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

(While the summoning bell was ringing)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Gary FAN, please put down your placard.

(Mr Gary FAN did not put down his placard)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): You may display a smaller placard. This one of yours is too big. It blocks my view. Please put it down.

(Mr Gary FAN did not put down his placard)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Your placard is too big. It hinders the proceedings of the meeting. You may decide on your own how to display your placard, but I consider it too big. Please put it down.

(Mr Gary FAN still did not put down his placard)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Gary FAN, please put down your placard.

(Mr Gary FAN put down his placard)

(After the summoning bell had been rung, a number of Members entered the Chamber)

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Questions. Question 1. Mr SHIU Ka-chun has informed me that Dr Fernando CHEUNG will ask the question on his behalf. I now call upon Dr Fernando CHEUNG to ask the question.
Protecting the labour rights and interests of employees who work long hours or under high pressure

1. DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, this question is supposed to be asked by Mr SHIU Ka-chun. Regrettably, …

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHEUNG, please read out the question as per the wording printed on the Agenda.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): Alright. I just wish to point out that I am asking the question on Mr SHIU Ka-chun's behalf. It is regrettable that he cannot attend the meeting.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHEUNG, if you do not read out the question, I will ask another Member to do it. Please read out the question.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, I am going to read out the question.

It has been learnt that employees who are older in age generally work longer hours, and there are relatively more cases in which such employees died in the course of work not as a result of accidents. It has been heard from time to time in recent years about press reports and study findings that employees fell ill or even died as a result of long working hours or high work pressure. Regarding protection of the labour rights and interests of such kind of employees, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it will regard mental, emotional or physical illnesses triggered by long working hours or work pressure as occupational diseases covered by the Employees' Compensation Ordinance ("the Ordinance"), so that the employees concerned will be entitled to compensations by their employers; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
(2) whether it will expeditiously set up an independent committee comprising representatives from trade unions, employers' organizations, civic bodies and the Government to conduct studies on formulating under the Ordinance a legal definition for "death from overexertion" and the relevant obligations of employers in respect of compensations; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(3) given that the Government will roll out a total of 11 sets of sector-specific working hours guidelines in this year and the coming year, and that it will, three years from then, assess their effectiveness and further explore feasible ways for improving the working hours policy, whether the Government will commence preparatory work for establishing a statutory standard working hours regime so that the related legislative exercise could be launched immediately when those guidelines have been assessed as ineffective; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

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

(1) According to the definition of the International Labour Organization ("ILO"), occupational diseases are diseases having a specific or strong relationship with occupations of the patients. As such, we normally see a specific pairing relationship between an occupational disease with a specific type of work. For example, occupational deafness is related to work in a noisy environment, silicosis is related to work with exposure to silica dust, and tenosynovitis of the hand or forearm is related to work involving repeated movements. In considering whether a certain disease should be prescribed as an occupational disease under the Employees' Compensation Ordinance ("ECO") (Cap. 282), the Labour Department ("LD") draws reference from the ILO criteria, and adopts an evidence-based approach to assess objectively whether a specific or strong causal relationship exists between a disease and a certain type of work. In doing so, LD will take into account whether there is sufficient medical evidence, as well as the relevant local research and disease data, etc.
There are no internationally recognized criteria or medical evidence to establish that long working hours or the work stress so induced will directly cause a certain kind of mental, emotional or physical diseases such as cardiovascular and cerebrovascular diseases ("CCVDs"). In fact, these common diseases are not known to be attributed to certain specific work-related factors. To the contrary, mental diseases, emotional diseases or CCVDs may be associated with a multitude of complex personal, family and work-related factors, e.g. history of personal growth, health condition, family inheritance, family or life stresses, eating and living habits, work nature and environment, etc. Perhaps this also explains why a vast majority of countries do not categorize mental diseases, emotional diseases and CCVDs as occupational diseases. Nevertheless, we will continue to closely monitor developments in this area.

(2) As for "death from overexertion", there is also no internationally accepted definition and there is little experience among overseas jurisdictions in defining "death from overexertion" in terms of employees' compensation. This notwithstanding, as we reported to the Panel on Manpower in April 2018, LD commissioned the Occupational Safety and Health Council ("OSHC") in October 2017 to conduct a study focusing on death of employees at the workplace caused by CCVDs. OSHC objectively studies the working condition of such employees during employment, their personal health condition and living habits, etc. through interviewing the deceased employees' relatives, employers and colleagues. The purpose is to try to analyse whether there is any possible relationship between the employees' death and their working condition as well as other personal factors, e.g. whether the working condition could have directly caused the death or whether there could be other relevant circumstances at the same time. OSHC started the interviewing work in the first quarter of 2018 and expects to collect necessary data and complete the study in about three years. LD will consider if we have a clear basis to include "death from overexertion" as an occupational disease under ECO subject to OSHC's study outcome and developments in the international arena.
At the same time, if an employee dies (including the case of sudden death) as a result of an accident arising out of and in the course of the employment, the existing ECO already requires the employer to take up the liability to pay employees' compensation in accordance with the Ordinance.

(3) Since the labour sector had strong views on the "contractual working hours" legislative proposal put up by the last-term Government and the business sector opposed legislating for standard working hours, the current-term Government, having regard to the diverse views among different sectors of the community and the absence of a broad-based consensus on any working hours legislative proposal, has decided to focus efforts on formulating working hours guidelines for 11 designated sectors, so as to improve employees' working hours arrangements as soon as practicable. LD has been engaging its 11 industry-based tripartite committees, comprising representatives of LD, employers and employees, to formulate for these designated sectors guidelines with suggested sector-specific working hours arrangements, overtime compensation arrangements and good working hours management measures for reference of and adoption by employers and their employees. The Government will review and assess the effectiveness of the sector-specific working hours guidelines and further explore feasible ways for improving the working hours policy three years after the release of all the 11 guidelines.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, in terms of labour protection, particularly the regulation of working hours, the Government really lags behind others and keeps procrastinating. The Government stated in the main reply that there is currently no internationally accepted definition of "death from overexertion". President, at the World Health Assembly on 28 May, the World Health Organization ("WHO") already included "burnout" as a disease in the International Classification of Diseases ("ICD"). ICD is the international standard for uniform classification of diseases promulgated by WHO. It helps doctors in making diagnoses and insurance companies in determining the amount of compensation. It clearly points out that "burnout" is characterized by three symptoms. I will not go into the details here.
Regarding the relevant review, the main reply states that it will take three more years to complete the study. Only then will the Government decide whether "death from overexertion" should be listed as an occupational disease for which employees' compensation will be made. The main reply also states that it does not know how much longer it will take before it can deal with the issue of standard working hours, but it will roll out the so-called contractual working hours guidelines for 11 sectors and conduct a review three years later.

President, in 2012, LD already published …

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr CHEUNG, please come to your supplementary question direct.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, my supplementary question is like this. As the Government has repeatedly delayed legislating for standard working hours and "death from overexertion" and kept "filibustering", how long do we still have to wait for statutory standard working hours such that all employees can have reasonable working hours, with eight hours of work, eight hours of rest and eight hours as their private time?

SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Cantonese): President, I believe that when Dr Fernando CHEUNG studied social work, he should have read the concept of "burnout" and the relevant empirical studies. WHO has also clarified that its recent act is simply adding an item QT85 to its ICD-11 and explained that "burnout" is a phenomenon rather than a disease. I believe Members may learn about this clarification in reading newspapers.

President, I have said "burnout" in English because there is no official Chinese translation of this term. Generally speaking, it refers to a syndrome of physical and mental exhaustion, not a disease.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): Will the Secretary please stop playing with rhetoric. Syndromes and diseases …
MR POON SIU-PING (in Cantonese): President, the Government keeps delaying legislating for standard working hours. We find it regrettable. Certainly, just now a Member mentioned the news report today about the inclusion of "burnout" in ICD by WHO, expressing his concern for wage earners. No matter what, just now I heard the Secretary say that in 2017, LD already commissioned OSHC to study the issue of "death from overexertion" and said that the study would take three years. I mainly wish to follow it up. OSHC commenced the relevant study in 2018, and now it is already 2019. Will OSHC submit an interim report to LD? Or do we really have to wait for three years before LD will further examine whether "death from overexertion" should be included as an occupational disease under ECO?

SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Cantonese): President, LD has all along kept in view OSHC's progress in this study. It needs three years because only then can it manage to get sufficient cases for making the relevant analysis and conclusion.

MR LUK CHUNG-HUNG (in Cantonese): President, why is it necessary to wait for three years? According to the statistics of LD on occupational injuries and deaths, in the past five years, there were already 635 cases of deaths caused by non-occupational diseases, half of which being related to heart disease. A pet phrase of wage earners is "They can die but not fall ill". They are really "busy to death". The trigger for many diseases is work stress, or the workplace being too scorching hot, etc., causing employees to fall ill—especially those suffering from cardiovascular diseases—ending up with sudden death arising from overexertion. As a matter of fact, Japan has also stipulated the definition of "death from overexertion". Because it is only when there is—and there must be—a definition of "death from overexertion" that workers who suddenly die at work will be awarded reasonable compensation, rather than receiving none even if they die in the course of their busy or overtime work. This is totally unfair. May I ask the Secretary what criteria the Government needs before it considers that there are cases of "death from overexertion", so as to facilitate the formulation of relevant protection measures, thereby enabling employees to claim compensation?
SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Cantonese): President, as I have mentioned in part (1) of the main reply, most importantly, we "[draw] reference from the ILO criteria, and adopts an evidence-based approach to assess objectively whether a specific or strong causal relationship exists between a disease and a certain type of work. In doing so, LD will take into account whether there is sufficient medical evidence, as well as the relevant local research and disease data, etc."

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): President, in recent years, we have seen a continual increase in non-industrious injuries and deaths. In particular, non-occupational fatalities in the course of employment also keep rising. We in the labour sector are deeply concerned about this issue. However, the Government stated that given the absence of a clear basis or definition of "death from overexertion" at the moment, it is difficult to include it in ECO. On the other hand, however, the Government has indicated its wish to alleviate the problem of working hours. For this reason, now it is formulating 11 sector-specific working hours guidelines. Three years after the release of all these guidelines, it will review and assess their effectiveness and further explore how best to ameliorate the problem of working hours. May I ask, regarding this policy, three years after the release of all these 11 sector-specific working hours guidelines, how will the Government assess their effectiveness? Because in the past, for purposes of formulating the minimum wage rate, the Government also adopted this kind of tactics, that is, consulting some sectors to see if the bosses would implement the minimum wage rate before launching the minimum wage system. But such an approach made us feel that the Government was merely stalling. The bosses actually would not implement it. In fact, when the last-term Government proposed the introduction of standard working hours, those bosses refused to implement it. That being the case, how can the Government tell us with certainty how standard working hours can actually be implemented if, three years later, the guidelines are assessed as ineffective?

SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Cantonese): President, generally speaking, after our formulation of a guideline, the assessment will mainly review the progress of implementation of the relevant guideline by the employers and employees concerned, and follow up the extent of what we call "compliance" for future policy assessment.
MR SHIU KA-FAI (in Cantonese): President, regarding this topic, some members of the labour sector hold that many of their colleagues may have worked excessively long hours. For this reason, part (3) of the main question particularly asked why the Bureau did not explore the issue of standard working hours. As a matter of fact, every time the Chief Executive presented the Policy Address, she would point out, as she has kept telling the people of Hong Kong in recent years, that the unemployment rate of Hong Kong was 2.8%, close to full employment. Last week, as pointed out by me to the Secretary in the Public Accounts Committee, the Director of Audit's Report shows that in 2018, LD recorded a total of 170,000 job vacancies in three sectors. Among them, only 3,000 were filled successfully. Moreover, only 1,600 job interviews were arranged. That means various sectors and industries actually suffer from a manpower shortage. To resolve the problem of excessively long working hours about which so many Members of the labour sector are concerned, will the Secretary seriously consider expeditious importation of labour?

SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Cantonese): President, my response is the same as that in the past. We will give it serious consideration.

MR HO KAI-MING (in Cantonese): President, maybe Dr Fernando CHEUNG did not read the report of the Oriental Daily News that "burnout" is an occupational phenomenon. The most fundamental solution to this phenomenon is certainly implementation of standard working hours, but regrettably, the Secretary is still unwilling to take it forward. May I ask, while it is yet to be implemented, if this occupational phenomenon of "burnout" can be included as a disease which can be treated by the Hospital Authority ("HA"), so that wage earners can receive corresponding treatment when they seek medical consultation owing to "burnout"?

SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Cantonese): President, as pointed out by the Honourable Member just now, WHO said it is an occupational phenomenon rather than an occupational disease. Hence, I believe HA will not treat it as a disease.
DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): President, it is in fact rather embarrassing that we have to tell and teach a scholar how to implement standard working hours. However, in respect of legislating for standard working hours, the Government keeps delaying, brushing it aside. The last-term Government had even delayed it for five years and deceived members of the public for five years without taking it forward. I actually hold some expectation on the current-term Government. So I have this question for the Secretary. Most importantly, how many people have to die of burnout or this occupational phenomena before the current-term Government will consider it necessary to promote standard working hours? How many deaths will suffice for the implementation? Are there any criteria?

SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Cantonese): President, part (3) of the main reply has already mentioned how the current-term Government regards standard working hours. I do not have anything to add.

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): President, my supplementary question is very clear. I asked the Secretary how many deaths would suffice.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr KWOK, you have already pointed out which part of your supplementary question has not been answered.

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): He could tell me that it will not be sufficient until a large number or even 10 000 people have died.

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

SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Cantonese): The number of deaths is not a factor in our consideration.

MR GARY FAN (in Cantonese): I thank Mr SHIU Ka-chun for his concern about labour rights and interests even though he is in prison. First of all, I wish to say that the introduction of legislation for standard working hours brooks no delay. Secretary, WHO has included "burnout" in ICD for the very first time,
officially recognizing it as a disease. In fact, it is certainly necessary to formulate a measure to include mental, emotional and physical diseases triggered by long working hours and work pressure as occupational diseases under ECO such that employees can receive compensation from employers, but the mere implementation of such a measure may not be enough.

Hence, I wish to ask the Government whether it has assessed how it can start with the prevention of mental, emotional and physical diseases triggered by work pressure among employees. For example, it can promote a friendly working environment, draw reference from the practices of other countries and advocate that enterprises allow employees to bring their children to the office for child care so that employees can strike a better balance between work and family needs. Or it can urge more large enterprises to provide additional facilities which can alleviate employees' work pressure, such as drawing reference from the practice of foreign enterprises, building gymnasiums and spas for use by employees.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr FAN's supplementary question is not relevant to the main question. Nevertheless, Secretary, do you have anything to add?

SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Cantonese): President, I believe the promotion of what we call a work-friendly or family-friendly environment is something which the Government has all along endeavoured to do.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Andrew WAN, please put down the placard on your right.

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): Why?

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Because that placard is so big that it blocks my view. When Council held its meeting last week, I had also requested you three times to put it down. Please put it down.
MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): How can it possibly block your view?

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I cannot see which Members are present behind you. Moreover, you already have another placard on your desk. Please put it down.

(Mr Andrew WAN did not put down the placard)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WAN, please put down your placard.

(Mr Andrew WAN put down the placard)


Regulation of the sale of residential units by way of tender

2. MR WILSON OR (in Cantonese): President, it has been reported that recently, some units of a residential development were offered for sale by way of tender. According to the tender results, a certain unit was sold unexpectedly at a price of $470,000 higher than that of another unit with the same orientation and size but 12 storeys higher, which was sold on the same day, and five other units with the same size and orientation but on different floors were sold surprisingly at the same price. There are comments that the sale of units by way of tender has resulted in a lack of information transparency, thereby placing prospective purchasers in an unfavourable position. Besides, as the payment terms drawn up by developers are multifarious, it is difficult to calculate their cash equivalents, rendering the "transaction prices" shown on the registers of transactions ("RT") unable to reflect the actual prices at which the units were sold. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

   (1) whether it will consider, by making amendments to the Residential Properties (First-hand Sales) Ordinance, stepping up the regulation of the sale of residential units by way of tender, e.g. requiring that only units larger than a certain size may be sold by way of tender, and no more than a certain proportion of the units of a development may be sold by way of tender; and
(2) given that although developers are required to set out, in the RT of developments, the payment terms for the units sold (including any discount on the price as well as any gift, financial advantage or benefit offered to the purchaser), it is difficult for ordinary prospective purchasers to compare the payment terms across different developments and different units, whether the Government will require developers to make public in the RT the cash equivalents of the payment terms calculated in accordance with a prescribed formula, so as to make it easier for prospective purchasers to grasp the actual prices at which the various units were sold?

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Cantonese): President, the objectives of the Residential Properties (First-hand Sales) Ordinance are to strike a balance between enhancing the transparency as well as fairness in the sales of first-hand residential properties to strengthen protection of consumers, and allowing vendors the flexibility in making business decisions with a view to providing a level playing field for the first-hand residential properties market. Though the requirement on the provision of price lists does not apply to developments sold by way of tender, the Ordinance stipulates that other provisions relating to sales brochure, show flat and Register of Transactions disclosing transaction information still apply.

The Government has all along been closely monitoring the implementation of the Ordinance and will intervene appropriately when necessary. We have adopted a three-pronged approach to enforce the Ordinance in regulating the sales of first-hand residential properties: Firstly, monitoring developers' and concerned persons' compliance with the Ordinance and taking enforcement action when necessary; secondly, issuing timely guidelines to the trade when necessary for the more effective and practical compliance with the Ordinance; and thirdly, fostering public awareness of the Ordinance to better protect consumer interests. Irrespective of the methods of sales, developers and concerned persons must strictly comply with the Ordinance to ensure open, transparent and fair transaction information.

In respect of law enforcement, the Sales of First-hand Residential Properties Authority ("SRPA") has spotted by proactive surveillance that sales practices and the transaction information of some individual first-hand residential properties sold by tender recently were not transparent enough. On one of the
cases, SRPA has completed the work of evidence collection and initiated prosecution. The case will be heard on 9 July. SRPA is taking follow-up action on the rest of the cases. SRPA does not rule out the possibility of further prosecution action subject to evidence available.

On enhancing the trade's compliance with the Ordinance, section 61 of the Ordinance states that the purpose of Register of Transactions of a development is to provide a member of the public with the transaction information relating to the development for understanding the market conditions. Prospective purchasers can thus get accurate transaction information timely to make a decision when purchasing first-hand residential properties. SRPA has earlier issued a Reminder to the Trade and a Frequently Asked Question and Answer requiring vendors to set out full details of the terms of payment in the Registers of Transactions of first-hand residential developments, and has reminded vendors that in the sales of first-hand residential properties, if they have offered any discount, gift, financial advantage or benefit (whether in terms of cash or not) to purchasers, they should set out the full details of the terms of payment as agreed between the vendor and the purchaser for each specified residential property. Moreover, the Register of Transactions should be self-contained so that prospective purchasers do not have to refer to other documents or materials for details of the terms of payment. Having issued the Reminder, the situation has generally improved and prospective purchasers can better understand the actual transaction information of individual units.

To promote public awareness of the Ordinance, SRPA launched a new radio Announcement in the Public Interest on 17 May, named "Bidding First-hand Residential Properties". The purpose is to remind prospective purchasers that before bidding for a first-hand residential property, they should obtain the prices, rebates and benefits of similar properties of the development from the Register of Transactions.

Meanwhile, the Estate Agents Authority ("EAA") is conducting an investigation to ensure that estate agents are strictly observing the Estate Agents Ordinance and EAA's guidelines when participating in the sales of residential properties by tender. EAA has also issued a Letter to Licensees reminding all licensees to comply with the Estate Agents Ordinance and the relevant guidelines set out in the Practice Circular issued by EAA, regardless of the method of sales adopted by developers for selling their properties. In particular, EAA reminds licensees that without obtaining a vendor's written endorsement, they must not
issue any materials promoting the sales of any first-hand residential properties by tender, including the materials containing information on the suggested bidding price.

On further enhancing the trade's compliance with the Ordinance, SRPA intends to issue a Best Practice for the Trade in the near future illustrating how a developer should list various discount, financial advantage or benefit in monetary terms in the Register of Transactions in a clear and orderly manner so that prospective purchasers could have a better grasp of the transaction information of individual units.

SRPA will also upload case examples on its website to elaborate the calculation of various discount, financial advantage or benefit in the Register of Transactions so that prospective purchasers could have a good grasp of the methods of calculating the actual prices of the units to make a decision.

The Government will continue to implement the above measures. SRPA and EAA will monitor closely the sales of first-hand residential properties by tender and take necessary measures to ensure that the level of transparency of the sales of first-hand residential properties by tender is the same as that for open sales with price lists with a view to safeguarding consumer interests.

MR WILSON OR (in Cantonese): President, perhaps Members still remember that last year, the Chief Executive proposed six measures on housing and one of them is to review the Consent Scheme to require developers to offer for sale no less than 20% of the total number of residential units in a development. The original intention is to prevent developers from selling residential units in the fashion of "squeezing toothpaste".

However, at present, we can see that if property developers offer properties for sale by way of tender or switch to selling properties by way of auction, they do not have to provide any price list at all and can withdraw the properties at any time if the reserve prices are not reached. Frankly, although the 20% requirement is complied with, such a method sorely lacks transparency. Secretary, may I ask you if you are prepared to consider fixing this loophole again—this loophole in the Consent Scheme—to plug an existing loophole of great concern to the general public?
SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Cantonese): On the pre-sale of uncompleted flats and the sale of first-hand residential properties by way of tender, basically, we understand that, as stipulated clearly in the Ordinance, regardless of the way of selling first-hand residential properties, the requirements to be complied with are the same, that is, the openness and transparency of information must be ensured to afford protection to consumer rights.

Just now, Mr OR mentioned the requirement that the number of units offered in the pre-sale of uncompleted flats cannot be less than 20% of the total number of units in a development. SRPA and the Lands Department will monitor the relevant procedure closely in accordance with the provisions on the pre-sale of uncompleted flats. If it is found that the relevant arrangements are not complied with, appropriate measures will be taken.

We do not rule out the possibility of examining whether or not existing legislation has to be amended, when necessary. However, the situation currently is that, after SRPA and EAA have taken action, we can see that there are improvements in overall market behaviour. We will continue to monitor the relevant situation closely and take appropriate measures in due course.

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): I thank Mr Wilson OR for following up this question, about which I believe we are all concerned. A month ago, I voiced my views on this issue to the Secretary and staff members of the Policy Bureau concerned and I also thank the bureau for giving the main reply today. I think the right steps have been taken in several areas, including providing clear records of transaction price, advantage, rebates, benefit, and so on. In addition, in response to the request of the legislature, the authorities have taken prosecution actions, so as to create a deterrent effect and prevent the concerned parties from going too far.

However, President, I have noticed one issue, that is, the Democratic Party proposed that a restriction be imposed on the floor area and now, there is a guideline for developers, that is, only units over 700 sq ft in area can be sold by way of tender but not for those below 700 sq ft, unless they are units with three rooms.
President, I think this is a loophole. If this situation continues, new variations of the same thing will keep coming up. If there is no improvement to the situation or it even deteriorates, can the Policy Bureau concerned tell this Council if it will consider amending the Ordinance to plug the relevant loophole by specifying that units below a certain floor area cannot be sold by way of tender?

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Cantonese): President, on the sale of first-hand residential properties, we understand that the real estate sector and the development sector have issued guidelines to their members and their sectors and made internal arrangements concerning the sale of first-hand residential properties by way of tender. We know that the sectors are happy to comply with the guidelines and hope that in the sale process, consumer interest can be protected. We understand that the community—including Members seated here—is concerned about the guidelines on sale by way of tender, for example, the issue of three-bedroom units that are 1,076 sq ft or about 700 sq ft in floor area.

SPRA will also keep watch on the situation closely. Depending on the actual operation, we will ensure that in future, the protection for consumers and the openness and transparency of information will comply with legal requirements. In addition, SPRA will specify clearly how developers have to set out clearly the relevant special offers in the Register of Transactions, for example, financial advantages and even discounts, so that consumers can calculate the actual property prices by reference drawn from the Register of Transactions. We will deal with some situations in a case-by-case approach, for example, if the price of a residential unit is $10 million and the developer offers a discount of, say, 3%, on early total repayment, and consumers are aware of such a calculation method and a purchaser takes this special offer, the actual property price will then become $9.7 million. Through this kind of information dissemination, we will provide information to consumers by way of case examples, so that they can make appropriate calculations of various special offers, discounts and even rebates and get a clear idea of the actual transaction prices, so as to make informed decisions.

Of course, Mr WAN asked just now if the Government could conduct a review. The Government never relents in taking law enforcement actions. If there is any violation of the law, we will take prosecution action. In future, if we find that there is a need to make legislative amendments, we will not rule out making them accordingly.
MR LUK CHUNG-HUNG (in Cantonese): President, at the outset, the first sentence of the main reply given by the Secretary spells out clearly that "... the objectives of the Residential Properties (First-hand Sales) Ordinance are to strike a balance between enhancing the transparency as well as fairness in the sales of first-hand residential properties to strengthen protection of consumers ...". I consider this statement most ironical. The bureau believes that it is necessary to have transparency and protect consumers in the sale of properties, yet it sanctions or allows the emergence of such a ridiculous situation as selling properties by tender. The sale of property involves millions or tens of millions of dollars but surprisingly, there is no need to list the prices clearly. President, how can this be so outrageous? This is not transparent, nor is there any protection for consumers. Moreover, this enables developers to shore up prices easily.

Some time ago, the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong issued self-regulation guidelines to specify that units with more than three rooms and a floor area of no less than 753 sq ft—that is, residential units with floor areas below what is considered large floor areas—must be sold by way of price lists but I wish to tell the Secretary that given the interests at stake, such self-regulation is totally ineffective. If Members have read news reports, they will know that some developers have disregarded the guidelines for the sector and continued to sell units by way of tender. Do the authorities ...

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LUK, please come to your supplementary question direct.

MR LUK CHUNG-HUNG (in Cantonese): ... think that it is no longer effective?

May I ask the bureau if it hopes to protect consumers, or it wants to protect the interests of developers? Secretary, you have to give us a reply clearly.

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Cantonese): President, Mr LUK said just now that the transparency and fairness of the sale arrangement were somewhat ironical but I think the angles from which we look at
matters are not entirely the same. We have to understand that the ways of selling items—including first-hand residential properties—are neutral per se and there is nothing wrong with them. The most important thing is that no matter what sale method is used to sell first-hand residential properties, developers must ensure the openness and transparency of information in accordance with law and ensure that consumer interests are guaranteed or protected.

If we look at what happened in the past period, it can be seen that ever since we found that in the course of selling the first-hand units in individual residential developments by way of tender, the information was not entirely open or transparent, we sent a message and after issuing guidelines to the developers and real estate agents concerned and giving them gentle reminders—from early April to the present … I mean up to 23 May—among the 1 900 units in six brand new developments put on sale, only seven units were put up for sale by way of tender. As pointed out by me in the main reply, improvements to the situation can be seen. The sector also issued guidelines on self-regulation and the Government will also monitor the situation closely. I hope Members can let the market exercise self-regulation and self-restraint because ultimately, all laws and regulations have limitations and cannot guarantee absolute compliance with the requirements in the relevant situations.

Therefore, as pointed out by me, in any situation, if it is found that any developer or sale arrangement does not comply with the relevant legal requirements, we will always follow up in earnest and if there is sufficient evidence, prosecution will be instituted. For this reason, basically, first, the whole set of laws and regulations, the whole sector and monitoring by society are at the forefront and second, the Government will also continue to make efforts in law enforcement in respect of first-hand residential properties and enhance public awareness. I believe that with our concerted efforts in implementing the measures in these three areas, the interests of consumers, in particular, those of buyers of first-hand residential properties, will be protected.

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

MR LUK CHUNG-HUNG (in Cantonese): The Secretary did not give me a reply on whether his priority task is to protect consumer interest or that of developers.
PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LUK, you have already pointed out which part of your supplementary question has not been answered. Please sit down.

MR LUK CHUNG-HUNG (in Cantonese): This is the biggest question.

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

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Cantonese): President, I have nothing to add.

MS ALICE MAK (in Cantonese): President, of course, we understand that selling units by way of tender is one way of selling properties but in formulating so many restrictions, rules and regulations, we want to ensure the transparency of information in the sale of properties, in particular, first-hand residential properties, so that the market and consumers can have a clear idea of the information on the market and property prices.

   However, we have to note that recently, several news reports pointed out specifically that selling the units concerned by way of tender is not the normal way of sale. When tenders for these units were invited, normal market prices were set out but in the tender, various special concessions were offered, that is, the actual prices paid by purchasers could be lower than the selling price that we see in the Land Registry. In this way, a wrong message was sent to consumers, who would thus think that a particular property is really worth the high price.

   In view of this, I believe the so-called information transparency is not just designed to let people who are willing to buy properties by way of tender know the prices of the properties bought by them and whether or not they are worth so much, more importantly, this approach of selling at one price, then making purchasers pay another actual price by offering other conditions after tender …

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms MAK, please come to your supplementary question direct.
MS ALICE MAK (in Cantonese): ... will make the market mistake that the value of a property is higher than the price it is actually worth, thus delivering a wrong message.

In view of this, will the Secretary consider how the loophole in this regard can be plugged, so that other consumers in the market can know clearly the actual transaction prices of properties?

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Cantonese): President, I thank Ms MAK for her supplementary question.

Indeed, earlier on, we found that in the sale of first-hand residential properties, individual developers provided incomplete information in the Register of Transactions, so SPRA will issue a good practice guide with the aim of instructing developers on how to set out various discounts, financial advantages or benefits in monetary terms in a clear and orderly manner, so as to enhance the transparency and readability of the transaction information.

The example cited by me just now is that, assuming the property price is $1 million but an early payment discount or other benefits and even rebates are offered, basically, the developer has to convert them into monetary terms in a simple and readily understandable manner, so that consumers do not have to refer to other information before they can know the actual transaction price of a unit. Under such an arrangement, it will be possible to clarify the ambiguities or even confusing points mentioned by Ms MAK just now.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Third question.

Addressing climate change and protecting biodiversity

3. MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): Last month, a socio-political movement called "Extinction Rebellion" staged a large-scale demonstration in London, putting forward the following three demands to the Government of the United Kingdom ("UK"): (1) the Government must tell the truth about the climate and wider ecological emergency, reverse inconsistent policies and work
alongside with the media to communicate with citizens; (2) the Government must enact legally binding policy measures to reduce carbon emissions to net zero by 2025 and to reduce consumption levels; and (3) a national Citizens' Assembly should be set up to oversee the changes, as part of creating a democracy fit for the purpose. On the other hand, a global environmental assessment report published early this month by an organization under the United Nations ("UN") has pointed out that a million species are threatened with extinction due to the destruction inflicted by human beings on the natural environment, and thus only "transformative changes" across the globe on various aspects may reverse this situation. Some environmentalists have pointed out that if the Hong Kong Government does not make transformative changes to its current policies for addressing climate change and protecting biodiversity, it can hardly satisfy the three aforesaid demands nor meet the UN Aichi Biodiversity Targets. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it will pledge to the public that it will devote all its efforts to satisfying the three demands of the Extinction Rebellion movement; if so, of the transformative changes to be made in respect of its policies for addressing climate change; if not, the reasons for that;

(2) given that the Parliament and dozens of local councils of cities and towns in UK have declared a climate emergency, whether the Hong Kong Government will make such declaration; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(3) whether it will study what transformative changes to the policies on protecting biodiversity are needed in Hong Kong; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (in Cantonese): President, my reply to the three parts of the question is as follows:

(1) and (2)

There is no time to waste in combating climate change. According to the Paris Agreement, all Parties should take appropriate measures based on the principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities" in order to tackle this imminent
challenge together. Hong Kong has responded positively when the Paris Agreement came into effect in 2016. We set up the Steering Committee on Climate Change under the chairmanship of the Chief Secretary of Administration to steer and coordinate climate actions among various bureaux and departments in the whole Government; and released the Hong Kong's Climate Action Plan 2030+ in 2017, setting out the target to reduce Hong Kong's carbon intensity by between 65% and 70% by 2030 compared with the 2005 level and detailing the key measures to be taken. These actions are in line with the Paris Agreement to hold the increase in global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels. The Government will also review our climate actions every five years as required by the Paris Agreement.

As electricity generation contributes to about two thirds of Hong Kong's carbon emissions, improving the fuel mix is the prime consideration. For this, the two power companies will use more natural gas in the coming ten years to replace the coal-fired generating units which will gradually retire. At the same time, the Government will continue to take the lead in developing renewable energy. For example, we have earmarked $2 billion to implement relevant projects at government premises, and will install solar generation systems of a larger scale at suitable reservoir and landfill locations. Beyond the Government, we have introduced Feed-in Tariff ("FiT") and implemented different facilitation measures, including suitably relaxing the restrictions on "village house" rooftop installations, launching Solar Harvest to assist eligible schools and welfare non-governmental organizations in installing solar photovoltaic panels, etc. There were only dozens of private renewable energy systems connected to the power grids in the past, but in the past year alone, the two power companies have already received about 3 000 FiT applications.

In addition, the Government unveiled in 2015 the Energy Saving Plan for Hong Kong's Built Environment 2015~2025+, setting a target of reducing energy intensity by 40% (compared with 2005) by 2025. To date, our overall energy intensity has decreased by more than 28%, putting us in the lead among members of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation. We have implemented a number of
measures to enhance our energy efficiency, including (a) taking the lead in saving energy and developing green buildings; (b) raising statutory standards; (c) providing tax incentives; (d) constructing district cooling systems; (e) promoting retro-commissioning; (f) expanding the Mandatory Energy Efficiency Labelling Scheme; and (g) harnessing technology and innovation, etc. After implementing all these measures, we expect that our annual carbon emissions will be reduced by 1.7 million tonnes. Using the carbon emission level of 2016 as reference, this would be equivalent to a carbon reduction of about 4%.

Energy saving is also a key element of the post-2018 Scheme of Control Agreements ("SCAs") we signed with the power companies. The two power companies have implemented different programmes under SCAs to assist the community in participating in energy saving. In the future, smart meters will be used to provide electricity consumption information to all customers in Hong Kong to help save energy and implement demand response schemes.

We are also developing Organic Resources Recovery Centres ("ORRCs") in phases to turn food waste into biogas. Phase 1 of ORRC was commissioned in 2018, while Phases 2 and 3 are under planning. Moreover, the first Food Waste/Sewage Sludge Anaerobic Co-digestion Trial Scheme that is carried out jointly by the Environmental Protection Department and Drainage Services Department is just being conducted at Tai Po Sewage Treatment Works. This allows proper recycling of food waste and turning waste into energy, while reducing carbon emissions at the same time.

The transport sector accounts for around 20% of Hong Kong's carbon emissions. Upon the completion of the Shatin to Central Link, the railway service will cover more than 70% of the local population. The Government will continue to promote "Walk in HK" to encourage people to walk more, and to foster a bicycle-friendly environment.

With the successive implementation of various measures, we are moving steadily towards the 2030 target of reducing per capita carbon emissions from 5.7 tonnes in 2016 to less than 4.5 tonnes in
2020 and within 3.3 to 3.8 tonnes by 2030. Pursuant to the Paris Agreement, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR") shall formulate, by 2020, our long-term decarbonization strategy up to 2050. To this end, the Council for Sustainable Development has accepted the Government's invitation to launch a public engagement exercise next month. In the process, the Council will, as usual, adopt a bottom-up approach, providing a platform to gauge the views of the community and help build consensus. We encourage all sectors of the community to take this opportunity to express their views.

In the face of various global challenges for biodiversity, the HKSAR Government launched the first city level Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan ("BSAP") for Hong Kong in 2016. The four major areas under BSAP include enhancing the existing conservation measures; mainstreaming biodiversity; improving knowledge and enhancing public participation in biodiversity. There are 67 specific actions under BSAP, many of which are related to mitigating and adapting to climate change.

At present, various work under the four major areas of BSAP has been progressing, and actions are being implemented by relevant bureaux and departments in accordance with the timetable.

MR CHU HOI-DICK (in Cantonese): President, in my question I clearly asked the Government whether it would make "transformative changes". The Secretary only enumerated, like a rapper, many initiatives in his reply. Does he consider those "transformative changes"? Secretary, I have learnt from the newspapers that Hong Kong intends to set the target of reducing Hong Kong's total carbon emissions up to 2050 by only 60% compared with the 2005 level—I do not know if it is true or not and will he please give a response to it—but the United Nations already adjusted its target in October last year, and the upper limit now is no longer 2°C, but 1.5°C. To achieve such a target, carbon emissions will have to be reduced to net zero by 2025. Eight countries in the European Union have now adopted such a target. The Mayor of Los Angeles, the United States, also stated in May that the city would follow suit. The Committee on Climate Change of the United Kingdom also published a report, indicate that the United Kingdom will undertake work on reduction of carbon
emissions in this direction. Can the Hong Kong Government face such a scientific reality and stop being an ostrich but set the target of zero carbon emission by 2050?

SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (in Cantonese): President, first of all, we have to see the facts clearly. The target of the Paris Agreement was set together by a number of signatories on the basis of scientific research. The goal of the Paris Agreement is striving to keep the global temperature rise below 2°C and endeavour by all means to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C, which coincides with the relevant goal recently announced by the United Nations. The Hong Kong Government set the carbon reduction target for 2030 pursuant to the Paris Agreement.

Compared to other advanced places in Asia, such as Tokyo, Seoul and Taipei, Hong Kong has set a similar carbon reduction target for 2030, reflecting the ambition of our target. However, we understand that persistent efforts are required to tackle climate change and achieve carbon reduction. The Government has yet to set the target of carbon reduction up to 2050. In this connection, we have adopted the approach of a civil society and encouraged bottom-up public engagement. As I have already pointed out in the main reply, we have invited the Council for Sustainable Development to engage the public in a bottom-up manner, while drawing reference from scientific data in various aspects and practices of places all over the world, so as to set an ambitious and achievable carbon reduction target for 2050.

IR DR LO WAI-KWOK (in Cantonese): President, the Secretary has mentioned in his main reply the many policies and initiatives put forward by the HKSAR Government in terms of energy saving and emission reduction. However, Hong Kong cannot win the battle against climate change fighting alone. We must cooperate with nearby cities. In this connection, the Outline Development Plan for the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area ("the Outline Development Plan") has made quite some mention of the ecosystem.

Therefore, President, may I ask the Secretary, as regards tackling climate change, especially after the promulgation of the Outline Development Plan, whether the governments of Guangdong Province, HKSAR and Macao Special Administrative Region have set up a new mechanism, or further enhanced the existing mechanism to make collaborative efforts?
SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (in Cantonese): President, I thank Dr LO for his question. I consider it a timely question because the Outline Development Plan has been promulgated just this year. And in the Plan, a separate chapter—Chapter Seven—is on how to take forward the ecological conservation in the Greater Bay Area, covering different aspects of environmental protection, particularly tackling climate change, air pollution, circular economy, etc. Therefore, the development of the Greater Bay Area presents a favourable and new opportunity to enable Hong Kong to make efforts in various aspects, including issues in relation to this question, i.e. how to tackle climate change, through regional cooperation. The SAR Government is now undertaking coordination across departments to better seize such an opportunity.

I would also like to discuss that, as we have mentioned earlier, the Council will initiate a public engagement exercise to hold discussion with the community and formulate a long-term carbon reduction strategy for Hong Kong up to 2050. It is a bottom-up process where various organizations, professionals and engineers, etc. in the community will make suggestions on the vigour of carbon reduction in Hong Kong society overall and by the Government. I believe in the public engagement exercise to be initiated by the Council, the opportunity for regional cooperation in the Greater Bay Area development will be given thorough consideration.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, I consider the most important message of the Extinction Rebellion movement is that climate change will result in the extinction of mankind. The Secretary's reply actually did not directly address such a message. As indicated in a lot of related scientific studies and data, if humans do not make fundamental changes to their living habits, global climate change and temperature rise will result, rendering, one day, the entire ecosystem unsuitable for continuous human habitation. It is an acute problem.

The main reply given by the Secretary does not indicate such an awareness. He merely approached the matter from the usual perspectives of carbon reduction target or changes in power generation methods. May I ask the Secretary whether serious consideration will be given to the message conveyed by the movement, which is not about measures to make gradual improvements to the environment, but the catastrophic consequences? If we are certain that it will be a catastrophe, and to save us from it, the initiatives presented by the Secretary are completely incommensurable.
SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (in Cantonese): President, as a matter of fact, on this subject which ranges from biodiversity to climate change, the focus of attention has been the same for the past 10 to 20 years—not just this year or last year—that is, how to raise and strengthen the global awareness and understanding of the issue through media, social movements, etc. Therefore, people ought to clearly discern the historical nature and genuine meaning of such social movements.

I have pointed out in my main reply that the Government has made a number of sizable changes, which can be regarded as transformative or fundamental changes. In the past, the Government placed the actions or measures taken regarding climate change in a relatively mid-level position. When the Paris Agreement came into force, we established a high-level and interdepartmental steering committee chaired by the Chief Secretary for Administration with all Secretaries being members. The committee makes planning and preparations, together with relevant departments, for the Hong Kong’s Climate Action Plan 2030+ and relevant actions. It is a specific, transformative and vigorous change within the government structure. Moreover, we will conduct a review every five years as per the Paris Agreement requirement. However, when there are changes in technologies or social awareness emerge, corresponding changes may have to be made to the relevant measures or actions. Furthermore, we also hold much respect for voices in the civil society, and so the Council has been invited to set up a platform for public engagement to canvass views of the public, including many different environmental groups, in a bottom-up manner. The Council will make joint efforts with various strata of society to, by drawing reference from different overseas social movements and policies of other countries and cities, make specific recommendations to the Environment Bureau and the Government on the basis of scientific research and social conditions.

