organized and comprehensive planning approach which can meet the overall needs and at the same time be led by the Government. If the work is conducted in the reverse way, serious problems will arise. How can I know who will bid for the project? Let me leave aside whether the process is fair or whether the monitoring mechanism is crooked. It is definitely so, but I am not going to talk about it for the moment. As far as the infrastructure is concerned, how can the Government know who will bid for it? Subsequently, various items will engage the developers in a fragmentary manner. As such, how can the Government handle the matter? Is it a comprehensive concept to build infrastructure and roads only? Or are we merely contented with small-scale land development?

If the Government is merely contented with small-scale development, then it is really superfluous because other land development will be impeded in the future. The Government says that such will not be the case. They can conduct overall planning continuously. In that case, the Government had better pursue development in the NDA model, President. It is a double-edged sword. Do they not realize that they are being self-contradictory? If the Government is
merely contented with small-scale development, the overall development will be affected in the future. If the Government is willing to take the overall picture into account, will it please pursue development in the NDA model. Then there will be no more worries. Why should bonuses be distributed to the developers? President, what land is held by the developers? What have the officials granted them? Officials of the Development Bureau know it only too well. The Government does not owe them anything. How can they talk about reasonable expectations? If the land held by the developers is privately owned for agricultural use, will they please use the land for farming now. Do not let the land stay idle and make irresponsible comments.

President, during the whole debate, a certain group of Honourable colleagues were only defending the Government. Their concept could be self-contradictory in the very same speech. I do not mean to taunt Mr CHAN Chun-ying, but he made a point alleging that most of Mr James TO's proposals were merely conceptual. I wish to point out that the proposals made by the Democratic Party this time are absolutely not conceptual. The lease of the golf course will expire in 2020. As regards the military sites, since the Government dare not make such proposal, the Democratic Party does it for the Government. President, I wrote to President XI Jinping late last year. He has not replied yet. However, this should not be done by me. It should be done by the Government and Carrie LAM. Where on earth did they hide? Now Mr James TO has only proposed negotiating with the Central Government. Mr CHAN Hak-kan has put it most correctly. They have many deputies to the National People's Congress. Will they please say something for Hongkongers. I implore them to say something for Hongkongers. There is no need to release a lot of land. Just the resumption of the 2 200 hectares of land of the Tsing Shan Firing Range will do. The Tsing Shan Firing Range is not needed in Hong Kong. In fact, now a lot of high-tech training or operations of the People's Liberation Army ("PLA") are conducted back on the Mainland. They know this better than I do. PLA can return to the Mainland for training. Moreover, now the "one-hour living circle" is so convenient. He has mentioned this point, too. But why did he not mention the "one-hour living circle" when talking about playing golf? President, the whole debate is like that. It is hard not to feel indignant.

With these remarks, President, I hope Honourable colleagues can be more clear-headed and stop making self-contradictory remarks.
MR MICHAEL TIEN (in Cantonese): President, a sheltered living place is what everyone needs in his life, but in Hong Kong, such a necessity has become a luxury.

The housing supply in Hong Kong is seriously imbalanced. We in the Roundtable have discussed this issue for quite some time. From May to August last year, we set up a number of street booths to conduct a questionnaire survey and received some 1 500 completed questionnaires. Our survey findings greatly tally with the report of the Task Force on Land Supply. However, before everything else, I wish to point out that our support for one proposal does not mean we give up others.

According to our survey findings, options which members of the public find most acceptable include developing brownfield sites, private agricultural land reserve in the New Territories, private recreational sites, especially the golf course, and the two reclamation options. Let me first talk about reclamation, which has been the most popular topic of discussion recently. Our survey has focused on the reclamation project of 1 000 hectares in East Lantau. In principle, it can provide land for building 250 000 housing units. It is also the only option among all the options which can facilitate the construction of the greatest number of units in the largest scale at a single location. Some Honourable colleagues say Lantau Tomorrow is like burning up the reserve. I wonder what they are saying. I absolutely do not agree. I like referring to data. As Members know, MBA (i.e. Master of Business Administration) is most particular about data.

Let us take a look. Under the Lantau Tomorrow reclamation project of 1 000 hectares, there are basically options A, B, C and D. Option A is reclamation. Based on the cost price of Tung Chung New Town in 2016 which was roughly $113 million per hectare, the projected figure as at the end of 2018, counting in inflation, was $124 billion. Regarding general infrastructure, the cost price of Anderson Road Quarry in September 2015 was about $100 million per hectare. As at today, with inflation counted in, the total expenditure for 1 000 hectares of land is $110 billion. In respect of the railway, it is quite a piece of work. I have made the estimation with the highest price. The whole route consists of tunnels. My calculation is based on the price in December
2018. With underground tunnels of 16 km, each kilometre costing $4.5 billion—my estimation is already relatively loose—and harbour crossings of 11.8 km, the estimated cost being $5.5 billion per km, the total is $64.9 billion. All these calculations were made by experts over a long time. There are eight stations, namely, Tuen Mun South, Sam Shing, So Kwun Wat, Siu Lam, Sunny Bay, Kau Yi Chau (two stations expected there) and Kennedy Town. With a total of eight stations, each costing $4 billion, the total cost is $32 billion. There are also four multi-storey park-and-ride car parks. The grand total is $170 billion. Regarding the cross-district highway, since there is a railway, there certainly has got to be a highway connecting with Route 11, passing Lantau Island, going through Kau Yi Chau across the sea and then linking with Island West. The total length is 12 km. If we base the calculation on the price of Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link in 2012, factoring in inflation of 20% to 30%, with each kilometre costing $4.6 billion, the total is some $53 billion. Based on the price in December 2018, the total expenditure for the whole project is $462.5 billion.

Now let me talk about revenue. According to the sale of land at Kai Tak in 2018—since this is a CBD (i.e. Central Business District), I have used Kai Tak as reference—for a residential-cum-commercial site at Site 1, Area 1F, Kai Tak, Kowloon, the tendering price was $17,800 per sq ft of the floor area. I discount it by 30%. The discounted amount is $12,500. Another site is a residential site at Site 3, Area 4B, Kai Tak. It is the latest and most up-to-date. The land price is about $14,500 per sq ft. Discounted by 30%, the amount is $10,000. In other words, for a residential-cum-commercial site of 40 million sq ft, if we multiply the area by $12,500, the price is $500 billion. For a residential site with a floor area of 35 million sq ft, if we multiply the area by $10,000, the price is $350 billion. This is the area for private housing, excluding public housing. The total revenue is $857 billion.

What are we saying now? Reduction of 1 000 hectares of the sea area can increase the cash revenue by $395 billion. According to calculations based on the figures in December last year, we can have an additional commercial floor area of 40 million sq ft, land supply for 78 000 private housing units, land supply for 180 000 public housing units, a new railway which is 28 km long consisting of eight stations, and a highway 11 km long going through bridges and tunnels.
Where on earth can such a deal be found? It cannot even be found in any case study. What is more, money will be gained. What is reduced is only 1,000 hectares of waters.

The second point I wish to talk about is the development of brownfield sites which is supported by more people. I support this, but we have got to be careful because some operations are beneficial to Hong Kong. We need to find places for their relocation. Compensation is very important. So is the establishment of a database. Some may warrant provision of compensation for closure of business, but some may wish to stay and need to identify land sites for relocation or move to factory buildings. We think this point can be discussed, but it is rather complicated and can hardly be supported by the infrastructural facilities.

Regarding the golf course, I will say a few words simply. Full development of the golf course site will certainly give a larger area of land, but the result will not be satisfactory. As a matter of fact, there are many old trees and graves. Such development, when put into practice, will merely turn out to be a show. On the contrary, partial development of 19% of the area can provide 35% of the housing units under the full development proposal. Having considered various factors such as the transport network, we think such factors can only support partial development. Hence, we in the Roundtable support partial development. Although many people, be they on this side or that side, do not find it pleasant to their ears, I am only being neutral. The prerequisite is that the European Tour can continue to be hosted. In this regard, it is necessary to continue to communicate with the organizer of the European Tour.

Regarding private agricultural land, as shown by the views obtained from our consultation, the majority support public-private partnership, but the prerequisite is that the Government must relax the plot ratio for land development. Of the increased GFA (i.e. gross floor area), 70% must be used for construction of public housing and 30% for construction of private housing. Moreover, full premium should be paid. These are the salient views of the Roundtable. We do not rule out invocation of the Lands Resumption Ordinance to resume land and see whether it can stand in law if negotiations fail. Thank you.
MR LEUNG CHE-CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, I believe the housing problem under discussion today is a matter of great concern to this Council and society. The serious housing shortage in Hong Kong has continually pushed up property prices, and the level of rents is also at a record high. The Chief Executive says that this is a top priority task in her administration. I believe the two Secretaries who are here today will try every possible means to find land for housing construction.

Information shows that Hong Kong is now short of 450,000 housing units and 1,200 hectares of land. It should not be difficult for the Government to tackle the housing shortage with its multi-pronged approach that it has adopted to find land. But people are more concerned about the suitability of the land it has found, rather than its ability to find land.

In his motion, Mr James TO suggests using military sites, golf courses, brownfield sites and other sites for housing. These are suggestions that Members made in the past. I wish to point out that if finding land becomes a cause of contention, or even political contention, it will not bring any good. As we all know, the Basic Law provides that military sites are owned by the Central Government. Members who deliberately want the Government to develop military sites, such as Mr Andrew WAN who just suggested that we should discuss this proposal with the representatives of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, are typical examples of people who want to incite political contention rather than solving the problem.

The Government has also formulated many measures to address the problem. The Task Force on Land Supply established by the Chief Executive issued a report titled "Striving for Multi-pronged Land Supply". The report is of considerable volume, providing many means and suggestions on land supply. We do not know how many suggestions the Government will adopt, but this is the only solution amid the contention. Members can express their views through the consultation, but the point of making any suggestions is that it must be able to achieve the goal.

How to achieve the goal of providing 1,200 hectares of land? The Chief Executive proposes to provide 1,700 hectares of land by reclamation, but the proposal has met with immediate opposition. Just now, Mr Andrew WAN asked Members to declare interests. I wonder whether the opposition Members who have a presentable dwelling themselves have done the same when they oppose
housing construction to provide dwellings for people without a home. I hold that they should also declare interests if they already have a property for residence and oppose, or disagree with, housing construction. It is because their opposition to housing construction will push up property prices and in turn increase the value of their property.

If reclamation will not be implemented due to opposition, how are we going to produce 1,200 hectares of land? Some people say that brownfield sites can be the solution. However, there is some truth in what Mr Michael TIEN just said. The brownfield sites are not one whole piece of land covering 1,200 hectares in area and some of the sites may be unsuitable for development. I reviewed the information on the planning of the North East New Territories Development Areas. Of the 400-odd hectares of land, only 200-odd hectares can actually be used. How do we find a single piece of brownfield site which is as big as 1,200 hectares?

The Government has used more than 10 years to resume the sites in North East New Territories, but to date, it still does not manage to start the housing construction. I believe it will take a very long time to meet the target of building 450,000 housing units. According to the report of the Task Force on Land Supply that we discuss today, even if we start develop all site options now, it may easily take 10 years or more to meet the target. Of the short, medium and long-term housing targets, the short-term target will take 10 years to meet. I thus hold that we should examine whether the present land supply can tie in with the housing supply targets. Can we solve the problem that Hong Kong people have entrusted this Council and the Government by our ongoing argument? I am afraid we cannot.

I originally did not plan to speak on this subject. But I hope that my speech can call on Members of different parties and groups to find a way forward together for the housing in Hong Kong, just like what we did in the previous motion. We should not introduce any more political arguments, like resuming military sites or golf courses. These options do not have the support of all people. If we continue to argue on these options, we will end up achieving nothing and we cannot produce any housing units in the end.

Recently, I talked to some members of the public living in the New Territories. They talked about the large amount of existing farmland, especially the abandoned farmland, which could be used for the construction of many
housing units. I hope the Government can seriously consider in this debate how to utilize the land in the New Territories to build more housing. I believe the New Territories residents are not against land resumption by the Government as long as adequate prior consultations are done and the problem of ancillary facilities is solved. I believe they will fully support the Government. Hence, I wish to take this opportunity to call on the Secretary to explore this subject with members of the New Territories Heung Yee Kuk, the New Territories residents or land owners, and see how to further lower the thresholds for compensation and relocation, so that they will be willing to hand over their sites for the Government to develop housing and address the present housing scarcity.

President, I so submit.

MR ABRAHAM SHEK (in Cantonese): President, I would first of all like to declare that I represent the real estate sector, and I am also a member of the Hong Kong Golf Club as well as many other similar clubs.

When listening to the speeches by Members today, I feel compelled to leaf through the Basic Law. Over the past five years, people from the pro-democracy camp, especially those from the Democratic Party, had been criticizing the governance of LEUNG Chun-ying for causing social and class conflicts, and such criticism and struggle had been going on for five years. However, after the commencement of the current-term Government, people from the pro-democracy camp, especially Mr WAN, have actually outperformed LEUNG Chun-ying. In his speech which lasted for seven minutes, Mr WAN has spent five minutes advocating for a single purpose: to destroy the Fanling Golf Course. Instead of solving the housing problem, he is trying to destroy the Fanling Golf Course and stir up social conflicts, and housing supply is just an excuse.