It is thus evident that because we are aware of the severity of the issue and so we wish to establish a platform for public engagement to win public support and build a consensus in society. Meanwhile, we wish to take this opportunity to carry out environmental education to educate the public on how to change consumption habits and lead a low-carbon lifestyle in such aspects as clothing, food, accommodation and transport. We have paid attention and seen the pressing problem faced by the world currently and hope to, through public engagement, make people realize and become aware of it, and set an ambitious and achievable target and strategy for 2050 together with the entire society.
**DR JUNIUS HO** (in Cantonese): President, I note from the Secretary's reply that electricity generation contributes to about two thirds of Hong Kong's carbon emissions, and I believe the other one third comes from vehicles. Can the bureau discuss with the Transport and Housing Bureau to formulate clear and definite policies and measures to limit the growing number of private cars (the number of private cars in the territory now stands at 700,000) by, for example, following Singapore's practice of "one vehicle in after one goes out"? I believe if Hong Kong can do the same, the carbon reduction target can be achieved sooner.

**SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT** (in Cantonese): President, Dr HO has asked a very good supplementary question. The carbon footprint of Hong Kong comes from four main sources: the first one is power generation; the second is electricity consumption of buildings; the third is transport; and the fourth is waste management. Therefore, to tackle climate change, we should exert efforts on four fronts: development of clean energy and low-carbon power generation, energy conservation and electricity saving, green commute and waste reduction (for example, supporting various waste reduction measures implemented by the Environment Bureau).

Moreover, the transport accounts for 18% to 20% of carbon emissions in Hong Kong, 18% of which is energy consumption by road and marine transport (i.e. vehicles and vessels) and the remaining 2% is MTR-related energy consumption, making up 18% to 20% altogether.

The Council will, through the public engagement platform, gauge the views of the community regarding the aforementioned four aspects and propose more ambitious and feasible strategies in respect of these four aspects, and colleagues in the Transport and Housing Bureau will also participate in it. Recommendations made by Members will be given thorough consideration as well.

**DR ELIZABETH QUAT** (in Cantonese): President, the lifestyle of mankind is the cause of global climate change. In fact, many living creatures have become endangered as a result. If we do not do anything about it, they may become extinct. As regards how to protect the endangered species and promote
biodiversity, I will make three suggestions today and hope the Secretary will give a positive response. First, to step up the efforts in combating smuggling of wild animals, we request that the Organized and Serious Crimes Ordinance …

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Dr QUAT, please come to your supplementary question direct and refrain from making suggestions.

**DR ELIZABETH QUAT** (in Cantonese): My supplementary question is whether the Government will consider the three suggestions I will make as follows. First, include Schedule 1 of the Organized and Serious Crimes Ordinance in the offences under the Protection of Endangered Species of Animals and Plants Ordinance; second, set up a database of alien species to effect further protection of native species; and third, protect green turtles. As regards the protection of green turtles, we hope to expand the restricted areas so that vessels are not allowed to enter the beaches and bays concerned. Regarding these three suggestions, I hope the Government will reply whether or not it will give them consideration.

**SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT** (in Cantonese): President, I thank Dr QUAT for her question. We will go back and study in detail the relevant suggestions. Here I would like to specifically respond to the last suggestion. We are now actively studying how to strengthen the protection of Sham Wan, Lamma Island, where green turtles are found.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Fourth question.

**Curriculum Development Council**

4. **MR AU NOK-HIN** (in Cantonese): The Curriculum Development Council ("CDC") is mainly responsible for advising the Government on matters relating to the curriculum development of kindergartens, primary and secondary schools. Its tasks include reviewing the existing curriculum policies, compiling curriculum guides and syllabuses, and putting forward recommendations on reform of
curriculum development. Some initiatives of CDC in recent years, such as the setting of a long-term vision that "Putonghua be used as the medium of instruction for teaching the Chinese Language Subject" and the compilation of the Moral and National Education Curriculum Guide, have given rise to controversies. CDC operates under a two-tier structure: the first tier being CDC and its Standing Committees, and the second tier being the Key Learning Area/Subject Committees and Functional Committees. All members of CDC and its committees are appointed by the Government, and their meetings are all held in camera. Some members of the education sector have pointed out that CDC lacks democratic elements in its composition and transparency in its operation, resulting in its decisions being prone to be questioned. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the criteria adopted by the Chief Executive for appointing members to the first-tier structure of CDC; why none of the 22 incumbent members of CDC are frontline teachers but several of them are members of the business sector; whether it will, by making reference to the method of formation of the Council on Professional Conduct in Education, let practitioners of the education sector nominate candidates from teachers and elect among them CDC members;

(2) among the current members of the various committees in the second-tier structure of CDC, of the respective numbers and percentages of those who are teachers nominated by principals; and

(3) whether it will request CDC to allow the public to observe the proceedings of CDC's meetings, publish detailed minutes of meetings as soon as possible after the meetings, and increase the channels for gauging public opinion; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION (in Cantonese): President, the Curriculum Development Council ("CDC") is an advisory body set up by the Government to give advice on matters relating to the curriculum development of kindergartens, primary and secondary schools. Currently, there are three Standing Committees under CDC (the first tier of CDC), which are responsible for reviewing and advising on matters relating to the curriculum of kindergartens, primary and
secondary schools, as well as exploring and reviewing curriculum initiatives, curriculum resources and support services. Committees on Key Learning Areas/Liberal Studies and Functional Committees (the second tier of CDC) have also been set up under the Standing Committees. The memberships of CDC and its Standing Committees seek to represent "a wide spectrum of stakeholders" as the members not only need to be well versed in the work of curriculum development or other related areas (such as technological development), but also examine and formulate the directions, emphases and priorities of curriculum development in a holistic manner. The membership of the second tier of CDC, on the other hand, is drawn from "specialised disciplines" as the members are required to provide concrete views on matters relating to the curriculum development of individual Key Learning Areas/subjects (such as languages and science). While performing their respective functions, the two tiers interact under a regular reporting and feedback mechanism with a view to facilitating the ongoing development of school curriculum effectively.

Like the appointment of non-official members of other government advisory and statutory bodies, members of CDC and its Committees are appointed on the principle of meritocracy. All members of CDC are appointed by the Secretary for Education under delegated authority of the Chief Executive for a term of two years. Members of CDC and its Standing Committees, which represent a wide spectrum of stakeholders, can pool their wisdom together and give their views on the policy of curriculum development and the way forward in a holistic and impartial manner during discussions at meetings. The current CDC, chaired by a professional with enthusiasm in education, comprises a total of 20 non-official members and two official members. The other non-official members include five academics from post-secondary institutions, nine school personnel, one parent, three members from the business and technology sectors and one representative of the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority. Among the nine school personnel, apart from a representative of a school-sponsoring body, the rest are principals and teachers of kindergartens, primary, secondary and special schools. Besides, the curriculum must keep abreast with social, economic and technological changes, etc. At present, CDC includes three members from the business and technology sectors. Building on their extensive experience and insights into areas such as human resources, vocational and professional education and training ("VPET"), innovation and technology, they can offer professional advice on how to equip students to meet the future development needs of Hong Kong and the world.
I must clearly point out to Members that the work of CDC is very professional. Members of CDC are required to have a high degree of professionalism, excellent performance in learning and teaching and/or extensive experience in public examinations, as well as capabilities for curriculum leadership. They can be school principals or teachers of other ranks. Therefore, assessing the representation of CDC simply with reference to the number of teachers appointed will not provide a comprehensive perspective. Apart from nine school personnel, there are five academics from post-secondary institutions who are educators with considerable experience and vision in areas such as teacher education, subject expertise (such as Chinese History and STEM education), educational research and VPET. Thus, together with the current Dean of Business and Management of The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, who is serving as the chairperson of CDC, 15 out of the 22 members come from the education sector. Members of the education sector form the majority of the membership of CDC, accounting for nearly 70% of the total number of CDC members; while the proportion of members from the business and technology sectors, parents and official members is relatively lower. Therefore, we do not agree with the view, as presented in the question, that there are no frontline teachers involved in the first tier of CDC. In fact, we should uphold the principle of meritocracy and appoint the most suitable persons as CDC members.

The term of office of the eight Committees on Key Learning Areas and Liberal Studies and the five Functional Committees under CDC is also two years. To identify the most suitable persons for participation in the work of curriculum development, the Education Bureau issues a circular memorandum every two years inviting schools to nominate their teachers as members of the second tier CDC's Committees. The selection exercise is administered by CDC in accordance with the established mechanism. Except for the Committee on Applied Learning, which must consist of a certain proportion of members from the professional and vocational sectors owing to its unique curriculum design, members of the second tier of CDC are mostly experienced educators with subject expertise and extensive experience, as well as profound knowledge of the Key Learning Areas/subjects and curriculum areas concerned. Most of them are educators from primary and secondary schools and kindergartens, while some are experienced teaching staff members from post-secondary institutions. They account for over 70% of the total number of members of the Committees. Though individual Committees have different functions and needs and therefore the total number of members and the number of members from various sectors
may vary, teachers nominated by schools have been appointed to serve on the eight Committees on Key Learning Areas and Liberal Studies, accounting for about 30% to 35% of the total number of members.

To increase the transparency of its operation, currently the membership lists, agendas and gist of meetings of CDC and its committees are uploaded to its website for public access. However, in view of the fact that sensitive and confidential issues such as new curriculum development, textbook publishing, resource deployment and information on public examinations may be involved in the discussions, and to ensure that members can freely and candidly express their views in an environment which is free from any external interference and pressure, the meetings of both tiers of CDC are not open to the public and the minutes of the meetings are not uploaded to CDC website. This arrangement is made having regard to the need to strike a balance between enhancing the transparency of CDC's operation and ensuring its effective operation. In fact, the Education Bureau and CDC have been directly collecting the views of the school sector on the ongoing renewal of curriculum through different channels including briefings, school surveys, focus group discussions, etc. For instance, when we updated the eight Key Learning Area Curriculum Guides and the General Studies Curriculum Guide for Primary Schools in 2017, questionnaires were distributed to all primary and secondary schools across the territory and the drafts of the relevant guides were uploaded to the Education Bureau website for public information. Furthermore, 22 large-scale consultation sessions were organized for the school sector and there was a total attendance of over 5,300. As regards the Revised Curriculum Frameworks of Junior Secondary Chinese History and History, a two-stage consultation exercise was conducted in 2016 and 2017 respectively to forge a broad consensus in the school sector. All these are proof that the work of curriculum development in Hong Kong is indeed highly transparent and that it is implemented after thorough consultation with the school sector. Members of the public who have any views or suggestions on matters relating to curriculum development may forward them to the Education Bureau through the existing channels or CDC Secretariat for our follow-up.

MR AU NOK-HIN (in Cantonese): President, though the Education Bureau mentions in the main reply that: "teachers nominated by schools have been appointed to serve … accounting for about 30% to 35% of the total number of members" and that members of the second tier of CDC may be nominated by principals, the actual number of teachers nominated by principals and appointed by the authorities is very limited. Take the Committee on Liberal Studies in the
second tier as an example. Only three out of the 18 members are frontline teachers, implying that it is not easy for experienced frontline teachers to enter CDC. May I ask the Government whether there are a fixed number or ratio and established criteria for the appointment of teachers nominated by principals, and whether the list of nominated teachers can be made public? Furthermore, as the current term will expire soon, in making appointments in the next term, will the authorities increase the number and ratio of appointment of teachers nominated by principals?

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION (in Cantonese): President, in respect of the second tier of CDC, we have an established mechanism of inviting school principals to nominate relevant teachers to be members of committees, and for CDC to make the final selection. Yet, as I mentioned in the main reply, those committees need voices from different sectors. In addition to school teachers, we may also need the views on curriculum or various topics of tertiary education personnel, such as professors of relevant subjects from the tertiary sector.

At the same time, it is mentioned in the main reply that over 70% of the members in the second tier CDC are educators, and as indicated by the current figure, around 50% or slightly over 50% of the members are teachers nominated directly by schools. For the time being, we note and believe that the current proportion may cope with the needs of CDC and curriculum development in operation. As for the appointment of CDC members for the next term, we have started sending nomination invitations to schools and the nomination will close by the end of May. By then, we will consider the suitable candidates and make the decision.

MR GARY FAN (in Cantonese): President, in my view, at present, CDC does not have adequate and effective channels for various stakeholders in education and the public to raise their views with CDC. To ensure that the decisions of CDC live up to the public expectation, has the Education Bureau assessed whether or not a standing mechanism should be set up to proactively solicit the views of users of curriculum like students and parents or observers? Will the authorities consider allowing the public to express their views on education issues of grave concern to them via effective channels like emails or post?
SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION (in Cantonese): President, as I have mentioned in the main reply, CDC is an advisory body appointed by the Government, whereas the Government is responsible for making decisions on curriculum development and curriculum frameworks. CDC is an advisory body providing advice to the Government on the future direction of curriculum development and individual subjects. I have mentioned also in the main reply that regarding the procedures, CDC is not working behind closed doors. If there are any changes in subjects or the curriculum, CDC will conduct extensive consultation, and the issue of questionnaires mentioned earlier is their established practice.

Take the latest revision of the Chinese History curriculum for junior secondary as an example. A questionnaire is issued to each secondary school, and the schools will discuss the subject concerned, such as Chinese History, and if views are expressed, they will submit the views to CDC. They will also organize focus groups, inviting teachers or persons concerned to discuss and study whether the changes to curriculum are correct. This is evident in the review of the Chinese History curriculum for junior secondary. They have spent nearly three years on the review. In this course, two large-scale consultation exercises were conducted and certain amendments made in response to the views expressed by the sector. Eventually, the proposal was submitted to the Government. After the Government proposed the changes, the public have expressed their views. In future, when we revise the curriculum, we will also consider these views.

MR AU NOK-HIN (in Cantonese): President, had CDC been truly operating with a high degree of transparency and full accountability, there would not have been so many problems in the past, such as the issue on the Moral and National Education subject and the review of the Liberal Studies subject. We notice that many teachers are beset by worries exactly because of the situation mentioned in the main reply, where the Bureau will suddenly introduce certain directions for consultation while teachers have no knowledge of the course of discussion and the appointment of members, and minutes of meetings are not available.

Hence, I really want to ask in what ways the Education Bureau will enhance the transparency. I understand that some information may be very sensitive. Yet, the Bureau may follow the general practice of covering up the
sensitive information, and it should at least inform the public of the issues the authorities are discussing and the curriculum the authorities plan to introduce, for many frontline teachers are worried about this. As in the case of the Liberal Studies subject, teachers have pointed out that many aspects of the curriculum are not down to earth. What does it mean by saying that they are not "down to earth"? Take the Independent Enquiry Study as an example. Theoretically, the Education Bureau has granted a great degree of freedom to teachers in teaching their students. Yet, more often than not, teachers must consider the assessment criteria and approaches to attain higher marks, and it ends up that students may only choose from a few topics. We do not know if CDC has ever discussed these issues. Will the Secretary for Education promise Members that the transparency of CDC will be enhanced to allay the worries of teachers?

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION (in Cantonese): As we have said in the main reply, currently, the membership lists, agendas and gist of meetings of various committees are uploaded onto its website for public access. Hence, members of the community are provided with certain information relating to membership and agendas of CDC, as well as the gist of meetings which provides a brief description of the decision made and issues discussed, though not detailed minutes of meetings.

However, Members have to understand that we are talking about curriculum development. In curriculum development, CDC definitely plays a significant role, yet it must be noted that extensive consultation and discussion of the sector have been included in the mode of curriculum development overall. As to whether it can merely be regarded as fulfilling the purpose when all discussion of the meetings is made public, I do not think so. On the contrary, Members should review all the curriculum development conducted in the past few years, where the secondary education sector and all educators had been given opportunities to express their views and participate in them and this is the most important point.

As for the Liberal Studies subject which Mr AU mentioned just now, Members should have noticed from the many press reports that CDC is not responsible for the work now under way. In fact, a task force is responsible for the study and consultation work related to the overall curriculum framework,
identifying ways to provide more room for promoting whole-person development. They are meeting with many people, adopting an open approach to listen to the views of different people. Have they not done so, there will not be so much information circulating. In the middle of this year, around June to July, the task force plans to commence the public consultation on the proposed curriculum to be implemented in the future. Hence, Mr AU can rest assured that regarding the development of these issues, we respect the views of members of the community and we hope to embrace their views as part of the curriculum development.

Insofar as procedures are concerned, upon the completion of the work of the task force, if specific changes to the Liberal Studies subject are required, the issue will be returned to CDC and be processed in accordance with the existing mechanism.

MR AU NOK-HIN (in Cantonese): President, I understand that the Secretary for Education has tried to increase the accountability of CDC in various issues concerning the education sector. Yet, if the accountability and transparency of CDC is adequate, it will not have prompted worries which I mentioned just now.

The term of the current CDC will expire soon. It relies on the Education Bureau to think of ways to enhance its performance and increase its accountability and transparency, so as to allay the worries of frontline teachers and the many school-sponsoring bodies. We are afraid CDC will work behind close door and we will only learn about issues discussed by CDC and CDC’s lines of thoughts at the sudden introduction of certain arrangements by CDC.

As for the appointment mechanism, will the Education Bureau consider conducting certain appropriate reviews, including my earlier proposal for increasing the ratio of educators appointed as members?

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION (in Cantonese): President, as I have pointed out in the main reply, decisions on the appointment of CDC members is made on the principle of meritocracy and in consideration of their background, specialist knowledge and sense of commitment.
Regarding the suggestion made by the Honourable Member just now, I would like to point out to Members that 11 out of the 20 non-official members of CDC have served in the second tier of CDC. In other words, after observing their services on various occasions, we elevate them to the first tier of CDC to leverage their professional knowledge. We will give full consideration to the Member's view.

MR AU NOK-HIN (in Cantonese): Since I am the only one asking supplementary questions, I will ask my third supplementary question.

There is another issue relating to CDC, which may be far away from the controversy I mentioned just now. But still, many people are concerned about this question. It is about the channel for us to learn how CDC will review the certification under the qualification framework. As the Secretary mentioned, in respect of the various vocational training programmes, I believe the authorities will appoint personnel in the tertiary education sector to explain the implementation of vocational training. At present, different trades and industries have their respective qualification framework certifications. In what way can better discussion be held in the next CDC, so that these problems which have been discussed for years but without progress can be addressed under the mechanism?

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION (in Cantonese): President, CDC is mainly responsible for discussion on issues concerning future curriculum development and existing curriculum, and one of the issues relating to vocational education is the curriculum of Applied Learning subjects. Yet, CDC will not discuss the overall development of vocational education but merely the bridging courses concerned. As for the overall development of vocational education in future, it does not fall into the purview of CDC, for CDC is mainly responsible for discussion on the curriculum frameworks of kindergarten, primary school and secondary school. As applied learning is one of the areas covered, we will continue to do a proper job of it in this aspect.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Fifth question.
Public dental services

5. **MR HOLDEN CHOW** (in Cantonese): President, currently, among the dental clinics under the Department of Health, 11 of them provide the public with free emergency dental treatment (commonly known as "general public dental session" ("GP dental session")). The service includes pain relief and teeth extraction only but not other dental treatment. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

   (1) of the consultation quota and attendance of the GP dental sessions provided by each of the 11 aforesaid dental clinics in the last financial year;

   (2) whether it will consider afresh expanding the scope of the GP dental session to cover fillings and dentures; and

   (3) given that Tung Chung Dental Clinic currently provides dental treatment to civil servants or their dependants only, and ordinary residents in Tung Chung need to travel a long distance to Tsuen Wan Dental Clinic in order to attend the GP dental sessions, whether the Government will consider making arrangements for Tung Chung Dental Clinic to set aside time slots for providing GP dental sessions for ordinary residents in Tung Chung?

**SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH** (in Cantonese): President, the Government's current policy on dental services aims to raise public awareness of oral health and encourage the public to develop proper oral health habits through promotion and education. Curative dental care services are mainly provided by the private sector and non-governmental organizations ("NGOs"). Over the years, the Oral Health Education Unit of the Department of Health ("DH") has implemented oral health promotion programmes targeting different age groups and disseminated oral health information through various channels to enhance oral health of the community. Apart from making efforts to promote oral health and prevent oral problems, the Government also provides emergency dental services for the public and special oral care services for inpatients and persons with special oral health care needs.
Government dental clinics are mainly responsible for providing dental benefits for civil servants/pensioners and their eligible dependents as required of the Government as terms of employment for civil servants, and therefore civil servants/pensioners and their eligible dependents are the major service targets of these clinics. Nonetheless, the Government provides free emergency dental treatments for the public through designated sessions (i.e. general public sessions) in 11 government dental clinics of DH.

My reply to the question raised by Mr Holden CHOW is as follows:

(1) The consultation quota and attendance of general public sessions provided by each of the 11 government dental clinics in 2018-2019 are set out in Annex.

(2) As providing comprehensive dental services for the public would require a substantial amount of financial resources, it is necessary for the Government to focus resources on providing emergency dental services for the public. At present, free emergency dental services are provided for the public through general public sessions in the 11 government dental clinics of DH. These services mainly cover emergency dental treatments, including treatment of acute dental diseases, prescription for pain relief, treatment of oral abscess and teeth extraction. Professional advice is also given by dentists to patients with regard to their individual needs. In addition, DH provides specialist treatments in the Oral Maxillofacial Surgery and Dental Units of seven public hospitals for referred patients. The Hospital Authority also provides dental services in four public hospitals for referred inpatients, patients with special oral health care needs and patients with dental emergency needs. As for curative dental care services, they are mainly provided by the private sector and NGOs.

Currently, government dental clinics are operating at their full capacity, with a usage rate of almost 100% for all appointment time slots. It is therefore not possible for DH to allocate more time slots for general public sessions on top of the existing service provided at government dental clinics, including Tung Chung Dental Clinic.
Apart from general public sessions, there are also other measures to take care of persons with special needs, including the School Dental Care Service for primary school students, and dental care support for the low-income elderly with special needs, such as the Outreach Dental Care Programme for the Elderly and Community Care Fund Elderly Dental Assistance Programme. Besides, the Elderly Health Care Voucher Scheme allows Hong Kong elderly persons aged 65 or above to use the vouchers for private dental services. To better meet the dental service needs of persons with intellectual disability, the Government launched a three-year project on 16 July 2018 for persons with intellectual disability named Healthy Teeth Collaboration to provide free oral check-ups, dental treatments and oral health education for adults aged 18 or above with intellectual disability.

### Annex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dental clinic with general public sessions</th>
<th>Consultation quota for 2018-2019</th>
<th>Attendance in 2018-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kowloon City Dental Clinic</td>
<td>6 132</td>
<td>5 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwun Tong Dental Clinic</td>
<td>4 116</td>
<td>4 023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Town Community Complex Dental Clinic</td>
<td>8 400</td>
<td>7 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanling Health Centre Dental Clinic</td>
<td>2 300</td>
<td>2 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mona Fong Dental Clinic</td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td>1 899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Po Wong Siu Ching Dental Clinic</td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td>1 970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsuen Wan Dental Clinic</td>
<td>8 232</td>
<td>7 994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yan Oi Dental Clinic</td>
<td>2 058</td>
<td>2 016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuen Long Jockey Club Dental Clinic</td>
<td>4 116</td>
<td>3 910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai O Dental Clinic</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheung Chau Dental Clinic</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MR HOLDEN CHOW** (in Cantonese): *President, pain relief and teeth extraction aside, we have urged the Government to also include in general public sessions such services as fillings and dentures, and we have talked about it so much that our gums have started bleeding but the Government has still given no response. In the main reply it is mentioned that government dental clinics are operating at their full capacity and cannot further increase their services. The Government must examine whether this is caused by a shortage of dentists in the*
As pointed out in the report on health care manpower planning in 2017, the proportion of dentists in public and private practice was 26%:74%, and a review by the Government is warranted.

President, according to the main reply, the attendance in Tsuen Wan Dental Clinic last year was close to 8,000, which was the second highest. Currently, the population in Tung Chung has increased from some 100,000 to over 200,000, and the residents still have to travel a long distance to Tsuen Wan Dental Clinic to queue up for general public sessions. My supplementary question is this: Why does the Government not respond to public aspiration and expand the services of the existing dental clinic in Tung Chung, so that it can serve not only civil servants but also the general residents in Tung Chung? The Government has to provide general public sessions for the ordinary citizens whether by setting aside time slots for them or providing these sessions at another place. This can kill two birds with one stone, namely alleviating the pressure on Tsuen Wan Dental Clinic while also addressing the problem of Tung Chung residents. Why does the Government not do it?

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Cantonese): President, I thank Mr Holden CHOW for his supplementary question. It is the Government's current policy to focus on people in need, such as students, children, the elderly, and persons with intellectual disability, and efforts have also been made to invite dentists in private practice to provide assistance in various programmes.

As Mr CHOW mentioned just now, there is a shortage of dentists in Hong Kong presently. Of the 2,562 registered dentists in Hong Kong, 293 are dental specialists, and over 74% of the dentists practising in Hong Kong are engaged in the private sector. However, the Government appreciates the aspiration of the community and we have reviewed the manpower in this respect over the years. Particularly after the publication of the report on health care manpower in 2017, we have increased the number of dental students annually since 2016-2017. In the past, about 53 students were admitted each year. The number has increased to 73 since 2016-2017, and 80 students will be admitted in the 2019-2020 to 2021-2022 triennium. We will certainly review the existing services when there are more graduates in dentistry in future.
MS CHAN HOI-YAN (in Cantonese): President, the Government's main reply has indeed hurt the feelings of the residents in every district. The Annex provided by the Government shows that there are 11 clinics in Hong Kong. Take Kowloon West as an example. In this district there is only Kowloon City Dental Clinic, of which the consultation quota was 6 132 for 2018-2019. But the entire Kowloon West has a population of as large as 1.1 million, and we do not need the authorities to tell us that the clinic is operating at its full capacity. Now the services are inadequate, not just the clinic operating at its full capacity.

The quotas are insufficient, so are the service points, and the coverage of the services is far from adequate because only teeth extraction and pain relief services are provided. When many elderly persons open their mouths, we can see that they are toothless. I understand that the operation of dental services requires a large amount of funds and there is also a shortage of manpower. But can the Government provide a timetable, so that we can have hope? Now there are 11 dental clinics in Hong Kong. Can their number be gradually increased such that at least a dental clinic is provided in each of the 18 districts? My another humble request is that I hope there can be an increase in the service of fillings because without teeth, elderly persons will have difficulty chewing and eating, and this can also lead to problems with their digestive systems. I would like to ask the Bureau if a timetable can be provided, so that residents in every district can have hope.

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Cantonese): President, I thank Ms CHAN Hoi-yan for her supplementary question. We have reviewed in a step by step manner how the dental services can be improved every year. Members may have noticed that on the one hand, the amount of elderly health care vouchers, which was lower originally, has been gradually increased; on the other hand, the eligibility age for the vouchers has been lowered from the original 70 to 65. In the past two years, the Financial Secretary also increased the original $2,000-worth elderly health care vouchers by $1,000 on a one-off basis to $3,000, and the accumulation limit has also been increased to $8,000 recently. This is because we understand that the elderly wish to use their health care vouchers for dental services. Currently, over 70% of the dentists provide services in the private sector, and elderly health care vouchers can also be used for these services. In view of the shortage of dentists, the Government can only focus on taking care of people most in need of these services, including people with financial difficulties, persons with intellectual disability, the elderly, and so on.
As I said just now, the number of dental students was already increased from 53 to 73 in 2016-2017. We hope that more manpower will be provided upon their graduation several years later and by then, we can make better planning, such as finding ways to enhance the existing services. We can do better in planning only when we know that there will be more manpower.

MR CHAN HAN-PAN (in Cantonese): When it comes to striving for the provision of dental services, Mr Holden CHOW said just now that we have talked about it so much that our gums have started bleeding. But I can tell Members that the elderly have waited for public dental services so long that their teeth have already fallen off.

I have this supplementary question. The Secretary said earlier that there is now a usage rate of 100% for all appointment time slots. Services are not expanded even when the time slots are fully taken up because, according to the Government, there is a shortage of manpower. And, in view of the shortage of manpower, the Government has increased the number of dental students from 53 to 80 as the Secretary said just now. There seems to be an increase of nearly 50% in the number or percentage but actually there is an increase of only 27 students. If we do not have sufficient dentists, will the Government further increase their number or even import overseas dentists to provide public dental services for the people in Hong Kong? Secretary, is there such an arrangement?

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Cantonese): I thank Mr CHAN for his suggestion. At present, apart from locally-trained dentists, there are also non-locally trained dentists. Non-locally trained dentists who wish to open practice in Hong Kong are required to pass an examination. This examination, which used to be held once a year, has been held twice a year in recent years. We certainly welcome and hope to see the registration of more non-locally trained graduates in dentistry returning to Hong Kong from overseas to provide services for us.

As regards the promotional work, currently our focus is mainly on attracting non-local doctors to Hong Kong. In the meantime, we can also encourage non-locally trained dentists to return to Hong Kong for practice, so as to increase the number of dentists.
Certainly, we also hope to increase the number of local dental students, and like the training of other health care workers, students receiving training in dentistry are required not only to attend lessons in classroom but also take up internship and therefore, the university will have to make appropriate arrangements. We hope that we can continue to increase the number of these students in future.

MR POON SIU-PING (in Cantonese): The World Health Organization considers that oral health and dental health are indispensable to general health, and that they are also essential to physical and psychological well-being. The Secretary said earlier in the main reply that the provision of comprehensive dental services for the public would require a substantial amount of financial resources, and I do not know how substantial the amount will be. But the Secretary said that the Government would focus resources only on providing emergency dental services for the public, adding that there are now 11 government dental clinics providing general public sessions for the public.

According to the Annex to the main reply, the 11 dental clinics in Hong Kong can provide a consultation quota of about 40,000. I have this supplementary question. The Secretary pointed out that the existing services are operating at their full capacity and as an Honourable colleague said just now, the problem is not just the clinics operating at full capacity but there is a very large demand. Does the Secretary have specific measures to alleviate the situation where dental services are operating at full capacity, and will there be an increase in the number of dental clinics and their consultation quotas?

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Cantonese): I thank Mr POON for his views. As I said earlier, around 70% of the dentists in Hong Kong provide services in the private sector. On the other hand, our dental policy mainly aims to, firstly, implement preventive measures and secondly, focus the existing resources on providing dental services for people most in need, including the assistance programme providing dental services for the elderly through the Community Care Fund, and dental services are also provided for low-income earners, people with special needs and persons with intellectual disability. Moreover, the elderly can use their health care vouchers to hire services in the private sector, and services are also provided by NGOs. As the 11 dental clinics are already operating at full capacity, on the premise of not having additional dentists now, we can only focus on taking care of people most in need.
DR PRISCILLA LEUNG (in Cantonese): President, toothache causes the worst pain of all. Over the last decade, the Government has injected resources to increase the quota of dental services for civil servants. However, the service quota of general public sessions has seen no increase at all. As a Member said earlier, there are only 11 dental clinics providing general public sessions in the 18 districts all over the territory, and while Kowloon West has a population of over 1 million, the service quota is only 126 a week.

Over the past few years, we have, in the form of NGO services, operated mobile dental clinics jointly with the dental association. Services were provided in several districts and well-received by the public. Even though members of the public had to pay a small amount of fee, it was still a lot cheaper than the fee charged by private clinics. People from all age groups swarmed to queue up for these services and at least a few hundred cases were handled daily, which is far more than the handling capacity of 126 cases per week. Has the Government considered supporting these NGOs resource-wise? Since the Government's dental services are already operating at full capacity and the Secretary said in the main reply that no additional services could be provided, is it possible to subsidize NGOs, such as the dental association, in operating mobile dental clinics in the 18 districts?

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Cantonese): I thank Dr Priscilla LEUNG for her suggestion. We have all along encouraged the provision of dental services in districts by NGOs, such as the six major charity groups which also have the experience of providing such services. We very much encourage and recognize the provision of dental services by these organizations, and we appreciate that they have been making increasingly more efforts in this respect.

At present, the Government mainly focuses its resources on providing services for people most in need through, for instance, the Community Care Fund. Besides, we will continuously encourage efforts made by charity groups and NGOs, and we will negotiate with them in the hope that they can provide services to fill the existing gap on the demand side.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr Priscilla LEUNG, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?
DR PRISCILLA LEUNG (in Cantonese): Will the Government provide support in terms of resources? This is a practical issue as NGOs currently rely on themselves …

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr LEUNG, you have already stated the part of your supplementary question that has not been answered.

DR PRISCILLA LEUNG (in Cantonese): … can the Secretary tell me whether support will be provided in terms of resources instead of merely giving encouragement?

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

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Cantonese): I think we will continuously discuss with various organizations because it was often the case that during our discussions with them, we found that actually they might not be entirely in need of resources and it was most important that dentists could be recruited to provide assistance. Having said that, we will review the situation in this regard.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Last oral question.

Terminally-ill patients

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): Regarding the provision of palliative care to terminally-ill patients, as well as their giving advance directives and seeking euthanasia, will the Government inform this Council if it knows:

(1) the details of the palliative care provided by public hospitals in each of the past five years, including the number of hospital beds, the attendance of the service, the manpower of healthcare workers and social workers involved, as well as the support received by the patients and their family members; whether the Hospital Authority conducted last year any study on improving this type of service;
(2) the number of public hospital patients making enquiries about advance directives in each of the past five years; whether the Government has drawn up a legislative timetable in respect of advance directives; and

(3) the number of public hospital patients seeking euthanasia in each of the past five years, with a breakdown by the disease suffered by the patients and the age group to which they belonged; whether the Government will study enacting legislation to permit the administration of euthanasia?

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Cantonese): President, Hong Kong is facing an ageing population and rising prevalence of chronic and complicated diseases. A holistic approach in the provision of health care services, therefore, should become more and more important. Such an approach gives terminally-ill patients a greater degree of autonomy to manage their own health as well as the full respect they deserve. In this context, the Government recognizes the need to promote the development of services for the elderly, particularly to strengthen palliative care services for persons facing terminal illness.

Currently, palliative care services in Hong Kong are mainly provided by the Hospital Authority ("HA") led by palliative care specialists, under the specialties of Medicine and Oncology. In the past, palliative care services of HA focused mainly on the care of advanced cancer patients. In the last decade, palliative care services have been gradually extended to cover patients with other diseases, such as patients suffering from end-stage organ failure.

To allow terminally-ill patients more options of their own treatment and care arrangements, the Government will consult the public in the second half of 2019 (i.e. this year) on arrangements of advance directives ("ADs") and relevant end-of-life care.

My reply to the various parts of the question raised by Dr Fernando CHEUNG is as follows:

(1) With the aim to provide holistic care for patients, HA has been providing appropriate palliative care services with a comprehensive service model for terminally-ill patients and their families through a
multi-disciplinary team of professionals, including doctors, nurses, medical social workers, clinical psychologists, physiotherapists and occupational therapists, etc. Palliative care services provided by HA include inpatient, outpatient, day care and home care services and bereavement services, etc.

Currently, palliative care services are provided by HA in all seven clusters to support terminally-ill patients and their families. At present, more than 40 doctors, 300 nurses and 60 allied health professionals (calculated on a full-time equivalent basis) provide the relevant services.

Palliative care inpatient services are mainly for terminally-ill patients with severe or complex symptoms and needs. As at 31 December 2018, HA has over 360 palliative care beds. Besides, if necessary, some terminally-ill patients admitted to other specialties who are in need of palliative care services can also receive treatment from the palliative care teams.

Statistics on utilization of palliative care services in the past five years are at Annex.

To plan and further improve the quality and sustainability of HA's palliative care services as well as to cope with increasing demand, HA has developed the "Strategic Service Framework for Palliative Care" in 2017 to guide the development of palliative care services in the coming five to 10 years and formulate strategic directions for improving adult and paediatric palliative care.

In fact, since 2018-2019, HA has further enhanced palliative care services provided by the multi-disciplinary team, including strengthening palliative care consultative service in hospitals, enhancing palliative care home care service and strengthening end-of-life care for elderly patients in residential care homes for the elderly ("RCHEs") as well as strengthening the competency of health care staff supporting terminally-ill patients beyond palliative care setting through training. HA will regularly review the demand for various medical services (including palliative care services) and plan
for the development of its services according to factors such as population growth and changes, advancement of medical technology and health care manpower, and collaborate with community partners to better meet the needs of patients.

(2) The Government consulted the public on matters relating to the introduction of the concept of ADs in Hong Kong in 2009. Most of the submissions showed no objection to introducing the concept of ADs by non-legislative means in Hong Kong. HA formulated a guideline together with standardized form on ADs in July 2010. Since August 2012, the Clinical Management System has marked ADs witnessed by HA's doctors as a reminder to assist clinical communication. A total of 5,561 ADs have been signed by HA's patients since August 2012. However, HA does not maintain statistics regarding patients making enquiries on ADs in public hospital.

As mentioned above, the Government will consult the public in the second half of 2019 on arrangements of ADs and relevant end-of-life care. We will study the way forward for ADs in accordance with the results of the consultation.

(3) ADs and euthanasia are not the same. The purpose of ADs is to state explicitly the specific situation where patients can refuse life-sustaining treatment when they are no longer capable to make decision during end-of-life, whereas under the Code of Professional Conduct of the Medical Council of Hong Kong, euthanasia is defined as "direct intentional killing of a person as part of the medical care being offered".

Euthanasia involves a third party's acts of intentional killing, manslaughter, or aiding, abetting, counselling or procuring the suicide of another, or an attempt by another to commit suicide, which are unlawful acts according to the laws of Hong Kong, possibly liable to criminal offence(s) under Offences against the Person Ordinance (Cap. 212).
Euthanasia is a highly complex and controversial issue involving implications on various dimensions, such as medical, social, moral, ethical and legal aspects. Any subject matters concerning life must be treated with care and caution. The Code has made it clear that euthanasia is "illegal and unethical". The Government currently has no plans to carry out any studies or consultations on the issue of legalizing euthanasia. HA also does not maintain statistics regarding patients in public hospital wishing for euthanasia.

Annex

Statistics on Utilization of HA's Palliative Care Services in the Past Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of palliative care inpatient and day inpatient discharges and deaths(^{(1)})</td>
<td>8 254</td>
<td>7 970</td>
<td>7 968</td>
<td>8 176</td>
<td>8 487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of palliative care specialist outpatient (clinical) attendances(^{(1)(2)})</td>
<td>9 449</td>
<td>12 499</td>
<td>13 364</td>
<td>13 372</td>
<td>12 644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of palliative care home visits by staff(^{(3)})</td>
<td>33 199</td>
<td>34 311</td>
<td>40 121</td>
<td>37 925</td>
<td>44 082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of palliative care day attendances</td>
<td>12 275</td>
<td>12 231</td>
<td>12 519</td>
<td>12 631</td>
<td>12 181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of palliative care bereavement interviews by staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Provisional Figures]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 034</td>
<td>3 436</td>
<td>4 192</td>
<td>3 918</td>
<td>3 610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

(1) The above figures only include palliative care inpatient and outpatient services that are captured by the designated coding in the computer system.

(2) Since 2015-2016, specialist outpatient (clinical) attendances also include attendances from nurse clinics in specialist outpatient setting.

(3) Data definition has been refined since April 2016 to better reflect the workload. Therefore, the statistics before and after April 2016 are not directly comparable.

**DR FERNANDO CHEUNG** (in Cantonese): President, every one of us hopes that we can "die pleasantly" with dignity in accordance with our wishes. However, according to some international data such as the Death Quality Index, Hong Kong ranks far behind Taiwan and Singapore.

The Secretary pointed out in the main reply that there are only 360 palliative care beds at present, whilst more than 40 000 persons passed away in HA hospitals every year. In fact, we are now seriously in lack of palliative care services. Moreover, as not everyone wants to die in a hospital, care and hospice support for terminally-ill patients in the community are hence very important as well. Yet, we learn from the Secretary's main reply that the authorities will only consult the public in the second half of this year on arrangements of ADs, and this is only a very minor part of end-of-life hospice care.

May I ask the Secretary when she will work with other Policy Bureaux to discuss the policy and planning in respect of end-of-life hospice care in a comprehensive manner? As this goes far beyond the portfolio of the Food and Health Bureau, if these services are not linked with welfare or other support systems, we will not be able to make our own choices and die with dignity.
SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Cantonese): President, I thank Dr Fernando CHEUNG for his supplementary question. In fact, it has been our long-standing goal to give terminally-ill patients a greater degree of autonomy to manage their own health as well as the full respect for their dignity. Therefore, just now I have mentioned in the main reply that while there are only 300-odd beds at present, HA already developed the "Strategic Service Framework for Palliative Care" in 2017 to formulate strategic directions for this in the hope of improving continuously the various services, including adult and paediatric care, in the next 5 to 10 years. Certainly, the legislative procedures in respect of ADs and the consultation exercise to be conducted are only part of our overall care for terminally-ill patients, whereas many other parts are also involved.

As a matter of fact, we have been striving to enhance the existing work of the hospitals or RCHEs, whilst additional resources have been allocated to improving the service model and strengthening multi-disciplinary services. Looking ahead, we will also continue to review the various services, taking into account factors such as population growth and changes, advancement of medical technology and health care manpower in the meantime, and provide more services having regard to the demand of terminally-ill patients. Factors of particular importance to palliative care are: First, provision of multi-disciplinary services; second, collaboration with community partners. Rightly as Dr CHEUNG has said, many patients may not want to die in a hospital, some of them would rather die at home or in other institutions, which is a better choice for them. Therefore, the mission of our services is to equip health care personnel with the competence to handle such cases, to understand the service model of providing multi-disciplinary services in its entirety, and to provide better care for patients and their family members, while enabling family members of the patients to assist the patients in going through this difficult time.

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): President, although the Secretary indicated that consultation on ADs would be conducted, the problem lies in the fact that the Secretary has refused to conduct a review of or consultation on euthanasia. May I ask the Secretary, why an extensive consultation on the legalization of euthanasia cannot be conducted when the consultation on ADs is ongoing? We all know that many people around the world are willing to seek euthanasia recently, and the number of them is ever-increasing. Such being the case, would it not be more desirable if the Government can give patients the
opportunity to make a choice? Therefore, may I ask the Secretary direct whether she will conduct an extensive consultation on the legalization of euthanasia during the consultation exercise on ADs or in the future?

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Cantonese): President, I thank Mr LEUNG for his views. As I have said just now, euthanasia is indeed a very complicated and controversial issue involving implications on medical, social, moral, ethical and legal aspects, as well as on various dimensions. Therefore, we would treat the care for terminally-ill patients or any subject matters concerning life with care and caution, especially because euthanasia is illegal and unethical under the existing laws of Hong Kong. The Code has also made it clear that euthanasia is illegal and unethical.

For this reason, we hope that the upcoming consultation will focus on examining issues related to ADs, as HA has already introduced some practices on ADs albeit legislation is yet to be enacted, and patients or their family members have all along raised requests in this respect. Under such circumstances, we believe the arrangements of ADs have developed to a relatively mature state. Certainly, during the upcoming consultation exercise, some people will present to us their views on other aspects in addition to ADs, such as end-of-life care, and we will gather the views on this aspect for consideration. However, we will focus on ADs in the upcoming consultation exercise.

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

MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): I was asking whether she would conduct an extensive consultation on euthanasia during this consultation exercise or in the future.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, I think the Secretary has already answered your supplementary question. Yet, Secretary, do you have anything to add?
SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Cantonese): I do not have anything particular to add. We do not plan to carry out a review or consultation on the legalization of euthanasia in this consultation exercise.

PROF JOSEPH LEE (in Cantonese): President, we are now discussing issues relating to terminally-ill patients, part of which involves palliative care services. In fact, it has been clearly stated in the Annex to the Secretary's main reply that home visits are very important when speaking of palliative care services, especially if the Government intends to encourage and promote "dying-in-place". I have this question for the Secretary. In the past five years, the number of home visits has increased by almost 10 000 times but her health care team only consists of 300 nurses, who are also tasked with attending to the 360 palliative care beds. Does the Secretary know the number of patients that each nurse has to take care per home visit? In addition, will the Secretary allocate additional resources to enabling the nurse team to cope with the increasing number of households in need of home visit services?

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Cantonese): President, I thank Prof LEE for his supplementary question. In fact, Prof LEE is right, we have all along been enhancing our palliative care services, such as extending or deepening the coverage of palliative care services, including the gradual strengthening of services in the community such as the establishment of Community Geriatric Assessment Teams ("CGATs"), which is also aimed at enhancing the support for terminally-ill patients in RCHEs. As regards home visits by nurses, this is one of the expanded services with a view to improving home-based palliative care. We need to train health care personnel so that they can take care of these patients beyond the palliative care setting (i.e. in the household setting), and they must possess some special skills as well.

I do not have the number of home visits made by each nurse on hand right now, but we understand that if there is a demand for this service—As I said earlier, HA had already reviewed and formulated strategies and would gradually study the development directions of the services on this aspect, taking into account the needs and the current circumstances, particularly the health care manpower. If home visits are welcomed by patients and are quality services, we will certainly provide the necessary resources to meet the requests of HA for developing this service.
PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Prof Joseph LEE, which part of your supplementary question has not been answered?

PROF JOSEPH LEE (in Cantonese): How much additional manpower will HA deploy to conduct home visits?

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

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Cantonese): President, Prof LEE, we do not have specific figures at present, since HA will raise proposals on various services with us on a yearly basis, and we will then provide the necessary resources. We have yet to receive information in this respect in the meantime, but as I said just now, if HA has a need in this regard, we will certainly provide resources.

DR HELENA WONG (in Cantonese): President, I hope the Government can tell us, while HA developed the "Strategic Service Framework for Palliative Care" in 2017, there are only 360 palliative care beds now … in fact, what plans does the Secretary actually have, and when can the number of these beds be increased? How many beds are we currently short of? How will the Secretary allocate and deploy resources to improving the existing palliative care services in hospitals? Particularly, if the patients choose to die in a hospital or at home, what palliative measures are provided by the authorities to enable them to die comfortably?

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Cantonese): President, I thank Dr WONG for her question. The existing palliative care inpatient services are mainly for terminally-ill patients with severe or complex symptoms and needs. Dr WONG is right in saying that HA has 360 palliative care beds presently. Yet, palliative care services may not necessarily be provided in hospitals, whilst some terminally-ill patients will of course be admitted to other specialities in the light of their clinical needs. If these patients need palliative care services, we can make arrangements for them to receive treatment in this respect.
As for other services, HA has actually allocated additional resources to improving the service model and enhance these multi-disciplinary services in recent years, including the expansion of the scope of services, and the gradual strengthening of the services provided by CGATs from 2015-2016 onwards, as well as arranging for collaboration between the palliative care teams and RCHEs.

**DR HELENA WONG** (in Cantonese): *The Secretary has not answered whether there are plans to increase the number of palliative care beds.*

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

**SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH** (in Cantonese): President, we will certainly review various health care services, taking into account factors such as population growth and changes, advancement of medical technology and health care manpower, and palliative care services are of course included. After understanding the patients' needs, we will provide resources to meet such needs upon request by HA. More importantly still, we will collaborate with community partners as well.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Oral questions end here.

**WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS**

Use of mobile phones by motorists while driving

7. **MR CHAN KIN-POR** (in Chinese): *President, it is not uncommon to see traffic accidents which were caused by drivers of vehicles for hire via telephone getting distracted as a result of their communicating with customers on mobile phones while driving. In 2017, traffic accidents caused by inattentive driving resulted in 5 735 casualties. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:*
(1) of the number of fixed penalty notices issued since January last year by the Police to motorists who used a mobile phone by holding it in his hand or between his head and shoulder while the motor vehicle being driven by him was in motion;

(2) whether the Police have reviewed the effectiveness of the law enforcement operations mentioned in (1); whether they will step up efforts in promoting the importance of attentive driving among motorists in the coming year; and

(3) as the Government indicated in May last year that, in respect of whether further restrictions should be imposed on motorists' use of smart phones/devices, it was conducting a study on the impacts of such restrictions on motorists and other road users as well as the regulation, enforcement and other related details, of the progress of the study?

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Chinese): President, to ensure road safety, motorists should always drive attentively and avoid being distracted. Therefore, motorists should avoid using mobile phones or other smart devices as far as possible while driving. The Road Traffic Ordinance (Cap. 374) has stipulated stringent provisions on "dangerous driving" and "careless driving". If a motorist uses a mobile phone or smart device while driving in such a way as to affect his driving, he may have committed the offence of "dangerous driving" or "careless driving", irrespective of whether his driving has caused a traffic accident. In addition, pursuant to the Road Traffic (Traffic Control) Regulations (Cap. 374G), if a motor vehicle being driven by a motorist is in motion, it is an offence for the motorist to use a mobile phone while holding it in his hand or between his head and shoulder, or use other telecommunications equipment while holding it in his hand.

My reply to the various parts of Mr CHAN Kin-por's question is as follows:

(1) From January 2018 to April 2019, the numbers of enforcement actions taken by the Hong Kong Police Force ("the Police") against a motorist who uses a mobile phone or a piece of telecommunications equipment by holding it in his hand or between his head and shoulder while driving were 25,712 in 2018 and 8,574 in January to April 2019. Enforcement actions taken include issuing fixed
penalty notices and summonses, and arresting the offenders. The Police do not maintain any breakdown of the cases showing the number of fixed penalty notices issued.

(2) According to the Police, the number of cases of enforcement actions against a motorist who uses a mobile phone or a piece of telecommunications equipment by holding it in his hand or between his head and shoulder while driving recorded a year-on-year increase of 15% in January to April in 2019. The Police will continue to step up enforcement actions to combat offences relating to inattentive driving under the "Selected Traffic Enforcement Priorities".

As regards publicity, the Transport Department ("TD") and the Police, as in the past, will continue to work in collaboration with the Road Safety Council to get across messages of driving attentively and avoiding the use of mobile phones and other devices while driving so as to raise motorists' awareness of road safety. Publicity efforts are made through different channels and modes, such as social media platforms and carnival activities. In the second quarter of 2019, the Government launched a new announcement in the public interest on the theme of "one good turn deserves another", reminding motorists of, among others, the importance of driving attentively. In addition, through regular meetings with the transport trades, TD also calls on commercial vehicle drivers to keep driving attentively and avoid using mobile phones and other devices while driving.

(3) The Government notes the concern of the society about motorists placing several mobile phones or other devices on the dashboard, while understanding that motorists may have practical needs to use mobile phones or other devices for, say, obtaining navigational information. As to whether further restrictions should be imposed on the use of mobile phones and other devices by motorists, the Government would need to exercise great caution in balancing the views of different parties. In this connection, we are examining the impact of such restrictions on motorists and other road users, as well as the regulation, enforcement and other related details. Upon the formulation of concrete proposals, the Government will consult the Legislative Council and various stakeholders.
Provision of government canteens at boundary control points

8. MRS REGINA IP (in Chinese): President, quite a number of staff members of the various disciplined services have relayed to me that only a Hong Kong style café, a convenience store and a takeaway shop selling Japanese rice balls, but no government canteen, are provided in the Passenger Clearance Building at the Hong Kong Port of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge. As many types of the food items provided at the Hong Kong style café are expensive and often sold out, and the lunch break is not long enough for disciplined services staff members working there to travel by car to other places for lunch, they often skip their meals, thus affecting both their health and work performance. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the names of the boundary control points (covering air, land and sea travel) currently provided with government canteens; and

(2) of the considerations and criteria adopted for determining the provision or otherwise of government canteens at boundary control points; whether it will consider providing a government canteen in the aforesaid Passenger Clearance Building; if so, of the anticipated commissioning date; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND THE TREASURY (in Chinese): President, my reply to the question is as follows:

(1) At present, there are government canteens at the boundary control points at Shenzhen Bay, Lok Ma Chau Spur Line, Lok Ma Chau, Man Kam To, Lo Wu and Sha Tau Kok. A government canteen will also be set up in the Heung Yuen Wai Boundary Control Point to be completed soon.

(2) To ensure the optimal utilization of government resources, canteens are not normally provided in government buildings according to the Accommodation Regulations. If a department considers that there is a genuine need and proposes to set up a canteen in a government building, the Property Vetting Committee ("PVC"), which comprises members of the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau, the Architectural Services Department and the Government Property
Agency, will consider the proposal having regard to the relevant factors and criteria, including whether there is any practical alternative means to provide meals for the staff other than the proposed canteen.

There are currently one restaurant and two takeaway food shops at the Passenger Clearance Building at the Hong Kong Port of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge ("HZMB") to serve passengers and the staff working at the Port. Before the commissioning of the HZMB control point, the Government has made a special arrangement so that the restaurant would provide discounted menus at designated hours for selection by government staff working in the Passenger Clearance Building. The Government has also designated a dining room for the exclusive use of these staff.

After the commissioning of the Hong Kong Port of HZMB, the relevant bureau/departments have proposed to set up a canteen, having regard to the actual operation of the Port and the dining needs of the staff, for the exclusive use of government staff. PVC is considering the proposal in accordance with the established policy and in the light of the actual circumstances.

Promoting the popularization of electric vehicles

9. **MR DENNIS KWOK** (in Chinese): President, on promoting the popularization of electric vehicles ("EVs"), will the Government inform this Council:

1. of the respective numbers of (i) parking spaces and (ii) standard, medium and quick chargers for EVs ("chargers"), at each of the car parks managed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") and the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HKHS");

2. whether HA and HKHS have plans to (i) install more chargers and (ii) replace all the existing standard chargers with medium or quick chargers, at their car parks; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
(3) whether it knows the respective numbers of (i) parking spaces and (ii) standard, medium and quick chargers, at each of the car parks managed by the Hospital Authority, the Urban Renewal Authority, the Airport Authority Hong Kong, the MTR Corporation Limited, the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation and the Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited;

(4) whether it will issue guidelines or provide subsidies to the organizations mentioned in (3) to encourage them to install more chargers at their car parks; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(5) whether it will incorporate provisions into the new leases of petrol filling station ("PFS") sites or adopt other measures to make oil companies retrofit quick chargers at their PFSs; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(6) given that currently quite a number of car parks in aged private buildings, due to deficiency in power supply capacity and other infrastructure facilities, have difficulties in installing medium chargers, thus deterring vehicle owners from switching to the use of EVs, whether the Government will take the initiative to assist the owners' organizations of those buildings in overcoming the difficulties; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(7) of the details of the seminars/workshops on installation of charging facilities at private car parks organized in the past three years by the relevant government departments, including the (i) dates, (ii) venues, (iii) target participants and (iv) numbers of participants; whether the Government will set a target on the number of such activities to be held each year; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(8) whether it will carry out, in collaboration with the 18 District Councils, more promotional work relating to the popularization of EVs; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (in Chinese): President, my responses to the question raised by Mr Dennis KWOK are as follows:
(1) The respective figures on existing parking spaces and electric vehicle ("EV") chargers at car parks in public housing estates and malls under the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") and Hong Kong Housing Society ("HKHS") are tabulated at Annex 1.

(2) To tie in with the Government's efforts to further promote the use of EVs, HA will gradually add EV medium charging facilities to the existing car parks as required and when technically feasible. The number of chargers that the HKHS plans to add in 2020 is shown at Annex 2.

(3) and (4)

The respective figures on existing parking spaces and EV chargers at car parks under the Hospital Authority, Urban Renewal Authority ("URA"), Airport Authority Hong Kong ("AA"), MTR Corporation Limited ("MTRCL"), Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation and Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited are tabulated at Annex 3.

Since 2010, the Government has expounded to various bodies and organizations (including the Hospital Authority, URA, AA and MTRCL) its policy and measures on promoting EVs and has written to encourage them to install more EV charging facilities at their car parks. The Government has also issued guidelines on installation of EV charging facilities for reference by those organizations interested in installing such facilities at their car parks.

(5) Apart from the need to overcome fire and gas safety issues, the petrol filling stations ("PFSs") in Hong Kong are in general relatively small and the potential for adding quick chargers is not high. Vehicles waiting for charging will also affect nearby traffic, therefore PFS is not considered as suitable location. However, as a quick charger can provide 50 km to 100 km of driving range for electric private cars ("e-PCS") in 15 to 30 minutes, we are looking for other suitable locations to set up public quick charging stations for e-PCS for trial. Should the trial of quick charging stations be successful, we will explore the feasibility of expanding the quick charging stations across the territory.
(6) In view of the constraints on installing charging facilities at car parks of existing private premises, the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") established in 2011 a dedicated team and a hotline to provide information and technical support. Currently, the two power companies not only provide technical advice for EV owners but also render power connection services to these owners' residential parking spaces. The two power companies have also indicated to the Government that they would endeavour to accept requests for additional power load from existing private premises to meet the needs of EV charging. Moreover, in recent years several private companies have been providing EV owners, housing estates or business establishments with one-stop EV charging services, including the installation of charging facilities at EV owners' parking spaces and the provision of charging services at other specified locations outside the housing estates where these owners reside. As far as we know, these companies have installed charging facilities in over 34 housing estates.

EPD will continue to step up its communication, publicity, educational efforts as well as technical assistance to be provided to building owners, property management companies and owners' corporations with a view to facilitating their installation of EV charging facilities.

(7) and (8)

By organizing seminars and workshops, EPD has appealed to owners' corporations and property managers for their support in installing EV charging facilities at their premises. Over the past three years, we held a total of four seminars/workshops on EV charging facilities to not only brief owners' corporations and property managers on the benefits of switching to EVs but also encourage the installation of EV charging facilities at car parks in existing private premises. The dates, venues, target participants and numbers of participants of these seminars/workshops are tabulated at Annex 4. EPD is preparing to continue to run similar seminars/workshops in various districts in this year.

Should any District Council be interested in hosting related publicity and educational activities, EPD stands ready to collaborate with it to make promotional efforts.
Annex 1

The Number of Private Car Parking Spaces and Electric Vehicle ("EV") Chargers at Car Parks in Public Housing Estates and Malls under Hong Kong Housing Authority and Hong Kong Housing Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Number of EV Chargers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Housing Authority</td>
<td>Cheung Sha Wan Estate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11 5* 5* -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choi Tak Estate</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>4 7* -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choi Ying Estate</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chun Man Court</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>7 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easyful Court</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7* - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Wah Court</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hung Fuk Estate</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>43 3 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kai Ching Estate</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>7* - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King Shan Court</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>7* - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kwai Chung Estate</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>7* - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lei On Court</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>7* - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Ching Estate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Shin Estate</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>4 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mei Tin Estate</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>20 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ngan Ho Court</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ngan Wai Court</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On Tat Estate</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>83 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ping Yan Court</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>44 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Po Heung Estate</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>37 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Po Shek Wu Estate</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>65 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheung Chui Court</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shui Chuen O Estate</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>126 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shui Pin Wai Estate</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So Uk Estate</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tak Long Estate</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>60 - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Number of Parking Spaces</td>
<td>Number of EV Chargers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard (13A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium (≤20kW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quick (&gt;20kW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tung Shing Court</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tung Tao Court</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yan Tin Estate</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yau Lai Estate</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi Fung Court</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ying Tung Estate</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yue Wan Estate</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Housing Society</td>
<td>Lai Tak Tsuen</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ka Wai Chuen</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Shore</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serenity Place</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pinnacle</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Belvedere</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo Shek Mansion</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony Place</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Can select standard or medium charger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai Tak Garden</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Can select standard, medium or quick charger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosperous Garden</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Can select standard or medium charger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenview Villa</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwun Tong Gdn Est.</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heya Aqua</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heya Crystal</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Habitat</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yue Kwong Chuen</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayman Rise</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Village</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragon Centre</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming Wah Dai Ha</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood Terrace</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Number of Parking Spaces</td>
<td>Number of EV Chargers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard (13A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwun Lung Lau</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1063 King's Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bel Air Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascades</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronin Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chun Seen Mei Chuen</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lok Man Sun Chuen</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilant Place</td>
<td></td>
<td>271</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful Court</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiant Towers</td>
<td></td>
<td>235</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbena Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td>283</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolly Place</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tui Min Hoi Chuen</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadview Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tivoli Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>205</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho Yiu Chuen</td>
<td></td>
<td>309</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon Lok Dai Ha</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clague Garden Est.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jat Min Chuen</td>
<td></td>
<td>247</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Grove</td>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sha Tau Kok Chuen</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heya Green</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heya Delight</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heya Star</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
* Standard and medium speed chargers are installed in the same parking space
### Annex 2

The Number of Chargers that the Hong Kong Housing Society Plans to Add in 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Number of EV Chargers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronin Garden</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Grove</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo Shek Mansion</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Shore</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwun Lung Lau</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner Hills</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bel Air Heights</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascades</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Belvedere</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbena Heights</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Habitat</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annex 3

The Number of Parking Spaces and Electric Vehicle ("EV") Chargers at Car Parks under Hospital Authority, Urban Renewal Authority, Airport Authority Hong Kong, MTR Corporation Limited, Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation and Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Number of EV Chargers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Authority</td>
<td>Hong Kong Children Hospital</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tin Shui Wan Hospital</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Number of Parking Spaces</td>
<td>Number of EV Chargers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yan Chai Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Elizabeth Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>661</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lantau Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tseung Kwan O Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven of Hope Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess Margaret Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Peak Hospital/Siu Lam Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>263</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Ho Miu Ling Nethersole Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradbury Hospice</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caritas Medical Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire Home, Chung Hom Kok</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire Home, Shatin</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantham Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Authority Building (Head Office)</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Buddhist Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Eye Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowloon Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Number of Parking Spaces</td>
<td>Number of EV Chargers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard (13A)</td>
<td>Medium (≤20kW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwai Chung Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacLehose Medical Rehabilitation Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North District Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>332</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Maryknoll Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>496</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pok Oi Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince of Wales Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>549</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Mary Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>425</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruttonjee and Tang Shiu Kin Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shatin Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Po Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Duchess of Kent Children's Hospital at Sandy Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsan Yuk Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuen Mun Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>706</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tung Wah Eastern Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Fung Yiu King Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tung Wah Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWGHs Wong Tai Sin Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Number of Parking Spaces</td>
<td>Number of EV Chargers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard (13A)</td>
<td>Medium (≤20kW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Christian Hospital</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong Chuk Hang Hospital</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Park 1</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Park 3</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Park 4</td>
<td>2,985#</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Park 5</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SkyCity Car Park</td>
<td>630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Commercial Car Park</td>
<td>408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKIA Tower Car Park</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport World Trade Centre Car Park</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saloon Car</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Service Equipment</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eResidence (Commercial Portion)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Central (Commercial Portion)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Avenue (Commercial Portion)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Forest SKYPARK (Commercial Portion)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywalk</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywalk 2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Number of Parking Spaces</td>
<td>Number of EV Chargers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard (13A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation</strong></td>
<td>Bio-Informatics Centre (2W)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1 Carpark (3W)</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photonics Centre (2E)/Wireless Centre (3E)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building 5E</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAE Technology Centre (6E)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2 Carpark</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3 Carpark</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited</strong></td>
<td>Cyberport Carpark 1/2</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyberport Carpark 3</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyberport Carpark 4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Le Meridien Cyberport</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MTR Corporation Limited</strong></td>
<td>Hong Kong Station</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kowloon Station</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tsing Yi Station</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kam Sheung Road Station</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tsuen Wan West Station</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ocean Park Station</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hung Hom Station</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Speed Rail Hong Kong West Kowloon Station</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choi Hung Park &amp; Ride Public Car Park</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

# The relevant figures are the estimated number of parking spaces and EV chargers provided after the expansion of the Car Park 4 at the Hong Kong International Airport
Details of Seminars/Workshops on Charging Facilities for Electric Vehicles Organized in the Past Three Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seminar or Workshop</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Target Participants</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminar on &quot;EV Charging Facilities&quot;</td>
<td>14 September 2018</td>
<td>Hong Kong Museum of History</td>
<td>Members of The Hong Kong Institute of Housing</td>
<td>over 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Management Workshop (Seminar on &quot;EV Charging Facilities&quot; included)</td>
<td>4 December 2018</td>
<td>Sai Ying Pun Community Complex</td>
<td>Owners' corporations and owners' committees</td>
<td>around 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Management Workshop (Seminar on &quot;EV Charging Facilities&quot; included)</td>
<td>13 December 2018</td>
<td>Mei Foo Community Hall</td>
<td>Owners' corporations and owners' committees</td>
<td>around 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Management Workshop (Seminar on &quot;EV Charging Facilities&quot; included)</td>
<td>23 January 2019</td>
<td>Sha Kok Community Hall</td>
<td>Owners' corporations and owners' committees</td>
<td>over 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quarters provided for civil servants

10. **MR TONY TSE** (in Chinese): President, in his Reports No. 51 and 62 published in October 2008 and April 2014 respectively, the Director of Audit conducted reviews one after another on the Government's work of managing its quarters provided for eligible civil servants, and he recommended that the relevant government departments should expedite their actions of putting surplus quarters and their sites into gainful use through various means, such as disposal or conversion of uses. There are views that such actions have become increasingly pressing amid the current acute shortage of land and housing supply in Hong Kong. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:
(1) of the respective (i) numbers and (ii) vacancy rates of the units of the various types of quarters (including non-departmental quarters ("NDQs"), departmental quarters and operational quarters, excluding surplus quarters) at present;

(2) whether it has adopted any mechanisms and criteria (e.g. period of vacancy) for determining whether certain quarters should be classified as surplus; if so, of the details;

(3) of the current number of government-owned surplus quarters, as well as the following details of such quarters: (i) managing departments, (ii) whether they are located on government sites or in private developments, (iii) since when they were classified as surplus, and (iv) their current and future uses;

(4) of its plans to put surplus quarters and the sites concerned into further gainful use;

(5) of the current usage of the 498 surplus quarters under the management of five government departments (namely, the Water Supplies Department, the Correctional Services Department, the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department, the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department) referred to in Chapter 1 of Report No. 62 of the Director of Audit;

(6) apart from the two sites at Mansfield Road, the Peak and 135 Tai Hang Road which have been included in the Land Sale Programme, whether it has plans to sell other existing or former quarters sites;

(7) whether it has adopted the proposal of selling nine NDQ sites as put forward by the Working Group on Long-Term Fiscal Planning in 2015; if so, of the progress of land sale work; if not, the reasons for that, as well as the usage of these nine sites and the quarters concerned at present; and

(8) of the current number of NDQ units that are owned by the Financial Secretary Incorporated and located in private developments; the number of such type of units sold in the past five years, and whether it has plans to dispose of such units in a progressive manner?
SECRETARY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND THE TREASURY (in Chinese): President, having consulted relevant bureaux/departments including the Civil Service Bureau, the Development Bureau, the Security Bureau and the Government Property Agency ("GPA"), the consolidated reply of the Government is as follows:

(1) As at 30 April 2019, the number of quarters units is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of quarters</th>
<th>Number of units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-departmental quarters (&quot;NDQs&quot;)</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental quarters (including disciplined services quarters (&quot;DSQs&quot;))</td>
<td>22 891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-tied quarters (&quot;PTQs&quot;)</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23 551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 0.1% of the government quarters units to be allocated to eligible officers are temporarily vacant and pending allocation.

(2) to (4)

Under the existing mechanism, the Civil Service Bureau or the Quarters Allocation Committee set up under the Civil Service Regulations is responsible for the allocation of NDQs. Individual departments are responsible for the allocation of quarters under their purview (for example, DSQs are allocated by the corresponding disciplined services departments ("DSDs")). If the bureau/departments, after considering their operational needs, confirm that the quarters units under their allocation responsibility are no longer required for quarters use, these quarters units would become surplus. GPA will then assist in identifying alternative users within the Government, or put the properties up for lease or sale in the market. If lands or planning issues are involved in the handling of surplus quarters, GPA will assist the owner department to consult the Planning Department and Lands Department ("LandsD"), etc.

The Civil Service Bureau regularly assesses the demand and supply of NDQs. Any surplus NDQs would be transferred to GPA for assistance and handling. Normally, GPA would put up the quarters units for sale. If the quarters en bloc become surplus, GPA would transfer the quarters site to LandsD for alternative development. As
an interim arrangement before the disposal of the quarters units or the site, GPA would consider leasing out the properties at market rent in the open market for better use of public resources. According to the information provided by GPA, the number of surplus former NDQs units transferred from the Civil Service Bureau to GPA as at 30 April 2019 was 147. Amongst these 147 units, 33 units were located in private developments while the remaining units were on government sites. The majority of these units were transferred to GPA in the recent five years. About 80% of the units had been leased out, with the rest being prepared for sale or lease.

According to the information provided by DSDs, as at 30 April 2019, there were no surplus DSQs units.

According to the information gathered by GPA from relevant departments, there are 90 surplus departmental quarters and PTQs. These quarters units, all situated on government sites, are either planned for other long term use, open for application for use by non-governmental organizations ("NGOs") or being considered for alternative uses since they became surplus in 2013 and 2014.

Starting from February 2019, NGOs that lease surplus government accommodation (including quarters) with the policy support of the relevant bureaux/departments may apply for subsidies from the Development Bureau to support one-off, basic and essential restoration works required to make such properties fit for other short-term community uses.

(5) According to the information gathered by GPA from relevant departments, the latest position of the 498 surplus quarters units mentioned in the Director of Audit's Report No. 62 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Re-used for quarters purpose or for alternative uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quarters sites have been included in the Land Sale Programme or sold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In search for tenant or being considered for alternative uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(6) According to the information provided by the Development Bureau, the former NDQs sites at Mansfield Road, the Peak and 135 Tai Hang Road have been included in the 2019-2020 Land Sale Programme. If other former NDQs sites are planned to be put up for sale, following the established practice, the Government would include the sites into the annual Land Sale Programme and announce all the sites planned for sale in one go before the commencement of the new financial year.

(7) The Phase Two Report of the Working Group on Long-Term Fiscal Planning in 2015 pointed out that nine NDQs sites were expected to become surplus in the coming two decades upon the retirement of eligible civil servants who joined the Government before 1 October 1990. The Working Group recommended that the Government should continue with the established policy of disposing of NDQs sites and units by sale as and when they become available, and adopt a pragmatic approach to allow flexibility in the disposal mechanism and to avoid "fire sale". The disposal priority should be guided by the status of the NDQs decanting programme, the potential revenue to be captured, the site utilization to be enhanced through redevelopment, and the sentiment of the market. As an interim arrangement pending permanent disposal, the existing practice of leasing out surplus NDQs units should continue.

According to the information provided by the Development Bureau, seven among the nine NDQs sites mentioned in the Report are still being used as NDQs. The Development Bureau is considering the appropriate options for the handling of the remaining two sites, including disposal by land sale.

(8) According to the information provided by GPA, as at 30 April 2019, there were 148 NDQs units owned by the Financial Secretary Incorporated and located within private developments. A total of 47 surplus quarters units of this category were sold in the past five years. If the Civil Service Bureau confirms that there are other surplus NDQs units, GPA will follow the mechanism described above in handling the surplus accommodation, including disposal by sale in the market where appropriate and feasible.
Work of the Urban Renewal Authority

11. MR WU CHI-WAI (in Chinese): President, the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA") commenced in May 2017 a district planning study for Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok to explore effective modes of urban renewal for old districts with limited redevelopment potential (i.e. currently having a high development density or not much residual developable plot ratio). On the other hand, the residential units under the Starter Homes Pilot Project for Hong Kong Residents offered for sale by URA early this year received very good response. Regarding the work of URA, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it knows the following details about each of the redevelopment projects expected to be completed by URA in the coming five years: (i) the address, (ii) the total floor area, (iii) the number of units (and among such units, the number of those with an area of 400 square feet or above), and (iv) the expected completion date;

(2) whether it will request URA to allocate some of the units under the redevelopment projects mentioned in (1) for the purpose of subsidized sale housing; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(3) whether it knows the latest progress of and expected completion date for the aforesaid study; whether URA will conduct similar studies for the various old districts in Kowloon East (e.g. San Po Kong and Ngau Tau Kok), and expedite the urban renewal work for such districts, so as to tie in with the development plans under the Energizing Kowloon East initiative; if URA will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR DEVELOPMENT (in Chinese): President, to explore sustainable ways of addressing the problem of urban decay, the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA") commenced in May 2017 the district study for Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok (Yau Mong District Study). The Yau Mong District Study aims to explore ways of enhancing the efficiency of existing land use and the redevelopment potential in the two districts. The findings would also serve as the basis for URA to identify more effective and efficient ways for urban renewal
as well as practical and feasible ideas and modus operandi for adoption in the work strategy of urban renewal in future. The efficacy of various initiatives under the 2011 Urban Renewal Strategy would also be examined in the context of the study.

Having consulted URA, my reply to the three-part question is as follows:

(1) Details about each of the redevelopment projects expected to be completed by URA in the coming five years (2019-2023) (including the location of the project, total floor area, number of units to be provided, date of completion, and number of units with an area of 400 sq ft or above) are listed at Annex.

(2) Of the projects listed in Annex, apart from the redevelopment project in Ma Tau Wai Road named "eResidence" which will be the Starter Homes Pilot Project for Hong Kong Residents, other projects will not be converted to subsidized sales flats. In fact, development agreements for development of these projects as private housing have been signed with joint venture developers.

As a statutory body with the function of promoting urban renewal, URA has all along maintained an appropriate division of labour with the Hong Kong Housing Authority/Hong Kong Housing Society in terms of their roles and ambits, with the latter two being responsible for providing public housing. That said, URA has also contributed to the provision of subsidized sales flats under its Kai Tak "flat-for-flat" project and "eResidence", the Ma Tau Wai Road Redevelopment Project. The Government has also invited URA to identify one or two clusters of sites formerly developed under the Civil Servants' Co-operative Building Society Scheme for redevelopment under URA's programme, and consider earmarking some of the redevelopment area for public housing development. As to whether URA will continue to provide public housing in future, both the Government and URA have to carefully consider the impact of this fundamental change on the supply of private housing (including the impact on replenishing the number of private housing affected by redevelopments) and URA's self-financing mode of operation.
URA is taking forward the Yau Mong District Study progressively. URA has earlier completed the assessment on the scale of urban decay, development density, transport and infrastructure capacity, and environmental issues of the study area, and will identify opportunities and constraints based on the study findings to address the key issues and problem areas. In addition, a selection framework for identification of "Potential Urban Renewal Opportunity Areas" will be developed. Selected opportunity areas will be consolidated into options of "Master Renewal Concept Plans" ("MRCP") in subsequent stages. After the MRCP options have been formulated, public engagement will be carried out to solicit views on the options. URA has also been reviewing the existing institutional framework and implementation mechanisms, and will incorporate the proposed implementation strategies into the MRCP options for testing. The Yau Mong District Study is expected to be completed in end 2019 or early 2020.

As mentioned above, the findings of Yau Mong District Study will serve as the basis for URA to identify more effective and efficient ways for urban renewal as well as practical and feasible ideas and modus operandi for adoption in other districts, including various old districts in Kowloon East.

Meanwhile, URA has been carrying out urban renewal efforts in various old districts in Kowloon East. Through its various building rehabilitation schemes, URA has provided assistance services to the owners of over 80 buildings in the area for improving building conditions and living environment. URA will also continue to follow the Urban Renewal Strategy and take into account a host of factors such as building conditions, living environment, land resources available in the district for relocating affected residents, planning gains that the redevelopment project can bring about to the entire community, as well as the financial and manpower resources of URA, in reviewing and working out the scopes and priorities of projects requiring redevelopment and rehabilitation in various districts.
### Details of URA's redevelopment projects to be completed between 2019 and 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Total GFA* (sq m)</th>
<th>Residential GFA* (sq m)</th>
<th>Non-residential GFA (including G/IC purposes)* (sq m)</th>
<th>Residential Flats Number*</th>
<th>Residential Flats Number of 400 sq ft or above*</th>
<th>Completion Date@</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 DL-1:SSP</td>
<td>229A-G Hai Tan Street</td>
<td>3 640</td>
<td>3 235</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 April 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 TKT/2/002</td>
<td>Anchor Street/Fuk Tsun Street</td>
<td>6 529</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6 529</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20 May 2019</td>
<td>Hotel purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 H18-Site B</td>
<td>Peel Street/Graham Street</td>
<td>17 790</td>
<td>14 810</td>
<td>2 980</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Q2 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 KC-006</td>
<td>Pak Tai Street/San Shan Road</td>
<td>9 783</td>
<td>8 152</td>
<td>1 631</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Q1 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 DL-2:SSP</td>
<td>205-211A Hai Tan Street</td>
<td>3 600</td>
<td>3 132</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Q1 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 H14</td>
<td>Sai Wan Ho Street</td>
<td>5 680</td>
<td>5 680</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Q2 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 TKW/1/002 (eResidence)</td>
<td>Ma Tau Wai Road/Chun Tin Street (eResidence)</td>
<td>24 398</td>
<td>20 332</td>
<td>4 066</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Q2 2020</td>
<td>450 units for subsidized housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 SSP/1/003-005</td>
<td>Hai Tan Street/Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street</td>
<td>57 399</td>
<td>50 024</td>
<td>7 375</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>Q4 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 DL-4:SSP</td>
<td>Kowloon Road/Kiu Yam Street</td>
<td>4 884</td>
<td>4 070</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Q4 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 KC-007</td>
<td>Kowloon City Road/Sheung Heung Road</td>
<td>12 456</td>
<td>10 380</td>
<td>2 076</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Q1 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 DL-3:YTM</td>
<td>Pine Street/Oak Street</td>
<td>6 590</td>
<td>5 609</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Q1 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 K7 (DA 2 and 3)</td>
<td>Kwun Tong Town Centre Redevelopment Areas 2 and 3</td>
<td>172 176</td>
<td>138 980</td>
<td>33 196</td>
<td>1 999</td>
<td>1 906</td>
<td>Q2 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 DL-6:YTM</td>
<td>Fuk Chak Street/Li Tak Street</td>
<td>5 733</td>
<td>5 095</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q3 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 H18-Site A</td>
<td>Peel Street/Graham Street</td>
<td>9 463</td>
<td>7 828</td>
<td>1 635</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Q3 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Total GFA* (sq m)</td>
<td>Residential GFA* (sq m)</td>
<td>Non-residential GFA* (including G/IC purposes)* (sq m)</td>
<td>Residential Flats Number*</td>
<td>Residential Flats Number of 400 sq ft or above*</td>
<td>Completion Date@</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 YTM-010</td>
<td>Reclamation Street/Shantung Street</td>
<td>12 510</td>
<td>10 425</td>
<td>2 085</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q4 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 DL-5:SSP</td>
<td>Tung Chau Street/Kweilin Street</td>
<td>13 410</td>
<td>9 090</td>
<td>4 320</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q2 2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 SSP-016</td>
<td>Castle Peak Road/Un Chau Street</td>
<td>14 841</td>
<td>12 367</td>
<td>2 474</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q3 2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 H18-Site C</td>
<td>Peel Street/Graham Street</td>
<td>40 275</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40 275</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Q4 2023</td>
<td>Offices and hotel purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 DL-10:KT</td>
<td>Hang On Street</td>
<td>6 663</td>
<td>5 922</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Q4 2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

#  Not including revitalization and preservation projects.
* GFA and residential flats number are subject to changes by the developers.
@ Completion date is the expected issuance date of Certificate of Compliance by Lands Department.

Administration of human papillomavirus vaccines

12. **DR ELIZABETH QUAT** (in Chinese): President, it has been reported that recently, some private healthcare institutions administered to their clients a type of human papillomavirus ("HPV") vaccines which were unregistered in Hong Kong and suspected to be parallelly imported. Some people who were administered such vaccines said that they had developed symptoms such as rash. There are comments that this incident may affect public health and tarnish Hong Kong’s reputation. Regarding the administration of HPV vaccines, will the Government inform this Council:

1. of the current procedure for handling reports of private healthcare institutions administering to their clients parallel-imported vaccines;

2. of the number and names of the healthcare institutions involved in the incident; whether it knows the number of people who were administered such vaccines and the total amount of money they paid;
(3) whether the Department of Health ("DH") has conducted laboratory tests on the vaccines concerned; if so, of the outcome; if not, the reasons for that; of the expected dates for completion of the investigation and announcement of the outcome;

(4) of the measures in place to assist those who were administered such vaccines;

(5) whether, following the occurrence of the incident, it has stepped up inspections of healthcare institutions to combat the administration of vaccines unregistered in Hong Kong; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(6) whether it will request the pharmaceutical company which is the sole manufacturer of the type of HPV vaccines concerned to publish a list of healthcare institutions to which it has supplied the vaccines; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(7) of the measures in place to prevent similar incidents from occurring in future;

(8) given that starting from the next two school years respectively, DH will send its staff to schools to administer, free of charge, the first dose of HPV vaccines to Primary Five female students and the second dose of the vaccines to Primary Six female students, how DH ensures that there will be an adequate stock of HPV vaccines for use; and

(9) whether it will, by drawing reference from the practices in overseas countries, launch a catch-up HPV vaccination programme to administer HPV vaccines to women aged 26 or below who have passed the optimal ages for, but have never been administered, such vaccination; if so, of the details and timetable; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Chinese): President, under the Pharmacy and Poisons Ordinance (Cap. 138) ("the Ordinance"), pharmaceutical products must meet the requirements of safety, efficacy and quality as stipulated in the Ordinance, and must be registered with the Pharmacy and Poisons Board of
Hong Kong before they can be sold or distributed in Hong Kong. Having consulted the Department of Health ("DH") and relevant law enforcement departments, I provide a reply to the question raised by Dr Elizabeth QUAT as follows:

(1) to (3)

Upon receiving complaints about pharmaceutical products, DH will take follow-up actions in accordance with the Ordinance. DH will conduct joint operations with other law enforcement departments if needed, and the investigations may involve conducting laboratory tests on pharmaceutical products. DH and other law enforcement departments will, on the advice of the Department of Justice, institute prosecution when there is sufficient evidence. If a major public health incident is involved, DH will announce the details in a timely manner.

From 1 January to 22 May 2019, the Drug Office of DH received a total of about 450 complaints regarding human papillomavirus ("HPV") vaccines, involving about 30 service providers. Most of the complaints are related to suspected supply of unregistered HPV vaccines by private health care institutions. As the investigations are still in progress, DH is not able to give further information on the cases at this stage.

(4) DH has reminded the public not to buy or use pharmaceutical products of unknown composition or from doubtful sources through various channels, such as web pages, promotional videos and leaflets. Registered pharmaceutical products should be labelled in accordance with statutory and registration requirements, including carrying a Hong Kong registration number on the package in the format of "HK-XXXXX". DH will continue to step up public education and publicity in this regard.

Members of the public may also use the "Search Drug Database" on the website of the Drug Office of DH by entering the particulars of a pharmaceutical product, such as its English product name or Hong Kong registration number, to confirm if the product has been registered in Hong Kong and obtain further information about the product. Should members of the public have any doubt about the
product, they may seek assistance from the Drug Office of DH. Anyone feeling unwell or having any enquiries after receiving a vaccine should consult registered health care professionals.

(5) to (7)

According to the Ordinance, illegal possession or sale of unregistered pharmaceutical products is a criminal offence. Upon conviction, the offender is liable to a maximum penalty of a fine of $100,000 and two years' imprisonment for each offence. Although the pharmaceutical products involved in the suspected cases may be manufactured overseas by pharmaceutical companies according to relevant requirements, they are unregistered pharmaceutical products as they are neither imported by registration holders nor registered in Hong Kong under the Ordinance. Apart from prosecuting the offenders, DH may also refer the cases concerned to the Medical Council of Hong Kong for follow-up if any registered doctors are involved.