It will be up to the Government to decide whether we should destroy the Fanling Golf Course, but the question is that we should not continue to create conflicts and demand an even distribution of wealth and resumption of land, and I find what he said is even more radical than communist ideas. I understand that Mr TO is a gentle person, and I have to remind Mr WAN that as clearly stipulated in Article 5 of the Basic Law, "[t]he socialist system and policies shall not be practised in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, and the previous
capitalist system and way of life shall remain unchanged for 50 years." The Fanling Golf Course and many other facilities have existed in Hong Kong for many years, and there are very clear provisions in this respect.

Besides, Mr WAN also mentioned just now that this or that piece of land should be resumed, but there are established procedures for the resumption of land. Mr TO, I would like to remind Mr WAN who is a member of your party once again that Article 105 of the Basic Law has already stipulated that the right of individuals to the acquisition of land shall be respected, and one cannot resume other people's land at will. We should not create more conflicts in our society, just like what you have been criticizing LEUNG Chun-ying all these years for stirring up social conflicts and neglecting the needs of young people or ordinary families. We should work together to resolve the problem of housing shortage which Mr TO has proposed to discuss today, and this is actually a problem that many places in the world have to face and resolve. Moreover, there are a few big mountains which the Chief Executive has to overcome: Firstly, the housing problem; secondly, the disparity between the rich and the poor in society; and thirdly, constitutional development.

How should we resolve the problem of housing shortage? The suggestions in the motion are nothing new. For example, resuming the site of the Fanling Golf Course, making optimum use of military sites and the site reserved for the development of the Hong Kong Disneyland, etc., all of which have been discussed. President, our problem is how to meet in the short and medium term the housing needs of 270 000 to 290 000 people who are waiting for allocation of public housing units, as well as 110 000 people who are living in cubicle apartments, and provide them with a good living environment.

However, President, our Government is really something. It has not only failed to find an answer to the above problem but also created another even bigger problem, and it is really amazing to see so many fools follow the Government's lead. When it cannot solve a small problem, let alone a bigger one. What should we do then? A task force chaired by Stanley WONG was thus set up by the Government, which visited a total of more than 40 places in the 18 districts across the territory to hand out a "dim sum list" with a number of options for selection by the public. Chairman WONG has taken each remark made by every member of the public very seriously, and he has even mistaken himself as the Chief Executive. Yet, it is after all a task force of an advisory nature, and he has been exploited him, just like some Members here who are also exploited now.
I would like to ask the Chief Executive: Will a consultation be conducted on all policies to be implemented in the future, such as the local legislation for Article 23 of the Basic Law and the National Anthem Law? The Basic Law has clearly stipulated that the political system of the Hong Kong SAR is basically an executive-led system, under which the Government may consult public opinion on the general approach to be adopted for formulating specific policies, but it should not ask the public what it should do. When each of the 7 million people in Hong Kong expresses his/her own personal views, what can the Government possibly do? There are so many shyster politicians now who think that they can do whatever they want with support from the public. As I mentioned just now, Mr WAN has spent four minutes out of his seven-minute speech talking about the Fanling Golf Course, but can he solve the problem by so doing? The answer is in the negative, and what is our problem in the short and medium term?

The problem does not lie in the short supply of land, and even though we have to solve the problem of land shortage, there is indeed no need to resume land, because country parks occupy 45% of the total land area in Hong Kong. Why does the Government not resume country park land or other idle land?

Moreover, the problem in the short term does not lie in the shortage of land, but in the overly bureaucratic system of the Government. Just imagine that according to the procedures laid down by the Town Planning Board and the Lands Department, it will take at least six to nine months to apply for the issuance of an occupation permit alone. It will take six to nine months after the completion of the construction works to go through the compliance assessment. Where have newly completed housing units gone? The Government is now considering the introduction of a vacant property tax, but it has never reviewed its own practices. When we are pointing at others, three of our fingers are in fact pointing back at ourselves, and the Government should therefore first change its policies and enhance its governance structure.

I hold much respect for pro-democracy Members, but please do not be fooled by the Government and present this big problem, because when we have not even resolved the small problem, how can we tackle the big one? The point is that there will be no use resuming anything and the most important thing is to resume country park land. *(The buzzer sounded)*
PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr SHEK, please stop speaking.

MR ALVIN YEUNG (in Cantonese): President, my feelings were stirred up by the remarks of Members. I did not intend to speak but to learn from Members. Of course, after listening to the speech of Mr Abraham SHEK, I have really learnt something new from one of the very experienced Members in this Council again. During the short period of seven minutes' speaking time, Mr SHEK used five minutes to explain to us the essence of the Basic Law, and also respond to the demand of the democratic camp for resuming the site of the Fanling Golf Course. Of course, Mr SHEK does not agree to this demand and has thus poured out lots of arguments against it.

However, I find that this Member representing the real estate sector is an iron hand in a velvet glove. He made a lot of remarks but his focus was actually not on the Fanling Golf Course but on the country parks. In fact, at the last minute, he tried to put in a good word for the real estate sector. That is fine as he is from a functional constituency, and it is only natural that he speaks in favour of his own constituency. Nevertheless, I only want to take this opportunity to say that the site of the Fanling Golf Course does not belong to the Hong Kong Golf Club. I believe Mr SHEK will also agree that this piece of land belongs to Hong Kong people.

If the rent paid by the Hong Kong Golf Club is not in proportion with the market level and its members are thus benefited, this will be what we really need to discuss. I understand some colleagues may query what benefits these members gain, and the answer is that they can thus enjoy using the Fanling Golf Course. Of course, some people will say that they have paid the membership fees and have really spent some money. Then we have to ask: In terms of public policy, do they pay proportionately? Is it in line with the long-term interest of Hong Kong people? Is it fair? I think this is what we genuinely need to discuss.

For sure, no one from us, at least no colleagues from the democratic camp as I believe, will reckon that we have to undermine the most basic principles of the Basic Law by nationalizing private property and imposing socialism upon Hong Kong. This is definitely not the case. However, when we make it unequivocally clear that private property has to be protected, we also need to ask, in terms of the spirit of public policy, whether we are doing justice to Hong Kong
people while protecting private property. In this regard, I believe this was not meant by Mr Abraham SHEK just now. But I think I am obliged to remind him here.

Of course, country parks should not be the main point of contention today, as they have not been particularly mentioned by many colleagues. Nonetheless, since they were mentioned by Mr SHEK, I would also like to make a brief explanation. In fact, country parks are a kind of property of all people in Hong Kong. As regards utilization of country parks, I believe that it is not the case that we cannot use one single inch of country park land. But before we use an inch of country park land, should we first exhaust all other means to identify land? This should be the focus of our debate today.

President, I do not intend to use up my seven minutes' speaking time. The above is my response to Mr Abraham SHEK's speech. Thank you.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak? Mrs Regina IP, please speak.

MRS REGINA IP (in Cantonese): President, first of all, I declare that I am a member of the Hong Kong Golf Club ("HKGC"), but no interests are involved because I do not hold any debentures. It is untrue that the 2 000-odd members share the $7 billion worth of 2 000-odd club memberships, as some articles suggested.

Having gone through the original motion and all the amendments, I find that none of them deserve my support because much of the content is factually incorrect. I wish to say a few words about HKGC. That piece of land was granted to HKGC under the policy on recreational land. So, of course, it is not owned by HKGC. However, in such a favourable ecological environment, there are many trees, including rare old ones such as water pine and Indian sandalwood, as well as many rare animals and plants, which belong to the whole of Hong Kong.

It strikes me as weird why nobody from the Civic Party speaks out for these trees, because usually a Member from the Civil Party—Tanya, who is not in the Chamber at this moment—would kick up a rumpus even if a single tree was
chopped down. I think there are major double standards at play. Most notably in our Chamber, many Members who used to attach great importance to the conservation and preservation of local culture and tradition of Hong Kong have, for unknown reason on this subject of the golf course, completely ignored the protection of our tradition, our ecological environment, our trees, our rare insects, and the development of recreational and sports activities. I really find it weird.

I know that the Task Force on Land Supply ("the Task Force") has included this 170-odd hectare golf course site into the short-to-medium-term options. However, do Members have any idea when it can be used? Even if the Chief Executive said that she would fully endorse your views, when could it be developed, given the need to do environmental and traffic impact assessments? As members of the public who often visit or live in North District, for example Mr WONG Kwok-kin, know full well, the frequent congestion at Ku Tung and Au Tau and narrowness of Fan Kam Road makes it difficult to accommodate the numerous vehicles needed by 4 000 additional households, (i.e., more than 10 000 people), not to mention that there are four schools in the vicinity, with North District Hospital on the opposite side.

Even if the Chief Executive pledged to destroy the long-existing best golf club in Asia now, fully endorsing your views, embracing public opinion and ignoring the views of the international community, it would actually take at least a decade to do so. Therefore, I wish to make it clear that this is indeed not a realistic short-term solution. In addition, we need a more comprehensive consideration as to conservation and sports development, as well as the attractiveness of Hong Kong as an international community.

I have noticed that many colleagues used their imagination to come up with various methods. However, some are indeed impracticable. The use of military sites is one example. Firstly, according to the Garrison Law, if a military site is resumed, it is necessary to provide another site in return. Secondly, all the military sites are used on a daily basis, except during wartime, for training or other military purposes invisible to the general public, and just because there is no drilling of soldiers in sight does not mean that the sites are idle. Moreover, any matters relating to the military sites are subject to the approval of the Central Military Commission. Therefore, the use of military sites is an impracticable option which will only give rise to senseless contradictions.
I believe that the Task force's report is comprehensible to all, and Lantau Tomorrow is a very long-term vision, which I think is fundamentally … Let us give some thoughts to it. As the first step, the Government has to apply for funding here and conduct a feasibility study. According to media reports, the cost of the feasibility study has increased from $240 million in the era of LEUNG Chun-ying to $500 million, and it seems that the Government will submit an application this year. Assuming that we approve the funding, and considering that even the study on brownfields will take more than two years, the feasibility study on Lantau Tomorrow may take five years to complete, and a further funding application is necessary for each phase five years later. This vision will not come to fruition in the next 20 years. I believe that the earliest available are the 1,000 hectares of agricultural land in the New Territories, which I think the Chief Executive is also pondering about. How to release these parcels of agricultural land is the most challenging test of the Chief Executive's political wisdom, and I know this is a huge political issue. Of course, we have heard Mr Abraham SHEK's voice relaying the property developers' query about why their land under private property rights should be resumed.

However, how can public-private partnership be appropriately beneficial? There were also many successful examples of public-private partnership in the past where sites were exchanged to facilitate social development. One of them was the relocation of San Miguel Brewery. The Government has had many successful examples of public-private partnership.

That said, there are also many examples of failure. In other words, the Government was outdone by the astute business community in terms of calculation, thus incurring heavy losses in every partnership. The ongoing losses suffered by Disney are definitely the consequence of signing an agreement under duress, with no hint on what to do about it now. As regards Link REIT, the transaction was completed for a price of $20 billion when the economy was in the deepest recession, but thanks to its financial trickery, the current market value has reached $170 billion. In addition, thousands of flats in Hunghom Peninsula were also sold at a time of economic downturn. When engaging in public-private partnership, would the Government be an utter dupe because of its desperate search for land?

As far as public-private partnership is concerned, I believe the Government will soon rack its brains on how to establish public-private partnerships that are truly beneficial to society, without itself being ripped off again. I think these are what we should pay close attention to instead.
MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): President, having just listened to the speeches delivered by two rather veteran Members, namely Mr Abraham SHEK and Mrs Regina IP, I feel obliged to make some responses, because both of them have mentioned "the Civic Party".

Mr Abraham SHEK was rather emotional when he mentioned Article 105 of the Basic Law earlier on. He asked whether we are going to violate the Basic Law and infringe on the legitimate rights and interests of title owners, and whether land resumption is tantamount to disrespect for Article 105 of the Basic Law. Knowing that Mr Abraham SHEK has studied law, I believe he is also aware that the wording in Article 105 is "in accordance with law". In other words, it is necessary to exercise one's property rights in accordance with the basic legal procedures and legal justice. I believe Mr Abraham SHEK is not unaware of this point, but the property developers who voted for him want him to speak in such a way that portrays the title as more important than … Even though there is an acute shortage of land in Hong Kong and an urgent public need for provision of more private homes and public housing—I declare in advance that I am a member of the Hong Kong Housing Authority—he, as a representative of the property developers, still has to read aloud Article 105 of the Basic Law in this Chamber, as if their title is sacredly inviolable.

However, please take a closer look at the Lands Resumption Ordinance ("the Ordinance") and the relevant court cases. In the past 20 to 30 years, the Court has never challenged any relevant cases. It has explained when the Ordinance should be invoked and under what circumstances it can be invoked. Land resumption for the purpose of public housing development is absolutely in compliance with the Ordinance and the requirement of acting "in accordance with law" set forth in Article 105 of the Basic Law. Therefore, I wish Mr Abraham SHEK had clearly heard and read Article 105 of the Basic Law in this Chamber before speaking.

Nevertheless, talking of such issues as golf courses and country parks, I myself occasionally play golf, and have been to Fanling as well. Of course, unlike the prestigious Mrs Regina IP, who is a member, I just followed my friends to go there. She mentioned just now that the Hong Kong Golf Club ("HKGC") is picturesque, with singing birds, fragrant flowers, beautiful trees and clear streams. Yes, it is really fun to play golf there, but it struck me as somewhat weird when she suggested that HKGC belongs to all Hong Kong people. If she meant that HKGC belongs to all Hong Kong people …

(Mrs Regina IP stood up)
PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mrs Regina IP, what is your point of order?

MRS REGINA IP (in Cantonese): President, Mr KWOK has misunderstood my meaning. What I meant just now was that there is such a good ecological environment in North District and the whole of it belongs to the public.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mrs IP, if you think Mr KWOK has misunderstood you meaning, please wait until he has finished speaking before asking for clarification. Please sit down first. Mr KWOK, please continue with your speech.

MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): President, it turns out that what Mrs Regina IP meant is that the ecological environment inside HKGC belongs to all Hong Kong people. Now I get it. That is to say, when those of us who are fortunate enough, or HKGC members, such as Mrs Regina IP, go there to play golf, they enjoy its beautiful environment and ecological value on behalf of all Hong Kong people. Now I get it. If this was the meaning of her speech, sorry, I cannot agree with it. Neither can I agree with the notion that members of the public of Hong Kong paying more than $1,000 to play a game of golf are enjoying the ecological value of HKGC together.

Many Honourable colleagues describe me as being out of touch with reality, but I think Mrs Regina IP is more so than I am. At the very least, I know I have to pay more than $1,000 to follow my friends to go golfing at Fanling, and I am not enjoying its ecological value on behalf of all Hong Kong people, nor that tree, that river, that green, etc.

I am not asking for the immediate demolition of the entire golf course, or disregard for the existing ecological or historical values of the Fanling Golf Course, but her remark that the golf course is for the enjoyment of all Hong Kong people is quite out of touch with reality and hypocritical. What exactly belong to Hong Kong people in the true sense? They are the country parks, which, according to the last paragraph of Mr Abraham SHEK's speech, should be subject to resumption. Only country parks really belong to Hong Kong people. For admission, we do not need to pay more than $1,000, nor make an appointment,
nor rely on our friends to escort us in. We just need to walk in, and there will be fresh air, as well as invigorating trees and rivers. These are what really belong to Hong Kong people.

I hope that during our debate on land use, there is no lack of clarity about Article 105 of the Basic Law, the meaning of "really belonging to Hong Kong people", and the exact perspective of Hong Kong people about country parks and HKGC, where Mrs Regina IP is a member. She is a directly elected Member, and I am only a Member returned by a functional constituency. She often says I do not know how to represent the people of Hong Kong, so I would suggest that she should visit her constituency and ask her supporting voters whether they consider HKGC an ecological environment that all Hong Kong people can enjoy together. She might as well have this point printed on her campaign leaflets for the constituency and invite everybody to enjoy the ecological value of HKGC together. If the public cannot enjoy it, it does not matter, because she will enjoy it on their behalf. I would like to appeal to Mrs Regina IP that if she has the guts to do so, she should accept my challenge to distribute this leaflet the next time she visits her constituency.

President, I so submit.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr SHIU Ka-fai, please speak.

(Mr Abraham SHEK stood up)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Abraham SHEK, what is your point of order?

MR ABRAHAM SHEK (in Cantonese): President, I wish to make a clarification. Just now, Mr KWOK distorted my speech on Article 105 of the Basic Law. When it comes to Article 105 of the Basic Law, I know better than he does. I am not a counsel, but I have bought more land than he has. I know full well that the Land Resumption Ordinance aims to serve the public interest, and that is what I meant earlier on.
MR SHIU KA-FAI (in Cantonese): The motion topic we discuss today is "Increasing housing supply in the short to medium term to rectify the problem of public housing shortage". I believe it is the issue of biggest concern to Hong Kong people. It is because many people who are on the waiting list for a public housing flat or living in "sub-divided units" are living in great hardship and full of grumbles. This is a problem everyone in Hong Kong can see. At present, 5 500 buildings in Hong Kong are aged over 40 to 49 years, while 7 300 are aged over 50 years. Therefore, what problem will arise in 20 to 30 years? For that reason, this is the problem of grave concern to Hong Kong people.

The most important element in housing construction is land. Today, I can see that many Members or the mover of the motion—Mr James TO, are holding different opinions. It is a good thing to help the public find a comfortable place to live in. Nevertheless, I do not agree with certain land grabbing approaches, such as resuming the 172-hectares site of the Fan Ling Golf Course as some Members suggested earlier. The present proposal is to take back an area of 30 hectares of land with 8 holes for the construction of public housing. I have pointed out on various occasions that we can only build a little more than 4 000 housing units if we resume the land with 8 holes.

What I wish to say is that when we are trying to find a solution to the housing problem, we need to strike a balance among the needs of different sectors, such as the needs of recreational sports or other industries. It is impossible for us to use all the land which is currently used for business or sports activities to build public housing. This is simply unrealistic. Let me cite an example. Last week, in the meeting of the Panel on Food Safety and Environmental Hygiene ("the Panel"), one of the topics discussed was the establishment of an Agricultural Park ("Agri-Park"). Panel members hoped that an area of about 42 hectares in Kwu Tung South could be used for the development of agriculture and fisheries projects so as to facilitate the development of local agriculture and fisheries industry. It is of course very important that Hong Kong should supply its own people with local food products. Nevertheless, members of the public in Hong Kong know that the majority of food products—about 90% of them, are imported from other places. The quantity of local agricultural and fishery products is basically inadequate to meet
the need of Hong Kong people. However, should we not support the development of local agriculture and fisheries industry in view of the small production volume? In the last meeting of the Panel, I have heard clearly that almost the majority of the members, almost all Members from leftist, centrist and rightist political parties agreed that the area of about 40 hectares should be used for agricultural and fishery development, so as to facilitate the production of local food products for Hong Kong people.

Is the agriculture and fisheries industry a high output or high value industry? I believe the answer is no. Nevertheless, why Members from leftist, centrist and rightist political parties all support it? This is exactly what I have said just now. Besides housing needs, Hong Kong should also cater for the development needs of different sectors, industries or activities. So why the proposal of using the 42 hectares land for the development of the agriculture and fisheries industry and an Agri-Park was supported by Members from leftist, centrist and rightist political parties, but why so many Members hold opposing views this time around when some other people want to preserve the Fan Ling Golf Course—a world class golf course? Is it a result of the anti-rich sentiments or populism as many people have claimed? What I wish to say is that we need to strike a balance. Of course it is not okay if all land in Hong Kong is used as golf courses and no homes will be built. Nonetheless, this is one unique and very important brand name of Hong Kong and it is also one of the many reasons for world renowned corporates to come to Hong Kong. For that reason, I hope the Government and Members will think carefully about the resumption of part of the golf course.

The next thing I wish to talk about is the Hong Kong Disneyland ("the Disneyland"). Many of my colleagues in the Legislative Council have raised different views and questions about the performance of the Disneyland in recent years, and some even proposed that the site for phase two development of the Disneyland should be used for the development of public housing in view of the Disneyland's poor performance and revenue. But when we invited the Disneyland to come to Hong Kong, I believe we have signed an agreement with the Disneyland, otherwise it was not necessary for the Disneyland to come to Hong Kong. Even though its ticketing revenues are unsatisfactory, the Disneyland can still attract visitors from all different places to come to Hong Kong. They do not just spend money in the Disneyland, they also benefit the wholesale, retail, food and catering, hotel and transport sectors. For that reason, I hope Members should broaden our horizon when looking at matters in this regard.
Moreover, Hong Kong is a city which values commitment. When we signed the agreement with the Disneyland in order to attract it to come to Hong Kong, we have promised that a plot of land would be allocated for its phase two development. If we move the goalposts in respect of the agreement today, whether we can speak with pride (i.e. whether Hong Kong will be trusted) will be questioned. For that reason, I hope Members will think twice.

Finally, I wish to speak about invoking the Lands Resumption Ordinance to resume land in the New Territories. There are different types of land in the New Territories, some are brownfields, some are deserted farmlands, and it will be nice if they can be resumed. However, how should we negotiate with the landowners? I believe the Special Administrative Region Government should keep its promises and it should not arbitrarily take away other people's assets. As to how the negotiation should be conducted in order to make a better deal, it really depends on the bargaining chips in the hands of the Government. If the Government does not announce immediately that it will go ahead with the reclamation plan and make use of the 1,700 hectares of land as a backup, let us guess whether or not those landowners will ask for higher prices in the knowledge that the Government virtually has no land reserve at all? Therefore, if we want to help the Special Administrative Region Government and Hong Kong people obtain more land at more reasonable costs so as to increase housing supply, we should go ahead with the reclamation as soon as possible. Only when we have land reserve as a backup, will those landowners not ask for higher prices. (The buzzer sounded)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr SHIU, please stop.

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr James TO, you may now speak on the amendments. The time limit is five minutes.
MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): President, this motion has quite a number of amendments and I will only focus on a few points. First of all, I notice that most of the amendment movers from the pro-establishment Members have deleted item (4) of the measures to the original motion, which is "to negotiate with the Central Government" for returning certain military sites not needed to Hong Kong for development purpose. We do have precedent in regard to this proposal. In fact, since the handover of Hong Kong in 1997, the Central Government has indeed returned a few pieces of land to Hong Kong for development purpose. According to the Law of the People's Republic of China on the Garrisoning of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("the Garrison Law"), if some sites are not needed, they can be returned by the Central Government to Hong Kong. The problem is how the mechanism is invoked.

Theoretically speaking, when the above is provided in the law, we can assume that the Hong Kong Garrison or the Central Military Commission ("CMC") will review the need of using the land sites for military purpose from time to time. In case there is no military usage, it will, on its own initiative, return the sites to the SAR Government for development. However, it may also be the situation that when the SAR Government really finds the need to use the sites, especially 20 years later, it will inform the Central Government, but if the Central Government also requires the sites for military purpose …

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr TO, you should speak on other Members' amendments but not on your original motion.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): … No, President, it is because some amendments have deleted the proposal "to negotiate with the Central Government" in the original motion, which I think is not right. President, I am now speaking on the amendments which have deleted that proposal. What is the meaning for the deletion of that proposal by Members? Does it mean that we cannot remind the Hong Kong Government to negotiate with the Central Government for returning certain military sites to Hong Kong if they are not needed by the Central Government?

Besides, as also mentioned by a colleague earlier, under the Garrison Law, the land sites are actually exchangeable. For instance, if the Central Government thinks that these three land sites are no longer necessary because the
area is too large to be suitable for modern military requirements, and wants to find another site for the installation of nuclear bombs underground—this is just an example as it surely will not tell us its purpose—these three land sites will be returned to the SAR Government which will then need to find another site for the Central Government. When the Central Government has any need, it of course does not need to give any explanation. Hence in practice, how does the mechanism work?

Finally, I notice another interesting point, President, and that is about Dr Junius HO's amendment. In this regard, he is the only pro-establishment Member who has not completely deleted the proposal on the use of military sites. According to him, if the use of certain military quarters—military quarters are also inside the military sites—is not required, they can be released to us for transitional housing purpose.

In my view, it is also desirable if this proposal is feasible, and I implore XI Jinping, Chairman of CMC, to seriously consider it. I think Hong Kong people will definitely not scramble for military sites, as the purpose of military sites is for the protection of public safety. National defence is necessary especially when the global situation at present is unstable. According to Dr Junius HO's proposal, if military quarters are not required, they can be used for transitional housing purpose. In fact, after a period of time, if the Central Government thinks that these quarters are necessary, we can also demolish those transitional housing and hand over the sites to the Central Government. If the Central Government agrees to this approach, I think Hong Kong people will be grateful to the Central Government. The total area of military sites is really not negligible, covering over 2,000 hectares of land. If the Central Government can give us back 100 to 200 hectares of land, it is already sufficient. Hence, this proposal is practically feasible. However, we are not scrambling for the sites but are asking for them. If the Central Government really thinks that those land sites are not needed, it should return them to Hong Kong people, and that is my proposal.

SECRETARY FOR DEVELOPMENT (in Cantonese): President, I would like to thank Mr James TO again for moving this motion, and my thanks also go to nine other Members who have proposed amendments to the motion. I would also like to express my thanks again to Members who have offered valuable views today on ways to increase housing supply. In fact, many of the views,
including those on new sources of land supply, the planning of transport infrastructure and ancillary facilities, the actual implementation of housing development projects, etc., have been discussed and analysed in the report submitted by the Task Force on Land Supply ("the Task Force"). The Government is now examining in details the recommendations put forward by the Task Force and consolidating the relevant information, and will provide a timely response. However, I wish to give a brief response here to some main points raised by Members earlier.