DH has established a mechanism to monitor the sale of pharmaceutical products in the market, and will collect information through various channels. In light of the recent incident of suspected supply of unregistered HPV vaccines, DH has proactively followed up the cases and stepped up inspections. In general, when suspected illegal sale or possession of unregistered pharmaceutical products is detected, DH will immediately carry out investigations and conduct joint operations with other law enforcement departments where necessary, and any irregularities so found will be dealt with in accordance with the laws. DH and other law enforcement departments will continue to strengthen inspections and law enforcement actions to safeguard public health.

In addition, DH will continue to step up public education and publicity, and maintain close liaison with the pharmaceutical company concerned on its supply of 9-valent HPV vaccines to Hong Kong. Members of the public may contact the pharmaceutical company for enquiries about the supply of vaccines.

(8) As regards the arrangements for cervical cancer vaccination under the Hong Kong Childhood Immunisation Programme ("HKCIP") in 2019-2020, DH has earlier on procured the required vaccines from
suppliers on a contract basis in accordance with the established procedures. The procurement procedures are expected to be completed shortly to ensure an adequate supply of cervical cancer vaccine for HKCIP.

(9) According to a position paper on cervical cancer vaccines issued by the World Health Organization ("WHO") in 2017, WHO recommended that young women aged 9 to 14 years prior to becoming sexually active be included in the primary target group for cervical cancer vaccination for the prevention of cervical cancer.

The Scientific Committee on AIDS and STI and the Scientific Committee on Vaccine Preventable Diseases under the Centre for Health Protection of DH have kept in close view the scientific evidence on the use of HPV vaccines to prevent cervical cancer. The School of Public Health of The University of Hong Kong completed a cost-benefit study on HPV vaccination for young women last year. The findings revealed that the provision of HPV vaccination for all young women aged 12 is cost-effective in the prevention of cervical cancer.

In July last year, after reviewing the relevant scientific evidence, both of the above Scientific Committees recommended that HPV vaccination be included in HKCIP as one of the public health strategies for cervical cancer prevention. Regarding the suggestion of providing HPV vaccination for women of other age groups not covered by HKCIP, there is currently no sufficient local scientific evidence supporting its cost-effectiveness. The Scientific Committees will continue to closely monitor the latest and relevant scientific evidence and revisit the suggestion when necessary.

Besides, the Government encourages the public to get appropriate vaccination to enhance their immunity. In October 2016, the Community Care Fund launched a three-year "Cervical Cancer Vaccination Pilot Scheme" ("Pilot Scheme") to provide free or subsidized HPV vaccination to eligible young women aged between 9 and 18 of low-income families. As at the end of April 2019, the Pilot Scheme has provided HPV vaccination to 22,430 eligible young women.
Manpower situation of the accounting profession

13. **MR KENNETH LEUNG** (in Chinese): President, quite a number of the persons-in-charge of accounting firms have relayed to me that in recent years, they have continuously encountered difficulties in recruiting accounting professionals. In respect of the manpower situation of the accounting profession, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it knows the respective numbers of (i) graduates of post-secondary programmes in accounting and finance-related disciplines offered by the various tertiary institutions, and (ii) persons who obtained professional qualifications in accountancy through other routes, in each of the past five years in Hong Kong;

(2) whether it knows the number of private organizations providing accounting, auditing, book-keeping or tax consulting services in Hong Kong, and the number of accounting professionals they hired, in each of the past five years;

(3) whether it conducted, in the past five years, any comprehensive study on the future development as well as the manpower demand and supply situation of the accounting profession; if so, of the outcome; if not, the reasons for that; and

(4) whether it has plans, in the coming year, to gain an understanding from the various stakeholders of the accounting profession (including the persons-in-charge of accounting firms, the Hong Kong Institute of Certified Public Accountants and other professional bodies in the sector) about the current manpower demand and supply situation of the profession, so as to plan for the medium and long term human resources of the accounting profession, as well as promote the profession's healthy development in the long run; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

**SECRETARY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND THE TREASURY** (in Chinese): President,
(1) According to the information provided by the Hong Kong Institute of Certified Public Accountants ("HKICPA"), the number of persons who obtained professional qualifications in accountancy in Hong Kong through bachelors' degrees in accounting and finance-related disciplines offered by tertiary institutions, as well as other routes, in the past five years are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic qualifications</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree holders</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>1630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and Finance-related Degree holders</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>1366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Degree holders</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree holders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

(1) Others include graduate/member of the Hong Kong Institute of Accredited Accounting Technicians or former members of HKICPA who were re-admitted during the period with incomplete academic records.

(2) According to the "Quarterly Survey of Employment and Vacancies" of the Census and Statistics Department ("C&SD"), the number of establishments engaged in accounting, auditing, bookkeeping or tax consultancy services of the private sector in Hong Kong and their total number of persons engaged in the past five years are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(2)</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of establishments(3)</td>
<td>5 043</td>
<td>5 284</td>
<td>5 462</td>
<td>5 624</td>
<td>5 708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons engaged(4)</td>
<td>29 155</td>
<td>29 852</td>
<td>30 472</td>
<td>30 675</td>
<td>31 276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

(2) The figures refer to the average of the four quarters of the year.

(3) An establishment is defined as an economic unit which engages, under a single ownership or control, in one or predominantly one kind of economic activity at a single physical location, e.g. an individual factory, workshop, retail shop or office.
(4) C&SD does not have detailed breakdown on the number of accounting professionals employed by such establishments. "Persons engaged" include:

(a) individual proprietors, partners and persons having family ties with any of the proprietors or partners and working in the establishment without regular pay, who are actively engaged in the work of the establishment for at least one hour on the survey reference date;

(b) full-time salaried personnel/employees directly paid by the establishment and working directors of limited companies, both permanent and temporary, who are either at work (whether or not in Hong Kong) or temporarily absent from work (viz. those on sick leave, maternity leave, annual vacation or casual leave, and on strike) on the survey reference date; and

(c) part-time employees and employees on night/irregular shifts working for at least one hour on the survey reference date.

(3) and (4)

The Government conducts manpower projection from time to time to project the broad trends of Hong Kong's manpower supply and requirements of our economy at the macro level for the medium term. Amongst others, manpower requirements are projected for various economic sectors which include "accounting, auditing and bookkeeping services". In addition, the Vocational Training Council conducts manpower surveys for the accountancy sector regularly. These exercises provide valuable information for the tertiary institutions in planning programmes on accountancy.

In additional to making reference to various sources of information, we have all along maintained close liaison with the accounting sector to discuss various initiatives relevant to the development of the accounting profession. As for the manpower development of the accounting sector, HKICPA has set up an Advisory Panel to study the manpower situation of the accounting sector since 2015. Annual surveys have been conducted with HKICPA members and students covering different aspects to understand the dynamics of the accounting profession such as the employment prospects, trend in employment change, work-life balance, earning power, training and development, etc. HKICPA has also conducted in-depth employer
interviews with accounting firms in 2018 on issues relating to their recruitment plans, difficulties in recruitment and retaining staff, and attractiveness of the accounting profession, etc.

High-quality professional accounting services are an integral part of Hong Kong's status as an international financial centre. We will continue to maintain close liaison with HKICPA and other relevant stakeholders, with a view to facilitating the healthy development of the accounting sector in the long run.

Determining the English names for public places and facilities, streets and government buildings

14. MR ANDREW WAN (in Chinese): President, the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority ("WKCD") has earlier determined the English name for the newly completed "戲曲中心" which is situated in the West Kowloon Cultural District as "Xiqu Centre". Instead of adopting the commonly used term "opera" to refer to "戲曲", the term "Xiqu" (Hanyu Pinyin for "戲曲") is used in that English name. However, quite a number of visitors to Hong Kong, as well as local people who are ethnic Chinese and those who are not non-ethnic Chinese, have relayed to me that they have no idea of what "Xiqu Centre" means. Some members of the public have pointed out that the naming of "Xiqu Centre" has deviated from the Government's established practice for determining the English names for streets and buildings in Hong Kong, i.e. using the Cantonese transliterations of their Chinese names or English terms with the same meaning. Besides, the term "中國戲曲" has been invariably translated as "Chinese Opera" on a number of webpages of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department and on the printed materials for activities and exhibitions held by it. On the other hand, the term "opera" is widely used in the Chinese communities. For instances, the term "戲曲" is translated as "opera" by the relevant organizations in places such as Beijing and Singapore. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) given that it is uncommon to see English names of local buildings comprising Hanyu Pinyin, whether it knows the specific reasons for WKCD to adopt "Xiqu Centre" as the English name for "戲曲中心";
whether it will request WKCD to consider changing the English name for "戲曲中心" to "Chinese Opera Centre", or adding "Chinese Opera Centre" to its English name by way of a note, so that people from different sectors can have a clearer idea about the functions of the venue;

of the existing policies on as well as criteria and procedure for determining the English names for public places and facilities and government buildings; the public places and facilities as well as government buildings whose English names comprise Hanyu Pinyin;

whether it will adopt Hanyu Pinyin in determining the English names for public places and facilities, streets and government buildings in future; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that, and whether the fact that the English name for "戲曲中心" has given rise to controversies is one of the reasons?

SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS (in Chinese): President, in consultation with the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority ("WKCD"), my reply to parts (1) and (2) of Mr Andrew WAN's question is as follows:

WKCD is a statutory body established to develop the West Kowloon Cultural District ("WKCD") into an integrated arts and cultural district. Being the first major performing arts venue in the district, Xiqu Centre has the vision to be a world-class platform for the conservation, promotion and development of all forms of xiqu (Chinese traditional theatre) in Hong Kong, in particular Cantonese opera. The opening of Xiqu Centre is conducive to developing a locally-rooted xiqu network that has a regional impact with an important role in international arts development.

As far as Xiqu Centre is concerned, the naming hinged on the substance of the art form. The term "Xiqu" has been used in both the artistic and academic fields for decades. Following the report of the Performing Arts and Tourism Advisory Group under the
Consultative Committee on the Core Arts and Cultural Facilities of WKCD, WKCDA has been using the English name "Xiqu Centre" as a working title for the proposed venue for the art form concerned since its establishment in 2008.

WKCDA kept an open mind on the English naming of the venue, and it noted that different English terms have been used by different organizations when referring to this art form and there is no single universal English term for it. In the course of considering the English name of the venue, WKCDA has engaged different stakeholders, including academic and artistic professional groups through different platforms and channels. Different options had been given full consideration before settling on the current title.

During the discussion with the stakeholders, WKCDA was aware that one of the important views from academic and artistic professional groups was that the term "Xiqu" represents a unique Chinese traditional performing and theatrical art form which should be differentiated from opera or theatre in the Western culture in order to reflect the unique identity and the distinct artistic techniques including singing, recitation, acting and acrobatics in the variety of genres of the art form.

WKCDA takes the view and believes that the current English name "Xiqu Centre" is an appropriate and balanced choice to communicate the uniqueness of the xiqu art form to local and international audiences. WKCDA will establish the reputation of Xiqu Centre as a world-class performing arts venue and enhance public understanding of the rich traditional Chinese art form of xiqu in due course.

After consulting Development Bureau, the reply to parts (3) and (4) of the question is as follows:

(3) and (4)

At present, the Lands Department ("LandsD") is responsible for the naming of streets pursuant to the Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance (Cap. 132), while the naming of geographical
In general, when naming a new street and geographical place, the English name is normally the transliterated version of the Chinese name in Cantonese Romanization, unless there is specific corresponding Chinese/English term in common use, in which case the literal translation of the Chinese name is used.

Proposals (in Chinese and English) of street naming and geographical place naming will be circulated among relevant government departments and the District Council for their consideration and comment. Relevant District Offices will conduct local consultation among representatives of nearby residents and local organizations on the bilingual naming proposals. A notice of the proposed bilingual geographical place name will also be posted on site and advertised in local English and Chinese newspapers for public consultation. The accepted street name will be published in the Government Gazette and accepted geographical place name will be shown on official maps published by LandsD.

As far as government buildings are concerned, they are usually named by the project proponents taking into account the nature of individual projects, and it is hard to make generalization.

Application of blockchain technology

15. **MR CHARLES PETER MOK** (in Chinese): President, in the "Hong Kong Smart City Blueprint", the Government has proposed promoting Fintech initiatives and exploring the application of distributed ledger technology ("DLT") in different areas, such as trade financing and cross-boundary remittances. Blockchain technology ("BCT") is a type of DLT. In October last year, the Hong Kong Monetary Authority ("HKMA") launched, in collaboration with 12 local banks, the eTradeConnect, which uses BCT as the backbone to facilitate trade settlement and financing. Furthermore, the application of BCT in supervisory and regulatory technology and other industries (e.g. Smart Contracts of the insurance industry and information authentication system) has gained
increasing popularity. It has been reported that the governments of a number of places are currently examining and allocating resources to the application of BCT in public services, in areas including identity authentication, anti-counterfeiting, and enhancement of the security of information system and data, with a view to improving the transparency in the processing of information and the efficiency of public administration, as well as saving in public expenditure. On the other hand, the application of BCT is not yet subject to regulation under the existing legislation. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the operation of eTradeConnect since its launch, including (i) a breakdown of the registered local banks and enterprises (set out by enterprise scale), and (ii) the number of cases in which trade transactions have been completed successfully through eTradeConnect and the amount of money involved; the follow-up actions taken after HKMA and the Monetary Authority of Singapore exchanged a Memorandum of Understanding, and the work progress achieved in connecting with the relevant platform in Singapore;

(2) whether it will, by drawing reference from the relevant studies and trial schemes of other advanced places, assess the potential of BCT in enhancing the efficiency of public services, as well as launch BCT trial schemes in areas such as handling of tax returns, land registration, voting and issuance of various types of identification documents;

(3) whether it will formulate strategies aiming at promoting a keen interest of applying BCT within the Government (e.g. requesting government departments to submit plans, objectives and timetables for trial uses of such technology, as well as formulating performance indicators); if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(4) whether it will allocate more funding for scientific research projects relating to BCT, formulate measures to encourage the application of such technology by commercial organizations, and draw up in the near future strategies for training BCT-related talents; if so, of the details and the timetable;
(5) whether it has examined regulating the application of BCT; if so, of the details; and

(6) of the respective details (including the numbers of participants) of the seminars, workshops, talks and training courses in relation to BCT organized last year by the Innovation and Technology Commission, the Office of the Government Chief Information Officer, the Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited, the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation, the Hong Kong Productivity Council as well as other relevant government departments and organizations?

SECRETARY FOR INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY (in Chinese): President, having consulted the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau, my reply to the six parts of the question is as follows:

(1) According to the information provided by the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau, eTradeConnect is fully funded by a consortium of 12 major banks in Hong Kong under the facilitation of the Hong Kong Monetary Authority ("HKMA"). Since the implementation of the platform is still at initial stage, it is premature to announce the specific registration and transaction numbers. Based on the feedback collected from users, banks have started the platform enhancement work, including enhancing its functionalities, preparing to connect the platform to different trade participants and overseas platforms, etc. The next round of customer acquisition will commence after the completion of the related enhancement work.

Since the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding between HKMA and the Monetary Authority of Singapore ("MAS"), the two authorities have discussed for several times the operation model and technical details of the "Global Trade Connectivity Network" and reached a consensus to some degree. HKMA and MAS are jointly working on the preparation work to identify a suitable solution provider. HKMA will announce more information in due course when available.
As we understand, the adoption of blockchain technology in public services is still at the exploratory and initial stage. The Office of the Government Chief Information Officer ("OGCIO") commenced in end 2018 the Pilot Application of Blockchain Technology Project to explore the applicability and benefits of adopting blockchain technology in government services. OGCIO is discussing with four departments (the Intellectual Property Department, the Companies Registry, the Environmental Protection Department and the Department of Health) on the implementation of pilot projects in areas including the transfer of intellectual property ownership, change in registered company information, etc. These pilot projects will be completed in phases from end 2019 to 2020.

The results and experience of the pilot projects will help government bureaux and departments ("B/Ds") consider adopting blockchain technology in their services, on matters such as the Internet connection speed requirements for handling a large quantity of transactions, the corresponding design and measures for maintaining information security, etc.

In addition, through the recently established Smart Government Innovation Lab, OGCIO will invite the industry to submit technology solutions and product suggestions, including the adoption of blockchain technology, that can address the service needs of and challenges being faced by B/Ds. OGCIO will also arrange proof-of-concept trials and technology testing for suitable solutions to help B/Ds better adopt information technology ("IT") in their businesses and services.

Through various funding schemes of the Innovation and Technology Fund ("ITF"), the Innovation and Technology Commission has been supporting the research and development work of research institutions, universities and private companies in various technology areas. In the past three years, ITF has supported 18 projects involving blockchain and Distributed Ledger Technology ("DLT") with a total funding amount of about $67.2 million.
As regards talent, the Re-industrialisation and Technology Training Programme under ITF subsidizes the staff of local enterprises to receive technology training, including those relating to blockchain technology. As for government personnel, OGCIO will provide structured training for all government IT staff in 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 so as to enhance their knowledge of and ability to apply various innovative technologies, including big data, artificial intelligence, blockchain, cloud computing, etc. In the long run, OGCIO will continue to provide suitable training for relevant staff having regard to the demand and technological development.

(5) At the present stage, relevant government departments will devise the plans to promote the adoption of blockchain technology in different public services with reference to the experience of the pilot projects and the new development of governments in other regions. Based on the demands of individual sectors in adopting related technologies in various areas (such as financial products, land registration, licence application, etc.), relevant government departments will also consider the need to introduce regulatory measures on such technological adoption in light of future development.

(6) In 2018-2019, OGCIO arranged a total of 13 seminars and courses on blockchain technology for government IT staff, with 270 participants in total.

Cyberport organized or supported the organization of 11 workshops and talks related to blockchain in 2018-2019, with over 450 participants. The concepts of blockchain technology, cryptocurrency, etc. were introduced to start-ups, students and industry participants.

Since January 2018, the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation has organized 13 seminars, workshops, talks and training courses related to blockchain and DLT, attracting over 700 participants. The Hong Kong Productivity Council has also organized blockchain technology-related activities during the same period, including the "Blockchain for Industry Applications Summit" in September 2018, as well as the "Supply Chain Traceability and Authentication by Blockchain" seminar in January 2019, which attracted nearly 300 participants in total.
In addition, Invest Hong Kong hosted the "Hong Kong Fintech Week" in October 2018, which featured panel discussions and new initiatives on blockchain applications, attracting around 2,000 participants.

Monitoring the administration of estates for charitable purposes

16. MR PAUL TSE (in Chinese): President, the estate of the late Mrs Nina WANG comprises the Chinachem Group with a net asset value of as high as HK$137 billion as at August last year. The Court of Final Appeal handed down a judgement in 2015, which held that the Chinachem Charitable Foundation (the "Foundation") was to hold the estate as a trustee rather than as a beneficiary which had received it as an unconditional absolute gift, and requested the Department of Justice to establish a supervisory managing organization to ensure that the Foundation would operate in accordance with the testamentary intention of Mrs WANG and use the estate for charitable purposes. So far, the incumbent Secretary for Justice ("SJ") and her predecessors have not submitted to the court any plan for establishing the supervisory managing organization. Furthermore, recently, SJ has been alleged to have failed to fulfill her duty as the protector of charities for having mishandled the over HK$10 billion estate for charitable purposes of the late "tycoon of hourly-rated hotels", and a lawsuit has been filed against SJ in a bid to holding her accountable. On the other hand, it has been reported that the Executive Committee of the Chinachem Group ("ECCG"), which is under the direction of the interim administrator ("the administrator") of the estate of Mrs WANG, recently relieved the duties of one of the members of the trustee on grounds that the person in question was allegedly involved in false investment projects on the Mainland and had allegedly divulged papers on ECCG making "abnormal termination payment" to the former chief executive officer of the Group. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it has inquired into the various acts, in which the trustee and the administrator were alleged to have been involved, of improper use of the assets of the Foundation; if so, of the outcome, if not, the reasons for that;

(2) whether, in view of the concerns of the media and the community regarding whether the estate of Mrs WANG has been misappropriated, it will make public the expenditures of the
Foundation; if it will not, of any credible means in place to convince members of the public that the Government can effectively monitor the operation of the Foundation;

(3) of the reasons why the incumbent SJ and her predecessors have so far not formulated any plan for establishing a supervisory managing organization for the Foundation; when the aforesaid estate can formally be used for charitable purposes;

(4) as it has been reported that an estate management fee of as high as HK$60 million per annum is being charged by the administrator, and that over HK$200 million have been charged since 2015, whether the Government has assessed the aggregated amount of management fees to be charged by the administrator before the estate can formally be used for charitable purposes;

(5) as it has been reported that SJ is considering a request of the Foundation for replacing the administrator, of the outcome of SJ's consideration;

(6) given that SJ has been criticized for the repeated delays and impropriety in handling sizeable estates for charitable purposes and thus causing unduly long delays in putting the relevant assets to charitable uses, whether the Government has assessed if such incidents will affect public confidence in SJ assuming the role as the protector of charities;

(7) as it is estimated that the sizeable estates to be used for charitable purposes in just the aforesaid two cases amount to HK$150 billion, whether the Government has assessed the negative impact on social welfare as a whole brought about by the unduly long delays in putting the relevant assets to charitable uses; and

(8) of the difficulties of and constraints on SJ's handling of her work as the protector of charities; the strategies in place to prevent problems such as mishandling of sizeable estates and unduly long delays in putting sizeable estates to charitable uses?
SECRETARY FOR JUSTICE (in Chinese): President, as the protector of charity, the Secretary for Justice has the role of safeguarding charitable interests. Under this principle, the Secretary for Justice can participate in the relevant legal proceedings, and assist the Court in the administration of charitable trusts. If there is sufficient information or evidence showing that a charitable organization may have breached the charitable trust, or there is maladministration prejudicing the beneficial interest of the charitable organization, the Department of Justice ("DoJ") will pay close attention to the administration and operation of the said charitable organization, and take such follow-up actions as may be appropriate, including seeking directions or appropriate relief from the Court.

Regarding Member's question in relation to the estate of the late Mrs Nina WANG and the estate of the late Mr YU Panglin, DoJ's consolidated reply is as follows:

I) The estate of the late Mrs Nina WANG ("NW Estate")

Mrs Nina WANG passed away in April 2007 leaving a home-made Chinese will dated 28 July 2002 ("the Will"). In May 2012, the Secretary for Justice, as the protector of charity, commenced proceedings in the Court of First Instance of the High Court seeking the Court's adjudication on the proper construction of the Will, in order to ensure proper management and ultimate distribution of the NW Estate.

The Court of Final Appeal handed down its judgment on 18 May 2015 and unanimously held that the Chinachem Charitable Foundation Limited ("the Foundation") should hold the entire estate as a trustee and would not receive any part of the estate as an absolute gift ("CFA Judgment").

(1) Latest developments regarding the scheme of administration ("Scheme")

DoJ has been actively following up on the Scheme in light of the blueprint laid down in the CFA Judgment on 18 May 2015, and has provided its proposed scheme. DoJ has been in contact with the Foundation's responsible persons to discuss the detailed arrangements of the Scheme, with a view to completing the relevant tasks as soon as possible. Nevertheless, parties are unable to reach consensus on some fundamental issues. Accordingly, DoJ had made an application to the Court on 29 March 2019 in respect of the relevant matters, to seek the Court's determination or directions, such that DoJ may continue to complete the remaining tasks. The relevant matters concern the propriety of the
Scheme proposed by DoJ and details thereof, including the setting up of a supervisory managing organization to monitor the Foundation as trustee. The Court has fixed a directions hearing on 13 June 2019. Given that legal proceedings have already been commenced, it would not be appropriate for us to publicly discuss any further details. DoJ will continue to closely follow up in order to ensure the early preparation and implementation of the Scheme, in order to handle the NW Estate in accordance with the wishes of the late Mrs Nina WANG.

Currently, the administration of the NW Estate is vested with the interim administrators appointed by the Court. DoJ has also filed a caveat against a grant of probate or administration to preserve the status quo pending a scheme to be set up and sanctioned by the Court.

(2) The work of the interim administrators

The current interim administrators are professional accountants appointed by the Court. Their principal responsibilities are to get in and preserve the properties of the NW Estate, including making enquiries as they deem reasonably necessary or taking out legal proceedings to ensure that the NW Estate is properly preserved. Besides, the relevant work also includes handling matters arising from the operation of the Chinachem Group. As the Chinachem Group is a big business conglomerate comprising numerous companies with multiple areas of business, the relevant work activities can be very complicated. The interim administrators have been making efforts to improve its governance structure, to ensure the smooth operation of various lines of corporate business. In discharge of their duties, the interim administrators would investigate and take follow-up actions against any irregularity known to them which might prejudice the proper preservation and management of the NW Estate. The interim administrators are also required to submit periodical reports to the Court, DoJ and the Foundation to account for the administration of the NW Estate.

As "officer of the Court", the interim administrators owe a duty to the Court on matters relating to the interim administration of the NW Estate. The Court may also give directions to the interim administrators if and when necessary. The work of the interim administrators has all along been monitored by the Court, including the consideration of the periodical reports and other relevant materials provided by them.
DoJ has, at all times, been paying close attention to the administration of the NW Estate and has been in frequent contact with the interim administrators, including considering the periodical reports provided by the interim administrators, approaching the interim administrators to further understand relevant matters, requesting the interim administrators to take follow-up actions and provide reports as the circumstances require, assisting the Court in legal proceedings taken out by the interim administrators, and seeking directions from the Court as may be required in the course of interim administration of such estate.

DoJ has noted that certain governors of the Foundation have been suspended from their duties in the Chinachem Group's Executive Committee; the termination payment made by the Chinachem Group to its former Chief Executive Officer; the requests for the change of the interim administrators, etc. DoJ will consider these matters thoroughly. It is not appropriate to make any comment at this stage. Generally speaking, if any misappropriation of the charitable assets by the administrator or trustee is found, DoJ being the protector of the charity can apply to the Court for the appropriate relief (including the change of the relevant personnel if necessary). DoJ will continue to closely monitor the interim administrators' work in managing and preserving the NW Estate, and take such follow-up actions as may be appropriate.

Regarding the fees of the interim administrators, they have been prescribed by the Court in the appointment order and are subject to the Court's scrutiny. Without the Court's order for disclosure, we are not in a position to disclose such information. DoJ and the Foundation have also been monitoring the fees charged by the interim administrators. Should DoJ and the Foundation consider the amount to be excessive or unreasonable, an application may be made to the Court for taxation of the fees, in order to ensure that the interim administrators' fees are maintained at a reasonable level.

As the protector of charity, the Secretary for Justice will actively follow up on the detailed arrangements for the implementation of the Will in the light of the blueprint laid down in the CFA Judgment, including handling the court proceedings already commenced and closely monitoring the management and preservation of the NW Estate with a view to protecting and safeguarding the charitable interest.
II) The estate of the late Mr YU Panglin ("YP Estate")

Regarding the estate of the "Clocktel Tycoon" (i.e. Mr YU Panglin), the Court of First Instance of the High Court, with the assistance of the Secretary for Justice as the protector of charity, handed down a judgment on 8 March 2018 after trial holding that the will of the late Mr YU was valid and confirmed the trustee of the YP Estate. As the YP Estate involves charitable interests, the Secretary for Justice has been paying attention to the management of the estate and will approach the trustee in order to further understand the administration of the charitable trust as appropriate.

Regarding the lawsuit filed against the Secretary for Justice as referred to in the question, the plaintiff alleges that the Secretary for Justice has failed to perform her duties as the protector of charity. Since there are ongoing legal proceedings, it is not appropriate for DoJ to make any further comments.

Preventing sexual harassment at universities

17. MR JIMMY NG (in Chinese): President, the findings of a study conducted last year by the Equal Opportunities Commission revealed that, among the university students surveyed, 15.6% (i.e. 2 259 persons) indicated that they had been sexually harassed on campus, and among them, 4.4% (i.e. 98 persons) indicated that the perpetrators were tutors, lecturers or professors. In addition, among the university students who had been sexually harassed on campus, off campus by fellow students or teaching staff, or online, only 2.5% (i.e. 84 persons) said that they had lodged complaints with the university to which they belonged. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it will request the various universities to (i) examine the mechanism for handling sexual harassment complaints, and (ii) review and improve the policy on prevention of sexual harassment; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(2) whether it will request the various universities to establish a committee to be headed by a Pro-Vice-Chancellor/Vice-President dedicated to taking forward the university's policy and initiatives on gender equality and prevention of sexual harassment on campus; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
(3) given that only a small number of university students who had been sexually harassed had lodged complaints with the university to which they belonged, whether the Government will request the various universities to set up an online complaint and reporting platform which guarantees information confidentiality and anonymity for students who have been sexually harassed to lodge complaints and for witnesses to provide information, with a view to encouraging victims to make reports and protecting them from being discriminated against; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(4) whether it will allocate additional resources to the various universities to enable them to step up efforts in spreading to university students via social media the message that they should be alert to sexual harassment; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(5) whether it will request the various universities to provide training to all newly recruited teaching staff on prevention of sexual harassment; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION (in Chinese): President, all universities in Hong Kong are independent and autonomous bodies. According to Section 39(2) of the Sex Discrimination Ordinance (Cap. 480), it is unlawful for a person who is a member of the staff of an educational establishment to sexually harass a person who is seeking to be, or who is, a student of the establishment. As an employer, an educational establishment must take "reasonably practicable steps" to prevent its employees from committing an act of sexual harassment. As such, universities are obliged to take reasonable and practical measures to prevent sexual harassment on campus, including laying down the relevant policy in writing and setting up a mechanism to handle complaints about sexual harassment.

The Government noted that all universities have put in place policies on the prevention and handling of sexual harassment, as well as complaint mechanisms and procedures, to ensure that every case is dealt with in a serious and impartial manner. Besides, these policies and mechanisms are subject to timely review. According to universities' policies, a member, employee or student of the university shall not sexually harass any other member, employee or student of the
university or any other person who has dealings with the university. The universities will definitely not condone or tolerate any form of sexual harassment and are committed to eliminating and preventing sexual harassment. Disciplinary actions will be taken against those who are found to have committed sexual harassment as and when necessary.

All universities have open policies on the prevention of sexual harassment and mechanisms for handling related complaints. They also provide support for those who are concerned about sexual harassment, have worries about being sexually harassed or have lodged sexual harassment complaints, and offer advice on the mechanisms and ways of handling allegations or complaints of sexual harassment. No one should circumvent such policies and mechanisms or prevent any persons involved from exercising their rights to complain, or else they may be deemed to have abused office and breached the code of practice for staff, and hence liable for disciplinary actions. Similarly, staff of the committees and secretariats responsible for handling sexual harassment complaints should follow the established procedures and deal with every case properly in accordance with the mechanism on confidentiality, with a view to ensuring confidentiality of the process and protecting the privacy of all parties concerned. Otherwise, they may also be considered to have neglected their duties and subject to disciplinary actions. As for potential sexual harassment cases that are not brought about by formal written complaints but come to the knowledge of the universities nevertheless, the universities will take appropriate follow-up actions with due regard to the wishes of the alleged victims, including initiating complaint and investigation procedures and providing support and assistance to them. Depending on the nature and evidence of the case, the university will also consider whether to follow up on individual anonymous complaints. Besides, apart from complaining to the institutions, alleged victims of sexual harassment may lodge a complaint direct with the Equal Opportunities Commission ("EOC") or bring civil proceedings in court. The internal complaint mechanisms of the institutions will in no way affect the alleged victims' rights to complain or litigate outside the institutions. For cases involving criminal offences, they will be referred to the police by the institutions concerned for further investigation.

The management of the universities will handle sexual harassment complaints carefully in deference to the established policies of the universities and the principles of fairness and impartiality. At present, the universities regularly arrange for their heads, deans, management, staff and students to attend training courses, seminars and talks on how to prevent and handle sexual
harassment, and invite the training officers of EOC to deliver talks on campus. The general education programmes offered by the universities have included modules or elements of sex education in general. Taking into account the actual circumstances on their campuses, the universities have also widely promoted their policies and measures for the prevention of sexual harassment through effective channels (including social media) by launching regular publicity and education activities on campus.

Following the release of the report of the "Break the Silence: Territory-wide Study on Sexual Harassment of University Students in Hong Kong" in January 2019, EOC respectively met with the Chairman of the University Grants Committee ("UGC"), the Convenor of the Heads of Universities Committee ("HUCOM") and Presidents and/or Vice-Presidents of individual universities to discuss possible measures for addressing sexual harassment in universities. Responses from the management of the universities were positive. HUCOM is pro-actively exploring the follow-up actions to be taken, including proposals on commissioning EOC to conduct a follow-up survey in three to five years' time and produce training materials for the universities, as well as creating the post of equal opportunities officer in university. UGC will actively consider providing the funding required having regard to the outcomes of the discussions between HUCOM and EOC and the proposals raised. Besides, some universities indicated that they would require all new students to attend a compulsory general education course on sexual harassment or explore mandatory online training for all staff.

The Education Bureau will continue to support the work of EOC, and follow up with UGC and HUCOM on the progress achieved by universities in the continuous enhancement of their policies on the prevention and handling of sexual harassment and the complaint mechanisms.

Working dogs under the various government departments

18. MR CHAN HAK-KAN (in Chinese): President, at present, some foreign governments have made arrangements about the use of working dogs by government departments, such as work conditions (e.g. weekly working hours), retirement ages and the protection for post-retirement living. Regarding the working dogs under the various government departments, will the Government inform this Council:
(1) of the government departments which currently use working dogs to perform duties, and set out the numbers of dogs by name of government department;

(2) of the details of the guidelines formulated by the various government departments on the use of working dogs to perform duties;

(3) of the details of the duties performed by working dogs under the various government departments;

(4) of the general weekly working hours for working dogs under the various government departments;

(5) whether the various government departments have set retirement ages for their working dogs; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(6) of the relevant expenditures incurred on and manpower deployed for managing working dogs by the various government departments in each of the past five years;

(7) of the numbers of working dogs euthanized in each of the past five years, and the reasons for that;

(8) of the current number of retired working dogs; whether the Government has provided them with support in their living (e.g. medical services); if so, of the details and the relevant expenditure in each of the past five years; if not, the reasons for that; and

(9) given that the Government plans to amend the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Ordinance (Cap. 169) to impose a "duty of care" on persons responsible for animals to look after their animals well, whether the Government will bring dog handlers of the various government departments within the scope of regulation; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?
SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Chinese): President, having consulted other departments, the Food and Health Bureau's reply to the various parts of the question is as follows:

(1) to (4)

Currently, six government departments, namely the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department ("AFCD"), Customs and Excise Department ("C&ED"), Correctional Services Department ("CSD"), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department ("FEHD"), Fire Services Department ("FSD") and Hong Kong Police Force ("HKPF"), have set up working dog units, assisting officers of the departments in performing various duties pertaining to the maintenance of law and order and the protection of public safety. These include quarantine and inspection, narcotics interdiction, search operation, investigation and patrol. The number of working dogs in the six departments is tabulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AFCD</th>
<th>C&amp;ED</th>
<th>CSD</th>
<th>FEHD</th>
<th>FSD</th>
<th>HKPF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of dogs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having regard to the duties of its working dogs and the actual circumstances, each department has formulated guidelines for managing and taking care of its working dogs, covering the scope of their daily duties, meal arrangements, rest schedules, management of their rest stations and their retirement plans. Working dogs of AFCD, C&ED, CSD, FEHD and HKPF work three to eight hours a day in general. Working dogs of FSD are responsible for providing support in fire investigation and assisting in the search for trapped victims or missing persons in rubble or mountainous areas during rescue operations. Given the special nature of their duties, FSD's working dogs and their respective dog handlers work on a "24 hours on, 24/48 hours off" shift system on a team basis.

(5) The above mentioned departments have drawn up retirement plans for their working dogs. Depending on the health conditions of individual working dogs and the veterinary advice, a working dog usually retires at the age of eight to nine.
(6) The average annual expenditures (including the salaries of dog handlers and supervisors, dog food and medical expenses) and the manpower involved in managing working dogs for the above six departments over the past five years are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AFCD</th>
<th>C&amp;ED</th>
<th>CSD</th>
<th>FEHD</th>
<th>FSD</th>
<th>HKPF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average annual expenditure ($0,000)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual manpower involved (number of staff)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
HKPF does not keep a breakdown of the expenditure on the management of police dogs.

(7) On average, three working dogs were euthanized by veterinary surgeons due to serious illness in each of the past five years.

(8) In general, handlers of working dogs will have priority over others when applying for adopting the retired working dogs. However, not every handler is able to adopt the dog due to personal reasons or constraints of his/her living environment. Some of the retired dogs are adopted by interested parties, subject to the assessment of the relevant department. Working dogs awaiting for adoption or those that are not adopted will be arranged to live their full span in the relevant departments. In the past five years, there were a total of 213 retired working dogs in the above six departments. The Government does not keep a breakdown of the expenditure involved in keeping retired working dogs.

(9) The Government is now consulting the public on proposals for strengthening the protection of animal welfare, including imposing a duty of care on a person responsible for an animal. As the persons responsible for their working dogs, dog handlers in the relevant departments also have the responsibility to take reasonable steps to ensure that the welfare needs of their dogs are met. We will finalize the details of the proposals in the light of the views received during the consultation period.
Sickness allowance

19. MR LUK CHUNG-HUNG (in Chinese): President, under the Employment Ordinance (Cap. 57), an employee employed under a continuous contract who has taken a sick leave for not less than four consecutive days is entitled to a sickness allowance, provided that other statutory requirements are met. Some employees have relayed to me that as no sickness allowance will be payable to them if they take a sick leave for less than four consecutive days, they strain themselves to go to work even when they are sick. In addition, as the early symptoms of certain infectious diseases are mild, the risk of such infectious diseases spreading will increase if employees who have contracted those diseases still go to work as usual. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it encouraged private enterprises and institutions in the past three years to (i) handle their employees' requests for taking sick leave in a sympathetic manner during the surges of measles and influenza, and (ii) grant a sickness allowance to their employees who have taken a sick leave for less than four consecutive days; if so, of the details; if not, whether it will do so in the future;

(2) whether the Government, being the largest employer in Hong Kong, will (i) take the lead in granting a sickness allowance to all of its contract staff members who have taken a sick leave for less than four consecutive days and have met other statutory requirements, and (ii) require contractors of outsourced service contracts to follow suit; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(3) whether it will, in the long run, introduce legislative amendments to (i) stipulate that an employee who takes a sick leave for less than four consecutive days is also entitled to a sickness allowance, and (ii) raise the daily rate of the sickness allowance from 80% of the daily average wage earned by the employee during the 12-month period before the sick leave to 100% of that amount; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?
SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND WELFARE (in Chinese): President, having consulted the Civil Service Bureau and the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau, I provide a consolidated reply to the Member's question as follows:

(1) The Labour Department ("LD") has all along been promoting to employers and employees their obligations, rights and benefits under the Employment Ordinance ("EO") (Cap. 57) through a wide range of publicity activities. LD also actively promulgates good human resource management practices and encourages employers to provide to their employees employment benefits which are more favourable than those required under the law in order to help establish harmonious labour relations. Relevant publicity activities include distributing leaflets and promotional materials, displaying posters, publishing feature articles through newspapers and online media, placing advertisements at periodic journals of major employers' associations and trade union federations, etc. As far as LD is aware, many enterprises and organizations provide sickness allowances to their employees who have taken sick leave of less than four consecutive days, having regard to their own human resource management practices and the situation of individual staff.

(2) For part (i) in the question, as advised by the Civil Service Bureau, under the Non-Civil Service Contract ("NCSC") Staff Scheme, bureaux/departments ("B/Ds") may determine the entitlements of NCSC staff to sickness days and sickness allowance, provided that they are no less favourable than those provided in EO, or else the arrangement should be made according to EO. In the past three years, about 90% of full-time(1) NCSC staff enjoyed more favourable sick leave entitlement than those provided in EO. They were allowed to take paid sick leave for less than four days on top of the sick leave entitlement provided in EO. Given the nature of the NCSC Staff Scheme, it is the Government's policy to allow B/Ds due flexibility in the employment of NCSC staff. B/Ds may, having regard to their operational and service needs, as well as the specific needs of individual job's nature, determine the employment and

(1) "Full-time" employment means employment under a "continuous contract" as defined by EO. According to the Ordinance, an employee is regarded as being employed under a continuous contract if he/she works continuously for the same employer for four weeks or more, with at least 18 hours in each week.
related matters of staff, including whether paid sick leave for less than four consecutive days is provided. B/Ds may consider each case based on its own merits. Across-the-board arrangement is not appropriate. Notwithstanding this, the Civil Service Bureau has reminded B/Ds from time to time to enhance the terms and conditions of NCSC staff on a discretionary basis if situation warrants, and to conduct periodic reviews and pay adjustment to ensure that the employment package remains competitive with the prevailing employment market situation. As regards part (ii) in the question, according to the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau, the employees of Government Service Contractors do not have employment relationship with the Government, and they are entitled to the protection under EO (including sickness allowance) like other employees.

(3) Under EO, an employee is entitled to sickness allowance equivalent to four fifths of his/her average daily wages if he/she can produce appropriate medical certificate for sick leave of not less than four consecutive days and fulfils other statutory requirements (e.g. sufficient number of paid sickness days being accumulated). EO only sets out the minimum standards of rights and benefits for employees under the law. The Government always encourages individual employers, having regard to their own business operations and affordability, to offer employment benefits (including sickness allowance) above the statutory standards to their employees.