The first point is about brownfield sites. As far as brownfield sites are concerned, the Government has commissioned consultancy studies earlier on existing profile and operations of brownfield sites in the New Territories as well as the feasibility of accommodating brownfield operations in multi-storey buildings, and we expect that these studies will be completed within the next few months. The Government will then proceed to the formulation of relevant policies and operational arrangements with reference to the results of the consultancy studies. We will strive to put forward our proposals later this year for discussion by the community. In the mean time, the Planning Department will conduct a study in advance on the development node at San Tin/Lok Ma Chau near the future Northern Link in the New Territories North, and consider the future use of the area. The Planning Department will also initiate a study on the development potential of 760 hectares of relatively scattered and fragmented brownfield sites on the basis of a number of planning parameters, including the accessibility of transport and community facilities, the areas of brownfield sites, the capacity of other infrastructural facilities, whether their use is compatible with the neighbouring areas, etc. There is also a need for us to identify brownfield sites with a higher development potential for further study on their development feasibility. With regard to the remaining brownfield sites with a relatively low development potential, a study will be conducted to ascertain if the problems surrounding these sites and the rural environment can be improved through the implementation of planning measures, the provision of more comprehensive supporting facilities and other methods.

Some Members mentioned the need to optimize the use of vacant sites. The Government has all along endorsed the principle of land use optimization, and we have never precluded the possibility of using and developing individual short-term tenancy sites, sites granted by way of temporary Government land allocation and vacant government sites. On the contrary, this initiative has been
implemented on an ongoing basis. For example, when undertaking development projects in new development areas, or identifying and vacating individual land lots for development through regular review on land use, the Government has from time to time terminated short-term tenancies or put vacant government sites to use. Some common examples are the use of car parks operating under short-term tenancies, or vacant sites zoned as open space but with no specific development plan. However, I have to point out that using these sites which have been put to temporary uses or are pending long term use for other development purposes will also pose a lot of challenges, because, though of a temporary nature, the sites may have been occupied by different uses for a rather long period of time. Take car parks operating under short-term tenancies I mentioned just now as examples. If the community has been provided with such facilities for a long time, these are to a certain extent community facilities that the public genuinely need. Such uses can therefore not be terminated without the need for reprovisioning, but it is not always simple and easy to identify other sites for accommodating these operations.

Besides, not all vacant government sites are suitable for high-density development. As at December 2018, about 850 vacant sites (including 23 vacant school premises) with a total area of about 120 hectares were available for application by non-government organizations for short-term uses, but a more in-depth analysis has revealed that around 60% of them were sites with an area of less than 500 square metres, thus imposing a great restriction on their development potential.

The over 210 housing sites I mentioned earlier, include over 70 sites in Green Belt areas with an estimated total area of about 227 hectares, accounting for approximately 1.4% of the total area of all Green Belt sites in the territory. If we can timely introduce amendments to statutory plans and complete the relevant procedures, over 114,000 public and private housing units can be provided, and upon review, over 80% among which are public housing units. These sites were identified after two stages of Green Belt review carried out by the Planning Department. With regard to the rezoning of Green Belt sites, we mainly focus on the identification of formed, deserted or devegetated Green Belt sites with potential for housing development. In the second stage of the review, we have examined Green Belt sites in the fringe of built-up areas close to existing urban areas and new towns. These sites mainly fall on the fringe of Green Belt zones or are close to developed areas or public roads. However, I have to point
out that when consideration is given to the desirability of rezoning a particular Green Belt site for high-density development, we will also be required to tackle the complicated task of striking a balance between development and conservation needs.

Some Members have mentioned unleased or unallocated Government land within "Village Type Development" zones. Similar to the elaborations made above on the use of vacant sites, not all vacant sites within "Village Type Development" zones possess potential for high-density development or public housing development, because a considerable portion of them involves gaps or passageways between existing small houses, slopes or other fragmented or irregular land parcels. Even if individual land parcels are relatively more complete in shape, their development potential may be limited by factors such as geographical features, local environment and infrastructural constraints. Furthermore, given the scattered and irregular parcels of land within "Village Type Development" zones, extensive land resumption and clearance will be inevitable in order to realize the full development potential of the area and undertake major infrastructural works, while the compensation and rehousing issues involved must also be handled prudently. Detailed studies and assessments are thus required to confirm the feasibility of the option, while the necessary statutory processes of rezoning, road gazettal and environmental impact assessment can also be very time-consuming. Hence, after discussion, the Task Force found it difficult to accord a high priority to this option for implementation.

(The President's Deputy, MS Starry Lee, took the Chair)

There is a view which suggests that advocating public-private partnership or the launching of the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme would mean the Government giving up the right to resume private land through invoking the Lands Resumption Ordinance for development. This kind of view that regards land resumption by the Government and private development as mutually exclusive is incorrect, and the Government certainly does not agree. Currently, if the Government sees the need for developing an area for a "public purpose", such as the provision of public housing and government facilities, and for which open planning and studies have already been conducted, the Government will invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance timely to resume private land for an established
"public purpose" pursuant to the law. As I have mentioned in my opening speech, examples in this respect include projects undertaken for new development areas, the public housing development at Wang Chau, etc.

However, the balanced consideration and the healthy development of society cannot solely rely on Government's power. As a matter of fact, it will be difficult for the Government to make overall planning and take forward development for different districts in Hong Kong simultaneously. Hence, due consideration should also be given to any development plan proposed by private land owners for a certain area not covered by Government's planned development if the proposal is conducive to unleashing earlier the development potential of privately owned land in the area and is in the interests of the public. In this connection, the Chief Executive has outlined in the 2018 Policy Address the framework of the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme, with a view to better releasing the potential of land in the New Territories as soon as possible. Under the framework, a target has been set to use not less than 60% to 70% of the increased floor areas for public housing development.

I have to emphasize that both Articles 6 and 105 of the Basic Law mention about the protection of "the right of private ownership of property" by the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR") in accordance with law. The Government must adhere strictly to the spirit of and the constraints imposed by the law, and cannot neglect the importance of respecting the right of private ownership of property when deciding to exercise its statutory power to resume private land. The Government will continue to act carefully and prudently under the Lands Resumption Ordinance, and exercise its public power to resume private land only after the relevant "public purpose" has been established. In this connection, some Members suggested that the Government should consider reinstating the Letter B system. I would like to make it clear that in the face of the current tight supply of land, we have no plan to reinstate the system of land exchange entitlement, particularly as a means to offer compensation to land owners. The Government will continue to follow the effective mechanism currently in place, and offer private land owners appropriate compensation for the land resumed.

Some Members requested the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA") to participate in the provision of subsidized sale flats and public rental housing. Let me explain here that with the statutory function of promoting urban renewal, URA has all along maintained an appropriate division of labour with the Hong
Kong Housing Authority and the Hong Kong Housing Society in terms of roles and ambits. However, this does not mean that there is completely no participation of URA in the provision of subsidized sale flats. The units put up for sale under the De Novo project in 2015, as well as the sale of units of the eResidence project under the "Starter Homes" Pilot Scheme for Hong Kong Residents in the beginning of this month are examples of URA's participation in this respect. We believe that in this connection, there will still be a certain role for URA to play when appropriate in the future, but consideration will have to be given at the same time to two related factors. Firstly, the redevelopment projects undertaken by URA since its establishment have all along been focusing mainly on the redevelopment of private properties, so as to replenish residential units in the private property market after redevelopment and maintain the balance in the overall supply of public and private housing. Secondly, the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance provides that URA shall exercise due care in the handling of its finances.

The modus operandi of URA has all along been generating revenue through the sale of units constructed after redevelopment to achieve the principle of a self-financing urban renewal programme. As all of us may be aware, under the acquisition policy of URA, compensation offered to owner-occupiers is based on the level of a seven-year old replacement flat in the same district. In this connection, URA has to shoulder a very huge financial commitment. Moreover, the surplus accumulated by URA over the years has been used to finance the acquisition, compensation and rehousing for redevelopment projects, and other works of URA which would bring benefits to the public but would not generate any income, such as building rehabilitation, preservation and revitalization. Therefore, if private old buildings put under the redevelopment projects of URA are mostly developed into subsidized sale flats or public rental housing, we will have to consider the impact of this fundamental change on the supply of public and private housing as well as the financial sustainability of URA.

With regard to the option put forward by some Members to redevelop buildings under the Civil Servants' Co-operative Building Society Scheme ("CBS"), it was proposed in the Policy Address delivered in October last year that URA would be invited to identify one or two clusters of CBS sites suitable for high-density development as pilot sites, and explore the redevelopment of the sites in accordance with the usual project implementation approach adopted by URA. Subject to the completion of the planning studies and the approval of the URA Board, URA intends to submit the implementation proposals to the
Government later this year, with a view to subsequently announcing and commencing the pilot projects. We will consider our work in the next step on the basis of the experiences gained from the pilot projects on the redevelopment of CBS sites.

As for military sites, the SAR Government has repeatedly reiterated that the status and nature of military sites are different from other land in Hong Kong. According to the stipulations in the Basic Law and the Law of the People's Republic of China on the Garrisoning of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the use and management of military sites are matters of national defence for which the Central People's Government has sole responsibility, and are not matters of HKSAR. All existing military sites are used with none left idle. The SAR Government has no plan to seek any change to the use of these sites.

With regard to the site reserved for the second phase development of Hong Kong Disneyland Resort ("Phase 2 site"), according to the Option Deed signed in 2000 between the Government and the Hongkong International Theme Parks Limited, that is, the joint venture with the Walt Disney Company as one of the shareholders ("the joint venture"), the joint venture has an Option to purchase the Phase 2 site for taking forward further development of Hong Kong Disneyland. Before the joint venture exercises the Option for the Phase 2 site, the short-term uses of the site have to comply with various permitted uses as listed in the Deed of Restrictive Covenant, including recreational, sports and cultural facilities, but not residential use. When considering these short-term uses, we also need to take into account whether such uses are compatible with the use and overall atmosphere of Hong Kong Disneyland. The Government has no intention to change the existing land use arrangements for the Phase 2 site.

As for sites under Private Recreational Leases ("PRLs"), including the Fanling Golf Course ("FGC") site, the Task Force pointed out in its report submitted at the end of last year that uses of PRL sites involved not only the matter of land supply, but also touched upon policy areas concerning sports, recreation, ecological conservation, as well as the issue of whether PRL sites should be opened up further to the public. The Task Force has formulated its recommendations to the Government mainly from the perspective of increasing land supply. The Chief Executive also pointed out earlier that the Government should thoroughly examine the recommendations put forward by the Task Force, as well as the results of the policy review conducted by the Home Affairs Bureau on PRLs, and consider the future uses of individual PRL sites holistically. In the
debate today, we have also received different views on many different aspects of the issue, such as the recreational functions of FGC, its contribution to sports development, as well as the ecological, heritage and aesthetic value of the FGC site. As the Home Affairs Bureau has not yet completed its policy review on PRLs, the Government will consider and examine these views and concerns together with the recommendations of the Task Force, and provide a consolidated response later.

As pointed out by the Task Force, the community generally agrees that land supply is a pressing problem, and coupled with the long lead time for land production, we should prepare for the rainy days, adopt a multi-pronged approach, make concerted efforts and work together to break the stalemate in land supply. As far as Government's efforts are concerned, our work in finding and creating land has never ceased. We will submit funding applications to the Legislative Council later this year to take forward a number of large-scale land supply projects, including main works for the new development areas in Kwu Tung North, Fanling North and Hung Shui Kiu, as well as undertaking dedicated research studies on reclamation at Kau Yi Chau and three near-shore reclamation locations at Lung Kwu Tan, Siu Ho Wan and Sunny Bay. In response to the recommendations contained in the report of the Task Force, we are also planning to commence a study on the development of the River Trade Terminal site and the coastal areas of Tuen Mun.

Deputy President, there is no single land supply option that can fully replace other options, and each option has to be considered at different time to meet the needs of different land uses. The key point of the "multi-pronged" land supply strategy proposed by the Task Force lies in the need to implement a number of options concurrently in order to increase land supply, because it will not be practical to expect that we can come up with a panacea, or rely on a single option to completely resolve the problem of land shortage and tight supply of housing that Hong Kong is now facing.

We will keep up the efforts at land use rezoning before medium-to-long term options can be implemented to increase land supply, and strive to optimize the use of existing land by increasing the development density and maintaining other ongoing land supply initiatives. We understand local concerns about the so-called "infill" developments, but such developments are indeed of a relatively smaller scale and can increase land supply in a more efficient manner. The Government will endeavour to adopt the necessary supporting measures, thereby
minimizing the impact on local communities. Looking ahead, we have to take bold and decisive actions persistently to create land and build up a land reserve, because apart from the provision of housing, an ample supply of land is needed to address the demands for ancillary transport facilities, promoting economic development, taking forward education initiatives, providing elderly services, etc. Only by making more land available can greater room and flexibility be allowed for embarking on a forward-looking and comprehensive planning to meet our development needs, instead of trapping ourselves in the stalemate where we have to make up for the shortage of land supply and clear our "old debts".