Since the introduction of sickness allowance under EO, the relevant provisions have been reviewed from time to time. Apart from gradually raising the rate of sickness allowance from one half to the current level of four fifths of an employee's average daily wages, the maximum number of paid sickness days to be accumulated has been progressively increased from the initial 24 days to the present 120 days. In addition, the medical professionals recognized under EO for certifying an employee's incapability to work in consequence of sickness or injury have been extended from registered medical practitioners to cover also registered dentists and registered Chinese medicine practitioners, thus affording employees more options on treatment.
An employee's absence from work owing to illness is not necessarily work-related. In apportioning the financial loss arising from an employee's illness, there is a need to take into account the interests of both employers and employees. Given that sickness allowance is payable for sick leave of four consecutive days or more, the present provisions have served to provide a certain level of protection to eligible employees if they need to take a longer period of sick leave. The Government has no plan to make amendments to the concerned provisions at this stage.

Incidents of pigs in slaughterhouses infected with infectious diseases

20. MR SHIU KA-FAI (in Chinese): President, immediately upon confirming on the afternoon of the 10th of this month that African Swine Fever ("ASF") virus had been found in a pig sample from Sheung Shui Slaughterhouse ("SSSSH"), the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department ("AFCD") announced that all pigs in SSSH would be culled. In addition, the operation of SSSH was suspended for more than one week for thorough cleansing and disinfection. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) given that ASF is transmitted only among pigs and does not infect humans, nor does it pose a food safety risk, of the measures the Government took in the past and will take in future to publicize this message among members of the public, so as to maintain public confidence in pork consumption;

(2) whether it will, after duly consulting stakeholders, establish a compensation mechanism in respect of such kind of incidents; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

(3) whether it has studied how the process of cleansing and disinfection of SSSH can be expedited in future, with a view to shortening its closure period as far as practicable; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

(4) whether it has summed up the experience gained from this incident for formulating a standard practice for handling similar incidents in future; if so, of the details?
SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND HEALTH (in Chinese): President,

(1) Since the first African Swine Fever ("ASF") case occurred on the Mainland in August 2018, the relevant government departments have been widely disseminating information to the public and stakeholders about the prevention of ASF, including the messages that ASF will not be transmitted to humans and well-cooked pork is safe for consumption, through different means and channels such as government websites, announcement of public interest, radio soundtracks, and social media platforms etc. The Food and Environmental Hygiene Department ("FEHD") has also enhanced publicity by putting up posters in MTR train compartments and at various control points, as well as disseminating information via social media to promote the message that it is an offence to carry raw meat into Hong Kong without a health certificate.

(2) Under the existing mechanism, each pig culled will be compensated by the Government according to the market price of its type. We will liaise with the trade on the details of the compensation arrangement.

(3) and (4)

The Government declared the Sheung Shui Slaughterhouse ("SSSH") as an infected place after a pig sample collected therein was tested positive for ASF virus on 10 May 2019 and carried out thorough cleansing and disinfection after culling all the pigs kept therein to prevent the virus from spreading beyond SSSH. This is the general international practice in handling ASF infected places.

The cleansing and disinfection work carried out at SSSH was conducted after clearance and completed smoothly on 18 May with the concerted efforts of the slaughterhouse operator and relevant stakeholders. In the light of this experience, FEHD will continue maintaining dialogue with the trade to fine-tune the process with a view to shortening the closure period of the slaughterhouse as far as practicable.
In addition, we will review the existing preventive measures and contingency plans for controlling ASF, and identify any areas for improvement in future, in view of this incident.

Providing financial assistance to victims of marine traffic accidents

21. MR HOLDEN CHOW (in Chinese): President, in response to a vessel collision incident near Lamma Island that happened on 1 October 2012, the Government announced on 18 October 2012 that the Marine Department ("MD") would, in consultation with the trade, explore the implementation of 10 improvement measures. One of the measures was to consider, by drawing reference from the Traffic Accident Victims Assistance ("TAVA") Scheme, whether a Marine Traffic Accident Victims Assistance ("M-TAVA") Scheme should be introduced. On the other hand, the Government set up a Steering Committee on Systemic Reform of the Marine Department ("Steering Committee") on 3 May 2013 to advise and steer the Director of Marine on undertaking a comprehensive systemic review and reform. The Steering Committee indicated in its final report published in April 2016 that having considered the findings of a consultancy study, it had agreed not to introduce an M-TAVA Scheme at the present stage. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

1) of the assistance schemes through which the Government currently provides financial assistance to victims of marine traffic accidents;

2) in respect of each of the assistance schemes mentioned in (1), of (i) the respective numbers of marine traffic accident victims to whom financial assistance was provided, and (ii) the total amounts of subsidy granted to such persons, in each year since 2012; and

3) whether it will consider extending the scope of the TAVA Scheme to cover victims of marine traffic accidents; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Chinese): President, in response to Mr Holden CHOW's question, in consultation with the Marine Department ("MD"), the Social Welfare Department and the Home Affairs Department, our reply is as follows:
In October 2012, the Government announced that it would take forward 10 measures to enhance marine safety. One of these measures was to consider, by drawing reference to the Traffic Accident Victims Assistance ("TAVA") Scheme, whether a Marine Traffic Accident Victims Assistance ("M-TAVA") Scheme should be set up. Subsequently, MD engaged a consultant to study the feasibility of establishing the M-TAVA Scheme, as well as whether or not the TAVA Scheme could be extended to cover victims of marine traffic accidents. After careful examination and consultation with the trade, the consultant found that the definition of a marine traffic accident was more complicated than that of a road traffic accident and that the probability of a marine traffic accident was relatively lower. The severity of marine traffic accidents was also found to be different from that of road traffic accidents. Furthermore, should the coverage of the relevant assistance scheme be expanded to cover victims of marine traffic accidents, a levy would need to be imposed on the vessel trade to cover the financial assistance granted in cases of marine traffic accidents. Since the number of vessels was much smaller than that of vehicles, it was estimated that a rather high levy would need to be charged and the vessel trade would have concern with regard to the associated financial burden. In view of the considerations above, the consultant concluded that it was impracticable to expand the coverage of the existing TAVA Scheme to include victims of marine traffic accidents. The Government accepted the findings and recommendations of the consultancy study, and reported the relevant findings of the study to the Legislative Council Panel on Economic Development in 2015, and received support from Members.

While at present there is yet to be a dedicated financial assistance scheme set up for victims of marine traffic accidents, there are nonetheless numerous charitable trusts and funds administered by the Government or other organizations which could provide emergency financial relief to victims of marine traffic accidents. These include the Hong Kong Jockey Club Charities Trust, the General Chinese Charities Fund, the Special Aid Fund, the Tang Shiu Kin and Ho Tim Charitable Fund, etc. Given the various charitable trusts and funds involved, the large volume and diverse backgrounds across different types of application cases they receive, as well as the individual processes and mechanisms of handling, sorting and recording approved cases used in each charitable trust/fund, we do not have the readily available breakdown on the financial assistance granted to victims of marine traffic accidents by each assistance scheme and thus cannot provide the relevant information.
Repair and maintenance of recreational facilities in public rental housing estates

22. MR WILSON OR (in Chinese): President, some residents of public rental housing ("PRH") estates have complained that it has often been the case that the repair/replacement of recreational facilities (e.g. slides, health walkers and table tennis tables) in the estates has yet to be completed long after they were out of order or damaged, and individual facilities have been out of use for periods of time spanning years. Regarding the repair and maintenance of recreational facilities in PRH estates, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) of the current arrangements for the repair and maintenance of recreational facilities; the number of contractors to which the Housing Department has currently outsourced such work;

(2) of (i) the number and percentage of recreational facilities that were out of use because they were out of order or had been damaged, and (ii) the average time taken for repairing/replacing such facilities, in each of the past three financial years; and

(3) whether it has set any target completion time or performance pledge in respect of the repair/replacement work for recreational facilities that are out of order or damaged; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

SECRETARY FOR TRANSPORT AND HOUSING (in Chinese): President, my consolidated reply to Mr Wilson OR's question is as follows:

Under the concept of "communal play areas", the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") provides recreational facilities in its Public Rental Housing ("PRH") estates to provide a comfortable, healthy and safe living environment for PRH residents of different age groups.

The installation and repair works of the play/fitness equipment in PRH estates are conducted by agents in HA's "Play/Fitness Equipment Agents Reference List" (the "Reference List"). At present, there are five qualified agents in the "Reference List". HA requires the agents to provide safety certificates and warranty periods for the facilities installed by them to ensure that
they satisfy the international safety standards. In order to avoid affecting the existing safety certificates of the play/fitness equipment, HA adopts "repairing by original agents" strategy in which repair works are done by the original agents to ensure that the equipment can meet the safety standard of the original design, safeguarding the safety of the residents. Apart from regular inspection of the play/fitness equipment, HA also engages independent safety consultant to carry out inspections every two years and submit reports and recommendations to HA to ensure proper maintenance and repair of the play/fitness equipment.

HA has been closely monitoring the performance of all play/fitness equipment agents. In the past three years (i.e. 2016, 2017 and 2018), there were 418, 446 and 500 works conducted to repair the play/fitness equipments respectively. The average time required for the repair works were 34, 24 and 36 days respectively. In case the defective situation of the above mentioned equipment may affect the safety of the users, HA would fence off those play/fitness equipment before commencing the repair work. Since HA does not keep statistics on temporary suspension of equipment, we are not able to provide the percentage of suspension due to defects.

Separately, when some of the old types of equipment are seriously damaged and beyond repair, HA will replace them, and invite agents in the "Reference List" to submit initial designs. HA will conduct the tendering exercise after consulting the residents through the Estate Management Advisory Committees. HA will also request the awarded agents to complete the works as soon as possible. As it takes time to go through the stages of design, consultation, tendering and installation, the time required to install new equipment is longer than that of normal repair work of existing equipment.

There are many different types of play/fitness equipment and their scale vary, the scope of repair works and the required spare parts are also different. Therefore, HA is not able to establish a pledge time for the repair works of the play/fitness equipment. However, once the repair proposals have been confirmed by the agents, HA will require the agents to put up notices to clearly indicate the scope of the repair works, the expected completion date and contact number for enquiries. Most of the repair works could be completed before the expected completion date.
MEMBER'S MOTION ON SUBSIDIARY LEGISLATION/INSTRUMENT

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Member's motion on subsidiary legislation and instrument.

 Proposed resolution under the Interpretation and General Clauses Ordinance to extend the period for amending five items of subsidiary legislation in relation to the Central Military Dock, which were laid on the Table of this Council on 8 May 2019.

 I call upon Mr WONG Ting-kwong to speak and move the motion.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO EXTEND THE PERIOD FOR AMENDING SUBSIDIARY LEGISLATION

MR WONG TING-KWONG (in Cantonese): At the meeting of the House Committee on 10 May 2019, Members agreed to form a subcommittee to study the five items of subsidiary legislation in relation to the Central Military Dock.

 In my capacity as Chairman of the Subcommittee, I now move a motion to extend the scrutiny period of the five items of subsidiary legislation to 26 June 2019.

 President, I urge Members to support this motion.

Mr WONG Ting-kwong moved the following motion:

"RESOLVED that in relation to the—

(a) Protected Places (Amendment) Order 2019, published in the Gazette as Legal Notice No. 66 of 2019;

(b) Protected Places (Safety) (Authorized Guards) (Amendment) Order 2019, published in the Gazette as Legal Notice No. 67 of 2019;
(c) Military Installations Closed Areas (Amendment) Order 2019, published in the Gazette as Legal Notice No. 68 of 2019;

(d) Shipping and Port Control (Amendment) Regulation 2019, published in the Gazette as Legal Notice No. 69 of 2019; and

(e) Merchant Shipping (Local Vessels) (General) (Amendment) Regulation 2019, published in the Gazette as Legal Notice No. 70 of 2019,

and laid on the table of the Legislative Council on 8 May 2019, the period for amending subsidiary legislation referred to in section 34(2) of the Interpretation and General Clauses Ordinance (Cap. 1) be extended under section 34(4) of that Ordinance to the meeting of 26 June 2019."

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

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Mr WONG Ting-kwong be passed. 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.

MEMBERS' MOTIONS

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Debates on motions with no legislative effect.

Motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive".

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

I call upon Mr Andrew WAN to speak and move the motion.

MOTION ON "VOTE OF NO CONFIDENCE IN THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE"

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): President, I move that the motion, as printed on the Agenda, i.e. the motion of no confidence in Chief Executive Carrie Lam proposed by me, be passed. Next, I am going to expound on my reasons and views.

President, it has almost been 22 years since the reunification. Hong Kong has gone through many ups and downs, tough moments, batters and challenges. Except a few of them which were attributed to natural disasters, most of them were unfortunately attributed to man-made disasters of the Government's doing, particularly the political crises as well as social conflicts and dissension triggered by the poor leadership of or even initiated by the former Chief Executives and the incumbent. In the past, people criticized TUNG Chee-hwa and chastised LEUNG Chun-ying for being incompetent or belligerent, who continually executed political missions assigned by the Beijing authorities in a bid to tighten freedom in Hong Kong, mute the voices of Hong Kong people, ban the Hong Kong Alliance in Support of Patriotic Democratic Movements of China and legislate for Article 23 of the Basic Law. But President, given the public resistance by the united and unyielding Hong Kong people who refused to be resigned to fate, they could not have their way easily and succeed.
Nevertheless, the performance of Chief Executive Carrie LAM is outstanding, knowing that there is simply no need to legislate for Article 23 of the Basic Law as long as she can get the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") over and done with. As a start, she introduced amendments to FOO, striking a direct blow at "one country, two systems" and demolishing Hong Kong's rule of law system and the firewall against the Mainland, and by transferring Hong Kong people to the Mainland for trial, they can be silenced or even be killed. If we say that LEUNG Chun-ying, labeled "CY the wolf", has used equivocation, and some members of the public also criticize the former Chief Executive for his viciousness when facing opinion and ruthlessness in administration, then I would say Carrie LAM's recent performance and remarks in respect of the amendments to FOO have gone from vicious to insidious. Such insidiousness is characterized by her wicked intentions, sugar-coated plots, bold lies and perversion of the truth. She has attempted to mislead the public and the international community, acting as if she is the only one in the right and everyone else is wrong in the whole world. Recently, Carrie LAM has even repeatedly dismissed all opinions and voices as nonsense, thus prompting me to propose this motion of no confidence in her today.

About three years ago when Carrie LAM was still a Chief Executive candidate, she certainly sweet talked to all people in Hong Kong. President, let me particularly quote two lines from her Manifesto, one of which is that her election slogan is "WeConnect", and if she became the Chief Executive, her priority would be to unite everyone in society and connect with the general masses to develop our economy, improve people's livelihood, promote a more democratic society and re-ignite hope for our next generation. As to the other one, based on my understanding, it should be a solemn pledge to the entire community in Hong Kong. According to her, if the mainstream opinion of Hong Kong people renders her no longer able to continue to be in office as Chief Executive, she will resign. Unfortunately, President, the first pledge has been broken because, since her assumption of office, Carrie LAM has done way too many things not connecting with Hong Kong people but acting perversely. I will point them out one by one later on. But President, for the second one, she still has a chance to deliver.

(THE PRESIDENT'S DEPUTY, MS STARRY LEE, took the Chair)
According to the latest opinion poll done by the University of Hong Kong, Carrie LAM scores 44.7 marks, and 59% of the public oppose her as Chief Executive, which is close to 60%. What percentage will be regarded by her as mainstream opinion? Deputy President, does 60% still not make the mainstream opinion? If you get 60% of the votes in an election, you will become the Chief Executive, right? It can be regarded as a landslide victory, right? Is 60% still not the mainstream opinion? Does she need to deliver? Will it be regarded as the mainstream opinion only when the net rate drops to negative 99 percentage points? Who are the remaining ones not among these 99 percentage points? Only her and the bootlicking vassals surrounding her. Deputy President, Carrie LAM can take a vigorous move to make good her pledge. But certainly, I will not hold such an optimistic and simplistic belief that someone like her will ever walk her talk. No matter what, we have to quote her words in order to set the record straight in history.

Since her assumption of office, Carrie LAM has not only failed to unite society, but also outdone her predecessors in tearing it apart. We all know how awesome LEUNG Chun-ying is, who is ridiculed as "CY the wolf" by the general public. But Carrie LAM has outdone him. For what LEUNG Chun-ying could not achieve, she made it; for what TUNG Chee-hwa could not achieve, she made it as well. In addition, she also "DQ" (disqualified) Members, pushed through the co-location arrangement, suppressed dissent and at the same time let go of "689" and Mr Holden CHOW, and instituted political prosecutions that created a large number of political offenders, while major works projects were plagued by blunders and falsification. Deputy President, such things are simply too numerous to list, and if the same happens in a foreign country, such gravity will already constitute a sufficient ground for a head of state to step down. Fearing that we are not doomed yet, Chief Executive Carrie LAM has taken a further step to actively undermine "one country, two systems", amending FOO on the pretext of the Taiwan homicide case to place Hong Kong people at the mercy of China by extraditing them to the Mainland for trial, thereby dragging Hong Kong society, our economy and the rule of law system into the same grave. She is downright vicious!

Deputy President, the Government's amendment of FOO this time around has provoked widespread uneasiness and aroused grave concern among the international community. A number of places have expressed their intentions to not only abolish the extradition arrangements with Hong Kong, but also impose economic sanctions on Hong Kong. Facing the prevailing atmosphere troubled by the China-United States trade war, public officers have also indicated that the
economy is actually going down. What prompts her to throw a few more grenades to ruin members of the public in Hong Kong and our economy? Is it not enough just to drag our people into the same grave? Who will be held accountable in case of trouble? Will Carrie LAM alone be held fully accountable? How will she be held accountable? How can she be held accountable? Will she go back to the United Kingdom? How can we pursue her responsibility? In case the economy is impacted by a collapse of the property and stock markets, what should we do? But we can only wait and see.

As we all know, Deputy President, Hong Kong people are full of worries about the rule of law system on the Mainland, and see clearly the absence of the rule of law there. I am utterly astonished by the remark of a pro-establishment figure that "an open, sunshine judicial system" has been implemented on the Mainland. If that is the case, then they should not be overwhelmed by worries, requesting that the threshold of extraditable offences be adjusted to imprisonment of seven years. John LEE has made concessions to the business sector, right? Certainly, we have no objection to the concessions made, but retraction of the bill is the best course of action. There is no reason for the Government to make concessions only to the fat cats in the business sector who have expressed strong views. Are ordinary members of the public not human beings? Why are they given the cold shoulder?

Hong Kong people are well aware of the situation on the Mainland, where political imprisonment is commonplace, with concentration camps and education camps. Picking quarrels and provoking troubles can be termed as subverting the State, and people can get a glimpse of the life inside those notorious prisons where inmates, denied visits by family members, have gone missing for several years whose whereabouts and fate remain unknown. After being sentenced to jail, they are denied visits and may even be "suicided". Deputy President, this is no alarmist talk, and there are precedents. We vividly recall what happened to LI Wangyang, LIU Xiaobo and WANG Quanzhang, all bearing eloquent testimony to it.

Perhaps Carrie LAM remains obstinate and finds such claims unacceptable. But I hope someday she will see for herself and let us know. On the FOO amendment, Carrie LAM has done one thing that greatly irritates Hong Kong people, including me, that is, she keeps lying. Deputy President, you must allow me to use these words because she really is lying. I am going to substantiate this with evidence. If I am wrong, you can rule that I have made a misstatement.
Why do I say that she is lying? The first occasion was the Question and Answer Session of this Council more than a month ago, where I asked her why she took the initiative to undermine "one country, two systems" and the undertaking that "river water did not intrude into well water". And it was a solemn covenant made between the Central Government and Hong Kong people before the reunification, without which there would not be the pledges in the Basic Law and "one country, two systems". Yet she rejected the claim, pointing out that there was no firewall, and that it was a loophole to be plugged. Deputy President, all those who have read history will not agree with such interpretations and views advanced by Carrie LAM. Given her intelligence and talent, I do not believe it was a slip of the tongue she made. Also, being a high-ranking official of the colony back in those days, she could not have no idea about the line of historical development back then. Apparently, her statement was an intentional attempt to call a stag a horse.

In amending FOO, Carrie LAM keeps telling a lie even now, and some public officers also parrot her lines, stating the urgency of the Taiwan homicide case which warrants prompt action. Why should she feel a sense of urgency? The Mainland Affairs Council of Taiwan has made its position clear several times, but she turned a deaf ear and just kept talking about the urgency. The other party thus gave her a snub, expressly stating that no extradition would be sought under the mechanism of the amended FOO. We in the pro-democracy camp are actually most pragmatic. A number of Honourable colleagues, including Mr Alvin YEUNG and me, have put forth some proposals. Certainly, we may further discuss the technical details, and I see no problem with that. But surprisingly, the Secretary for Justice has refuted us, claiming that our proposals are unfeasible, yet hers are no better, such as the point concerning retrospective effect. I am really baffled. Why can they not show some sincerity in settling the issue? There really seems to be strong political motives and reasons behind it.

Certainly, the hidden agenda has recently come to light. Quite a number of Honourable colleagues from the pro-establishment camp had an audience with HAN Zheng and relayed some so-called opinions with legal authority after the meeting. We have then realized that the China extradition law is not that simple. It deals not only with the extradition arrangements for Hong Kong people committing the some 40 offences, or some 30 offences as revised, on the Mainland. Some have even pointed out the possibility of extraditing a Hongkonger perpetrating acts that threaten national security or a foreigner
perpetrating acts that threaten China or Chinese nationals. I see that the Government has not refuted such a remark that seems to be sorely mistaken to all appearances. Is it a future goal of "2.0"? Or is it a desired outcome under the framework subsequent to this legislative amendment exercise? The public officers owe the community an explanation.

I have found another thing rather amusing about Carrie LAM's habitual lying. A few days ago, Honourable colleagues from the pro-democracy camp floated the idea of holding a debate as a resolute attempt to break the deadlock between both sides. To put it simply, Carrie LAM is such a "good fighter", acting as if she is the most powerful person in the whole world, while those foreign envoys and heads of states are all wrong, and it is also foolish of the 28 countries of the European Union to issue the so-called diplomatic notes, which is a stupid thing to do. She is number one, but she has to battle with no one else but our Mr James TO only. I have great respect for "Ah TO", but from Carrie LAM's point of view, she should be crowned "world number one". Why does she lack the courage to pick up the gauntlet? Citing a downright ridiculous reason, she has again called a stag a horse and slipped in a straw argument—Deputy President, I see it as lying—indicating that a debate should be held in the Legislative Council, which is the best venue.

Buddy, what was she talking about? We certainly know that the Legislative Council is a place for debates, where debates can be held among Members or political parties on their different political views. But we are now talking about the gauntlet thrown down by Members mostly from the pro-democracy camp in the Legislative Council to Carrie LAM as head of the executive authorities, who was challenged for a debate with us. Since she has presented her arguments in a plausible manner with such a strong basis, a debate should be held. We now accuse her of lying, and she can refute us. If we are wrong, then we are the ones who are lying. If she claims that it involves Taiwan, she should present justifications, right? If she now holds that the amendments to FOO are feasible, a debate should be held. Why does she lack the courage to do so? Carrie LAM has again refused to pick up the gauntlet.

After all, Carrie LAM's bark is worse than her bite. In fact, she only attempts to get away with it. Carrie LAM is now behaving in precisely the manner criticized by our Chairman, Mr WU Chi-wai, earlier. In the last Question and Answer session, he chastised Carrie LAM for being a person with servility and party sense, but no empathy and humanity. I think he missed one point. Judging from the latest developments over the past few days, I wish to add that she also has a thief instinct. What is a thief instinct? Troubled by a
guilty conscience, she dares not face all Hong Kong people because the debate will surely be televised, right? Will she be knocked out by Mr James TO in no time? Particularly after seeing the courageous performance of "Ah TO" earlier, has Carrie LAM been so scared that she dares not pick up the gauntlet?

Deputy President, Carrie LAM also told an awful lie recently, misleading those foreign envoys as if they were fools. She said they were deceived by many from the pro-democracy camp who claimed that their nationals would be arrested after coming to Hong Kong, which was actually an invented story. Why is it an invented story? The framework of the Ordinance is clear. Does it set out any restrictions? Will a law-breaking tourist not be arrested? Are there such provisions? Not at all. All persons coming to Hong Kong will be bound by the mechanism under the amended FOO, and may be extradited to China. Why did Carrie LAM lie through her teeth again, calling it an invented story? Certainly, it will not happen to an ordinary tourist. Did she want to model on "689"? She was smarter than "689" because "689" was accused of equivocating as soon as he spoke, but she almost managed to muddle it through. It was only when we chewed her words afterwards did we realize she was such a wicked person.

Deputy President, I have noticed a recent wave of voices from the pro-establishment camp, talking about the Eight-Nation Alliance, and so on. The first thing that popped up in my mind was, I wondered why their emotional attachment to monarchy had not eased a bit over the years, and they still saw things with a servitude mentality. But those who make such remarks should first tell us the persons to whom Empress Dowager Cixi the traitor and Emperor Guangxu are referred, and point out the corresponding figures on the Mainland. More importantly, are they themselves an embodiment of the Boxers? That is, does it mean that they can sort things out just by making some remarks that whip up nationalist sentiments with no logic at all?

One last point, Deputy President, 22 years since the reunification, I hope our Chief Executive and the attending public officers can act in the overall interest of Hong Kong. I am aware of the great deal of political pressure and missions involved, but will they please act according to conscience. If they really cannot cope, will they please step down. In view of the foregoing and Carrie LAM's betrayal of public trust and her own election pledges, today I have proposed the motion of no confidence in her, which I hope will have the support of Honourable colleagues.
In addition, I notice that our Honourable colleague Ms Claudia MO has proposed an amendment. It also has my support because basically, "Auntie MO"s amendment largely echoes what I said just now. I would like to listen to Ms Claudia MO's arguments later on. Meanwhile, it does not matter even if Honourable colleagues from the pro-establishment camp disagree with my views because today is an opportunity for debate. But Carrie LAM still owes us an open debate. Thank you, Deputy President.

**DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Mr Andrew WAN, please move your motion.

**MR ANDREW WAN** (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I move that the motion, as printed on the Agenda, be passed. Deputy President, I already did so once earlier.

Mr Andrew WAN moved the following motion: (Translation)

"That this Council has no confidence in the Chief Executive, Mrs Carrie LAM."

**DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): I remind Members not to say "the Chief Executive 'is lying'" in their speeches because this expression has been ruled unparliamentary by the President of the Legislative Council. I remind all Members again that if Members use offensive and insulting language or unparliamentary expressions, I will ask the Members concerned to withdraw such remarks. If the Members concerned do not withdraw them, I will regard it as disorderly behaviour.

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

**DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Mr Andrew WAN, what is your point of order?
MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): Deputy President, "lying" is a Cantonese expression, but there are many different Chinese expressions, including the "訛 (ngo⁴)" of "林鄭月訛" (Carrie LAM the liar) as shown on the placard in front of me, as well as "calling a stag a horse", "calling black white" and "failing to tell right from wrong". Deputy President, are all such remarks not to be used?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I made it very clear just now, and expressions which have been ruled by the President of the Legislative Council as offensive and insulting language or unparliamentary are set out in the relevant papers. Will Members please comply with the Rules of Procedures ("RoP").

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

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

MS CLAUDIA MO: What if I do it in English? I was told that to call somebody a liar is indeed a bit insolent. But, if you call that person mistaken or misinformed, it would be a nicer way of addressing the problem. So, what do you think?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I believe Members are aware of the need to comply with RoP in making speeches.

MS CLAUDIA MO: Do you understand my question?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I think I have responded to your question.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Mr Andrew WAN be passed.
DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Claudia MO will move an amendment to this motion. This Council will conduct a joint debate on the motion and the amendment.

I now call upon Ms Claudia MO to speak but she may not move the amendment at this stage.

MS CLAUDIA MO (in Cantonese): My amendment mainly seeks to facilitate a more focused discussion on Mr Andrew WAN's motion. The Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge, the co-location arrangement and the disqualification of six pro-democracy Members are all reasons for which we may cast a vote of no confidence in Carrie LAM, but our discussion should be better focused. The matter under discussion now is the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 which enables extradition to the Mainland. Hong Kong has already been placed in a coffin. Now, she simply wants to hammer the final nail by dealing a serious blow to the rule of law in Hong Kong. Let us leave aside the livelihood and economic issues for the time being.

On the Internet, many people named LEUNG Chun-ying "father of Hong Kong independence" and Carrie LAM "mother of scorched earth". Some people think that LEUNG Chun-ying is a "truly mean" man who is outspoken and scolds as he wishes; while Carrie LAM is a hypocrite who smiles with total indifference. When she was running in the Chief Executive Election, I told the Time magazine reporters visiting Hong Kong that I was worried that she might be a "笑面虎" who eats you up, licks her lips and keeps smiling. It is really frightening. The English translation of that is "laughing tiger".

We have invited her to have a debate with Mr James TO, this she will not attend, of course. Many Hong Kong people used witty words to describe her, such as "acting like a fox in tiger's hide", "knowing that she is in the wrong" and a "tortoise hiding in its shell". She knows she is in the wrong, hence we are not allowed to say "Carrie LAM is lying". Carrie LAM will never lie. However, as I said in English just now, perhaps she has been misinformed, or mistaken. First, in 1996 or 1997, an extradition agreement was not signed with China because the judicial system in the Mainland was a concern indeed, thus a
"firewall" had to be erected. But now, she calls this a loophole and whoever who does not understand this is all talking nonsense. She did not lie. Did Carrie LAM lie? No, she has never said that.

Moreover, people like John LEE kept commenting on this matter—I wonder if he took himself as Teresa CHENG. Does he know the law? But frankly, I am not sure whether Teresa CHENG knows the law either—He said the Court will be the gatekeeper? If you ask anyone in Hong Kong, not only lawyers, barristers or Judges, they will say: On what basis can the Court perform the gate-keeping role? Only prima facie evidence, like photocopies of witness testimonies and photos of material evidence, is required to extradite someone. The Judge has no power to verify the authenticity of the evidence whatsoever.

John LEE's pet remark is that one may appeal all the way to the Court of Final Appeal under the mechanism in Hong Kong. But anyone who works in the Hong Kong Judiciary with some basic sense of law would tell you that is it is useless to lodge an appeal. What does one lodge an appeal for? One may not appeal. If the Court of First Instance decides that someone should be extradited based on prima facie evidence, how does that person lodge an appeal? If witness testimonies, material evidence, time, venue, year, etc. are all in order procedure-wise, how does one lodge an appeal? It is useless to appeal all the way to the Court of Final Appeal in that case. Please do not lie. I did not say who is lying, but someone is lying, right?

Members of the media outside asked this question just now. Joseph LAU has withdrawn his judicial review application today. Even he, who was involved in such a serious case, is not worried, there is no reason for ordinary Hong Kong people to be worried. So, people do not have to take to the streets on 9 June? Quite the contrary. He was so scared as to leave Hong Kong and put himself on exile, in Canada it seems, as his case was obviously extraditable. Why did he have the confidence to come back to Hong Kong all of a sudden? Not only did he withdraw his judicial review application, he even gave himself away in saying that the withdrawal was meant to alleviate the rift, unhealthy situation and polarized views in society. This is really frightening, all the more. We thought there was the rule of law, but actually the rule of man prevails. Who at when and where told Mr LAU not to be afraid and guaranteed his safe return? They used this action to tell Hong Kong people not to be afraid as even a high-profile person involved in a serious case is not afraid, why should the
average Joe hold any fear? If it is not the rule of man, what else can it be? Why is it like this all of a sudden? What has happened? Hong Kong people should all the more take to the streets on 9 June. We should let the Government see 3 million people taking to the streets.

The crux of the matter lies not in what crimes are exempted so that people are not afraid and believe they will not be arrested; nor does it lie in raising the threshold for extradition to crimes punishable by at least seven years of imprisonment. The business sector is very contented now because they consider themselves safe now that the threshold for extraditable offences is raised to seven years. Then why not make it 10 or 20 years, or keep raising the threshold, or even make extradition possible only by order of the Supreme Court?

The crux of the matter is the lack of confidence and trust in the judicial and legal systems in China. Regardless of their explanation, people still have misgivings. To put it bluntly, do they want to "fix me"? If they want to "fix someone", they might as well lay a charge against him packaged as whatever crime.

Have Members read the latest report by Reuters? It is said to be an exclusive interview of a richly experienced Judge in Hong Kong who stated that under this legal or judicial system, extraditions should be based on, first the presumption of a fair trial; and second, humane punishment in the receiving country. Even if there will be punishment, it should be humane. According to him, there is a lack of that trust now and Judges are dragged into the mire. How can that be?

There is another saying in the community about 300 corrupt officials having come to Hong Kong from the Mainland, so the Mainland Government has to bring them back. But then, someone asked the Security Bureau how these people came to Hong Kong. The Security Bureau answered that these people hold Hong Kong identity cards. So, they are actually Hong Kong people, how can they be corrupt officials from the Mainland then?

If the Government really has to amend something, it should amend the 150 daily one-way permit quota expeditiously. No one will object to genuine family reunion, but the one-way permit is available for sale in the Mainland at RMB250
to RMB300 apiece and those who have resided in Hong Kong for seven years are eligible for the Hong Kong identity card. That is how Mainlanders move to Hong Kong, is it not?

Sunshine judiciary"? There is "sunshine judiciary" in the Mainland? Until now, Carrie Lam still dares not comment on whether "sunshine judiciary" really exists in the Mainland. All she had got to say was that people spoke nonsense, that people misunderstood, that people parroted others' views. She is a so-called leader who is entirely brainless and pushes Hong Kong to death.

I must make it clear to everyone that although this motion of no confidence has no legislative effect, we have to at the very least voice the views of Hong Kong people. I am very grateful to Mr Andrew WAN for proposing this motion. Nevertheless, it is most unlikely that the motion would be passed because they are the majority, and according to them, the majority should prevail. Under this distorted electoral system, plus the disqualification of six Members, the pro-democracy camp which had the support of the majority of the voters became the minority in the Council. Hong Kong people must take to the streets on 9 June in order to make Carrie LAM realize that she must step now. Down with Carrie LAM! Carrie LAM is lying!

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION (in Cantonese): Deputy President, on behalf of the current-term Government, I sternly oppose the motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive" proposed by Mr Andrew WAN and the amendment proposed by Ms Claudia MO. Meanwhile, I also take exception to some opposition Members' accusation of the Chief Executive of "lying", which is insulting.

In less than two years since her inauguration, the Chief Executive, her team of accountable officials and colleagues in the civil service have undertaken much pragmatic work in promoting the economy and improving people's livelihood, arguably with remarkable results. The motion moved by Mr WAN stems from the views on, or misunderstanding of, individual policy proposals, not least the recent Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill"). The levelling of criticisms arbitrarily at the Chief Executive for such a reason is both unreasonable and unfair, tantamount to dismissing out of hand the efforts made by the current-term Government. Such political posturing is uncalled for and utterly regrettable.
Under the Basic Law, the Chief Executive has a unique constitutional status in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR"). The Chief Executive is accountable to both HKSAR and the Central People's Government. According to Article 43 of the Basic Law, the Chief Executive shall be the head of the HKSAR, shall represent HKSAR and shall be accountable to the Central People's Government and HKSAR in accordance with the provisions of the Basic Law. The Central People's Government shall appoint the Chief Executive in accordance with Article 45 of the Basic Law. At the same time, according to Article 60, the Chief Executive is the head of the HKSAR Government. Under this system of "dual responsibility", the Chief Executive is required to comprehensively, accurately and firmly implement the "one country, two systems" principle, uphold the Basic Law, defend the rule of law and promote the relationship between the Central Government and HKSAR. Since almost two years ago, the Chief Executive has done everything within her ability to deliver these pledges with deeds, fearlessly and impartially addressing in accordance with law any attempts to threaten our country's sovereignty, security and development interests, while safeguarding the rule of law and judicial independence of the HKSAR, defending the core values, human rights and freedom of Hong Kong, promoting Hong Kong's role in the overall international development, and ensuring the implementation of "one country, two systems" in Hong Kong fully and successfully. She has also fully leveraged the unique edge afforded by a system based on "one country" and facilitated by "two systems" to develop our economy and society and improve people's livelihood.

The current-term Government has all along been steadfast in safeguarding judicial independence and upholding the rule of law in Hong Kong. The Basic Law lays out the fundamental principles underpinning our independent judiciary system. Notable ones are the independent exercise of judicial power by our courts free from interference, vesting of the power of final adjudication in the Court of Final Appeal ("CFA"), and invitation of Judges from other common law jurisdictions to sit on CFA. At present, there are 14 eminent and distinguished Judges from the United Kingdom, Australia and Canada being appointed as Judges of CFA. To ensure the effective operation of the Judiciary, the Government has all along been providing sufficient resources and necessary support for the Judiciary. HKSAR is widely recognized and highly regarded internationally for its judicial independence, ranking first in Asia and eighth in the world.
The current-term Government respects the functions of the Legislative Council to exercise checks and balances on the executive authorities. In the spirit of accountability, the Chief Executive has been attending the Chief Executive's Question and Answer ("Q&A") Session four times a year and the Chief Executive's Question Time once a month on average, making reports on the progress of implementation of various policy measures by the current-term Government while enabling the Government to better feel the pulse of society and promptly respond to issues of public concern. As the saying goes, no livelihood issue is too trivial, the Chief Executive attaches great importance to the aspirations of the public. Let me cite a few examples. At the Chief Executive Question Time on 11 April 2018, for instance, Mr YIU Si-wing raised the issue of upgrading the facilities and hygiene condition of public toilets in Hong Kong. Subsequently, additional resources were allocated by the Government in the 2019-2020 Budget to the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department for refurbishing 240 public toilets in Hong Kong in phases, improving ventilation facilities, as well as enhancing their cleanliness and hygiene. Moreover, following the suggestion of reviewing primary health care and elderly health care vouchers made by Ms CHAN Hoi-yan in the Chief Executive's Q&A Session on 10 January 2019, the Department of Health completed its review of the Elderly Health Care Voucher Scheme and briefed the Panel on Health Services of the Legislative Council about the results on 18 March 2019. Various optimization measures, such as allowing the use of vouchers at District Health Centres and streamlining enrolment procedures for health care service providers, were progressively implemented. Besides, at the Chief Executive's Question Time on 3 April 2019, Dr Fernando CHEUNG relayed the problem concerning the relocation of the Factory for the Blind from To Kwa Wan to Tuen Mun during redevelopment. The Government followed up the issue swiftly and proactively, deciding to relocate the Factory to the premises of S.K.H. St. John's Primary School in Ping Shek instead in less than two weeks during the Easter holidays. It is evident in these examples that by coming to the Legislative Council, the Chief Executive not only answers questions from the legislature, but also gives audience humbly and seriously, addressing public aspirations irrespective of scale swiftly and proactively and doing solid work for the people.

Over the past year or so, the current-term Government, under the leadership of the Chief Executive, has adopted a new style of governance, new roles for the Government and new fiscal philosophy, adhering to the principle of good governance as the priority and cornerstone of administration, taking a pragmatic approach to "care", "listen" and "act" while being "innovative",
"interactive" and "collaborative" in implementing our policy initiatives proactively. We have discharged our responsibilities as a "service provider" or a "regulator" and taken up the new roles of "facilitator" and "promoter", striving to promote the economy and improve people's livelihood and continuously driving the progress of Hong Kong. Assuming an attitude of setting no easy goals and avoiding no difficult tasks, the Government has acted swiftly and decisively on anything that is clearly in the interest of the public.

In the two Policy Addresses presented since inauguration, the Chief Executive has put forward almost 500 policy measures in total, covering such diverse areas as improving governance, housing and land supply, developing a diversified economy, improving people's livelihood, nurturing talent, building a liveable city and connecting with young people. All this bears testimony to her passion, determination and boldness in serving Hong Kong. Under the leadership of the Chief Executive, we have made substantial interim achievements in various areas. Let me give a concise update to Members on the progress and effectiveness of different measures.

As a start, Members must recall that in the Policy Address 2017, the Chief Executive set out four elements that comprise the housing policy of the current-term Government, i.e., taking housing as not just a simple commodity; placing emphasis on home ownership; focusing on supply and optimizing the existing housing resources when new supply is not yet available in order to help families that have long been on the waiting list for public rental housing ("PRH") and residents in poor living conditions. In June last year, six new initiatives in housing were announced, including revising the pricing policy for subsidized sale flats so that the prices would be more affordable. In promulgating the Long Term Housing Strategy in December last year, the Government announced that for the ten-year period from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029, the public/private split of new housing supply will be revised from 60:40 to 70:30 in order to meet the keen demands for public housing in the community.

To tackle the challenge of land shortage, the current-term Government set up the Task Force on Land Supply ("the Task Force") in September 2017 to launch an extensive public engagement and announced in February this year its full acceptance of the report published by the Task Force and implementation of the eight land supply options recommended by the Task Force as worthy of priority studies and implementation. In the Policy Address 2018, the Chief
Executive put forward a series of initiatives to increase land supply in the short, medium and long terms, which include the Lantau Tomorrow Vision and various measures aimed at making better use of existing land resources.

On developing a diversified economy, the current-term Government has been leveraging the unique strengths of Hong Kong under "one country, two systems" fully in a determined effort to develop new areas of economic growth. To this end, the Government has been exerting its best as a "facilitator" and "promoter", seizing the growth opportunities presented by the Belt and Road Initiative and the development of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area ("the Greater Bay Area") in a bid to give fresh impetus to Hong Kong economy. The Special Administrative Region ("SAR") Government has cooperated closely with the relevant central ministries and the governments of Guangdong and Macao in a joint effort to formulate the Outline Development Plan for the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area and introduce a series of policy measures for developing the Greater Bay Area and strengthening the convenient flow of people, goods, etc., within the Greater Bay Area. The Chief Executive will continue to leverage her position as a member of the leading group for the development of the Greater Bay Area and strengthen the internal coordination within the Government with a view to promoting the active participation of Hong Kong in the Greater Bay Area development, opening up more room for development for Hong Kong and facilitating the upward mobility of young people. To strengthen bilateral and multilateral ties, the Chief Executive has visited no less than 14 countries since taking office in an effort to establish stronger bilateral ties with like-minded trading partners around the world and enter into free trade agreements and investment promotion and protection agreements with more economies along the Belt and Road. We will continue to deepen Hong Kong's economic integration with different parts of the world and promote the long-term economic growth of Hong Kong.