Deputy President, the Under Secretary for Transport and Housing will give a reply to issues concerning housing policy.

UNDER SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Cantonese): Deputy President, once again, I thank Mr James TO for moving his motion, nine Members for proposing their amendments, and a number of Members for expressing their views on how to increase housing supply. Some of the views have been discussed in my opening speech, so I will not repeat them here. As for other views, I would like to make a summary now. In addition, I will make a response and provide supplementary information in relation to the following points.

In their earlier speeches, a number of Members put forward various views and suggestions, all founded on the hope of increasing public housing supply in the future, especially in the short and medium term. In fact, the Government has been actively taking forward the work in this area. First of all, the public/private split of new housing supply has been revised from 60:40 to 70:30 for the ten-year period starting from 2019-2020, so as to further address the demand for public housing in the community. In addition, the Chief Executive has indicated in the 2018 Policy Address that more land will be allocated to public housing development, and 70% of the housing units on the Government's newly developed land will be for public housing.

To increase public housing supply, the Government introduced two new measures last year. One of them, as in the Government's decision announced on 29 June last year, is to re-allocate nine sites, which were originally intended for sale in the coming few years, at Kai Tak and Anderson Road Quarry for public housing. The sites are expected to provide some 11 000 public housing units,
which will help narrow the public housing shortage in later years. The Government will consider in future converting more private housing sites for public housing development.

Another measure is that, to optimize the use of public housing land, the current policy allows the maximum domestic plot ratio for public housing sites, except those in the north of Hong Kong Island and Kowloon Peninsula which are more densely populated, to increase by up to 30% where their technical feasibility permits. Both new measures will increase the supply of public housing. Some Members suggested making optimal use of the spaces in public housing. In this connection, the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") has been exploring and studying how to make optimal use of space, and we will continue to consider the feasibility of various proposals.

Some other Members said that prior availability of infrastructure would facilitate housing development. When the Transport and Housing Bureau was formulating the Railway Development Strategy 2014 ("RDS-2014"), the consultant at that time evaluated in detail the feasibility of constructing a railway along the coastline between Tuen Mun and Tsuen Wan. According to the consultant's analysis, the local population is mainly concentrated at the eastern and western ends of the coastline between Tuen Mun and Tsuen Wan; while the development density of the remaining areas is relatively low and no basis for new source of passengers is anticipated. Meanwhile, due to the technical difficulties involved, solely the construction cost of a railway along the coastline between Tuen Mun and Tsuen Wan is expected to be very high. The RDS-2014 states that the cost-effectiveness of Tuen Mun-Tsuen Wan Link can hardly be established, according to the information at that time; and in longer term, the Government would consider revisiting the railway proposal if there are further changes in the planning circumstances and population as well as an increase in transport demand in the coastal areas between Tuen Mun and Tsuen Wan, or new considerations in the planning for development in the region.

The Chief Executive mentioned the Lantau Tomorrow Vision in the 2018 Policy Address, in which a part of the proposed railway corridor is similar to the alignment of Tuen Mun-Tsuen Wan Link (Tuen Mun to Tsing Lung Tau). The Transport and Housing Bureau plans to take forward the Strategic Studies on Railways and Major Roads beyond 2030 ("RMR2030+ Studies") on the conceptual spatial requirements to be firmed up under the Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030 ("Hong Kong
2030+"), which is being conducted by the Development Bureau and the Planning Department. Based on the latest planning information, the Transport and Housing Bureau will examine the demand for and supply of transport infrastructure, including railways and major roads, in Hong Kong between 2031 and 2041, and study the loading of the heavy rails in the Northwest New Territories beyond 2030. The Transport and Housing Bureau will consider the planning studies and the recommended strategic transport corridors in relation to the Lantau Tomorrow Vision, as well as look into the layout of the proposed railway and major road infrastructure with regard to the transport infrastructure required for the longer-term strategic growth areas of Hong Kong 2030+ (including the New Territories North), to ensure that the planning of large scale transport infrastructure can meet the needs of the overall long-term land use developments of Hong Kong. The Transport and Housing Bureau will also examine the impact of the proposed transport infrastructure on the existing transport network and formulate corresponding strategies. The Legislative Council Panel on Transport expressed support for the aforesaid studies in June 2017. Since Hong Kong 2030+ has not yet been completed, the Transport and Housing Bureau will seek funding approval in due course for implementing RMR2030+ Studies.

(THE PRESIDENT resumed the Chair)

Subsidised home ownership is an essential element of the housing ladder and a core component of the Long Term Housing Strategy ("LTHS"). Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS") flats and other forms of subsidized sale flats ("SSFs") serve as the first step for home ownership for low to middle-income families. As envisaged in LTHS, the Government will consider how to expand the forms of subsidized home ownership and, where appropriate, introduce supplementary schemes of SSFs. The Chief Executive has also indicated in the 2017 Policy Address that the Government will strive to build a housing ladder and, focusing on supply and based on LTHS, step up its effort in increasing the supply of housing units.

Following such strategic direction, subsidized home ownership has been enriched from solely HOS to also include the Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme ("GSH") and the Starter Homes ("SH") Pilot Scheme for Hong Kong Residents now. Some Members said that GSH would affect PRH supply. On this point, the Government has explained many times that GSH,
characterized by a "one-for-one" arrangement, will not cause a reduction in public housing supply. In order to make SSFs more affordable, the Government announced the revised SSF pricing mechanism in June last year. Some Members proposed to prohibit the resale of SSFs in the private market upon payment of the premium. In fact, arising from the revised SSF pricing mechanism, the alienation restrictions for SSFs to be launched for sale by HA from 2019 will be tightened correspondingly. Under the new restrictions, owners will be barred from paying premium and selling their flats in the open market within the first ten years from first assignment from HA. They will be allowed to re-sell in the Secondary Market without premium payment to eligible buyers at not more than the original price during the first two years after first assignment and at freely negotiated prices as from the third year. The revised restrictions will strike a balance between deterring short-term speculations and facilitating market circulation of SSFs.

On the other hand, the regularization of the White Form Secondary Market Scheme and introduction of the Flat for Flat Pilot Scheme for Elderly Owners by the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HKHS"), among other measures, will facilitate the circulation of existing flats and ensure optimal use of them. These measures have promoted the turnover of SSFs among eligible persons.

The Government stands ready to increase spending on public housing and has set aside about $82.4 billion as the Housing Reserve to provide financial support to HA. HA will keep a close watch of its financial position. When necessary, it will discuss with the Government the needed amount of funding and timetable. The Government will seek funding approval from the Legislative Council Finance Committee in due course for the Housing Reserve, in support of HA's public housing developments.

Some Members expressed views on the Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid. HKHS is currently reviewing the scheme, and will consider appropriate improvement measures in light of the operation of the scheme and the public's views, such as the feasibility of allowing owners to rent out the whole flat. The scheme helps improve the living conditions of those on the PRH waiting list and facilitate the optimal use of SSF resources. HA will actively look into and discuss allowing owners of SSFs with premium not yet paid to rent out their flats, and consider including this measure into the scheme.
As regards some Members' reference to other demand-side management measures, the Government holds that the current demand-side management measures have effectively curbed the external demands for home ownership, but will continue to closely monitor the situation of the residential property market and ensure its healthy development.

Some Members also mentioned earlier the need to ensure that housing resources have not been abused. In this regard, HA has all along been striving to combat tenancy abuse. In addition to estate staff's periodic visits to households of public rental housing ("PRH") to detect tenancy abuse, the Housing Department also investigates suspected abuse cases referred by frontline management and reported by the public, and conducts in-depth investigations into randomly selected cases.

Increasing land supply is the most pressing challenge of the moment. Over the past few years, the Government has continued its multi-pronged efforts to increase land and housing supply, with a view to increasing and expediting PRH supply. In fact, we expect to build 248 000 PRH units in the ten-year period starting from 2019-2020. Compared with the 237 000 units as announced last year for the ten-year period starting from 2018-2019, this housing production has already increased by more than 10 000 units. In addition, the PRH production of HA and HKHS in the next five years starting from 2018-2019 will be 100 800 units, showing a steady growth compared with that of the previous four five-year periods.

During the motion debate, a number of Members expressed a range of views on transitional housing. While making efforts to identify land for housing construction, we will continue to support and facilitate the implementation of various short-term initiatives put forward and carried out by the community to increase the supply of transitional housing and alleviate the hardship faced by families awaiting PRH and the inadequately housed households.

President, the Government is very concerned about the housing difficulties faced by the public, and is determined to solve the problem. We will continue to work with the Development Bureau and relevant departments to identify land and adopt a multi-pronged approach to increasing housing land and production in the short, medium and long term, so as to effectively address the public demand for housing. Thank you, President.
PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now call upon Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok to move his amendment.

IR DR LO WAI-KWOK (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr James TO's motion be amended.

The amendment moved by Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok (See the marked-up version at Annex 6)

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

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Ms Alice MAK rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Alice MAK 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 Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr SHIU Ka-fai and Mr Kenneth LAU voted for the amendment.

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 against the amendment.

Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung and Mr Tony TSE abstained.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Junius HO voted for the amendment.

Ms Claudia MO, Mr Michael TIEN, 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 against the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Mr Wilson OR, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan abstained.
THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 30 were present, 10 were in favour of the amendment, 10 against it and 9 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 31 were present, 3 were in favour of the amendment, 17 against it and 11 abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

MS STARRY LEE (in Cantonese): President, I move that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of the motion on "Increasing housing supply in the short to medium term to rectify the problem of public housing shortage" or any amendments thereto, this Council do proceed to each of such divisions immediately after the division bell has been rung for one minute.

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

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(No hands raised)

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

I order that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of the motion on "Increasing housing supply in the short to medium term to rectify the problem of public housing shortage" or any amendments thereto, this Council do
proceed to each of such divisions immediately after the division bell has been rung for one minute.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Tony TSE, you may move your amendment.

MR TONY TSE (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr James TO's motion be amended.

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

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

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Dr KWOK Ka-ki rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

Functional Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr POON Siu-ping, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying and Mr Tony TSE voted for the amendment.

Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Mr Kenneth LAU and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted against the amendment.

Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW and Mr LUK Chung-hung abstained.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN and Dr Junius HO voted for the amendment.

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

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 30 were present, 6 were in favour of the amendment, 18 against it and 5 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 31 were present, 3 were in favour of the amendment, 16 against it and 12 abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki, you may move your amendment.

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr James TO's motion be amended.

The amendment moved by Dr KWOK Ka-ki (See the marked-up version at Annex 8)

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

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

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

(Members raised their hands)

Dr KWOK Ka-ki rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK Ka-ki has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr Kenneth LAU and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr HO Kai-ming, Dr Pierre CHAN and Mr LUK Chung-hung abstained.

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 LAM Cheuk-ting, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr Jeremy TAM and Mr Gary FAN voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan voted against the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Mr AU Nok-hin abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 30 were present, 10 were in favour of the amendment, 16 against it and 3 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 31 were present, 13 were in favour of the amendment, 11 against it and 7 abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Alice MAK, you may move your amendment.

MS ALICE MAK (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr James TO's motion be amended.

The amendment moved by Ms Alice MAK (See the marked-up version at Annex 9)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Ms Alice MAK to Mr James TO's motion, be passed.
PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you as stated. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Ms Alice MAK rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Alice MAK has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr HO Kai-ming and Mr LUK Chung-hung voted for the amendment.

Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr Kenneth LAU and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted against the amendment.
Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr CHAN Chun-ying and Mr Tony TSE abstained.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Ms Alice MAK and Mr KWOK Wai-keung voted for the amendment.

Mr Paul TSE, Ms Claudia MO, Mr Michael TIEN, 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 against the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 30 were present, 3 were in favour of the amendment, 21 against it and 5 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 31 were present, 3 were in favour of the amendment, 18 against it and 10 abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr Fernando CHEUNG, you may move your amendment.
DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr James TO's motion be amended.

The amendment moved by Dr Fernando CHEUNG (See the marked-up version at Annex 10)

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

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHU Hoi-dick rose to claim a division.

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

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

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

Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-yin, Mr Kenneth LAU and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr HO Kai-ming, Dr Pierre CHAN and Mr LUK Chung-hung abstained.

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, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Gary FAN and Mr AU Nok-hin voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan voted against the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung and Dr CHENG Chung-tai abstained.
THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 30 were present, 10 were in favour of the amendment, 16 against it and 3 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 31 were present, 15 were in favour of the amendment, 11 against it and 5 abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Gary FAN, you may move your amendment.

MR GARY FAN (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr James TO's motion be amended.

The amendment moved by Mr Gary FAN (See the marked-up version at Annex 11)

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

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr Gary FAN rose to claim a division.
PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Gary FAN has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr SHIU Ka-chun and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the amendment.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr Kenneth LAU and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr HO Kai-ming, Dr Pierre CHAN and Mr LUK Chung-hung abstained.

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 amendment.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan voted against the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Ms Alice MAK and Mr KWOK Wai-keung abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 31 were present, 10 were in favour of the amendment, 17 against it and 3 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 31 were present, 16 were in favour of the amendment, 11 against it and 4 abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Wilson OR, you may move your amendment.