Deputy President, the current-term Government has been vigorously promoting the development of innovation and technology. In her first Policy Address, the Chief Executive outlined eight major areas for innovation and technology development, laying down a clear pathway for innovation and technology development in Hong Kong. In less than two years' time, the Government has finalized and implemented various specific policy measures for innovation and technology development and allocated over HK$100 billion in total to perfecting the innovation and technology ecosystem in Hong Kong, with
good results. Other measures put forward by the Chief Executive in her two Policy Addresses to incentivize industrial research and development and the transformation of technology research outcomes have been implemented progressively. To complement the development of smart city, various important infrastructure projects will be launched or completed in the next 18 months. Thanks to these initiatives that drive innovation and technology, the President of China recognizes and renders his support for Hong Kong in its development into an international innovation and technology hub and as an important force in implementing the nation's innovation-driven development strategy through closer cooperation in innovation and technology between the two places.

On financial development, the current-term Government, on the premise of maintaining monetary stability, financial security and market quality, strives to further reinforce Hong Kong's status as an international asset and wealth management centre while contributing to the opening up of our country's financial markets. The Financial Leaders Forum, set up by the Government in August 2017 for the provision of policy guidelines from a strategic point of view and forward-looking suggestions, has achieved remarkable results. For instance, the Stock Exchange of Hong Kong Limited implemented a listing regime for emerging and innovative companies at the end of April last year to cater for capital-raising needs in the new economic environment and develop Hong Kong into a broader and deeper fund-raising platform. Besides, the Government is striving to develop and firmly establish Hong Kong as a prime hub for green finance in the region, efforts of which include a newly-launched sovereign green bond programme worth HK$100 billion. With the joint efforts of the Government, financial regulators and the industry, financial technology (“Fintech”) development is thriving in Hong Kong. A series of Fintech measures will also be rolled out successively.

In respect of improving people's livelihood, the SAR Government has been making every effort to improve Hong Kong people's lot, devoting around 60% of the recurrent expenditure to education, health care and welfare. Over the last two financial years, the recurrent expenditure on education, health care and welfare have grown on average 6.3%, 13.5% and 13.6% respectively year-on-year.

As regards poverty alleviation, the Government initially launched the substantially enhanced Working Family Allowance and then implemented the Higher Old Age Living Allowance and the Fujian Scheme in 2018. Taking into
account the Old Age Allowance, the Disability Allowance and the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance, the entire social welfare system now covers over 70% of the elderly population.

On elderly services and assistance to families and the disadvantaged, the current-term Government has introduced many pragmatic policies to provide additional support for elderly persons. Such support includes purchasing an additional 5 000 places under the Enhanced Bought Place Scheme in the next five years, enhancing the overall service quality of private residential care homes for the elderly and strengthening the community care and support services to meet the various needs of elderly persons living in the community.

In addition, we are setting up 48 social worker teams in phases for early identification and provision of assistance to pre-school children with welfare needs and their families. We have also regularized on-site pre-school rehabilitation services with the number of service places increased to 7 000, set up 13 new Parents/Relatives Resources Centres for persons with disabilities, provided home-based care services for about an additional 1 800 persons with disabilities living in the community, and so on.

On labour welfare, the Government is also concerned about labour benefits. Having increased the statutory paternity leave from three days to five days from 18 January onwards this year, the Government has also began drafting the legislation for the proposed extension of statutory maternity leave to 14 weeks with the aim of presenting the relevant bill for scrutiny in the Legislative Council by the end of this year. In the meantime, the maternity leave for government employees has been extended upon the presentation of the Policy Address last year. Another key labour initiative of the current-term Government is certainly the abolition of the offsetting arrangement under the Mandatory Provident Fund System. It is hoped that, with the relevant preparatory work now in full swing, the relevant bill will be ready for presentation to the Legislative Council next year.

Deputy President, the current-term Government strives to make continuous improvement to the health care system and its services while planning ahead for medical hardware facilities and manpower requirements of health care professionals. To cope with the ever-increasing demands for health care and to ease the enormous pressure on the public health care system and frontline health care staff, the Government has rolled out a number of countermeasures, including the provision of an additional recurrent funding of $700 million for the Hospital
Authority ("HA") to boost staff morale and retain talent. On increasing doctors' manpower, HA will recruit all qualified locally trained medical graduates and provide them with relevant specialist training. There will be a total of over 2,000 medical graduates becoming registered doctors in the coming five years. The Government, meanwhile, will continue to proactively attract more eligible non-locally trained doctors to serve in the public health care sector in Hong Kong through limited registration. In the 2019-2020 Budget, an additional $5 billion has been earmarked by the Government for expediting the upgrading and acquisition of medical equipment. An additional recurrent subvention of $400 million has also been provided for HA to expand the Drug Formulary.

On hospital facilities, HA will commence the services of Tin Shui Wai Hospital, North Lantau Hospital and Hong Kong Children's Hospital in phases. Nine hospital projects under the First Ten-year Hospital Development Plan are now in full swing. The Government plans to seek funding from the Finance Committee for four other hospital projects in the second quarter of this year. Meanwhile, HA has commenced planning for the Second Ten-year Hospital Development Plan, which will incur about $270 billion for the provision of around 7,000 additional beds.

On education, we commit substantial resources to education. In the Policy Address 2017, the Chief Executive highlighted eight major policy areas of education for in-depth studies. Five of the eight task forces concerned have now completed their work. The Government is now proactively following up the relevant recommendations, including injecting $20 billion into the Research Endowment Fund and setting up a $3 billion Research Matching Grant Scheme. The "one executive officer for each school" policy and the "all-graduate teaching force" policy are among the first initiatives to be launched in the 2019-2020 school year. Over the past two years, the Government has allocated at least $8.3 billion in recurrent expenditure to implementing a series of measures, which include a recurrent Life-wide Learning Grant for schools, enhanced support for children with special education needs and more opportunities of vocational education, thereby improving the environment for teaching and learning.

On transport, various major cross-boundary and local transport infrastructure were successively commissioned in the past year, notable examples of which include the Hong Kong Section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link, the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge and the Central-Wan Chai Bypass. These infrastructure facilities have been operating
smoothly since commissioning, providing great convenience to the public in commute. In respect of public transport services, under the Public Transport Fare Subsidy Scheme rolled out in 1 January this year, monthly subsidies of no less than $160 million on average have been disbursed in the first four months since the Scheme's implementation, benefiting around 2.2 million people monthly on average. Meanwhile, the Government has waived the tolls charged on franchised buses for using seven government tunnels and roads, with a view to bringing direct benefit to the public through relieving the fare increase pressure on franchised bus operators. The Government will also continue to implement smart mobility initiatives in which technology is applied for more effective traffic management and alleviation of road traffic congestion, thereby enabling the limited road space to achieve the greatest efficiency.

In face of the challenge of climate change, the current-term Government, under the leadership of the Chief Executive, has adopted a multi-pronged approach to promote Hong Kong's transition to a low-carbon future. Last year, the Government and the power companies implemented the Feed-in Tariff Scheme to encourage the development of renewable energy. Moreover, the Government has taken the lead in saving energy and promoting green building. Over 400 energy-saving works have been launched in government buildings, cutting energy consumption by 5% in the past four years. We also raised energy efficiency through statutory standards, tax concession, construction of energy-saving infrastructure and proper use of technology. It is expected that with the implementation of various energy-saving measures, the annual carbon emission in Hong Kong can be reduced by as much as around 1.6 million tonnes.

The current-term Government attaches great importance to the development of arts and sports. In the last two years, we have allocated additional resources to performing art groups of various sizes while granting a provision of $500 million for the acquisition of museum collections and commissioning of art and culture projects and $300 million for the establishment of a funding scheme for intangible cultural heritage.

At the same time, we proactively promote sports in the community, support elite sports development and make Hong Kong a hub for major international sports events. A sum of $60 billion has been allocated to supporting sports development, including the construction of the Kai Tak Sports Park and 26 regional leisure and sports facilities.
Deputy President, the current-term Government takes a particular interest in youth development and strives to connect with them by addressing young people's concerns about education, career pursuit and home ownership, and encouraging their participation in politics as well as public policy discussion and debate. We also endeavour to broaden the horizons of young people through the continued enhancement and expansion of various programmes of youth exchange, internship, innovation and entrepreneurship as well as life planning. To encourage youth participation in public affairs and engagement in public policy discussion and debate, we have regularized the Member Self-recommendation Scheme for Youth to attract young people aspiring to serving the community to participate in government boards and committees.

Deputy President, due to the time constraint, I cannot enumerate in detail every single achievement made by the current-term Government under the leadership of the Chief Executive since inauguration. It is understandable that views expressed by various deputations and parties in the community on the proposed amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") vary. However, the accusations made by Ms Claudia MO in her amendment, that the Bill fails to take into account the grave concern of Hong Kong people and facilitates another jurisdiction in suppressing dissidents, are entirely false and an utter distortion of the Bill's objectives and content.

I must solemnly state that there is no political purposes whatsoever behind the proposed amendments to FOO. Nor is it a political mission. The legislative amendment seeks mainly to deal with two practical problems: first, a murder case which happened in Taiwan in early 2018 involving a Hong Kong resident killing another Hong Kong resident with the suspect subsequently returning to Hong Kong; second, plugging the loopholes in Hong Kong's mechanism for mutual legal assistance and surrender of fugitive offenders to ensure that offenders of serious crimes will not evade their legal responsibility, thereby protecting the overall safety of the people and community of Hong Kong.

While a case-based surrender mechanism is already in place under the existing FOO, it has never been invoked in nearly 22 years due to difficulties in actual operation. The proposed case-based surrender arrangement is not in any way tailored to a particular jurisdiction. Instead, it targets all the 100 or so jurisdictions which have yet to enter into long-term arrangements with Hong Kong, with a view to providing an effective legal basis for handling surrender
requests, when necessary. More importantly, the Bill targets offenders of serious criminal offences wanted for prosecution, not ordinary law-abiding citizens.

Not only is the amendment exercise undertaken for a valid cause, it is also consistent with our enforcement of the United Nations resolution on joint efforts against organized crimes and serious offences. It remains our key policy objective to enter into long-term cooperation agreements with different jurisdictions. All existing human rights and procedural safeguards provided for in the current FOO, which have drawn reference from the model treaty on extradition promulgated by the United Nations and are in line with the common practices in juridical assistance overseas, will be maintained under case-based arrangements. These safeguards include no surrender if the "double criminality" principle is not complied with; no surrender for offences of a political character; no surrender for prosecutions on account of race, religion, nationality or political opinions; no surrender for any conviction made in the absence of a trial; no "double jeopardy"; no surrender if charges go beyond the surrender order; no re-surrender to a third party; no surrender if the offence attracts the death penalty. The comprehensive human rights and procedural safeguards under FOO will not be altered by the legislative amendment.

The Government will comprehensively and meticulously review and consider each case-based surrender request and has full discretion as to whether such a request should be agreed. In light of the needs of individual cases, the Government may require additional assurance made by the requesting party, such as legal representation, visits by family members, medical care, etc. The executive and the Court will act as dual gatekeepers for all surrender requests. The proposed amendments will by no means affect the existing long-term agreements or arrangements already signed. Hong Kong remains committed to observing all the signed agreements. Case-based surrender arrangements are transitional in nature and will cease to apply once long-term agreements are signed.

As the Chief Executive explained in the Chief Executive's Question Time in the Legislative Council on 22 May, there is this view that given her accountability to the Central Authorities, the Chief Executive cannot refuse a request for surrender of fugitive offenders from the Central Government, thereby
resulting in the arbitrary surrender of everyone to the Mainland. Such an assertion is totally unfounded and groundless. For a start, the Chief Executive, constitutionally speaking, is accountable not only to the Central Authorities, but also to everyone in HKSAR and be held accountable to everything that happens here. Second, the Chief Executive assumes the role of activator in the entire procedure for reasons of not alarming the suspects in such situations. Hence, it is necessary for an executive authority to activate the procedure before handing over to the Court. I must stress that other countries, such as the United Kingdom and Canada, have adopted such a practice as well. Third, the Court of Hong Kong, being impartial, independent and free from political influence, will be a key gatekeeper in the surrender procedure, handling such cases in sunshine in a highly transparent manner. As we all know, there is the "fourth estate" in Hong Kong: the media play a strong role of monitoring. If, after reviewing a case, the Court determines against the surrender out of insufficient evidence, there is no way for the Chief Executive to surrender the suspect concerned. In considering cases of surrender, the Court must make sure that requests are fully compliant with the relevant requirements and safeguards of the rights of individuals under the law and the relevant arrangements. These include, among others, the rights to apply for judicial review of the executive decisions, appeal against the Court's decisions all the way to the Court of Final Appeal, and apply for legal aid in respect of a complaint in accordance with the law. I hope to take this opportunity to allay public concerns. Such a system is extremely robust and dependable that precludes the possibility of the Chief Executive arbitrarily sending some people to any jurisdiction and subjecting them to sanctions there.

Deputy President, I wish to reiterate that the legislative amendment aims at enhancing HKSAR's capability in dealing with fugitives of serious criminal offences and protecting the general public in HKSAR. There are no other motives, let alone those in the nature of political persecution, behind the proposed amendments, as some Members suggest. To allay the misgivings of various sectors in the community about the legislative amendment, the Security Bureau, the Department of Justice and our team will continue to relentlessly explain in detail the proposed amendments to FOO.

It has been seven weeks since the Bill was presented to the Legislative Council by the Government on 3 April. In the two meetings presided by Mr James TO, four hours had gone by with the Chairman yet to be elected. That
was unprecedented. The Government had been actively facilitating the operation of the Bills Committee with well-prepared officials of high level—a great number of officials, to be precise—in attendance at every meeting in the hope of conducting with Members thorough and in-depth exchanges and interactions at the meetings of the Bills Committee, which are open, fully transparent and available for press coverage and public observation. But regrettably as we can see, the Bills Committee, hampered by scenes of unprecedented chaos with Members being injured, could not function in the last few meetings. The Government was thus denied the opportunity to explain to Members and the public the content of the Bill in the tripartite platform of the Bills Committee. Given that the Bills Committee could no longer function normally, the Government had no choice but to make the difficult decision of requesting the resumption of the Bill's Second Reading in the Legislative Council on 12 June, in the hope of breaking the deadlock. The Government sincerely hopes that with the Second Reading of the Bill resumed, Members will engage in in-depth discussions rationally and pragmatically, instead of rejecting the legislative amendment and thus allowing some people to evade the legal system, even endangering public security.

The SAR Government has stepped up communication with different stakeholders across the board, explaining the content of the legislative amendment and listening closely to the views of various sectors, with a view to clarifying misunderstandings, improving understanding and allaying concerns. In the next few weeks, we will cooperate fully with the arrangement of the Legislative Council, striving for the opportunities to communicate, explain and discuss with Members.

As a final note, I wish to stress that any criticisms or views of Members that are factually-based and constructive in nature will be heeded humbly with modesty by the Chief Executive, accountability officials and all the colleagues in the civil service for improvement in governance. However, in response to false, unfair—even deliberately defamatory or personal—attacks directed at the Chief Executive, the Government must make clarifications solemnly and express our profound regrets to such political posturing.

Despite the tall challenges and enormous difficulties faced by the SAR Government on certain events and issues in the past year, the Chief Executive, the entire accountable team and 170 000 colleagues in the civil service have made their utmost effort to serve the community. We should by no means dismiss the
efforts made by everyone on various fronts simply because of criticisms surrounding one single Bill. I hereby urge Members to oppose this motion so that the Chief Executive, the government team and the community can refocus their attention, casting aside prejudice and striving together for people's well-being and the alleviation of their hardship in Hong Kong.

With these remarks, Deputy President, I implore Members to oppose Mr Andrew WAN's motion and Ms Claudia MO's amendment. After Members have spoken, I will give a concise response to the specific views put forward by Members in my concluding remarks. Thank you, Deputy President.

MR LAM CHEUK-TING (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I have listened to the speech of the Chief Secretary for Administration attentively. He spent 20 minutes recounting the achievements made by the Government in administration. Yet, may I ask the Chief Secretary, had the administration been beneficial to Hong Kong, why the approval rating of the Chief Executive would have dropped to the record low of -27% now? Why would 60% of the public oppose her to be the Chief Executive? Has the Chief Secretary opened up his eyes and looked into the views of the public? Or does he think that members of the public have been misled and their views lack substantive content?

Deputy President, another point raised by the Chief Secretary is the improvement of people's livelihood made by the authorities, and he even cited the quality improvement of public toilets as an example. The Government is so low in vision and standard that it would quote its "shit-pit" achievement to illustrate its success in administration. How deplorable and ludicrous it is.

Deputy President, Carrie LAM bulldozes through the draconian law, and I will say she has a vicious heart. She capitalizes on the Taiwan homicide case to betray the people of Hong Kong. As the President has ruled that Members are not allowed to describe her as "lying", I will say that she is the terminator of right and wrong and the truth. The Chief Secretary for Administration, who is the most loyal supporter of hers, only speaks sophistry.

Insofar as the Taiwan homicide case is concerned, the Taiwan Government has already stated clearly that it will not receive the criminal if the criminal is surrendered under the "China extradition law". When we pointed out this fact, she explained that the legislative amendments were made not merely for an
individual case but for plugging loopholes in the existing laws. When we pointed out that there is no urgency for passing the legislative amendments if they are for the purpose of plugging loopholes, she said conversely that given the urgency of the Taiwan homicide case, the amendments have to be passed expeditiously. Following this loop of argument, she can always justify herself, for all she says is sophistry.

Deputy President, all along, Carrie LAM has held the reasonable opinions expressed by society and the international community in contempt. She dismissed the many queries raised by Members of the Legislative Council and society as "nonsense". Regarding the worries expressed by foreign envoys, she said they were mere declarations of political stance lacking specific content, and she said the many queries raised by the public were prompted by misunderstandings. I wonder if the queries of The Bar Association of Hong Kong, the Hong Kong Journalists Association and the many chambers of commerce, as well as those of members from various professional sectors, academics, the people of Hong Kong and Members of the Legislative Council, and all kinds of queries raised lack specific content, being nonsense and misunderstandings?

Deputy President, in respect of the arrangement for the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance ("CSSA") for the elderly, Carrie LAM had made it an absolute mess. Later, she said she would listen humbly to improve administration. I wonder if the current practice is humbly listening. She is a laughing stock. I will say her arrogance has reached a pathetic point. I suspect there is a magic mirror in Government House, where Carrie LAM will stand in front of the mirror everyday asking, "Mirror, mirror, who is the greatest in this world?" Then the Mirror will reply, "Carrie LAM". She does not merely refuse to listen to the views of the public and Members of the Legislative Council from the pro-democracy camp, she also refuses to listen to the views of the civil service and Administrative Officers. Many Administrative Officers have complained to me about this. She even refuses to listen to views expressed by foreign chambers of commerce and foreign envoys.

Carrie LAM is known for coming number one in school examinations every year. In my view, for a person with a personality problem like her, it will be a curse on her to be able to come number one every year. She thinks she is always right and she is the greatest, so she will not listen to the views of other people. This curse does not merely affect her, for Hong Kong as a whole is affected. Once the "China extradition law" is passed, both local and foreign
people in Hong Kong will be extradited to the Mainland in future. In the face of cases of injustice and persecution, the Government has blood on its hands, Carrie LAM has blood on her hands and all who have facilitated Carrie LAM in enacting this draconian law have blood on their hands in each case of injustice.

Since Carrie LAM assumed office, in what way is she different from LEUNG Chun-ying? I will put it this way: LEUNG Chun-ying did more bragging than actually doing bad deeds, for he lacks the courage and ability; but Carrie LAM has done more bad deeds than talking about them. The present "China extradition law" lays bare her blatant betrayal of Hong Kong.

Deputy President, Mrs LAM has this famous line: "A place has been reserved for me in heaven". I have to ask her what kind of "heaven" she was referring to. Is it the "Heaven of the Western District"? Has the Western District reserved a place in heaven for her? Is it the position of the next Chief Executive or the Vice-President of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference ("CPPCC"), or other position of State leadership ranking? It does not matter if Mrs LAM wants to go to heaven, but she should not push the people of Hong Kong into hell. She often says that she is a Catholic. I would like to point out that in the Gospel of Matthew, it is said that: "... it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God". I think I can borrow this verse in the Bible to describe the present situation. In fact, for colleagues of the Legislative Council like Mr Abraham SHEK and Mr Christopher CHEUNG in the Chamber, it will be easier for them to go through the eye of a needle than for Carrie LAM.

Deputy President, 9 June is the date for the procession, a significant date for safeguarding Hong Kong. I implore everyone to come forward to "fill up" Causeway Bay, "fill up" Wan Chai and "fill up" Admiralty, so that the world will know the anger of the people of Hong Kong, our perseverance in upholding justice in Hong Kong and our faith in safeguarding the rule of law of Hong Kong.

Lastly, Deputy President, here, I call on LAW Chi-kwong—a former comrade of the Democratic Party—to resign and sever his tie with Carrie LAM's Administration if he still has a conscience.

I so submit.
MR LEUNG YIU-CHUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I speak in support of the original motion and the amendment. Yet, Ms Claudia MO pointed out in her speech earlier that she had proposed the amendment in the hope that we could focus on the amendment exercise of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") in discussing the motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive". But in my view, as some Honourable colleagues have mentioned, the policy blunders made by Carrie LAM during the two years after her assumption of office have made people extremely disgusted. She has not only created great hardship for the public, but also social dissension. What is more, she has even caused the core values of "one country, two systems" and "a high degree of autonomy" that we have been upholding to falter, leading to extreme dissatisfaction among people from all walks of life in society.

While the Secretary tried to put in a good word for Carrie LAM on the aspects of administration and people's livelihood, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting commented that the Secretary's remarks were really of low quality as he presented the refurbishment of public toilets as her first achievement in governance. However, I do not think it is a problem of low quality. On the contrary, I hold that this precisely reflects that the Government, under the leadership of Carrie LAM, has actually made very few achievements in the past, such that the Secretary does not have much to tell us. Therefore, he mentioned public toilets at the very beginning and then had nothing else to say. In fact, if I have to criticize Carrie LAM—as the Secretary requested us not to accuse her of lying, I would not say that she is lying—the most important thing is that she has gone back on her words, not walking her talk, which has discredited herself with the people, and this is the more serious problem. In addition to causing the general public to cast a vote of no confidence in her, a vote of no confidence is also cast in the SAR Government. Apart from her low popularity, even the popularity of the officials under her leadership is low as well, whereas people also have very low confidence in the entire Government.

Why am I saying this? Deputy President, it is very simple. Just now some Members also mentioned that Carrie LAM had indicated that she would step down if the public thought that she should no longer serve as the Chief Executive. Despite her low popularity now and the fact that her popularity rating is far below the passing mark, yet she has no intention to step down. She has gone back on her words already. She might claim that the current situation is not extreme enough, and it is not the view held by the vast majority, so that she has adopted a wait-and-see attitude. However, I wonder for how long she wants
to wait and see on issues of people's livelihood. During her election campaign, and even after the election, she kept reiterating that certain problems must be solved. Unfortunately, she has accomplished nothing so far. For instance, she has all along been saying that she must overcome the "three big mountains", so what do the "three big mountains" refer to? These include the Link Real Estate Investment Trust ("Link REIT"), the fares of the MTR Corporation Limited ("MTRCL"), and the offsetting mechanism of the Mandatory Provident Fund ("MPF") System.

The Secretary just mentioned that the abolishment of the MPF offsetting mechanism is settling into shape and that it may be implemented in 2022. I will just wait for this day to come. How about the other two issues, that is, Link REIT and the fares of MTRCL? We have been discussing these two issues for a long time. This Council has also held numerous meetings on these issues, whereas a subcommittee meeting was even held particularly in respect of Link REIT. Yet, what did the Government officials or Carrie LAM tell us? They simply said that their hands were tied on these issues. What does this mean? It means that they have just been paying lip service. What is this if it is not her failure to keep faith? The Secretary accused us of making false statements and demanded that we should make clarifications, so as to save her face. Fine. Would the Secretary please tell us later on what exactly the authorities have done on the issue of Link REIT? In addition, the fares of MTRCL have only been adjusted upward but not downward. Apart from these livelihood issues, a more important issue is that both the Governments of the previous and the current terms proposed to amend the Prevention of Bribery Ordinance ("PBO"), an exercise which they have been talking about over and over again, but they are still saying that they would continue to study the issue. We know that after the reunification, members of the public have been discussing whether the Chief Executive should be granted special immunity. The public considers that the Chief Executive should not be granted any privilege and should be covered by PBO. Well, it seems that the previous terms of Government could not see this problem, or had forgotten it, but the previous-term Government said that it was aware of this problem and would study it. Yet, they have studied it for four years, whereas two years have already passed since the current-term Government assumed office, but they are still studying it. Can the Secretary tell us how long it will take to complete the study? How long will they procrastinate? What is this if they are not going back on their words?
Apart from the said issues, the relationship between the executive and the legislature is of the utmost importance to us. When Carrie LAM was still the Chief Secretary for Administration of the previous-term Government, she had repeatedly said that she would improve the relationship between the executive and the legislature. Since she had not yet taken office as the Chief Executive at that time, we cannot blame her for accomplishing nothing. This is because the previous Chief Executive was not good and he constantly inflicted damage on the relationship between the executive and the legislature. That said, what has she done in this term? In fact, the situation in this term is even more deplorable. They breach the rules and regulations of the legislature for the sake of amending FOO. They do not follow our good tradition but bypass the Bills Committee and resume the Second Reading of the Bill at a Legislative Council meeting directly. The Secretary just now said that they had no alternative and it was a difficult decision. Who says it is a difficult decision? As a matter of fact, we have suggested to the authorities a lot of opinions, methods and means, but the authorities deliberately refused to adopt them and insisted on furthering it their own way. If the Government is not damaging the relationship between the executive and the legislature, then what is it? Moreover, the Government has not only damaged the relationship between the executive and the legislature, but also undermined social solidarity. It has acted in the same way as the previous-term Government did by continuing to create dissension in society, prompting members of society to fight and quarrel with each other due to the amendment exercise of FOO. In addition, Members from the pro-establishment camp have not only exhausted all kinds of filthy tactics in the legislature, they have also adopted many dirty tricks among the public, thereby disrupting social peace. Are these not the responsibilities of the Government? The problem lies in the fact that whilst the Government tells society something pleasant to the ear, what they do is quite another matter.

Just now the Secretary kept mentioning that FOO must be amended for two major reasons, one of which is the case in Taiwan. Yet, Taiwan has made it clear that if the amendments to FOO are passed in Hong Kong, it will definitely not cooperate with the Hong Kong Government, and it will certainly not make a request for the surrender of the suspect. Such being the case, why do we still have to pass the amendments? The Secretary asked us to be patient, but who has the patience to deal with this issue? (The buzzer sounded)
DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, your speaking time is up. Please stop speaking.

DR KWOK KA-KI (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I thank Mr Andrew WAN for proposing this motion of no confidence in the Chief Executive. Having listened to the speech of Matthew CHEUNG earlier on, I lament the standard and cognitive ability of the principal officials of the SAR Government. They are downright a disgrace to us. A no confidence motion is the most powerful language of a parliamentary assembly. In any democratic society or any place where democracy truly prevails, when a so-called leader has a net popularity rating of -27% today, he or she has only one ending, that is, stepping down. We in the Legislative Council must perform our duty, and although this is a distorted legislature and although Members representing the majority public cannot obtain the majority of seats, we must make our voices heard and point out that Carrie LAM is unbecoming of the office of Chief Executive.

(THE PRESIDENT resumed the Chair)

That we are not allowed to say "Carrie LAM is lying" in this Council is already a joke. But to say that she is lying is already a mild comment indeed. She is the most vicious Chief Executive ever since the reunification. TUNG Chee-hwa insisted on enacting legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law and finally withdrew it as a result of James TIEN of the Liberal Party and other Members of the Legislative Council at the time eventually changing side. As for Donald TSANG, although his policies had produced very bad results for Hong Kong in various aspects, especially in real estate development or housing, he is not as vicious as she is. "689" LEUNG Chun-ying is abhorrent in the eyes of many Hongkongers and he was likewise considered unbecoming of the office of Chief Executive but the harms done by him on Hong Kong are not as severe as those inflicted by Carrie LAM.

From the latest news reported in Reuters today, three senior Judges in Hong Kong had expressed grave reservations about this extradition law, in addition to the 12 senior counsels expressing their position earlier, many of whom are former Chairmen of the Hong Kong Bar Association. Even Matthew CHEUNG had lied, and he said that Hong Kong can keep the gate? The Judges
said that they are unable to keep the gate because in Hong Kong, the Court can only consider prima facie evidence and cannot examine or even question the evidence produced by Mainland officials. They just cannot do it. If a prima facie case is established, they can do only one thing and that is, to extradite the person concerned to the Mainland, and this is a fact. In Hong Kong, many people who usually care little about politics and do not like to get involved in the whirlpool, including housewives—today there is a signature campaign organized by housewives in Hong Kong—and also many alumni from different universities and secondary schools who normally do not voice their views have come forth. Why do they come forth? Because they have to point out how this Government led by Carrie LAM has wreaked havoc on Hong Kong. This is not only damaging the rule of law and "one country, two systems" in Hong Kong, but also ruining the future of Hong Kong.

We have seen two facts. Many foreign envoys in Hong Kong have already voiced their views and worries. In fact, these issues are generally not of concern to foreign diplomats in Hong Kong because as we all know, so long as "one country, two systems" and "a high degree of autonomy" prevail, the rule of law in the Mainland, however bad it is, still gives no cause for our concern. The standard of the rule of law in the People's Republic of China ranks 82nd among 126 countries or territories, whereas Hong Kong ranks 18th. As we can see, regarding this flimsy firewall that we managed to maintain only after much difficulty, Carrie LAM intends to ruin it today. She is damaging "one country, two systems", and she is damaging the only firewall of Hong Kong. She is indeed so evil-minded. If she has to answer the whistle blown by the "Western District" and Beijing, she would betray Hong Kong people in so doing and this would be the worst, and even worse than lying. One who lies is just a big liar, and LEUNG Chun-ying has already taken up that niche. We do not need another one of his kind. But when it comes to betraying Hong Kong people, and when this is done by Carrie LAM, a senior civil servant with 37 years of experience under her dress, we simply cannot forgive her.

Now even some ordinary businessmen are saying that they would relocate their investment and the most ordinary people are thinking about emigration, will Hong Kong still have a future? She is such a smart woman. We all know that she used to be a student leader and a senior Administrative Officer for several decades. She is cleverer than all Hong Kong people, and she outsmarts those officials sitting opposite to us. She can criticize the officials ruthlessly, lashing
out at them until they break down in tears. But this very woman knows well that this China extradition law will ruin Hong Kong and she still pushes it forward. Tell me, how evil and malicious she is! How unfortunate it is to Hong Kong!

We can see that the China extradition law is an evil law most destructive to Hong Kong over the past 21 years since the reunification, and not only have we seen it but also the entire world has seen it. Taiwan has made remarks that we wish to hear badly. They said that the SAR Government had thrice given Taiwan a cold shoulder on this issue, showing that it has an ulterior motive. Why can the Government piggyback on a murderer? Why is it that even the teachers and students of the alma mater of the victim have come forth to criticize Carrie LAM for absolutely doing a disservice to Hong Kong people? Because everyone knows that she is finding an excuse to introduce into Hong Kong this draconian law which is even more venomous than Article 23 of the Basic Law.

We can tolerate no more such a person who continues to say in the political arena in Hong Kong, one who claims she represents Hong Kong people. Now comes a time when Hong Kong people must come forth. Be it the march on 9 June or the ensuing campaigns, such as besieging the Legislative Council, they need Hong Kong people to voice their views and come forth. I urge all the people to come forth. For the sake of ourselves, our next generation and our families, we absolutely cannot give up. No matter whether or not Carrie LAM can hear it, no matter whether or not the "Western District" can hear it, we have to make our voices heard (The buzzer sounded) … With these remarks, I support the motion …

**MS STARRY LEE** (in Cantonese): President, regarding a motion of no confidence, by convention in the United Kingdom, if a motion of no confidence in the prime minister is passed, the prime minister will either bow and step down, or dissolve the parliament and then call for a general election. The community will have to pay a heavy price for the political repercussions that ensue. For this reason, unlike an ordinary political gesture, a motion of no confidence is essentially a solemn matter, which is traditionally tabled by the opposition camp before the parliament in a bid to undermine a government or embarrass a government or a leader, or in an attempt to rock the confidence of supporters of a
government or a leader in the government or the leader. No matter what, it is merely a tactic or gesture of attack, which is by no means constructive. Apart from draining social resources and the energy of those members of the public who are concerned about it, it will just adversely affect or even undermine governance.

The situation in Germany is somewhat different. While initiating a motion of no confidence, the opposition parties also need to nominate a candidate for prime minister for the purpose of preventing a political vacuum and avoiding a crisis of governance. The situation in Hong Kong is different, where a motion of no confidence carries no legislative effect. But its passage is tantamount to an indication of distrust of the Chief Executive by the Legislative Council. The resulting political message will likewise pose serious challenges to the governance of the SAR Government.

President, the passage of a motion of no confidence will only pose unnecessary but serious challenges to governance, but those in the opposition camp have not exercised such powers with prudence. Instead, more often than not, they are way too ready to propose such motions, and it seems that nothing can stop them. Let us do some counting. Since the reunification, the SAR has been headed by four ChiefExecutives in succession, and none of them have been immune from a motion of confidence proposed by the opposition camp, with the only difference lying in the number of times. Mr TUNG Chee-hwa and Mr Donald TSANG have respectively faced it twice and once, and Mr LEUNG Chun-ying, in addition to two motions of no confidence, has faced impeachment under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law twice. As for Mrs LAM, this is the first time she faces a motion of no confidence since assumption of office. While it is not something I wish to see, it is difficult to tell whether it will be the last time. In fact, Members proposing a motion of no confidence every time simply do not sincerely believe that the motion of no confidence stands a reasonable chance of passage. Yet, they still insist on proposing it in a bid to put on a political show to undermine the prestige of the SAR Government in governance.

President, the Chief Executive is not the only target of a motion of no confidence. The targets of the motions of no confidence proposed by the opposition camp also include the principal officials of the SAR Government, such as the former Secretary for Education and the former Secretary for Development,
the last and incumbent Presidents of the Legislative Council, the Chairman of the Finance Committee, and me as Chairman of the House Committee, all of whom having been subject to a motion of no confidence. Judging from the scope and frequency of the motions of no confidence proposed by the opposition camp, the public cannot but suspect that such motions of a solemn nature have been hijacked by the opposition camp, degenerated into an ordinary political gesture or even treated as a tool of venting dissatisfaction with the governance of the SAR Government.

President, I cast every vote in the Legislative Council with great caution. Facing the motion of no confidence this time around, we must act with even greater caution and extra care. The reason for them to propose this motion of no confidence in the Chief Executive is obviously the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO"). They allege that the Chief Executive has been bulldozing the amendment of FOO through the Legislative Council, asserting that the legislative amendment would undermine "one country, two systems", seriously affect Hong Kong's political and rule of law systems, or might even deal a severe blow to the economy. President, this Ordinance has long since existed. While members of the community hold divergent views and may not necessarily agree that the Government has introduced the legislative amendment for the purpose of plugging loopholes, they cannot deny or rule out the possibility of fugitives at large still hiding in Hong Kong under the existing legislation. As a responsible government, it must address such imperfections and inadequacies, irrespective of whether it has been acting like an ostrich or the duration of the situation having been left unattended.

President, the amendment of FOO is extremely controversial, but those in the opposition camp have, while swearing to uphold the Basic Law on the one hand, failed to scrutinize the legislation and spend more time on studying and considering ways to enhance the Bill in accordance with the Basic Law on the other. They have instead repudiated it altogether, and even arbitrarily politicized and demonized it, making all sorts of allegations of conspiracy to provoke public sentiment, with anti-communist and red scare as the guiding principles. President, when Secretary for Security John LEE moved the First Reading of the Bill, those in the opposition camp interrupted him for almost 20 times by raising points of order. Subsequently, the Bills Committee of the Legislative Council fell into an unprecedented deadlock due to struggles, chaos and incidents of personal injuries, rendering it unable to give play to its original
normal function of scrutiny. The Government must, and does, respect the operation of the Bills Committee and views of Members in accordance with the law, but the opposition camp has done the opposite. Hence, with no other way out, the Bill could only go straight to a Council meeting for consideration.

President, FOO is basically a matter within Hong Kong's autonomy. But the opposition camp has once and again paid visits to the United States and Europe, met with the Vice President and the Secretary of State of the United States, invited foreign interference disguised as concern and even called on the United States Government to adopt a hard line on the legislative amendment exercise of the SAR Government. President, such moves will only do a disservice, prompting action by the Central Government. We are well aware of the stance and bottom line of the State, which remains consistent. The State has made sovereignty the top priority, neither allowing nor accepting foreign interference in internal affairs. But the opposition camp has forcibly escalated the internal affairs of Hong Kong to the international level. That is precisely what jeopardizes Hong Kong and undermines "one country, two systems".

President, in the prevailing environment and landscape, the China-United States trade war has been escalating, clearly signifying a game between both great powers. It is almost certain that the Hong Kong economy will be impacted. Months ago, Financial Secretary Paul CHAN already warned against an uncertain global economic outlook. But the opposition camp has disregarded such crises, ignored the interests of Hong Kong, continued to stir up such political issues today, caused chaos to our society and torn Hong Kong and the country apart, fanning the flames purely for political gains.

Hence, President, as part of our community, a lawmaker and Chairman of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong, I cannot but adamantly oppose this motion of no confidence.

President, I so submit.

MR TONY TSE (in Cantonese): President, I have all along considered the mindset and logic of the opposition camp irrational because they keep moving the goalposts. For example, the opposition camp invited Chief Executive Carrie
LAM to a live televised debate the other day. But since the opposition camp have indicated their distrust of the Chief Executive and that they are not going to believe her words, why bother debating with her? Do they wish to insult the other party again with grossly indecent and discriminatory remarks in front of television viewers, including children, during the debate? Since those in the opposition camp have recently taken a liking for petty tyranny games scripted, directed and acted by themselves, with a self-proclaimed Chairman of the Bills Committee, they might as well get one of their Members to impersonate the Chief Executive for a debate with Mr James TO, or Mr James TO may declare himself Chief Executive to debate with himself. That will also do.

Another point showing that the opposition camp have moved the goalposts is that while terming the opinion about the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") expressed by officials of the Central Government as interfering in the affairs of SAR and pressurizing the SAR Government on the one hand, they have, on the other, gone on a tour of visits to Europe and the United States, openly lobbying for foreign intervention in SAR's local legislative exercise and interference in Hong Kong's affairs. Is the opposition camp not exerting pressure in so doing? Or are they also pressurized to do something so that they can explain themselves away?

I notice that when Members in the opposition camp visited the United States in the past, they could consider themselves lucky if they were offered to meet with the Deputy Secretary of State. But this time around, they were really blessed to have had the opportunity of meeting with the incumbent Secretary of State, Mike POMPEO, and Head of the House of Representatives, Nancy PELOSI. The anti-China icons from both the Republican and Democratic Parties met with them in person. It so happens that the negotiations between China and the United States have fallen apart, and the United States has been forcing the world to crack down on China's advanced technology enterprises. Seeing the coincidental timing of various incidents occurring simultaneously, one really finds it hard to sort out the intricacies involved.

By another sheer coincidence, soon after Mr Dennis KWOK and Mrs Anson CHAN expressed their opinions about FOO during their visit to Germany, the two "Hong Kong independence" advocates charged with rioting in Hong Kong who had jumped bail and long absconded suddenly broke silence,
revealing in interviews with the European and American media that they had been granted refugee status and political asylum by Germany.

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

Yesterday, the German Consulate General Hong Kong responded that the relevant cases were vetted and approved by the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees. I wonder if Germany has amended the relevant legislation, treating all those charged with offences involving the use of force as political refugees. If so, there are a few in this Chamber who may also be eligible.

Deputy President, I may have gone far off topic, and will now come back to the motion of no confidence proposed against the Chief Executive. At the beginning of the tenure of Chief Executive Carrie Lam, the opposition camp were actually quite nice to her, as evidenced by their support for her initiative to significantly increase the expenditure on education and social welfare, and they also spoke highly of her when she came out from the Government House to meet with rare disease patients. And the Democratic Party to which Mr Andrew Wan, mover of this motion, belongs even invited the Chief Executive to its anniversary dinner, and invited her to make a donation to celebrate the occasion.

Nevertheless, since the Chief Executive put forward the Lantau Tomorrow Vision in a bold attempt to resolve the land and housing problems of Hong Kong, those in the opposition camp have started to turn hostile, stating that the relevant reclamation project is tantamount to pouring money into the sea. They include quite a number of Members who have all along been calling on the Government to expedite identification of sites for housing construction in order to assist households living in subdivided units in moving into public housing. And the Democratic Party which originally supported reclamation in the Central Waters has also changed its position and indicated opposition.

According to some, if the SAR Government can resolve the land and housing problems of Hong Kong, on what grounds can the opposition camp still oppose the Government? How can they still demand the Chief Executive to step down? Some have also pointed out that no matter who becomes the Chief
Executive, as long as he really wants to do something good to and find solutions for Hong Kong, the opposition camp will demand him to step down and move a motion of no confidence in him.

Reviewing history, Deputy President, I have found that the opposition camp has, on separate occasions, proposed a total of seven motions of no confidence or impeachment against the three former Chief Executives, which means an average of 2.3 times for each of them, with one of them facing such a motion in just six months after his assumption of office. It has almost been two years since Chief Executive Carrie Lam assumed office. It is not until this moment that the opposition camp has proposed a motion of no confidence in her for the first time. I do not believe it is because they are suddenly moved by their conscience. Rather, it may be because they were previously unable to find any material to launch a massive campaign of smear and attack on the Chief Executive.

Concerning the co-location arrangement previously, the opposition camp claimed that it would destroy human rights, freedom and the rule of law. They criticized the Chief Executive for ceding territory and selling out Hong Kong, and claimed that public security officers of the Mainland would make arbitrary arrests in the West Kowloon Terminus of the Express Rail Link. But such claims failed to hit the headlines despite all the hype. Someone was indeed arrested subsequently, but that person is called Howard Lam, who also happens to be a member of the Democratic Party with a liking for performances scripted, directed and acted by himself, whose attempt to deceive others turned out to be self-deceit.

I hope the Chief Executive will not be disheartened by this motion and the recent controversy. Instead of succumbing to the opposition camp and anti-China foreign forces, she should keep going and do more solid work for Hong Kong and members of the public, thereby enabling Hong Kong to keep progressing. With these remarks, I oppose the motion of no confidence against Chief Executive Carrie Lam and the amendment to it.

MR MICHAEL TIEN (in Cantonese): Deputy President, we are discussing the motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive" today. While it is not clearly stated in the original motion, it is very obvious that the motion is induced by the amendment of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO"), and this is
stipulated in the amendment. I think Members are aware that I have put forward a lot of views on this matter, and I also disagree with the views and practices of the Government. I guess many of those from the pro-establishment camp would have a lot of criticisms against me in public and in private. Yet, does it mean that I think this matter has reached such a degree that we can no longer trust the Chief Executive? Different camps in the legislature would certainly have different demands on the Government, be they issues relating to politics or people's livelihood, and if we have to propose a motion of vote of no confidence on each and every occasion when our views differ from those of the Government, we will then have to debate once every month. I reckon no legislature all over the world would do so.

Discarding some statements of political stance firmly set on urging the Chief Executive to step down, I believe that when Members consider whether they should support the motion of no confidence, they should ask themselves several questions: First, is there any obvious evidence suggesting that the Chief Executive has committed serious dereliction of duty? Second, have the Chief Executive and the entire Government done nothing desirable in their overall administration? Is it true that every policy is indeed abominable to all people? Certainly, all of these issues cannot be considered across the board, and we have to put these factors on a scale for evaluation before making such a major decision. Hence I have evaluated them for a long time before writing up this speech.

To start with, I have total confidence in the incumbent Chief Executive on the question of whether she has committed dereliction of duty. I believe it is quite difficult for people to make allegations against her for acceptance of advantages. Second, on the issue of overall administration, especially matters relating to people's livelihood, I have asked my assistants to briefly sort out the demands made by the Roundtable to the Government in the past two years … Deputy President, there are some backdrops behind me, could you ask Honourable colleagues to put them down before I go on? Please stop clocking my speaking time, thank you.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Will Mr Gary FAN please move your placard slightly aside.

(Mr Gary FAN did not move his placard)
DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Gary FAN, please move your placard aside, as Mr Michael TIEN has now made a request that he does not wish to be harassed by the placards behind him when he gives his speech.

(Mr Gary FAN still did not move his placard)

MR MICHAEL TIEN (in Cantonese): He is reluctant to do so. It is very simple, I would leave my seat and speak. It is not a must for me to speak in my seat, right?

(Mr Michael TIEN left his seat and spoke while standing in the aisle next to the seats)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr TIEN, please return to your seat.

MR MICHAEL TIEN (in Cantonese): Please give me more time as compensation for the speaking time lost.

Among the demands made by the Roundtable to the Government in the past two years, eight or ten items can be named by each assistant in respect of different aspects on which Carrie LAM's Government has responded to me and other Members positively. Frankly speaking, this differs greatly from the situation in my previous term of office. Take the grand debate on land supply as an example, even though not everyone agrees with the conclusion, but at least she dared to deal with it. Were the Governments of the previous two terms not aware of where the problem lay? However, they really did not think deeply about how to solve it. Take the rationalization of traffic distribution among the three road harbour crossings ("RHCs") as another example, though it could not be realized in the end, she could actually have kept her hands off the issue. To date, I still find the opponents' arguments most untenable. While opposing a fare increase, they also expressed their worries about congestion in the three RHCs concurrently, which are in fact self-contradictory. If I go on listing these items, such as the planning of a cross-harbour railway in New Territories West, drastic increase of resources in education, urgent allocation in respect of health
care funding, extension of the vaccination programmes, improvement of the home-based child care service, enhancement of the quality of primary school and kindergarten teachers, substantial increase and improvement of transitional housing, enactment of legislation on animal welfare, establishment of a contract cooling-off period, doubling of the amount of subsidy under the Continuing Education Fund, optimization of the system of non-refoulement claims, improvement of the tendering procedures of the Government and even the crackdown on touting activities for scalped tickets, all of these are issues of great concern to members of the public but to which the Government of the previous term treated with indifference.

Yet, on the other hand, I believe that the Government and the Chief Executive should be held largely responsible for arousing such a big controversy this time. Almost a year has passed after the murder case in Taiwan took place, but the Government did not propose any solution until the last two months, in an attempt to sort out in one go the problems which not settled in the past two decades, an act which is most unconvincing indeed. The Secretary has repeatedly claimed that they have to uphold justice, but who in fact caused this belated justice? Many people have queried that even if the amendments were passed, the problems concerning the murder case in Taiwan could not be solved. Even if we assume that the Mainland Affairs Council which has raised opposition does not represent the ultimate stance of the Government of Taiwan, but the Hong Kong Government only indicated that "we have done our part and we cannot control the others" every time it gave a response in respect of this issue. It is not an attitude of clenching one's teeth to uphold justice. Should the Government test the water with the Taiwan side through unofficial communication at an early stage, so as to enhance the possibility of solving the problems? The Government said they could not do so at the very beginning as there was no legal basis for discussion, but they then said that they were doing it. It really gave people the impression that the policies are subject to change frequently and quickly.

When many people—including the Secretary for Justice—mentioned my proposal, they all focused on the suggestion that "Hongkongers should be tried by Hong Kong courts". In fact, there is another key point in my proposal, which is "introducing the amendments by batches, and resolving the simple issues before the difficult ones". We should settle the problems concerning the murder case in
Taiwan first, and then plug the loopholes later on. The Secretary for Justice said the suggestion that "Hongkongers should be tried by Hong Kong courts" was very complicated and detailed deliberation was necessary. I fully agree with her view, but should the Government not handle the simple issues first and then make further deliberation to plug the loopholes? If it turns out that the proposal of the Government is more preferable than the suggestion that "Hongkongers should be tried by Hong Kong courts", I will certainly lend it my full support. In short, I fully agree with the proposition of upholding justice and plugging the loopholes, but I am afraid the handling approach adopted by the Government is probably the main cause of the situation today.

Lastly, I wish to express my personal dissatisfaction with the Government's handling approach. I have taken it rationally and sent two letters, consisting of a total of 4,523 words, to the Office of the Chief Executive ("CE's Office"). CE's Office replied me that they would hand them over to the Security Bureau for follow-up. Yet, while the Second Reading of the Bill will soon be resumed, the Security Bureau has not made any response, not even a single word. Acts of storming are of course wrong, but they do not reply to our correspondence either, is this the proper attitude of the Government? Certainly, this discontent is somewhat personal. Deputy President, this is personal, personal feeling, but I think it has not reached such a degree that I can no longer place my trust in the Chief Executive.

In conclusion, as I said earlier, I have evaluated it for a long time and I take great exception to the handling approach of the Government. That said, I will not support this motion as I am satisfied with the overall performance of the Government.

MR CHAN CHI-CHUEN (in Cantonese): Today, it is opportune to debate the motion of no confidence in Carrie LAM. The evil doings of Carrie LAW are too numerous to enumerate. Even if I can speak for seven hours, seven days and seven nights, I cannot recount all of her evil doings, not to mention that I only have a speaking time of seven minutes. Hence, I will only talk about how her deeds this month have pushed Hong Kong into an abyss of no rescue.
During the examination of the Budget in the middle of this month, I pointed out that Hong Kong was at the critical moment of life and death, and "if Carrie LAM does not die, the people of Hong Kong will". Those who have not watched this speech of mine on screen may visit Facebook or YouTube, and they have to view the comments left below the video. I sympathize with Chief Secretary for Administration Matthew CHEUNG who has to show support to Carrie LAM today. What did Carrie LAM say yesterday? She said during her 4.5 years of tenure as the Chief Secretary for Administration, she had made proactive efforts to liaise with foreign envoys, but now she could no longer have direct discussions with foreign consuls, and she went on saying that had she been able to explain the case in person earlier, the issue would not have developed into such a great controversy. What she was saying is that it is a dereliction of duty on the part of Matthew CHEUNG and she should have explained the case in person had she noticed that.

In the past two weeks, what has Carrie LAM done to expedite the fall of Hong Kong? First, it is the intervention in the incident by the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the Hong Kong SAR in high profile. Carrie LAM dared to say that there is nothing wrong with the intervention by the Central Authorities as certain Members have gone overseas to meet with overseas governments and prompted them to express their views on the China extradition law, which has damaged the relationship between Hong Kong and the Central Authorities. Carrie LAM thrusted the draconian law on extradition to China to the Council meeting of the Legislative Council direct, pressing the Legislative Council to pass the Bill in July. This is the greatest crime of hers.

Moreover, in response to the approval granted for the asylum applications of Ray WONG and Alan LI by Germany, Carrie LAM protested to the Acting Consul General of Germany in Hong Kong direct. She indeed dishonoured herself. In fact, the German authorities may KO (knock out) her query simply with the phrase that they are "acting in accordance with the law", just as she did when she refused foreigners' entry into Hong Kong. On the same day, 28 countries of the European Union took the rare move of issuing a demarches to the SAR Government in respect of the "China extradition law". Though representatives of the European Union have put forth some concrete proposals, Carrie LAM did not listen and smeared them as political statements.

Regarding the words and deeds of Carrie LAM since May, I can only describe Carrie LAM as a cruel anti-foreign government official who only has the Communist Party of China ("CPC") in her heart. All that Carrie LAM did is not
putting the interest of the people of Hong Kong first but that of the highest echelon of CPC. She has even sacrificed the international reputation of Hong Kong, destroyed proven systems and undermined the confidence of the people of Hong Kong in order to remove all obstacles blocking her progress, so that she can spare no effort to execute at all cost the order of the highest echelon of CPC, appeasing CPC's perpetual desire for power and control. Hence, when the highest echelon of CPC ordered that the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill") be passed expeditiously to reinforce their control over Hong Kong and to enable them to freeze the enormous amount of foreign funds in Hong Kong, Carrie LAM executed the order of her master at all cost. She is comparable to the tank in the 4 June massacre, as she will disregard everything and every cost incurred to dash ahead, bulldozing flat all the advantages unique to Hong Kong.

Given Carrie LAM's inherent character of pleasing her master to prove her value of existence, she displays anti-foreign sentiments in every aspect and gives top priority to pleasing her masters who see the world as their enemies. This draconian "China extradition law" allows CPC to request the SAR Government to surrender foreigners in Hong Kong, even foreigners in transit, to Mainland China for trial. In fact, all overseas governments know that Carrie LAM is merely a puppet of CPC, who lacks courage and ability to refuse surrender requests made by CPC.

The Hong Kong Government often claims that the Court can act as a gatekeeper, yet how can the Court do the gatekeeping? Members may learn from the interview of a few anonymous Judges given to Reuters that they consider the arrangements unworkable, which mean that the arrangements are not going to work, not practicable. Hence, even if Members of the pro-democracy camp have not made overseas visits—overseas governments are not dumb—overseas governments will reason and recognize that the Bill will have impacts on the interest and safety of their nationals in Hong Kong. However, Carrie LAM regards these voices as interference of foreign forces with ill intentions, and she is even hostile to all overseas governments which have voiced their views.

Carrie LAM has adopted anti-foreign measures blindly. This reminds me of an article written by FUNG Hei-kin (馮晞乾), which is one of my favourite articles recently. He says that some people compare Carrie LAM to members of the Boxers during the time of Eight-nation Alliance who adopted an anti-foreign
attitude blindly, and she can be dubbed "Boxer Carrie". The article also says that Carrie LAM is "the bane of her supervisor" and what she does will bring troubles to her supervisors. Nonetheless, in my view, it is less than accurate to describe her as "Boxer Carrie" of the Boxers or Empress Dowager Cixi. I think Carrie LAM is now comparable to the cruel government officials in the time of the Boxer Rebellion who harboured the Boxers on one hand and pleased Empress Dowager Cixi on the other, encouraging Empress Dowager Cixi to besiege the embassies and declare war on the 11 nations. Carrie LAM is like the group of government officials offering malicious advice at all cost to please their anti-foreign master, and she may consider the expeditious passage of the Bill a "display of power" to overseas countries, which may help her master who has suffered a row of defeats in foreign affairs to fight back. For this reason, Carrie LAM will continue to adopt a strict attitude towards overseas governments and their nationals and give no regard to the interests of foreigners in Hong Kong.

Carrie LAM has put Hong Kong on the spot. She is driving this tank in an anti-foreign mood to implement the Bill with a barbaric and hardline approach. Both men and God are scowling in anger. In the past few days, many schools in Hong Kong, including Carrie LAM's alma mater, have issued statements to call for the signing of petitions and implore the public to go to East Point Road to join the march to be held at 2:30 pm on 9 June to oppose the draconian law, oppose extradition to China, protect Hong Kong and call for Carrie LAM to step down. A Member shouted at the meeting of the Legislative Council: "Carrie LAM, why don't you die, you are a wasted life". People may query the term "… woman" he used to call Carrie LAM but no one will query the remarks "why don't you die, you are a wasted life".

Lastly, I would like to say: Carrie LAM, no matter you die or not, when will you die and how will you die, the people of Hong Kong just do not care, but "if you want to die, it is your own business", you should not pull the people of Hong Kong into your grave.

MR CHRISTOPHER CHEUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I speak in resolute opposition to Mr Andrew WAN's motion and Ms Claudia MO's amendment. I think this debate on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive", proposed purely for vexatious effect, is nothing more than political posturing on the part of opposition Members against the amendment of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") and their revenge—in the form of a big
tantrum—inflicted because their unreasonable demands failed to elicit a positive response. I utterly disapprove of this kind of unreasonable political grandstanding.

This motion of no confidence was triggered by the amendment of FOO. Leaving aside the question of whether the Government has acted appropriately in handling the amendment, I think it is indeed biased, unjustifiable and most unfair to the Chief Executive if opposition Members proposed a motion of no confidence and called for her resignation for the sole reason of the amendment, while giving no regard whatsoever to her day-to-day performance and attitude at work and denigrating everything she has done.

Justice is in the hearts of the people. If only opposition Members would cast aside their radicalism, they would have seen clearly what the Chief Executive has done since assuming office. From what I have seen, the Chief Executive has attached importance to people's livelihood and addressed the pressing needs of the public. In addition to increasing the recurrent expenditure on education by $5 billion shortly after inauguration, she has allocated additional resources to easing the pressure on public hospitals, visiting spinal muscular atrophy patient Josy CHOW in person and introducing new drugs for patients suffering from rare diseases. The Chief Executive has also been hard at work, seizing opportunities of promoting the sustainable development of Hong Kong. Apart from establishing a Task Force on Land Supply for the formulation of housing policies, she also put forward the Lantau Tomorrow Vision, strove for the smooth commissioning of the Hong Kong Section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link and the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge while promoting the development of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area. Moreover, she has, in a dedicated effort to improve the relationship between the executive and the legislature, made arrangements to meet with Members of different political parties and groupings (including those of the opposition) after taking office, received questions from Members monthly in this Council, even taken time to attend the Anniversary Dinner of the Democratic Party amidst her busy schedule with officials of various bureaux in tow and made a generous donation of $30,000. Are they so blind that they cannot see all this?

I wish to ask the opposition Members this question. Is what the Chief Executive has been doing harming public interest, impeding the development of Hong Kong and undermining the executive-legislature relationship? If not, on
what grounds do they propose a no-confidence motion against the Chief Executive? Or, are they in fact playing dumb, deliberately turning a blind eye to what the Chief Executive has done for Hong Kong?

Still, this no-confidence motion was set off by the proposed amendment to FOO. It is well known that the relevant amendment effort has been fraught with controversies. I am sure the Chief Executive and the Government have expected the amendment proposal to draw flak from the opposition. Nonetheless, the Government introduced the proposal all the same, which bears testimony to the Chief Executive's dauntlessness in assuming responsibilities and taking on challenges. Such commendable courage should be applauded indeed. Moreover, since the amendment proposal was introduced, the Government has been exerting its utmost to explain matters to various sectors of the community in a pragmatic manner with a view to easing public concerns. It can be said that insofar as the amendment exercise is concerned, the Chief Executive has exerted her very best and done everything she can.

What has the opposition done in contrast? They oppose the amendment proposal, but refuse to make their case through reasoning. Within this legislature, they have resorted to dirty tricks in an attempt to block the amendment effort: first filibustering madly, then preventing the relevant Bills Committee from electing a Chairman, followed by establishing a counterfeit committee, not to mention blocking pro-establishment Members' access to a conference room by force. In addition, they have no scruples about going overseas to squawk their disgruntlement with the West in an attempt to leverage opposition influence in the West to pressurize the SAR Government and force the Chief Executive to withdraw the legislative amendment.

The facts are all before us: who is in the right and who is in the wrong are readily discernible. In respect of the legislative amendment exercise, who have failed to do their own job properly? Who are not to be trusted? This no-confidence motion put forward by the opposition camp is no more than a bid to put the blame on the Chief Executive, which is an outright distortion of the truth.

As a final note, I wish to emphasize that my opposition to the no-confidence motion does not equate my absolute approval of the legislative amendment. The financial services sector, which I represent, and I have quite a few doubts about the legislative amendment. Still, we would not dream of
stopping this Council from carrying out the relevant discussions and scrutiny. Nor would we lose our confidence in the Chief Executive because of those doubts. Rather, through the discussions and scrutiny by this Council in an open and rational manner, we hope that the truth would eventually come to light through debate.

Moreover, my opposition to the no-confidence motion has nothing to do with blind toadyism. I have reservations about the Chief Executive's handling of such issues as legislating on Article 23 of the Basic Law, the levying of a vacancy tax and the partial development of the Fanling Golf Course. Yet, in evaluating the worthiness of the Chief Executive for our trust, I think the crux lies in whether what she has done is consistent with the overall interest of Hong Kong, not in whether her words and deeds appeal to us. Such is the objective and unbiased attitude that every Member should hold. Hence, I strongly oppose this no-confidence motion.

MR JEFFREY LAM (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I have to make it clear from the outset that, on behalf of the Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong, I rise to speak against the original motion and the amendment.

The motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive" proposed by Mr Andrew WAN today is simply groundless or even ridiculous because the prerequisite of a motion of no confidence is that there was confidence originally. However, when have opposition Members ever had confidence in the Chief Executive and the SAR Government since the Chief Executive took office?

Since the reunification, they have only trusted the Western approach. The lawn grass is always greener on the other side of the hedge. The Democratic Party even believed the "stapler story" scripted, directed and performed by its party comrade without doing any investigation in order to create panic and discredit the co-location arrangement. They even believed in such an absurd story, but I have not seen them ever placing trust in the Chief Executive, never.

Deputy President, the Central Government has always kept the door of communication opened to the opposition camp in the hope of enhancing trust through mutual understanding. However, the opposition camp has always refused the invitations. Instead, they went to all parts of world to beg for mercy, requested Western countries' attention to the development of Hong Kong,
bad-mouthed "one country, two systems", bad-mouthed Hong Kong and smeared the Motherland. Upon assumption of office, the Chief Executive showed great sincerity in communicating with the opposition camp and responded to their various demands. She even went so far as to make a donation to the opposition camp under her own name. Nevertheless, what she got in return was the insult of being called a "bitch" in the Council. It was a mistake for the Chief Executive to have tried to please them. Gaining the confidence of the opposition camp is tantamount to asking a tiger for its hide.

Deputy President, as we all know, today's motion arose from the recent controversy over the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill"). A so-called motion of no confidence in the Chief Executive is only one of their usual tactics. In fact, the Government has not had the opportunity to give a detailed explanation on the Bill in the Council until now after all the chaos. In the meanwhile, we can see that the opposition camp shifted the blame and exhausted all means to hinder the scrutiny of the Bill for political purposes. Not only did they delay the procedure for the election of Chairman for the Bills Committee, they also ignored the decision of the House Committee, held unlawful meetings and violently obstructed the proceedings of the official meetings. Their actions have seriously damaged the image of the Council and Hong Kong as a whole.

Amidst the heated trade friction between China and the United States presently, the opposition camp took delight in going to foreign countries to badmouth Hong Kong and object to the Bill. At one time, they claimed that political offences would be extraditable and, at another they said businessmen in the Mainland would be most vulnerable. These remarks are all grossly misleading, seeking to attract public attention.

Deputy President, as clearly stipulated in the Bill, the human rights and procedural safeguards under the existing Fugitive Offenders Ordinance and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Ordinance, such as double criminality and political offence bar, will all be retained. The Government has to do its explaining properly and clearly.

As a matter of fact, there are many legal professionals in the opposition camp who understand full well the scope of amendment in the Bill and the relevant safeguards in law. Nevertheless, they created panic to pull wool over
the people's eyes and deliberately obstructed the Government's attempt at giving explanations. They started rumours and exaggerated the fear in order to use Hong Kong to serve their anti-China and anti-communist agenda.

Deputy President, in all fairness, the performance of the Chief Executive in administration merits recognition. Since assumption of office, she has been committed to solving various livelihood issues, such as increasing the recurrent expenditure on education by $5 billion per annum. Public expenditures on people's livelihood have increased under her new financial philosophy which is generally recognized by society. On the economy front, the Chief Executive has invested further resources in innovation and technology in education, infrastructure, talents and business support. She has also played an active role in the planning of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area and striven for a number of measures facilitating Hong Kong people's development and living in the Mainland.

The Chief Executive also attaches great importance to the relationship with this Council, attends the Question Time on a monthly basis to answer Members' questions in a "short question, short answer" format and strengthens the communication with various political parties and groupings. Unfortunately, the opposition camp does not appreciate her efforts at all. Certainly, not all policies are approved of by all sectors. For instance, the industrial and commercial sectors consider measures such as the vacant property tax somewhat populist and not conducive to solving Hong Kong's land issues in the long run.

Deputy President, Hong Kong people are tired of the endless disputes in the Council. I hope the opposition camp will rein in at the brink of the precipice, return to rational discussions and, together with the Government and various political parties, find a viable way to properly deal with and scrutinize the Bill. It is also hoped that they will acquit themselves as decent Hong Kong citizens and put aside their disagreement to focus on economic development and improving people's livelihood, so as to seek a way out for Hong Kong.

Deputy President, I so submit.

DR CHENG CHUNG-TAI (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I believe within the short span of a year or so, the administration and governance by Chief Executive Carrie LAM has taken Hong Kong to the verge of misrule and disorder.
Through my brief speech, I wish to clarify mainly the following three points: First, I think she has proven her own guilt. Obviously, Carrie LAM took office as "the fourth Chief Executive" thanks to the small-circle election, so she lacks a popular mandate in Hong Kong society. This is indisputable but at the same time, in order to come clean of the so-called "puppet of the China side or Western District" through and through, she declared publicly that she would not turn to the Liaison Office to beg or canvass for votes, so on, so forth, but within the short span of two months, she has proven her own guilt. Her guilt does not lie simply in the original sin of lacking a popular mandate but in showing all people that she too is a puppet.

The amendment of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") is tantamount to telling Hong Kong people, time and again, that under the reigns of former and incumbent Chief Executives, there is only one policy, that is, to sell out Hong Kong. Therefore, on proving her own guilt, even the controversies or discussions surrounding FOO recently are actually all invariably linked to this matter: Who is being sold? The rich and powerful will soon have the opportunity to be spared of being sold. The fact is, everyone is equal in this society, that is, there are at least fair trials and protection by the rule of law. Now, it is certain that the Government will put forward a proposal to raise the offence threshold from three years to seven years. People who can run away are fine and they can withdraw their court petitions. The general public in Hong Kong, who cannot run away, will face the collapse of the rule of law, the collapse of public order and the collapse of core values in Hong Kong one generation after another.

Therefore, on proving one's own guilt, basically, there is no need to say too much. I believe most Hong Kong people, in particular, supporters of my camp or like-minded people, all understand why in the Legislative Council elections of 2016, we demanded or proposed a constitutional campaign of "Five-constituency Referendum and Constitution Drawn up by all People" to achieve the goal of maintaining the Basic Law for good and rectifying the constitutional defects of the Basic Law of Hong Kong. Sadly, we suffered from our disadvantages and there was nothing we could do. I am the only survivor and as a result, I am facing the present moribund situation.

Second, as many Members said just now, another reason for the decline in the public opinion or support rating of Carrie LAM in public opinion polls within such a short period of time is perhaps her exposure of her own shortcomings
within a short period of time. She revealed her own shortcomings because she has high aspirations but low ability and she aimed high but shot low. When she initially took office, she said she wanted to overcome the "three big mountains" but where is this pledge now? There is now only Lantau under the Lantau Tomorrow Vision—this has got nothing to do with Fortress Hill—and there is no other big mountain but Lantau in the Lantau Tomorrow Vision now. She did not deal with Link REIT; as regards the Shatin to Central Link of the MTR Corporation Limited, even in the hearing ongoing now, there is discussion on the deliberate cover-up by the parties concerned. In that case, arrests should be made and items should be seized, right? Yet, she chose not to do so and used the Court and the Judge as the excuse. On the offsetting mechanism under the Mandatory Provident Fund System, she just found a low-ranking staff member casually and considered it as having faced the complaints of vested interests, thinking that she had got away with it. After the changes made in the past couple of decades, in fact, no significant amelioration of the problems related to MPF can be seen.

Again, on the exposure of her own shortcomings, not only did she say she wanted to overcome the "three big mountains", on the Prevention of Bribery Ordinance, as I have said many times, each year after she had presented the policy address, I would ask her why, although she said when taking office that she wanted to amend the Prevention of Bribery Ordinance, no trace of such a thing could be seen now. The aim is simply to include the Chief Executive in the ambit of the Ordinance, so that she cannot transcend the three branches of Government. Where is this pledge now? There is nothing of the sort now.

Third, on the exposure of her own shortcomings, recently, various people have mentioned the Toll Adjustment Proposal for the Three Road Harbour Crossings. I believe this is the watershed in the rule by the Chief Executive. This is tantamount to courting a setback for no good reason. That is a serious matter. The Western Harbour Crossing will be recovered in 2022, yet she tried to act smart by going to Beijing to find some matters with which to claim credit and tell Hong Kong people that she had lobbied for certain things successfully. In the end, both the Deputy President and Honourable colleagues of the pro-establishment camp all disagreed with it. That proposal was obviously designed to give more benefits to the vested interests, while Hong Kong people have to pay even more in order to implement the Toll Adjustment Proposal for the Three Road Harbour Crossings, all for bringing about slight improvements to the figures related to the Wanchai-Central Bypass. Moreover, in the long term,
the aim was to pave the way for levying tolls after the Government has recovered all tunnels at a later time. This is obviously exposing one's own shortcomings and having high aspirations but low ability.

Of course, she can shirk the responsibility and put the blame on the Chief Secretary for Administration, saying that other Secretaries of Departments or Directors of Bureau did not take actions in concert. Yesterday, she also shirked her responsibility by saying that when she was the Chief Secretary for Administration, her relations with consuls were very good and no misunderstanding ever occurred. What does this mean? There is a subtext in these remarks, that is, Matthew CHEUNG has not delivered in his duties. How did the Chief Secretary for Administration respond? Yesterday, she put him on the spot, so how can such a head of Government win the public over? Of course, maybe officials also have their share of the blame.

Third, revealing her own unsightliness. What I mean by revealing her own unsightliness is that she made a show of being fair and working for the public; during the election, she gave an old woman $500 but now, when reporters asked her one more question, she called it a waste of time. She held various press conferences at the same time, all for her own convenience, without thinking about other people—of course, some people would say that these are petty and trivial matters—coupled with the move to raise the eligible age of elderly people for welfare from 60 years to 65 years and the lack of notice or preparations in relocating the facilities for some socially disadvantaged groups. All of these done out of the will of the head of government, thus revealing her own unsightliness and telling all people that all along, everything had just been a vanity project.

For God's sake, please give us back the past Governments that did solid work—no, the past Governments did not necessarily do solid work—she described herself as someone who does solid work (*The buzzer sounded*) … but do not make the current-term Government practically deplorable.

**DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Dr CHENG Chung-tai, your speaking time is up. Please stop speaking.
MR ALVIN YEUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, when the Chief Secretary for Administration was making a speech on behalf of the Government earlier on, people who are not in the picture would think that Carrie LAM has stepped down. Chief Secretary for Administration Matthew CHEUNG appeared to be delivering a policy address as if he were the Chief Executive, speaking for a total of 29 minutes and presenting his arguments conversantly. But regrettably, from his 29-minute speech, all I could hear is the Government being headstrong and opinionated, completely failing to reflect on why the community is so dissatisfied with them.

Deputy President, in your speech earlier you said that a no-confidence motion would only cause damages and deal a blow to governance. This, I think, is quite interesting. What else can deal a greater blow to the governance of the incumbent Chief Executive than she being unable to handle by herself the so-called pro-Government or pro-establishment camp in this Council and having to turn to the "Western District" for aid and ask for a favour from Director WANG Zhimin to help canvassing votes? I just cannot believe a person who claimed back then that she would need no assistance from the "Western District" has now degenerated to a state where she has to stand behind the "Western District" and stand behind the pro-establishment camp in this Council, not daring even to take on a debate.

Deputy President, you have cited the United Kingdom and Germany as examples earlier, and most correctly at that. The examples of the United Kingdom and Germany are absolutely accurate. But most interestingly, Deputy President, you have completely neglected the unique situation of Hong Kong, falling short of pointing out that under this utterly flawed system of Hong Kong, the citing of these examples of United Kingdom and Germany wrongly only proves on the contrary the inadequacies of Hong Kong.

Meanwhile, I also wish to particularly remind you, Deputy President, that when you said earlier that all the four Chief Executives including the incumbent could not avoid a no-confidence motion in the Legislative Council, you have to ask the reason for it. Do we really have so much leisure time and want to have fun? Why do you, Deputy President, not go and ask if it is because every Chief Executive, including the incumbent, have failed to reflect on the problems with their governance that they have degenerated to a state where they have to face a no-confidence motion against them in this Council? But of course, there is no
cause for worry. No matter how distrustful they are to us in the pro-democracy camp, so long as there is the pro-establishment camp to act as convoy, they will definitely remain unharmed and free of all worries.

Deputy President, I wish to particularly point out that it is an offence to issue a dishonoured cheque in Hong Kong under section 18B of Cap. 210 of the Laws of Hong Kong. But the Chief Executive has exactly committed this offence. Why? Two years ago the then incumbent Chief Executive said this in Chapter 1 of her Election Manifesto: "I shall resolve as soon as possible those constitutional and legal issues aiming at amending the Prevention of Bribery Ordinance to extend the scope of Sections 3 and 8 to cover the Chief Executive." She made this vow categorically back then, and why was it not mentioned at all by Chief Secretary Matthew CHEUNG when he made that most impassioned speech of 29 minutes to defend the Government just now? Why? What is he afraid of? I thought the Chief Executive would honour her pledges and the current-term Government would assist her in achieving it. Why did she not do it? Is it because Beijing is unwilling to see it, or she does not have the courage to put her words into actions? This "dishonoured cheque" sounded to be a simple task or just a piece of cake supposedly. She is obviously in control of this Council but she cannot even make amendments to an ordinance. How possibly can she be qualified for the office of Chief Executive?

The second "dishonoured cheque" was written out to this effect: "If the mainstream opinion of Hong Kong people renders me unsuitable to serve as Chief Executive, I will resign." This, of course, has been cited by many people already. I wish to point out in particular one point. What does the incumbent Chief Executive think about the mainstream opinion in Hong Kong? Of course, in the eyes of the pro-establishment camp or the Government, the mainstream opinion is the opinion of toadies around them. These people are all in the cheering team; they definitely will not ask her to step down, and they definitely will not hold any grudge against her. However, when the discussion on the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") is being conducted on full throttle now, I wish to raise a point and that is, actually even the core supporters of the pro-Government camp, or the pro-establishment camp, or the "blue ribbon camp" as referred to by you, have started to feel deeply dissatisfied with the Government. I wonder if Chief Secretary Matthew CHEUNG and the others are aware of this.
Deputy President, the voting result of this no-confidence motion is no doubt already written on the wall, for everyone knows that it definitely cannot be passed. The pro-Government camp which takes up the majority of seats will certainly continue to vote against it and continue to take the Government under its wings. Having said that, I would like Members to think about one point carefully. Even though they are in control of the Central Government Office and the Legislative Council, so what? Outside these two buildings, more and more Hong Kong people have attempted to cast a vote of no confidence in the Carrie LAM Administration and in Hong Kong with their feet.

The statistics of the Security Bureau are telling us that more than 7,000 people left Hong Kong as emigrants in 2018 as they decided to start their life afresh in another place. Yet, the statistics cannot show the number of returnees who decided to emigrate for a second time. The relatives of a colleague of mine decided to sell their properties and return to Canada the day Carrie LAM was elected. A few days ago when I rode on a bus to work, a lady of about my age came to me and said that she had decided to return to Canada. Why? Because she has lost confidence in this place.

Deputy President, what I wish to tell Members is, the key word of the discussion in Hong Kong society now is "逃" (escape) as in, firstly, "《逃犯條例》" (Fugitive Offenders Ordinance)¹, and secondly, "逃亡" (making an escape). People are making an escape all because of their fear of FOO and their fear of your governance. Let me ask you this question. Why do so many people with the means want to leave while those who do not have the means are asking how they can leave? They said that if they do not have the means to go to the United Kingdom, the United States or Canada, they will go to Taiwan. Why? Even if there is no way for the whole family to leave, why do they still hope that their next generation can leave? Ask yourselves honestly: Do you also find such people around you? If you do, you have to ask yourselves why, given the powers in your hands, you cannot persuade Hongkongers to remain in Hong Kong. Certainly, the person who should bear the largest share of the blame is none in this Chamber but your boss, Carrie LAM, the incumbent Chief Executive.

¹ The Chinese translation of fugitive, "逃犯", consists of the word "逃" which means escape.
Deputy President, I believe when the Chief Executive told us about her idea of "We Connect" back then, it had never occurred to her that she would connect with us in a way that she is walking in the front and charging ahead, and even when she is going to plunge down the cliff, she wants Hong Kong people to follow her in heading towards a bottomless abyss. I would like Members to know just one thing. Even though the FOO amendment is forced through this Council by you people, the ultimate price or cost is not borne by Carrie Lam only. It is borne not only by the current-term SAR Government for it becoming a lame duck ahead of schedule. But the entire Hong Kong is made to bear it with you. I call on Members to rein in at the brink of the precipice and not to keep charging, charging and charging.

On behalf of the Civic Party, I support this motion on no confidence in the Chief Executive.

MR CHARLES PETER MOK (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I thank Mr Andrew WAN for proposing the motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive" and express my support for it.

Perhaps the content of the motion proposed by Mr Andrew WAN is not specific enough, for it mentions only no confidence, thus giving the Chief Secretary for Administration an opportunity to speak for half an hour. I almost thought I had gone to the wrong venue. Today it was like the presentation of the Policy Address. The Government kept boasting about its own achievements, mentioning such aspects as public toilets, welfare, land, the economy, technology and sports for half an hour. I thank Ms Claudia MO for bringing our attention back on focus, making us aware that the reason for proposing this no-confidence motion is definitely to facilitate a focused discussion on the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO").

(THE PRESIDENT resumed the Chair)

The Deputy President has just left. Indeed, as mentioned by Mr Alvin YEUNG just now, she has cited many examples, such as the United Kingdom and Germany, saying how big the political price would be. Very often, after the proposal of such a no-confidence motion, even the prime minister would have to resign, and the government would be dragged down. Please do not make such a
comparison. They have elections, democracy and alternation of the ruling party. Can we drag down the Government? Can the present Members of the pro-democracy camp who have obtained the vast majority of votes run in the Chief Executive Election? The Government would just remain intact. Therefore, do not cite these examples for comparison. They like to cite examples of the Western countries for comparison, but we have no system like theirs, because we do not have universal suffrage.

What does the pro-Government camp actually mean? That is to say, even discussion is not allowed. Time and again, we have been accused of expressing our political stance. Now if we do not express our political stance in the Legislative Council, what are we supposed to do? In fact, the subtext is that even an expression of our stance is not allowed. That will be the case in the future.

Hence, President, first of all, Carrie LAM disregards the public opinion and antagonizes the people. Not only did she attempt to force through the China extradition bill, destroying the human rights and freedom of Hong Kong. Just now the Chief Secretary also told us to not be so resistant. Why should we not resist? The reason for our present resistance is our distrust of the judicial system of Beijing, the Central Authorities and the Chinese Government. So we have to resist. We have got to understand that the original intent of "one country, two systems" in Hong Kong is to resist a number of Mainland systems not accepted by us. The most important one is its judicial system. We see that the judicial system on the Mainland is riddled with flaws. Frankly, as long as there is still not enough protection, we really cannot accept these amendments to FOO proposed in haste.

The Government flew the balloon about it being prepared to make various concessions, but actually everything is just an illusion. Anyone having some knowledge of the Mainland, especially businessmen, would say in private that even though there seems to have been some progress in the rule of law on the Mainland, after all, rule by the Communist Party of China ("CPC") and rule by man overrides the rule of law. An article published by Bruce LUI today mentioned the fragility of the judicial foundation on the Mainland. It is not trustworthy no matter what, and Hongkongers simply do not trust it. The article quoted a saying widespread on the Mainland: "Major cases hinge on politics; medium cases, on the impact; and minor cases, on relations; examinations boil down to law." The law is used only during examinations. The rest is irrelevant
to the law. Therefore, even if the Government raises the threshold to 7, 10 or 15 years, the result will be the same. If the prosecution wants to charge someone with an offence, it can always find one it can use.

According to Bruce LUI, can the laws on the Mainland control the Central Authorities? CPC leads the Public Security Bureau, the Ministry of State Security, the prosecution and the courts. CPC is superior to the law. How will such a system be fair, impartial and credible? Leaving aside whether the Mainland laws can control the Central Authorities, may I ask whether the Chief Secretary can do so? The Central Authorities are his boss. Can his boss exercise control over the Central Authorities? The latter are the boss of his boss.

So, what is the result today? We see that the Chief Executive disregards the public opinion. What is the public opinion? Clearly, the Chief Executive's popularity rating has hit a record low again. As indicated by the opinion poll results published by the University of Hong Kong today, 59% of the respondents oppose Carrie LAM serving as the Chief Executive. Among them, more than 71% are educated to the tertiary level or above. The more educated the respondents, the greater the distrust they have in her. Will she please look in the mirror. Just now "Ah Ting" said there is a magic mirror. In the light of this finding of 71%, she really needs to look in the mirror. The more educated the people, the greater the distrust in her. Today the no-confidence motion proposed by the Member will not be passed because of the system, but the people outside have already voted, telling us that they do not trust Carrie LAM serving as the Chief Executive.

In the last Chief Executive's Question and Answer Session, the Chief Executive said that all the voices against the "China extradition law" were nonsense. The President should not have allowed such words, but it could not be helped given her capacity as Chief Executive. However, we need to tell the Chief Executive that perhaps she herself is her own biggest enemy because she would not listen to other people. It precisely shows how the Chief Executive treats the voices of the people and the views of members of the community. To her, those are all nonsense. Maybe she will only heed her boss. Seeing it with their own eyes, the people say they do not trust her because she does not stand on the side of the people. She was not elected by the people, and after she was elected or hand-picked, she did not stand by the people. Even the slightest hope pinned on her initially after her election has been dashed.
When foreign consuls and governments presented their views against the China extradition bill, the Chief Executive levelled criticisms at them, saying she did not understand where the concerns of those foreign consuls lay. She did not listen to other people's views. Then she shifted the blame to the pro-democracy camp, accusing us of presenting incorrect views to the foreign consuls. She shirked and evaded her responsibility with excuses. Then how did she resolve the issue? By tabling the Bill to the Legislative Council meeting direct, bypassing all the procedures to "make swift work of the whole exercise". The officials keep talking to us about justice, but now the people ask where on earth justice is. The Government ignores the people's voices and opposition views, holding that we oppose it because of our lack of understanding or our misunderstanding. It is all our fault. She alone is right. As a matter of fact, no matter whether the Central Authorities tell her to turn left or right, she will just comply accordingly, but usually the direction is left.

In closing, I can only say this to members of the public here: Let us come forward together on 9 June to make this Government hear and note our voices. We do connect, but we do not connect with the Chief Executive or the Government. We connect with the people, expressing our opposition to the China extradition bill to the Government together.