MR WILSON OR (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr James TO's motion be amended.

The amendment moved by Mr Wilson OR (See the marked-up version at Annex 12)

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

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

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr Wilson OR rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Wilson OR has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr POON Siu-ping and Mr Holden CHOW voted for the amendment.

Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Mr Kenneth LAU and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted against the amendment.

Mr Martin LIAO, Mr HO Kai-ming, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung and Mr Tony TSE abstained.
THE PRESIDENT, Mr Andrew LEUNG, did not cast any vote.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Mr Wilson OR, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan voted for the amendment.

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 against the amendment.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Paul TSE, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung and Dr Junius HO abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 31 were present, 6 were in favour of the amendment, 18 against it and 6 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 31 were present, 9 were in favour of the amendment, 16 against it and 6 abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr CHU Hoi-dick, you may move your amendment.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr James TO's motion be amended.

The amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick (See the marked-up version at Annex 13)
PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the amendment, moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick to Mr James TO's motion, be passed.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHU Hoi-dick rose to claim a division.

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

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK and Mr SHIU Ka-chun voted for the amendment.

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO,
Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr Kenneth LAU and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr James TO, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Dr Pierre CHAN and Mr KWONG Chun-yu abstained.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Gary FAN and Mr AU Nok-hin voted for the amendment.

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

Mr WU Chi-wai, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr HUI Chi-fung and Dr CHENG Chung-tai abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 31 were present, 4 were in favour of the amendment, 20 against it and 6 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 31 were present, 10 were in favour of the amendment, 15 against it and 6 abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.
PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr Junius HO, you may move your amendment.

DR JUNIUS HO (in Cantonese): President, I move that Mr James TO's motion be amended.

The amendment moved by Dr Junius HO (See the marked-up version at Annex 14)

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

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr Alvin YEUNG rose to claim a division.

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

(While the division bell was ringing, Ms Tanya CHAN stood up)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Tanya CHAN, what is your point of order?
MS TANYA CHAN (in Cantonese): President, it seemed that Dr Junius HO was not present at the beginning of the motion debate and thus did not speak, but spoke for seven minutes, the speaking time allowed for other Members, afterwards if I recall correctly.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): The speaking time of Dr HO is the same as that of other movers of amendments.

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 POON Siu-ping voted for the amendment.

Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Pierre CHAN, Mr Kenneth LAU, Mr KWONG Chun-yu and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr CHAN Chun-ying and Mr LUK Chung-hung abstained.

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

Dr Junius HO voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Ms Claudia MO, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Helena WONG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-yan, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr Wilson OR, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Gary FAN, Mr AU Nok-hin and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan voted against the amendment.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Paul TSE, Ms Alice MAK and Mr KWOK Wai-keung abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 31 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment, 20 against it and 9 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 31 were present, 1 was in favour of the amendment, 26 against it and 4 abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

(Some Members made some noises inside the Chamber)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Members please keep quiet.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr James TO, you still have 58 seconds to reply. Then, the debate will come to a close.
MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): President, it was so noisy here that I almost
could not hear you calling me. Judging from the circumstances now, I do not
think the voting results would be anything positive. Nevertheless, I wish to say
something to Members, especially to the people of Hong Kong.

We made a calculation. By 2026, we will be short of 49 hectares of land.
So, today, no matter this motion is passed or vetoed, the Government still has to
respond to the proposals made by the Task Force on Land Supply ("Task Force")
and make a consolidated proposal on how to provide land. In fact, the Task
Force's proposal to resume the Fanling Golf Course will provide 32 hectares of
land and this is already a big and helpful way to meet the shortfall of 49 hectares.
If the Central People's Government is willing to let go a small corner of its
military sites, such as the Tsing Shan Firing Range, this will certainly help make
up part of the shortfall of land. So, I hope the related persons can try their
utmost to help make this possible.

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

(Members raised their hands)

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

(Members raised their hands)

Mr CHU Hoi-dick rose to claim a division.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

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

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr Kenneth LAU and Mr Tony TSE voted against the motion.

Mr HO Kai-ming, Dr Pierre CHAN and Mr LUK Chung-hung abstained.

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 LAM Cheuk-ting, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Gary FAN and Mr AU Nok-hin voted for the motion.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr Paul TSE, Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Dr Junius HO, Mr Wilson OR, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan voted against the motion.
Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Ms Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Dr CHENG Chung-tai abstained.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 31 were present, 10 were in favour of the motion, 17 against it and 3 abstained; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 31 were present, 14 were in favour of the motion, 12 against it and 5 abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was negatived.

NEXT MEETING

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now adjourned the meeting until 11:00 am on Wednesday, 23 January 2019.

Adjourned accordingly at 4:37 pm.
The marked-up version of the amendment moved by Dr Fernando CHEUNG (Translation)

That, given that the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance ('CSSA') Scheme is *has not been reviewed since 1996 and its contents are* outdated, therefore the amount of assistance received by CSSA recipients is unable to cover their basic needs in daily lives; *in this connection*, this Council urges the Government to immediately review and improve the CSSA Scheme; *specific proposals include:*

(1) particularly *formulating afresh* the mechanism to determine the amount of assistance;

(2) adjusting upward the special grants to CSSA recipients with disabilities and in ill health, including rent allowance, relocation allowance and special diet allowance, so as to ensure that they can live in adequate rented housing in light of their health care needs, and receive sufficient subvention for purchasing suitable food and health supplements on the recommendation of doctors;

(3) relaxing the disregarded earnings arrangement under the CSSA Scheme and regularizing the 'Pilot Scheme on Raising the Maximum Level of Disregarded Earnings for Recipients with Disabilities under the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme' under the Community Care Fund, so as to encourage recipients with disabilities to work and sustain employment to safeguard the *their* basic income of CSSA recipients;

(4) granting, in accordance with the recommendations made by the United Nations Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities to the Government in 2012, people with disabilities the right to apply for and receive CSSA on an individual basis, and extending this right to the elderly; and

(5) *shelving the tightening of eligibility age for elderly CSSA to 65.*

**Note:** Dr Fernando CHEUNG's amendment is marked in *bold and italic type* or with deletion line.
Annex 2

The marked-up version of the further amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Che-cheung to the motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG (Translation)

That, the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance ('CSSA') Scheme has not been reviewed since 1996 and its contents are outdated, therefore the amount of assistance received by CSSA recipients is unable to cover their basic needs in daily lives; in this connection, this Council urges the Government to immediately review and improve the CSSA Scheme; specific proposals include:

(1) formulating afresh the mechanism to determine the amount of assistance;

(2) adjusting upward the special grants to CSSA recipients with disabilities and in ill health, including rent allowance, relocation allowance and special diet allowance, so as to ensure that they can live in adequate rented housing in light of their health care needs, and receive sufficient subvention for purchasing suitable food and health supplements on the recommendation of doctors;

(3) relaxing the disregarded earnings arrangement under the CSSA Scheme and regularizing the 'Pilot Scheme on Raising the Maximum Level of Disregarded Earnings for Recipients with Disabilities under the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme' under the Community Care Fund, so as to encourage recipients with disabilities to work and sustain employment to safeguard their basic income;

(4) granting, in accordance with the recommendations made by the United Nations Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities to the Government in 2012, people with disabilities the right to apply for and receive CSSA on an individual basis, and extending this right to the elderly; and

(5) shelving the tightening of eligibility age for elderly CSSA to 65, and extending the Portable Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme to cover other provinces of the Mainland;
(6) strengthening the support for single-parent families, including increasing the single parent supplements and support services for single-parent families;

(7) reviewing the disregarded earnings arrangement to increase the incentive to encourage able-bodied CSSA recipients to work;

(8) increasing the grants to people with disabilities for various medical treatment and rehabilitation services to help them meet daily nursing care needs; and

(9) improving the rent allowance mechanism to alleviate the rent burden on the CSSA households.

Note: Mr LEUNG Che-cheung's amendment is marked in bold and italic type.
The marked-up version of the further amendment moved by Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung to the motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr LEUNG Che-cheung (Translation) 

That, the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance ('CSSA') Scheme has not been reviewed since 1996 and its contents are outdated, therefore the amount of assistance received by CSSA recipients is unable to cover their basic needs in daily lives; in this connection, this Council urges the Government to immediately review and improve the CSSA Scheme; specific proposals include:

(1) formulating afresh the mechanism to determine the amount of assistance;

(2) adjusting upward the special grants to CSSA recipients with disabilities and in ill health, including rent allowance, relocation allowance and special diet allowance, so as to ensure that they can live in adequate rented housing in light of their health care needs, and receive sufficient subvention for purchasing suitable food and health supplements on the recommendation of doctors;

(3) relaxing the disregardeds earnings arrangement under the CSSA Scheme and regularizing the 'Pilot Scheme on Raising the Maximum Level of Disregarded Earnings for Recipients with Disabilities under the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme' under the Community Care Fund, so as to encourage recipients with disabilities to work and sustain employment to safeguard their basic income;

(4) granting, in accordance with the recommendations made by the United Nations Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities to the Government in 2012, people with disabilities the right to apply for and receive CSSA on an individual basis, and extending this right to the elderly; and

(5) shelving the tightening of eligibility age for elderly CSSA to 65, and extending the Portable Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme to cover other provinces of the Mainland;
(6) strengthening the support for single-parent families, including increasing the single parent supplements and support services for single-parent families;

(7) reviewing the disregarded earnings arrangement to increase the incentive to encourage able-bodied CSSA recipients to work;

(8) increasing the grants to people with disabilities for various medical treatment and rehabilitation services to help them meet daily nursing care needs; and

(9) improving the rent allowance mechanism to alleviate the rent burden on the CSSA households;

(10) calculating the maximum amount of rent allowance on the basis of the average increase in actual rent payments of CSSA recipients renting private residential units;

(11) reintroducing the grants for rent deposit and removal expenses for able-bodied CSSA recipients to alleviate their financial pressure from finding accommodation elsewhere;

(12) providing long-term supplement for families who are not living with the elderly, the disabled or ill-health and have been in receipt of CSSA for 12 consecutive months or more, so as to help them replace durable goods such as furniture and electrical appliances; and

(13) providing grants to CSSA recipients, irrespective of age and disability, for covering costs of dental treatment and glasses having regard to their physical conditions and needs.

Note: Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung's amendment is marked in bold and italic type.
The marked-up version of the further amendment moved by Dr KWOK Ka-ki to the motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung (Translation)

That, the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance ('CSSA') Scheme has not been reviewed since 1996 and its contents are outdated, therefore the amount of assistance received by CSSA recipients is unable to cover their basic needs in daily lives; in this connection, this Council urges the Government to immediately review and improve the CSSA Scheme; specific proposals include:

(1) formulating afresh the mechanism to determine the amount of assistance;

(2) adjusting upward the special grants to CSSA recipients with disabilities and in ill health, including rent allowance, relocation allowance and special diet allowance, so as to ensure that they can live in adequate rented housing in light of their health care needs, and receive sufficient subvention for purchasing suitable food and health supplements on the recommendation of doctors;

(3) relaxing the disregarded earnings arrangement under the CSSA Scheme and regularizing the 'Pilot Scheme on Raising the Maximum Level of Disregarded Earnings for Recipients with Disabilities under the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme' under the Community Care Fund, so as to encourage recipients with disabilities to work and sustain employment to safeguard their basic income;

(4) granting, in accordance with the recommendations made by the United Nations Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities to the Government in 2012, people with disabilities the right to apply for and receive CSSA on an individual basis, and extending this right to the elderly; and

(5) shelving the tightening of eligibility age for elderly CSSA to 65, and extending the Portable Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme to cover other provinces of the Mainland;
(6) strengthening the support for single-parent families, including increasing the single parent supplements and support services for single-parent families;

(7) reviewing the disregarded earnings arrangement to increase the incentive to encourage able-bodied CSSA recipients to work;

(8) increasing the grants to people with disabilities for various medical treatment and rehabilitation services to help them meet daily nursing care needs; and

(9) improving the rent allowance mechanism to alleviate the rent burden on the CSSA households;

(10) calculating the maximum amount of rent allowance on the basis of the average increase in actual rent payments of CSSA recipients renting private residential units;

(11) reintroducing the grants for rent deposit and removal expenses for able-bodied CSSA recipients to alleviate their financial pressure from finding accommodation elsewhere;

(12) providing long-term supplement for families who are not living with the elderly, the disabled or ill-health and have been in receipt of CSSA for 12 consecutive months or more, so as to help them replace durable goods such as furniture and electrical appliances; and

(13) providing grants to CSSA recipients, irrespective of age and disability, for covering costs of dental treatment and glasses having regard to their physical conditions and needs; and

(14) before revising the benchmark for basic living allowance, taking account of structural changes in society and provide additional items of necessary family expenditure, such as subsidies for service fees of mobile phones, so as to develop a comprehensive safety net that does not only enable the recipients to cope with the basic living needs, but also satisfy their personal needs.

Note: Dr KWOK Ka-ki's amendment is marked in bold and italic type.
The marked-up version of the further amendment moved by Mr AU Nok-hin to the motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung and Dr KWOK Ka-ki (Translation)

That, the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance ('CSSA') Scheme has not been reviewed since 1996 and its contents are outdated, therefore the amount of assistance received by CSSA recipients is unable to cover their basic needs in daily lives; in this connection, this Council urges the Government to immediately review and improve the CSSA Scheme; specific proposals include:

(1) formulating afresh the mechanism to determine the amount of assistance;

(2) adjusting upward the special grants to CSSA recipients with disabilities and in ill health, including rent allowance, relocation allowance and special diet allowance, so as to ensure that they can live in adequate rented housing in light of their health care needs, and receive sufficient subvention for purchasing suitable food and health supplements on the recommendation of doctors;

(3) relaxing the disregarded earnings arrangement under the CSSA Scheme and regularizing the 'Pilot Scheme on Raising the Maximum Level of Disregarded Earnings for Recipients with Disabilities under the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme' under the Community Care Fund, so as to encourage recipients with disabilities to work and sustain employment to safeguard their basic income;

(4) granting, in accordance with the recommendations made by the United Nations Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities to the Government in 2012, people with disabilities the right to apply for and receive CSSA on an individual basis, and extending this right to the elderly; and

(5) shelving the tightening of eligibility age for elderly CSSA to 65, and extending the Portable Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme to cover other provinces of the Mainland;
(6) strengthening the support for single-parent families, including increasing the single parent supplements and support services for single-parent families;

(7) reviewing the disregarded earnings arrangement to increase the incentive to encourage able-bodied CSSA recipients to work;

(8) increasing the grants to people with disabilities for various medical treatment and rehabilitation services to help them meet daily nursing care needs; and

(9) improving the rent allowance mechanism to alleviate the rent burden on the CSSA households;

(10) calculating the maximum amount of rent allowance on the basis of the average increase in actual rent payments of CSSA recipients renting private residential units;

(11) reintroducing the grants for rent deposit and removal expenses for able-bodied CSSA recipients to alleviate their financial pressure from finding accommodation elsewhere;

(12) providing long-term supplement for families who are not living with the elderly, the disabled or ill-health and have been in receipt of CSSA for 12 consecutive months or more, so as to help them replace durable goods such as furniture and electrical appliances; and

(13) providing grants to CSSA recipients, irrespective of age and disability, for covering costs of dental treatment and glasses having regard to their physical conditions and needs; and

(14) before revising the benchmark for basic living allowance, taking account of structural changes in society and provide additional items of necessary family expenditure, such as subsidies for service fees of mobile phones, so as to develop a comprehensive safety net that does not only enable the recipients to cope with the basic living needs, but also satisfy their personal needs; and
(15) conducting the study on basic and essential needs on a regular basis to establish the support items for different groups to maintain a basic standard of living, and re-determining the CSSA rates based on the findings of the study.

Note: Mr AU Nok-hin's amendment is marked in *bold and italic type*. 
The marked-up version of the amendment moved by Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok (Translation)

That, the short supply of housing in Hong Kong tops the list of livelihood issues that are of concern to people from various strata; in the recently announced Long Term Housing Strategy, the Government has revised the new public and private housing supply in the 10-year period from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029 to a ratio of 7:3; however, due to inadequate supply of land for housing construction, it is anticipated that it will definitely not be easy for public housing supply in the short to medium term will fail to meet the expected target; in this connection, this Council urges the Government to adopt the following policies and measures to increase public housing supply in the short to medium term:

(1) to expeditiously formulate an overall land development strategy with greater courage and commitment; to adopt diversified planning proposals and a more pragmatic and convenient approach to increase land supply, including actively promoting reclamation at suitable areas outside the Victoria Harbour, expediting the development of rock caverns and underground space, increasing the plot ratio on specific conditions, changing land use, expediting land resumption and redevelopment, and taking forward various plans for expanding new development areas and new towns, so as to build up a long-term land reserve for the flexible adjustment of land supply; and, to formulate long-term infrastructure planning to expedite the planning of land that is suitable for residential purpose for constructing public, private and subsidized housing;

(2) to invoke the further invocation of the Lands Resumption Ordinance for the massive, the setting up of a flexible and transparent compensation mechanism and promotion of public-private partnership for the expeditious resumption of brownfield sites and idle agricultural lands in the New Territories, so as to open up new development areas for housing construction purpose;
(2) to fully resume the 172-hectare site of the Fanling Golf Course for developing housing and relevant ancillary facilities;

(3) to conduct studies on converting the use of the site which has been reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland to public housing development;

(4) to negotiate with the Central Government for releasing certain idle or under-utilized military sites in Hong Kong for housing development purpose;

(5)(3) to effect explore the feasibility of enabling the participation of the Hong Kong Housing Authority in the 'Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid' under the Hong Kong Housing Society, and to discuss the scheme with the Hong Kong Housing Society with a view to allowing owners to let their entire flats, subject to a pro-rata sharing of their rental incomes with the Government;

(6)(4) to formulate redevelopment plans for aged public housing estates for the expeditious redevelopment of certain aged public housing estates with higher residual plot ratios while relaxing the plot ratios of urban sites, so as to increase the supply of public housing units; and

(7)(5) to enhance the role of the Urban Renewal Authority as a facilitator in urban redevelopment, so that it can expeditiously use the land resumed by the Urban Renewal Authority for developing subsidized housing (e.g. the 'Starter Homes' Scheme for Hong Kong Residents);

(6) on the premise of protecting country parks, to develop green belt areas of relatively low ecological value for housing construction purpose;

(7) to expeditiously review and reconstruct a housing ladder to cater for the housing needs of people from different strata, including the provision of more incentives to encourage public housing households with the means to acquire their own homes, and to provide targeted measures for subsidized home ownership, such as
an enhanced version of the Home Starter Loan Scheme and the Sandwich Class Housing Scheme;

(8) to consider afresh the construction of a railway between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun with a supply-driven mindset, so as to bring new impetus for the further development of New Territories West and in turn develop the land along the railway for massive housing construction;

(9) instead of remaining indecisive on the land reclamation proposals for housing construction unveiled in the Policy Address, to comprehensively put forth long-term reclamation planning and specific reclamation proposals, and to present to the Legislative Council the proposals for reclamation in areas such as the east of Lantau Island, and apply funding for preliminary studies, so as to expeditiously commence the relevant reclamation plan;

(10) while increasing housing supply, to cater for the development of the economy, people's livelihood and society as a whole, including the development of industries, culture and arts, recreational and sports facilities, transport networks and community facilities; and

(11) to set up a high-level inter-departmental coordination mechanism to rationalize and strengthen the coordination of the land supply duties and procedures vested in the relevant government departments, with a view to expediting the process of increasing land supply.

Note: Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok's amendment is marked in bold and italic type or with deletion line.
The marked-up version of the amendment moved by Mr Tony TSE (Translation)

That, at present, the waiting time for public housing has kept increasing, and various types of subsidized sale flats have likewise remained in short supply; in the recently announced Long Term Housing Strategy, the Government has revised the new public and private housing supply in the 10-year period from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029 to a ratio of 7:3; however, due to inadequate supply of land for housing construction, it is anticipated that public housing supply in the short to medium term will fail to meet the expected target; in this connection, this Council urges the Government to adopt the following measures to increase public housing supply in the short to medium term:

(1) to invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance for the massive resumption and adopt a public-private partnership approach, so as to expedite the development of brownfield sites and idle agricultural lands in the New Territories, so as to open up new development areas for public and private housing construction purpose;

(2) to fully resume conduct professional and scientific studies on the way forward for the 172-hectare site of the Fanling Golf Course, including whether the site should be used entirely or partially for developing housing and relevant ancillary facilities;

(3) to conduct studies on the possibility of converting the use of the site which has been reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland to public housing development or other uses;

(4) to negotiate with the Central Government for releasing certain idle or under-utilized military sites in Hong Kong for housing development purpose;

(5) to effect the participation of the Hong Kong Housing Authority in the 'Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid' under the Hong Kong Housing Society, and to
discuss the scheme with the Hong Kong Housing Society with a view to allowing owners to let their entire flats, subject to a pro-rata sharing of their rental incomes with the Government;

(4) to stipulate that no newly-built subsidized sale flats can be resold in the private market after premium payment, and that such units can be bought back only by the Government or the Hong Kong Housing Authority ('HA') at reasonable prices and offered for application by eligible persons after renovation, so as to maintain the supply of subsidized sale flats;

(5) to increase transitional housing on all fronts, including optimizing the use of idle government sites, vacant school premises, and the rooftops, storerooms and empty bays in existing public housing estates as transitional housing; and, at the same time, to formulate measures for encouraging private land owners to convert idle agricultural lands into transitional housing and allocating some of the units to people in need by the Government or HA;

(6) to formulate redevelopment plans for aged public housing estates for the expeditious redevelopment of certain aged public housing estates with higher residual plot ratios while appropriately raising their plot ratios, so as to increase the supply of public housing units; and

(7) to use the land more lands resumed by the Urban Renewal Authority for developing subsidized housing (e.g. the 'Starter Homes' Scheme for Hong Kong Residents).

Note: Mr Tony TSE's amendment is marked in bold and italic type or with deletion line.
The marked-up version of the amendment moved by Dr KWOK Ka-ki (Translation)

That, as Hong Kong's housing problem has turned increasingly acute, in the recently announced Long Term Housing Strategy, the Government has revised the new public and private housing supply in the 10-year period from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029 to a ratio of 7:3; however, due to inadequate supply of land for housing construction, it is anticipated that public housing supply in the short to medium term will fail to meet the expected target; in this connection, this Council urges the Government to adopt the following measures to increase public housing supply in the short to medium term:

1. to invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance for the massive resumption of brownfield sites and idle agricultural lands in the New Territories, so as to open up new development areas for housing construction purpose;

2. to fully resume the 172-hectare site of the Fanling Golf Course for developing housing and relevant ancillary facilities;

3. to conduct studies on converting the use of the site which has been reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland to public housing development;

4. to negotiate with the Central Government for releasing certain idle or under-utilized military sites in Hong Kong for housing development purpose;

5. to effect the participation of the Hong Kong Housing Authority in the 'Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid' under the Hong Kong Housing Society, and to discuss the scheme with the Hong Kong Housing Society with a view to allowing owners to let their entire flats, subject to a pro-rata sharing of their rental incomes with the Government;
(6) to formulate redevelopment plans for aged public housing estates for the expeditious redevelopment of certain aged public housing estates with higher residual plot ratios, so as to increase the supply of public housing units; and

(7) to use the land resumed by the Urban Renewal Authority for developing subsidized housing (e.g. the 'Starter Homes' Scheme for Hong Kong Residents) public housing;

(8) to cease the execution of private treaty grants, rezone the lands within 'Village Type Development' zones, and exclude the existing idle government lands of over 900 hectares from 'Village Type Development' zones, so as to open up more lands for public housing development;

(9) to revitalize idle government buildings and vacant school premises and convert them into short-term housing; and

(10) to provide detailed information on the existing government sites granted by way of short-term tenancies and temporary government land allocations as well as idle government lands, and to study the construction of public housing on the aforesaid lands.

Note: Dr KWOK Ka-ki's amendment is marked in bold and italic type or with deletion line.
The marked-up version of the amendment moved by Ms Alice MAK  
(Translation)

That, in order to avert the imbalance between housing supply and demand in recent years, the Government formulated and announced the Long Term Housing Strategy in 2014, with annual updates on its projection of the long-term housing demand; in the recently announced Long Term Housing Strategy Annual Progress Report 2018, the Government has revised the new public and private housing supply in the 10-year period from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029 to a ratio of 7:3; however, due to inadequate supply of land for housing construction, it is anticipated that public housing supply in the short to medium term will fail to meet the expected target; in this connection, this Council urges the Government to adopt the following measures to increase public housing supply in the short to medium term:

(1) to invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance where practicable for the massive resumption of brownfield sites and idle agricultural lands in the New Territories, so as to open up new development areas for housing construction purpose;

(2) to expeditiously formulate a resumption timetable and initiate planning for ancillary community facilities, so as to fully resume the 172-hectare site of the Fanling Golf Course for developing housing and relevant ancillary facilities;

(3) to conduct studies on converting the use of the site which has been reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland to public housing development;

(4) to negotiate with the Central Government for releasing certain idle or under-utilized military sites in Hong Kong for housing development purpose;

(5) to effect the participation of the Hong Kong Housing Authority in the 'Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid' under the Hong Kong Housing Society, and to
discuss the scheme with the Hong Kong Housing Society with a view to refine the scheme, including provision of matching services and follow-up support for flat owners and tenants, and allowing owners to let their entire flats, subject to a pro-rata sharing of their rental incomes with the Government;

(6) to formulate redevelopment plans for aged public housing estates for the expeditious redevelopment of certain aged public housing estates which are old, dilapidated or with higher residual plot ratios, so as to increase the supply of public housing units; and

(7) to use the Housing Reserve to provide financial support to the Hong Kong Housing Authority, the Hong Kong Housing Society and the Urban Renewal Authority for conducting public housing construction projects, and to use all the land resumed by the Urban Renewal Authority for developing subsidized housing (e.g. public housing, including public rental housing, the Green Form Subsidized Home Ownership Scheme, the Home Ownership Scheme and the 'Starter Homes' Scheme for Hong Kong Residents);

(7) to introduce a vacant property tax in the residential property market, so as to drive flat owners to actively let their idle units and in turn increase the turnaround of residential units; and

(8) to expeditiously commence various land reclamation projects which are deemed appropriate after study, such as the artificial islands in the central waters, so as to create more lands for public housing construction.

Note: Ms Alice MAK's amendment is marked in bold and italic type or with deletion line.
That, in the face of the serious lag of public housing supply, in the recently announced Long Term Housing Strategy, the Government has revised the new public and private housing supply in the 10-year period from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029 to a ratio of 7:3; however, since the formulation of the Long Term Housing Strategy by the previous-term Government, the volume of public housing supply in the period from 2015-2016 to 2022-2023 has failed to meet the annual target of 28,000 units on average, and the new public and private housing supply in this eight-year period is likewise unable to reach the original ratio of 6:4, thus leading people to question whether the aforesaid revision is a mere play on figures; besides, due to inadequate supply of land for housing construction, it is anticipated that public housing supply in the short to medium term will fail to meet the expected target; in this connection, this Council urges the Government to adopt the following measures to increase public housing supply in the short to medium term:

(1) to invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance for the massive resumption of brownfield sites and idle agricultural lands in the New Territories, so as to open up new development areas for housing construction purpose;

(2) to fully resume the 172-hectare site of the Fanling Golf Course for developing housing and relevant ancillary facilities;

(3) to conduct studies on converting the use of the site which has been reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland to public housing development;

(4) to negotiate with the Central Government for releasing certain idle or under-utilized military sites in Hong Kong for housing development purpose;
(5) to effect the participation of the Hong Kong Housing Authority in the 'Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid' under the Hong Kong Housing Society, and to discuss the scheme with the Hong Kong Housing Society with a view to allowing owners to let their entire flats, subject to a pro-rata sharing of their rental incomes with the Government;

(6) to formulate redevelopment plans for aged public housing estates for the expeditious redevelopment of certain aged public housing estates with higher residual plot ratios, so as to increase the supply of public housing units; and

(7) to use the land resumed by the Urban Renewal Authority for developing subsidized housing (e.g. the 'Starter Homes' Scheme for Hong Kong Residents); and

(8) to use the majority of the sites on the Land Sale Programme for the next three years to construct public housing, so as to increase the supply of public housing units more expeditiously.

Note: Dr Fernando CHEUNG's amendment is marked in **bold and italic type** or with deletion line.
That, during the four years from 2014-2015 to 2017-2018, the number of public housing units provided by the Hong Kong Housing Authority and the Hong Kong Housing Society lagged far behind the supply target proposed in the Long Term Housing Strategy of 2014, and this has resulted in an increase of the average waiting time for public housing among general applicants from 3.1 years at the end of September 2014 to 5.5 years at the end of September 2018; due to residential property investment and speculation in Hong Kong by people and corporate buyers from outside Hong Kong, housing prices and rents have become far beyond Hong Kong people's affordability; in the recently announced Long Term Housing Strategy Annual Progress Report 2018 announced in December 2018, the Government has revised the new public and private housing supply in the 10-year period from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029 to a ratio of 7:3; however, due to inadequate supply of land for housing construction, it is anticipated that public housing supply in the short to medium term will still fail to meet the expected target; in this connection, this Council urges the Government to adopt the following measures to increase public housing supply in the short to medium term:

(1) to set up an open and transparent database on brownfield sites in the territory, accord priority to the development of brownfield sites and invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance for the massive resumption of brownfield sites and idle agricultural lands in the New Territories, so as to open up new development areas for housing construction purpose;

(2) to fully resume develop the sites leased under private recreational leases, including the full resumption of the 172-hectare site of the Fanling Golf Course for developing housing and relevant ancillary facilities;

(3) to introduce an idle land tax to reduce land hoarding by developers, so as to expedite housing construction and in turn increase housing supply;
(3)(4) to conduct studies on converting the use of the site which has been reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland to public housing development;

(4)(5) to negotiate with the Central Government for releasing certain idle or under-utilized military sites in Hong Kong for housing development purpose;

(5) to effect the participation of the Hong Kong Housing Authority in the 'Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid' under the Hong Kong Housing Society, and to discuss the scheme with the Hong Kong Housing Society with a view to allowing owners to let their entire flats, subject to a pro-rata sharing of their rental incomes with the Government;

(6) to formulate redevelopment plans for aged public housing estates for the expeditious redevelopment of certain aged public housing estates with higher residual plot ratios, so as to increase the supply of public rental housing units; and

(7) to use the land resumed by the Urban Renewal Authority, and above-station spaces and adjacent sites for developing public and subsidized housing (e.g. the 'Starter Homes' Scheme for Hong Kong Residents);

(8) while implementing the Home Ownership Scheme and the Green Form Subsidized Home Ownership Scheme, to refrain from lowering the proportion of public rental housing in the overall public housing, so as to expeditiously restore the average waiting time for public housing to three years; and

(9) by drawing reference from the practices in Australia and New Zealand, to forbid people and corporate buyers from outside Hong Kong to acquire and hold second-hand residential units (including subsidized sale flats with premiums paid), so as to ensure that priority is accorded to meeting Hong Kong people's demand for home acquisition.

Note: Mr Gary FAN's amendment is marked in bold and italic type or with deletion line.
The marked-up version of the amendment moved by Mr Wilson OR

(Translation)

That, due to the persistent short supply of public housing, in the recently announced Long Term Housing Strategy, the Government has revised the new public and private housing supply in the 10-year period from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029 to a ratio of 7:3; however, due to inadequate supply of land for housing construction, it is anticipated that public housing supply in the short to medium term will fail to meet the expected target; in this connection, this Council urges the Government to adopt the following multi-pronged measures to increase public housing supply in the short to medium term:

(1) to expeditiously formulate policies on tapping into suitable sites in the private agricultural land reserve in the New Territories for developing public housing and accommodating brownfield operations, so as to unleash the development potentials of private agricultural lands and brownfield sites more expeditiously and increase land supply for housing construction;

(1)(2) to invoke continue the adoption of previous effective measures, including the invocation of the Lands Resumption Ordinance and land exchange, for the massive resumption of brownfield sites and idle agricultural private lands in the New Territories, so as to open up new development areas for housing construction purpose in the New Territories more expeditiously;

(2)(3) to fully resume the 172-hectare actively study the recommendations of the Task Force on Land Supply, and to examine the resumption of the site of the Fanling Golf Course for developing housing and relevant ancillary facilities on the premise of properly handling transport facilities and other ancillary infrastructural facilities;

(3)(4) to conduct studies on converting the use of the site which has been reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland to public housing development;
(4) to negotiate with the Central Government for releasing certain idle or under-utilized military sites in Hong Kong for housing development purpose;

(5) to effect the participation of the Hong Kong Housing Authority in the 'Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid' under the Hong Kong Housing Society, and to discuss the scheme with the Hong Kong Housing Society with a view to allowing owners to let their entire flats, subject to a pro-rata sharing of their rental incomes with the Government, sublet the flats to grass-roots families at affordable rents through intermediaries such as social enterprises, non-profit-making organizations or public bodies;

(6) to optimize the use of idle government lands or facilities, including the use of lands or facilities on lease under short-term tenancies or with tenancies due to expire within one year for transitional housing purpose; and at the same time, to formulate a target on transitional housing supply and establish a 'dedicated fund for community housing', so as to take forward and support various transitional housing schemes;

(6)(7) to formulate redevelopment plans for aged public housing estates for the expeditious redevelopment of certain aged public housing estates with higher residual plot ratios, so as to increase the supply of public housing units; and

(7)(8) to use some of the land resumed by the Urban Renewal Authority for developing subsidized housing (e.g. the 'Starter Homes' Scheme for Hong Kong Residents).

Note: Mr Wilson OR's amendment is marked in bold and italic type or with deletion line.
Annex 13

The marked-up version of the amendment moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick (Translation)

That, in the recently announced Long Term Housing Strategy, the Government has revised the new public and private housing supply in the 10-year period from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029 to a ratio of 7:3; however, due to inadequate supply of land for housing construction, the actual public housing production has remained on the low side for many years; according to the projection of the Hong Kong Housing Authority, in the five-year period from 2018-2019 to 2022-2023, the production volume of public housing/Green Form Subsidized Home Ownership Scheme units will not show any substantial increase, and it is anticipated that public housing supply in the short to medium term will fail to meet the expected target; in this connection, this Council urges the Government to adopt the following measures to increase public housing supply in the short to medium term:

(1) to invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance for the massive resumption of brownfield sites and idle agricultural lands in the New Territories, so as to open up new development areas for housing construction on the premise of conducting full consultation, to consolidate certain brownfield sites which are unsuitable for preservation for business operation and convert them for the development of public housing with appropriate densities;

(2) to fully resume the 172-hectare site of the Fanling Golf Course for developing housing and relevant ancillary facilities, so as to replace most existing development plans in North East New Territories and reduce the eviction of residents;

(3) on the premise of ensuring that the noise and air pollution problems probably originating from the Hong Kong Disneyland and Penny's Bay Power Station respectively can be resolved, to conduct studies on converting the use of the site which has been reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland to public housing development;
(4) to negotiate with the Central Government for releasing certain idle or under-utilized military sites in Hong Kong for housing development purpose request the Beijing Government to release the military sites in Hong Kong for the purpose of developing public housing;

(5) to effect the participation of the Hong Kong Housing Authority in the 'Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid' under the Hong Kong Housing Society, and to discuss the scheme with the Hong Kong Housing Society with a view to allowing owners to let their entire flats at affordable rents, subject to a pro-rata sharing of their rental incomes with the Government;

(6) to formulate redevelopment plans for aged public housing estates and redevelopment schemes for buildings of the Civil Servants' Co-operative Building Society for the expeditious redevelopment of certain aged public housing estates with higher residual plot ratios and buildings of the Civil Servants' Co-operative Building Society, and to stipulate that the sites for redevelopment must be used to construct public housing, so as to increase the supply of public housing units; and

(7) to use the land resumed by the Urban Renewal Authority for developing subsidized housing (e.g. the 'Starter Homes' Scheme for Hong Kong Residents) public housing;

(8) to fully utilize idle government lands and facilities, and to construct transitional housing and operate the relevant programmes with government funding, so as to increase the volume of transitional housing as a means of alleviating the housing problems faced by people awaiting public housing allocation or living in inadequate housing conditions; and

(9) to require that future public housing production must be dominated by public rental housing, so as to ensure that people from the middle and lower strata are entitled to reasonable security of tenure in the public housing system and reduce people's overall housing expenses.

Note: Mr CHU Hoi-dick's amendment is marked in bold and italic type or with deletion line.
The marked-up version of the amendment moved by Dr Junius HO

(Translation)

That, in the recently announced Long Term Housing Strategy, the Government has revised the new public and private housing supply in the 10-year period from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029 to a ratio of 7:3; however, due to inadequate supply of land for housing construction, it is anticipated that public housing supply in the short to medium term will fail to meet the expected target; in this connection, this Council urges the Government to adopt the following measures to increase public housing supply in the short to medium term:

(1) to amend and invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance for the massive resumption of brownfield sites and idle agricultural lands in the New Territories, so as to open up new development areas for housing construction purpose; and to study the reinstatement of Letter B entitlement as a compensation option for landowners;

(2) to study the relaxation of the plot ratios for the topside development of container terminals for housing construction and other uses, and to accept the participation of Letter B entitlement holders in the relevant development plans on a priority basis;

(2)(3) to fully resume the 172-hectare site of the Fanling Golf Course for developing housing and relevant ancillary facilities open up the lands released from the frontier closed areas for setting up temporary housing and facilities, so as to accommodate the nearly 120 000 people who are now living in subdivided units or those who are awaiting public housing allocation;

(3)(4) to conduct studies on converting the use of the site which has been reserved for the second phase development of the Hong Kong Disneyland to the expansion of public housing development and the relevant road facilities in Tai O;
(4)(5) to negotiate with the Central Government for releasing certain idle or under-utilized military sites quarters in Hong Kong for transitional housing development purpose;

(5)(6) to effect the participation of the Hong Kong Housing Authority in the 'Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid' under the Hong Kong Housing Society, and to discuss the scheme with the Hong Kong Housing Society with a view to allowing owners to let their entire flats, subject to a pro-rata sharing of their rental incomes with the Government;

(6)(7) to formulate redevelopment plans for aged public housing estates for the expeditious redevelopment of certain aged public housing estates with higher residual plot ratios, so as to increase the supply of public housing units; and

(7)(8) to use the land resumed by the Urban Renewal Authority for developing subsidized housing (e.g. the 'Starter Homes' Scheme for Hong Kong Residents).

Note: Dr Junius HO's amendment is marked in **bold and italic type** or with deletion line.