**MR JIMMY NG** (in Cantonese): President, the reason for proposing the motion of no confidence in the Chief Executive today is very clear. The amendment of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") undoubtedly is the greatest trigger. This amendment exercise has indeed sparked off controversies in society, including the industrial and commercial sectors, which I represent, holding misgivings about it. Therefore, it is imperative to thoroughly discuss the amendment in the Council and seek the greatest common factor through the established mechanism of the Council, instead of levelling unreasonable criticisms at officials in charge of promotion, certainly including the Chief Executive. Doing so may perhaps create some political resistance but I do not see it achieving any effect.

As regards the FOO amendments, many scholars and organizations in the community have made some proposals one after another. I believe, to date, the Government has been keeping the door of communication open. Moreover, the amendments to FOO can always be optimized by, for example, setting a retrospective period and stipulating that applications must be made by the
highest-level judicial authority. I believe in the next stage of scrutiny, all Honourable colleagues will have an opportunity to engage in in-depth discussions on various amendments. If we now pinpoint the Chief Executive at this stage, or even make claims to request withdrawal of the amendment, it is neither constructive, nor will it be successful.

Moreover, Chief Executive Carrie LAM has assumed office for less than two years. It is now premature to criticize at her abilities in administration and the effectiveness of her policies. Since taking office, the Chief Executive has made numerous policy proposals, most of which having been implemented gradually and their effectiveness is beginning to be seen. As at May this year, among the new measures presented in the 2018 Policy Address, about 29 have been completed, while the remaining ones are being planned for implementation. Moreover, as regards the improvement of people's livelihood, the Government has made proactive responses to people's demands, ranging from housing construction to enhancement of public markets and toilets. Such work and efforts are worthy of recognition.

As members of the Council, I believe all Honourable colleagues are concerned about the executive-legislature relationship. And the Chief Executive has, both in her Election Manifesto and her first two Policy Addresses, proposed a number of positive and useful measures to improve the executive-legislature relationship. Over the past two years, the Chief Executive has engaged herself in fairly frequent communication and interaction with Members of this Council. Some examples are: establishment of a regular communication mechanism with Members of various political parties, acceptance of Members' suggestion of advancing the presentation of the Policy Address to October every year, addition of a monthly Question Time to take questions from Members in a "short question, short answer" format, the proposal of rearranging funding applications to the Legislative Council using the approach of "easy ones first and difficult ones later" so as to minimize disputes and expedite the approval of projects, etc. Therefore, I really do not see any reason for casting a vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive.

Regardless of the sharp and distinctive division of parliamentary politics, we as Members should not provoke further political disputes out of political motives. At present, the most pressing issue should be the upcoming Second Reading of the amendment bill related to FOO. If Honourable colleagues
holding dissenting views keep bringing up unnecessary ramifications, instead of focusing their attention on discussing the best amendment proposals, I am afraid they will fail the trust of the people.

Lastly, I hold that the Council should be pragmatic in monitoring the administration by the Government in respect of issues of concern to the people and make constructive suggestions so as to improve policy implementation and people's livelihood. They should not, on the contrary, only seek to inflict destruction without making constructive efforts. It brings no benefit to society. I must reiterate here that the factory owners I represent and I will, as usual, continue to support the Chief Executive and the SAR Government in implementing policies in accordance with the law, while opposing any political attacks against the Chief Executive personally by way of the no confidence motion, which further deepens the dissension in society.

President, I so submit.

MR YIU SI-WING (in Cantonese): President, I rise to speak against the motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive" proposed by Mr Andrew WAN and the amendment proposed by Ms Claudia MO. This opposition-sponsored motion stems from the amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") proposed by the Government. Driven by nothing but their resentment to the controversial amendment proposal, the opposition seizes the opportunity to dismiss out of hand the work undertaken by the Chief Executive in the last two years and undermine the prestige of the SAR Government in governance. Given that such a ploy is typical of the opposition, this no-confidence motion should come as no surprise. Ms Claudia MO asserts in her amendment that the Chief Executive has disregarded the public opinion demanding for withdrawal of the proposed legislative amendment, and that the passage of the proposed amendments will erode Hong Kong's "high degree of autonomy" and freedom. I take exception to that. The proposed amendments to FOO seek to plug the loopholes in law exposed by the CHAN Tong-kai case. The relevant proposed legislative amendments are both legal and constitutional. Moreover, the public reaction on the issue is far from unanimous: there are some lingering doubts and the Government lacks sufficient time to make explanations. In contrast, the opposition has been keen to exploit the opportunity presented by the legislative amendment exercise to mislead the public and complicate the
problem, in a bid to polarize the community and fuel public discontent towards
the Government on the eve of the District Council elections, thereby reaping
benefits in the elections. In evaluating the achievements and effectiveness of the
Chief Executive, I think we should look not at one single issue but her overall
performance. Besides, the amendment to FOO is a matter of social justice, not a
personal problem of the Chief Executive. The SAR Government and the
Legislative Council are both duty-bound to expedite the passage of the
amendment proposal.

President, it is clear that the Chief Executive, Mrs Carrie LAM, has
performed well since taking office almost two years ago. Trained as an
Administrative Officer, experienced in leading various departments and well
versed in the operation of her civil service team, the Chief Executive has a big
advantage in leading the civil service to implement policies. Under the
leadership of the Chief Executive, the incumbent government team boasts better
morale and greater efficiency, outperforming past governments in terms of both
efficiency and effectiveness in policy implementation.

With the Chief Executive at the helm, the SAR Government has achieved
solid outcomes in various aspects of its work. First, she has taken the initiative
to go global by proactively cultivating good relations with overseas countries and
Mainland cities while participating enthusiastically in the development of the
Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area ("the Greater Bay Area") and
the planning of the Belt and Road Initiative, with a view to raising the
international status of Hong Kong and laying a sturdier foundation for Hong
Kong to expand Mainland and overseas markets. Second, she has proactively
visited various ministries of the Central Authorities in an effort to boost the
Central Authorities' confidence in and support for the SAR Government and
strive for various policies benefiting Hong Kong. The fruits of the Chief
Executive's efforts include tax concessions for talents working in the Greater Bay
Area, and over 30 public livelihood services on the Mainland made available for
Hong Kong and Macao residents who are holders of Home Visit Permits. Third,
she proactively improves people's lot by allocating enormous resources to such
areas as education, health care, welfare and technology, winning the approval of
not just the general public, but the opposition camp as well. Fourth, she
proactively promotes various infrastructure projects and increases land supply for
housing with a view to creating more business opportunities for all sectors in
Hong Kong and finding ways to resolve the housing difficulty.
On improving the relationship between the executive and the legislature, the Chief Executive introduced an additional monthly session of the Chief Executive's Question Time in this Council as soon as she took office, giving responses pragmatically on issues ranging from people's livelihood and politics, to the economy and environmental protection, while carrying out follow-ups properly as pledged. For instance, I asked the Chief Executive in this Council about the ways in which the hygiene problem of public toilets in Hong Kong, particularly those in tourist areas, could be improved. The Chief Executive acknowledged the problem readily and pledged to urge the relevant Policy Bureau to follow up on the matter properly. After the session, the Secretary for Food and Health contacted me immediately with a list, drafted in collaboration with the Tourism Commission, of public toilets in tourist areas of which a first batch of 23 public toilets was singled out for improvement works. It was followed by a provision of $600 million made in this year's Budget for refurbishing works with a view to gradually improving the inferior hardware and software of the public toilets in Hong Kong.

Besides, in a bid to improve the relationship with the opposition, the Chief Executive took the initiative of extending an olive branch, including participating in events organized by the opposition and facilitating the implementation of reasonable proposals put forward by them. However, that proves to be wishful thinking on the part of the Chief Executive. The opposition remains unmoved. Some of them have even held attitudes nastier and more outrageous than before, to the antipathy of the public on the sidelines.

President, the SAR Government under the leadership of the Chief Executive will have to face numerous difficulties in the future. As well as the FOO amendment exercise that warrants speedy conclusion, the issue concerning the trade war between China and the United States is even more complicated with broader impacts. Recently, the United States has exploited every means and tactic to achieve its hegemonic ambitions by way of targeting even companies, going so far as to mounting an all-out clampdown on Huawei of China, which shook the world. Under such complicated circumstances, Hong Kong, far from remaining impervious, can quickly find itself the target of sanctions. It can only be hoped that the opposition will refrain from the self-serving act of going overseas and lodging complaints with the relevant political dignitaries, lest they play into the hands of American politicos. The SAR Government, on its part,
must make proper preparations for the worst, formulating countermeasures in advance to minimize the impacts of the trade war between China and the United States on Hong Kong.

President, I so submit.

DR FERNANDO CHEUNG (in Cantonese): President, why do we support the motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive"? The simplest and most direct reason is that she has betrayed Hong Kong. This Chief Executive has betrayed Hong Kong. Should we not let this Chief Executive who has betrayed Hong Kong to remain in office?

Why did I say that she has betrayed Hong Kong? She spared no effort in introducing the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill") which is even worse than Article 23 of the Basic Law. Under Article 23 of the Basic Law, the offence of treason shall be prosecuted, tried and punished by imprisonment in Hong Kong, while the Bill opens a gap. Hong Kong has been protected by a firewall in the past 20 years, but now an opening will be bored on the wall through which the Mainland may extend its arm over into Hong Kong and arrest whoever it wishes. This is what the amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance are about. As for mutual legal assistance in criminal matters, they will be able to freeze people's assets and conduct investigations as they wish. In a nutshell, they may practically arrest people and shut down businesses anytime. The Chief Executive said this is impossible, that she will not act arbitrarily and the Court will act as the gatekeeper.

The Court will act as the gatekeeper? Many legal professionals have publicly stated that the Court will not be able to do so. The Court is made a scapegoat. The Court has no say now, of course. They may not say if they will be able to act as the gatekeeper in their position, but 12 incumbent or former chairmen of the Hong Kong Bar Association have indicated that the Court will not be able to act as the gatekeeper, including a former Vice President of the Court of Appeal who is retired, of course, or else he would not be able to make such a comment. Judges are not supposed to comment on the merits of the law or controversial issues in society. However, if we think about it deeper, who is
more authoritative to comment on this matter than legal professionals? They have clearly indicated that the Court is restricted in that it has to grant the extradition request as long as a prima facie case is established.

Then who will act as the gatekeeper? The Chief Executive is subordinate to the Central Government, will she dare to ignore it if her superior tells her to arrest someone? Will she dare to resist? Will she dare to disagree? No way. The way Carrie LAM pushes the Bill ahead forcibly is concrete evidence that she is nothing but a servant and puppet who acts at the dictates of the Central Government. How can we expect her to perform the gatekeeper role? She said the Bill is compliant with the international mechanism for the surrender of fugitive offenders, and Hong Kong has signed extradition agreements with other countries, so criticisms should not be directed at the Mainland only. However, the situation with other countries is different. Those countries are not the bosses of Carrie LAM, but the Mainland is. Will she dare to refuse the order of her boss? It is as simple as that.

Carrie LAM has betrayed the security and the rule of law of Hong Kong. We are protected by the laws of Hong Kong, but they may come and arrest anyone anytime after the passage of the Bill. Some people said my worry is unnecessary: Do you really think you will be arrested? Do you really think they have so much time to spare? Not everyone goes to the Mainland and not everyone who goes to the Mainland breaks the law. It will be fine as long as you abide by the law. I do not believe the Mainland will arrest people anytime, but it is indeed capable of doing so.

Simply ask any Hongkonger in the street what cannot be forged in the Mainland. As long as Mainland authorities—we are not even sure which authorities now—make the extradition request to Hong Kong and provide prima facie evidence, the person concerned can be extradited. Is this possible? Sure. They said political offences are not extraditable, but why must it involve political offences? Does the Mainland have to charge someone with treason or disclosure of state secrets? Not necessarily. Many dissidents were not charged with these offences. It is so easy for the Mainland to charge or arrest someone. This is a matter of common sense not worth arguing here.

The Chief Executive was very tough at first. She was unwilling to make any amendment. We requested a meeting with her, but she refused. The Hong Kong Journalists Association requested a meeting with her, she refused. Some community groups wanted to express their views to her, again she declined such a meeting. Now what? There comes foreign influence, so she claimed. She
said other countries are making irresponsible remarks. What a joke. The Bill will affect everyone in Hong Kong. The fact is that not only Chinese citizens but people of all nationalities in Hong Kong may be extradited to Mainland China because of the Bill.

What was their original intention in this matter? They piggybacked on the Taiwan murder case. The Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong supported the amendments right from the beginning. They even accompanied the family of the victim in the interview. Have they eaten steamed buns soaked with human blood? Where is their conscience? Where is Carrie LAM's sympathy and empathy? Why did she present the Bill to the Council forcibly even after Taiwan had clearly stated that the suspect would not be extradited under the Bill? Does she not feel ashamed for piggybacking on this tragedy? How can this be fair to the family of the victim? We certainly have no confidence in such a unscrupulous and shameless person who has betrayed Hong Kong. Come out on 9 June (The buzzer sounded) …

MR CHAN KIN-POR (in Cantonese): President, the motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive" proposed by Mr Andrew WAN and the amendment thereto by Ms Claudia MO to cripple the effort of amending the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") are a "political show" of malicious intentions, a "critique session" that elevates the matter to the political plane, the purpose of which is to provoke and mislead the people in order to serve their own political agenda. Honourable colleagues who have paid attention would find that the last sentence of all of their speeches is an appeal to people to take to the streets on a certain day, which is a highly choreographed act.

The Chief Executive has not committed any misconduct, nor anything unlawful. Why is she being subjected to a public trial in the Legislative Council? Sometimes I think the pro-establishment camp ought to learn from the opposition camp, as they are most awesome actually. For example, during the discussions on the co-location arrangements back then, they almost said that people would be arrested for just walking past the West Kowloon Station, instilling much fear in the public. However, the reality is now the Express Rail Link has been in operation for some time and people only enjoy the benefits it brings, with no one having been arrested.

Similarly, as regards the amendment of FOO, why are they now asserting that certain situations will definitely happen? I was knocked into fears after hearing their speeches just now. It seems like I will be arrested walking on the
street tomorrow, and every citizen and visitor will be vulnerable to such treatment—everyone will be arrested. They have presented such situations as facts. I doubt if they should do so.

FOO has definitely caused concerns in society. But society should give the Government a chance to explain it, especially the details. People holding dissenting views can try to convince their opponents with arguments. It is what an assembly should do. To my understanding, the Bills Committee originally set aside approximately 70 hours for officials and Members to scrutinize the Bill in a question-and-answer format. It on the one hand could dispel public misgivings and force the Government to make changes to the amendments, and it could leave on the other an official record, which is in keeping with the fine tradition of the Council. If the opposition camp were really sincere in working for the good of Hong Kong, they should allow the Bills Committee to conduct its scrutiny of the Bill and only turn against it if they were still dissatisfied after the scrutiny. It is what the Council should do.

Regrettably, the opposition camp simply does not subscribe to reasons, and has prevented the discussion on the Bill in society from the beginning. They have employed all kinds of trickery, including delaying the election of the chairman, holding bogus meetings, ignoring the House Committee's decisions, storming the conduct of meetings, etc., disabling the Bills Committee and eventually forcing the Bill to be presented before the Legislative Council direct for the Second Reading debate. Such a situation is the doing of the opposition camp singlehandedly while the Government has been in a passive position. The opposition camp has resorted to its usual tactics and, conversely, put the blame of the present chaos on the Government, even slandering the Government and smearing the Chief Executive. People need only pay careful attention to find out that everything is the doing of the opposition camp.

Irrational, the opposition has been using scare tactics to raise alarmist talk, and has even teamed up with foreigners to instill hear in Hongkongers. But they have spread a lot of wrong information, misleading people all along. They have elevated the issue to the political plane. Despite the Government's categorical assertion that political offenders will not be extradited or be extradited on other offences and that the Court will act as the gatekeeper so that ordinary people will absolutely not be implicated for no reason, the opposition camp has outrageously smeared the Court. They claim to safeguard the rule of law, but keep attacking the rule of law. Particularly, for judgments that they are not happy with, they
will immediately criticize the Court. Sometimes, I consider their comments extreme exaggerations and they are unrivalled in the whole world for "moving the goalposts". Now, they have described the situation as one where even good law-abiding citizens will be arrested. It is absolutely preposterous. In fact, if FOO is not amended, Hong Kong will formally become a haven for fugitives in name and in essence.

President, the more truth is debated, the clearer it gets. At least we should listen to the Government's explanation. The Panel on Security will hold meetings and 14 hours have been set aside for officials and Members to discuss the details of the Bill in a question-and-answer format. If the opposition camp think they have grounds, they should convince the Government and the Council with reasons, instead of resorting to charging and storming to prevent the conduct of meetings. I am very worried that the meetings of the Panel on Security will likewise be stormed. I hope the opposition camp will not fulfil our prediction that they will definitely stir up troubles. I hope Honourable colleagues will raise questions to the Government on matters about which people are truly concerned, so that they can genuinely help them understand the law.

President, the Legislative Council is a venue where laws are made and improvements of people's livelihood discussed, not a platform on which time is wasted on smearing the Chief Executive and the Hong Kong Government, thereby inciting people to take to the streets. For this reason, I absolutely oppose such a motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive." I so submit.

MR GARY FAN (in Cantonese): I rise to speak in support of the motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive" proposed by Mr Andrew WAN.

Regarding the approval rating of "Liar Carrie LAM", I can only say that it is declining steadily. The poll findings of the Public Opinion Programme of the University of Hong Kong ("HKUPOP") were announced yesterday, which is most opportune. According to the latest findings, the approval rating of Chief Executive Carrie LAM is 44.7, the rating of vote of confidence is 32% and that of vote of no confidence is 59%, which means nearly 60%—it is 60%—of the public oppose her. The net approval rate of Carrie LAM is -27%, which is a record low since she assumed office. From a detailed analysis, we see that the younger the
respondents are and the higher educational attainment the respondents have, the higher is the ratio of vote of no confidence in Carrie LAM. For the respondent group aged between 18 and 29, as many as 83% of them oppose Carrie LAM as the Chief Executive. For the respondent group with an educational attainment of tertiary or above, 71% of them oppose Carrie LAM as the Chief Executive. Besides, not only one survey shows these findings. The findings of the opinion poll conducted by the Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies of The Chinese University of Hong Kong also indicate that the ratios of vote of no confidence in the Hong Kong Government and the Central Government are 30.1% and 41.1% respectively, which are the record high in the year.

Since Carrie LAM took office, she has made a series of blunders in administration, and in the taking forward of the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill") this year, she has adopted an imperious attitude, rejected dissidents and acted perversely. Such is her new style of governance, which is a main reason for her declining approval rating and the faltering confidence of the people of Hong Kong in the SAR Government and the Central Government. The present motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive" is a result which fully reflects the mainstream opinion of Hong Kong society.

As the saying goes, it takes more than one cold day for a river to freeze three-feet deep. Carrie Lam and the SAR Government are now facing seething public anger. Definitely, this situation did not occur overnight. Since Carrie LAM took office, she has done nothing that can bring about actual improvement in people's livelihood. On the contrary, she has given priority to pleasing the Central Government in Beijing in all aspects. What achievements has she made since she introduced her election slogan and became the Chief Executive? She has only connected with the Communist Party of China ("CPC") but remained disconnected with the people of Hong Kong. Worse than being disconnected, she suppresses and does harm to the people of Hong Kong.

In fact, the approval rating of Carrie LAM showed an obvious declining trend last year. After the presentation of the Policy Address in last October, her approval rating dropped below 50 points. What happened back then? It was the time when I used the phrase "burning our fiscal reserves" to describe the Lantau Tomorrow Vision, a programme which is actually "dumping money into the sea". The programme which proposes the reclamation of 1 700 hectares of
land has aroused a strong controversy in society. Many people have expressed opposition and queried the feasibility of the programme, yet the Chief Executive and her administrative team insist on having their way.

Early this year, the Government announced raising the age threshold for Comprehensive Social Security Assistance for the elderly. When Carrie LAM attended the Chief Executive's Question and Answer Session at the Legislative Council, she was extremely arrogant and supercilious, stating that the content of raising the threshold had already been included in the Appropriation Bill 2018. She mocked Members, Members from the pro-establishment camp and the pro-government camp, that they had voted for the passage of the Bill in the Legislative Council—I did not vote for the passage of that Bill.

Carrie LAM shirks her responsibilities. There is dereliction of duty on her part. She is stubborn. She brags on her inflated ego that only she is always right and turns a deaf ear to other opinions. Certainly, the trigger for her approval rating hitting rock bottom is the "China extradition law" about which we are most concerned now. Carrie LAM and Secretary for Security John LEE piggybacked on the homicide case in Taiwan to introduce the "China extradition law" hastily, which is comparable to killing its target with another person's knife. Despite the Government of Taiwan's clear statement that it will not agree to the surrender of the suspect, the authorities attempted to submit the Bill to the meeting of the Legislative Council next month and to bulldoze the Bill through this Council.

The "China extradition law" has aroused widespread panic and people are driven into great fear. According to the survey findings on "Social Indicators" announced by HKUPOP this month, all 10 freedom sub-indicators have also dropped. Among them, the freedoms of "academic research", "speech", "press", "publication" and "association" have even dropped to record lows since the questions were first asked in August 1997. The "freedom of association" has dropped drastically 1.03 points to 5.38 points. The people of Hong Kong are worried and extremely anxious that the core values which we have all along treasured will be destroyed by the Government led by Carrie LAM upon the passage of the "China extradition law".

During the election of the Chief Executive, Carrie LAM stated openly at the television forum to the people of Hong Kong that she would accept their views, and that she would resign if the mainstream opinion of Hong Kong people
renders her unsuitable to serve as Chief Executive. She has completely forgotten these words of hers. Even when 130 000 people had joined the march organized by the Civil Human Rights Front on 28 April on "No China Extradition", Carrie LAM and John LEE stuck to their line, adopted the practice that "a lie repeated 100 times will become the truth", continued sowing discord in society and insisted on having their way to amend the law unwavered.

Hence, under the governance of Carrie LAM, the SAR Government is heading towards autocracy and dictatorship. When the devil's claw of the "China extradition law" extends to Hong Kong, the people of Hong Kong will lose the freedom from fear whereas "one country, two systems" will be wrecked. Therefore, we must take to the streets and join the protest march. The people of Hong Kong must come forward to protest. I call on the people of Hong Kong to: Join us at the march on "No China Extradition" on 9 June to safeguard Hong Kong and to demand withdrawal of the draconian law.

MR WU CHI-WAI (in Cantonese): I heard many Members of the pro-establishment camp shamelessly extol just now the excellent performance of Carrie LAM. The Chief Secretary, meanwhile, spoke for half an hour, enumerating each and every achievement made by Carrie LAM. However, have they ever pondered about where the problem lies?

Come to think about this. Imagine there is this construction company long in the process of erecting a marvellous building. Yet, it knocks the foundation of the entire building down all of a sudden. Is it not unscrupulous of the construction company? Is the action of the construction company not undermining the interest of the residents of the building? In amending the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO"), Carrie LAM is essentially doing the same thing.

May I ask the Chief Executive, the Secretaries and government officials why "one country, two systems" is implemented in Hong Kong after the reunification in 1997? "One country, two systems" stemmed from our distrust in the Mainland system and our various fears about the Mainland. I am not sure whether Members have such fears or not, but we believe that Hong Kong must safeguard its core interest of "one country, two systems" and ensure that "one country, two systems" will not be distorted or deformed. For that is the only
way by which the values of Hong Kong can be preserved and the core interest of everyone living in the community of Hong Kong can be protected. This is the most fundamental issue.

Yet, in what light did the Chief Executive look at this issue? How did she address it? Initially, the Government cast the proposed amendment of FOO as an urgent task undertaken for the express purpose of plugging loopholes in law, handling the CHAN Tong-kai case and upholding justice. But then someone pointed out to the Chief Executive that the amendment exercise would prove futile since the Taiwan authorities would not make a surrender request once the amendment was enacted, precluding any chance for justice to be done. Left without any plausible defence, the Chief Executive only reiterated time and again that we must first do our part. Since we are only doing our part, why is the amendment still urgent and pressing? The problem lies in the Chief Executive's desire to "knock down the foundation" and do so within a limited time frame—getting the amendment passed by the end of June—lest people will come up with remedial measures following lengthy discussions and detailed deliberations. How can we trust her?

Some Members mentioned that the Mainland legal system, having undergone changes and improvement, is worthy of our trust. Yet, what is the Mainland legal system in essence? Is it a system based on the principle of presumption of innocence, or one under which a suspect is arrested first and then left to his own devices to explain and prove his innocence? The answer should be clear to the law professors present here. Will there not be an essential and fundamental change in the legal system of Hong Kong if fugitives are allowed to be surrendered to such a legal system? In the view of the pro-democracy or opposition camp, if the core values of Hong Kong society are to be upheld, it is imperative to keep Hong Kong away from the reach of such a legal system of the Mainland—a system underpinned by the so-called continental law under which the burden of proof falls on the suspect—lest we will be deprived of our original common law and its safeguard of presumption of innocence to which we are all entitled. What is wrong for us to stand up against such prospect? Yet, we are accused by the pro-establishment Members of being downright wrong, ungrateful and oblivious to the many good things that the SAR Government has done, and sponsoring a no-confidence motion to boot.
Frankly, as I have pointed out at the outset, the good things that the SAR Government has done as enumerated by them are tantamount to airbrushing the façade of a building to give an appearance of splendour. In fact, the Government is fundamentally knocking down the foundation of that building to the detriment of the originally secured living environment of our society. How can we possibly turn a blind eye to that?

Honestly, why has Mr Jeffrey LAM, an Executive Council Member, sold his land and property holdings, as stated in his declaration? I really do not have a clue. Why are some of our Honourable colleagues selling their properties and assets while appearing not in a rush to re-enter the property market of Hong Kong? Is it the case that "the duck is the first to know when the water of the Spring River gets warm"? Are they, while appreciating the seriousness of the problem as well, merely talking a good game and making irresponsible remarks simply because they can flee abroad? With the means to flee abroad and make a life there, they can certainly afford to make irresponsible remarks. What about the majority of Hongkongers. That reminds me of the situation of Hong Kong in the 1980s.

Here in Hong Kong in the 1980s, the one thing—apart from the Sino-British negotiations—that Hongkongers could not stop fretting about night and day was the scene of the communists entering the city. While feeling helpless and uncertain, they still held out a glimmer of hope of "one country, two systems" providing safeguards and the Basic Law acting as a firewall, thereby confining the communists to the north of the Shenzhen River. Now our SAR Government is really outdoing itself. Not only is the Government talking about integration every day, it is going one better by throwing open the back and the front gates to welcome the communists into the city: "Welcome, welcome; welcome, welcome; we extend our warm welcome (in Putonghua)".

Come to think about this. While knowing full well that they are in the wrong, the SAR Government and the Chief Executive lie through their teeth all the same on a daily basis, even forcing all government officials to come to the defence of the Bill that seeks to amend FOO while dismissing the views of everyone else as crap and their worries supposedly unfounded. While remaining impervious to the worries of others, the Government removed nine items of offences covered by the surrender arrangement in response to the worries of the business community. How can we trust a Chief Executive like this?
As I said just now, a gift of a palatial mansion from a real estate developer would worth nothing if its foundation has been knocked down and its residents face certain death. Hence, I support Mr Andrew WAN's motion. And will Members please think about this carefully: where does the crux of the problem lie? It is the Chief Executive knocking the foundation of Hong Kong down. Thank you, President.

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

(Mr HUI Chi-fung indicated his wish to raise a point of order)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr HUI Chi-fung, what is your point of order?

MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): President, I request a headcount.

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

(After the summoning bell had been rung, a number of Members returned to the Chamber)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Jeremy TAM, please speak.

MR JEREMY TAM (in Cantonese): President, if we look at this motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive" today, we can see that according to the contents proposed by Mr Andrew WAN and Ms Claudia MO, and especially in the amendment proposed by Ms Claudia MO, the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") is mentioned and it is stated that the public opinion demands for the withdrawal of the legislation but Carrie LAM, being the Chief Executive, insisted on forcing it through and it is for this reason that this no-confidence motion is proposed.
However, in his opening remarks earlier the Chief Secretary for Administration spent a lot of time talking about the renovation of public toilets, statutory holidays or the Greater Bay Area, which are entirely irrelevant. The subject matter under discussion now is FOO. Why on earth did he talk about the refurbishment of public toilets? It really beats me. What is the focus of the whole issue? Is he telling us that the importance of FOO has a lot to do with the cleanliness of public toilets? This is entirely incomprehensible to me.

Let us take a look at the popularity rating of Carrie LAM in the past. It is constantly on a decline and has sunk to the bottom in a short span of time. According to the latest poll results published by the University of Hong Kong, her net approval rate is -27%, and I repeat, -27%, a record low since she took up the office of Chief Executive. Among respondents aged 18 to 29, 83% are opposed to Carrie LAM taking the office of Chief Executive. She talked about the idea of "We Connect" at the outset when she ran for the office of Chief Executive, and I do not know with whom she has now connected. In this entire generation of people, 83% of them are opposed to her taking the office of Chief Executive, while 71% of respondents educated to the tertiary level or above are opposed to her taking the office of Chief Executive. I wonder what she thinks about such an awesome approval rate, or actually she dares not think about it.

Carrie LAM has assumed office as the Chief Executive for 22 months. Compared to her predecessors, her popularity rating is the worst in the corresponding period and it is most unfortunate that even LEUNG Chun-ying fared better than her. At the time when "689" had taken up office for 22 months, his net approval rate was -25%. As for Carrie LAM, I can only say that she has surpassed her predecessors, for her net approval rate is -27% which is more formidable than LEUNG Chun-ying, and it is really something. In running for the office of Chief Executive, Carrie LAM said that she would resign if the mainstream opinion of Hong Kong people rendered her unsuitable to serve as the Chief Executive. Therefore, we are here only to lend her a hand. Mr Andrew WAN, Ms Claudia MO or Members who will vote for this motion are actually giving her a hand. Since she does not wish to resign, we have, therefore, proposed a no-confidence motion against her.

Let me talk about some of the unprecedented practices in relation to her. Actually, apart from FOO, the response of foreign countries is also unprecedented. Let us take a look at the European Union ("EU"). EU has
issued a demarche to the Hong Kong Government because of the FOO amendment. A demarche is a formal diplomatic document, and I think many people know what it is. It is generally issued by a country as notification of its views or attitude on a certain incident. It is a way for expressing a position. Just take a look at the incidents over which EU has issued a demarche before and we will know how awesome Carrie LAM is. For instance, on 4 February 2003, an ultimatum was issued to Iraq on the Iraqi war, demanding that Saddam HUSSEIN gave up arms or else he would have to bear the consequences. Members can think about this. Now Carrie LAM's level is equivalent to that of the HUSSEIN regime in Iraq back then.

Moreover, on 13 February 2001, which is farther from now, the Israeli army was condemned by EU for killing a large number of Palestinians. Think about this. The international level of Carrie LAM or her outstanding, eye-catching performance in Hong Kong can be put on a par with Iraq's Saddam HUSSEIN or the incident of Israel killing a large number of Palestinians. We can imagine how awesome she has become.

Let us also take a look at the past couple of days when many signature campaigns were organized. What is the motto of Carrie LAM's alma mater? It is "live by the truth in love". Close to 1 000 students and alumni of St Francis' Canossian College have put down their signatures to call on this senior alumnus of theirs to remember to "live by the truth in love" and rein in at the brink of the precipice, in order not to aggravate injustice, and join hands with Hong Kong people to uphold human rights, freedom and the rule of law. I wonder how she feels about it. Usually, a normal person is, to a certain extent, emotionally attached to his or her alma mater and has a great sense of belonging towards it. When, in the blink of an eye, nearly 1 000 people from her alma mater have put down their signatures to criticize her, can Carrie LAM maintain that she is not an ostrich? Actually it is Carrie LAM who has acted like an ostrich most, not the several terms of government before hers. The person most resembling an ostrich is Carrie LAM, and it is she again who refused to take part in a debate on television. She told Hong Kong people that the SAR Government would listen to any good ideas that they may have. But when people proposed that a tripartite meeting be held, so that the pro-democracy camp and the pro-establishment camp in the Legislative Council as well as the Chief Executive can sit down and hold discussions, she turned down the invitation. We told her that the public might not understand the details and invited her to a debate on
television. She said that the Legislative Council would be the best venue but then, she scrapped the Bills Committee to enable the Bill to be tabled at a meeting of the Legislative Council direct. So this person has kept giving herself a slap in her own face, and she herself is a real ostrich, for she has been evading the public and evading the Hong Kong citizens. Such a Chief Executive might as well step down early.

Therefore, I appeal to members of the public that on 9 June, it is all the more necessary to *(The buzzer sounded)* … come forth and take to the streets.

**PRESIDENT** (in Cantonese): Mr Jeremy TAM, please stop speaking.

**MR CHU HOI-DICK** (in Cantonese): President, HAN Kuo-yu, who was elected as the new mayor of Kaohsiung City, Taiwan last year, has put forward a slogan of "100 percent economy, zero percent politics". Yet, he has shown his true colours after just a few months. When he visited the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region during his trip to Hong Kong, he demonstrated an extremely pro-communist attitude. The track of Chief Executive Carrie LAM and that of HAN Kuo-yu are very much alike. When HAN Kuo-yu switched from advocating "zero percent politics" to "100 percent politics" after several months, the people of Taiwan have seen through him and realized that they had been deceived by him. Hongkongers have also seen through Carrie LAM. She claimed that she would focus on livelihood issues when she assumed office, and that she would not take forward the enactment of legislation for Article 23 of the Basic Law as politics were too complicated and conditions for the exercise were still lacking in Hong Kong.

It turns out that she is even worse than LEUNG Chun-ying, as she pursues "100 percent politics" and she has even done the most evil thing in politics. If she has achieved something desirable in politics, such as implementing dual universal suffrage for Hongkongers and returning the power to the Legislative Council, everyone will give her kudos and her popularity rating would not be so low. Yet, she has done the most evil thing in politics by introducing the "China extradition bill" which will destroy Hong Kong, through a sneaky approach that Hongkongers hate most. Regarding the enactment of legislation for Article 23
of the Basic Law, the Chief Executives of the previous terms all indicated that there should be favourable conditions and social consensus before such an exercise would be launched. Yet, Carrie LAM turns to the back door and stabs Hongkongers in their back, taking forward the exercise by introducing the "China extradition law" which appears to have no problem. Duplicity is what Hongkongers hate most. The reason behind the "China extradition bill" is very simple, XI Jinping has made an order to tie Hong Kong up on the chariot of the China-United States trade war, aiming to pin down the United States with Hong Kong. As the United States arrested MENG Wanzhou in Canada, they now have to break the firewall to create a back door for China to arrest people in Hong Kong, which is aimed at pinning down the United States as there are a great number of Americans in Hong Kong.

The second reason is to assist XI Jinping in cracking down on his political enemies in Hong Kong, and also take this opportunity to confiscate their properties to fill the national coffers. *Wen Wei Po* interviewed a person in authority who pointed out that the legislation would also cover those people endangering national security in Hong Kong. Prof Priscilla LEUNG may respond to the interview of this person in authority by *Wen Wei Po* if she should speak later on. When attending the meeting today, Chief Secretary for Administration Matthew CHEUNG still dared to repeat the hypocritical statements of his boss, but the person in authority interviewed by *Wen Wei Po* has already spilled the beans. Will the Chief Secretary please respond to this person in authority interviewed by *Wen Wei Po* in his concluding remarks. He even dared to mention the murder case in Taiwan and the loopholes, but he just made the Government look like a scoundrel in saying that. The Government has proposed the "China extradition law" which will undermine the foundation of Hong Kong, damage Hong Kong's international reputation, and ruin Hong Kong's judicial independence, but they continue to package it with lies that even a three-year-old can see through.

I took to the streets with many colleagues in the past few days to make an appeal to members of the public. I explained to them concisely the reasons why they should oppose the "China extradition law". Even the Mainlanders do not believe in the judicial system of the Mainland, on what grounds does Carrie LAM seek to break the system that we have been implementing in the past 20-odd years and force us to board this pirate ship in a few months' time? It does not make sense. I went to Yuen Long to make an appeal to members of the public. Many Mainlanders go shopping there under the Individual Visit Scheme as they have trust in Hong Kong but not in the Mainland. I told the public that they
should never think it is useless to voice their opinions. Even the Department of State of the United States and the European Union have voiced their views on this matter these days and even the Judges have spoken up today, which exactly gives Chief Secretary Matthew CHEUNG a slap in his face. Just now he said that the Court would act as the gatekeeper and the Chief Executive would not arrest a person once Beijing made an order, claiming that this would not be the case. Yet, three veteran Judges have now pointed out anonymously to Reuters that this is unworkable, it will not work. They are forcing people in this manner and putting them on the spot in that they will be arrested by Beijing if they do not surrender someone, or they will undermine Hong Kong’s judicial independence if they permit the surrender. Why do they bother to do so? We are all Hongkongers. Why do they treat us in such an unsympathetic way?

Members of the public see that every party has spoken up, but the voices of Hongkongers are still absent in the meantime. Carrie LAM cannot possibly dictate everything, we can still reason things out in Hong Kong. Hongkongers have power. She and Chief Secretary Matthew CHEUNG should not consider what they said as entirely correct. The problem laid before us now cannot be clearer. The people of Hong Kong cannot find justice in the Legislative Council, which cannot speak up for them. Our only way out is to gather the power of the people and take to the streets on 9 June to tell Carrie LAM and Matthew CHEUNG that the SAR Government cannot dictate everything. If they want to be lackeys, they should do it themselves. They should go to Beijing to present themselves as lackeys, but they should not harm Hongkongers. They had better get away and resign immediately.

MR CHEUNG KWOK-KWAN (in Cantonese): President, theoretically, a motion of no confidence is proposed in a parliamentary assembly only when an issue of the utmost seriousness and significance is involved. In the legislature of Hong Kong, however, President, the moving of a no-confidence motion should be regarded as a most mundane and unremarkable affair instead. Why did I say that? Unverified statistics turned up after a cursory search on the Internet revealed that no less than 10 no-confidence motions—an imprecise estimation, and the actual figure should be higher—had been proposed in the legislature throughout the years since 1998. Apart from the President of the Legislative Council—meaning your goodself—who was the subject of one such motion, more than 10 government officials, including 4 Chief Executives, 2 Secretaries and 2 Directors of Bureaux, were targeted. Recently, even the Chairmen of our
House Committee and Finance Committee fell victim to the mechanism. And the Chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee might well be the next, according to Mr CHAN Hak-kan. Today, I also heard that a no-confidence motion against the entire SAR Government will soon be proposed by Members of the opposition camp for discussion in this Chamber. That is why, as I said just now, that moving a no-confidence motion in the legislature of Hong Kong is a mundane and unremarkable affair.

Dr KWOK Ka-ki said just now that a no-confidence motion is the most forceful kind of parliamentary language. This is not the case in the Hong Kong legislature however. Each Chief Executive had found himself or herself the target of at least one no-confidence motion, with Mr TUNG and Mr LEUNG each being targeted twice. As I said just now, apart from Chief Executives, Secretaries, Directors of Bureaux, the President of the Legislative Council, Chairmen of the House Committee, the Finance Committee and even the Public Works Subcommittee, and shortly our entire governing team will all have to contend with no-confidence motions. It can thus be seen that, except for those being not up to snuff, enjoying little recognition in the political sector and remaining untried in the rigours of Hong Kong politics, anyone in the business of politics or ruling in Hong Kong would invariably find himself or herself the target of no-confidence motions moved by Members of the opposition—a league that I has yet reached. Hence, a no-confidence motion moved against a certain political figure in the legislature of Hong Kong should probably be regarded as a stamp of approval from the opposition camp.

Mr Alvin YEUNG asked just now why Chief Executives never engaged in any soul-searching in the face of no-confidence motions against them. The answer is very simple: because proposing a no-confidence motion in our legislature is indeed very easy, requiring no more than a simple statement that "I have no confidence in a certain person" made by a Member. This would form a no-confidence motion up for discussion in this Council as we are doing today. That is why I say that in the Legislative Council of Hong Kong, proposing a no-confidence motion is a most mundane and unremarkable affair.

I heard Mr Alvin YEUNG mention just now that a certain acquaintance around him—a form of rhetoric commonly used among us—has emigrated. It is no cause for concern though, President. For whatever grievances they harbour against the SAR government team and the Chief Executive, they will not
emigrate as a certain acquaintance around a certain Member of the opposition
camp has done. Instead of emigrating, every Member of the opposition camp
present in this Chamber will stay in Hong Kong. Hence, there is no need for us
to worry about a certain acquaintance around a certain person, because despite
their nagging and harsh criticisms, Members of the opposition camp have shown
us with actions their love for Hong Kong and their desire to stay in Hong Kong.

I heard today many Members just ramble about all sorts of problems
concerning people's livelihood. Their grievances against the Chief Executive
range from those relating to the Link Real Estate Investment Trust to the fares of
the MTR Corporation Limited. However, there is no denying that, when it
comes to social issues of significance, the ability of Members of the opposition
camp to shape social discourse and agenda could be considerable. For example,
they presented the co-location arrangement simply as "selling out Hong Kong",
equating the Lantau Tomorrow Vision with "dumping money into the sea" and
calling the Bill on the surrendering of fugitive offenders as a "China extradition
law". All in all, any social policies formulated by the Government are meritless
to them. Why is that the case? It is in fact a consequence of the system: a
refusal—in the most fundamental sense—by Members of the opposition camp to
accept the existing SAR Government system under "one country, two systems"
and to recognize the Chief Executive selected under the existing system. So,
they will certainly not, in the most fundamental sense, approve the policies of the
SAR Government. Nor will they laud the Chief Executive or any officials of the
SAR Government for the policies formulated by them. Otherwise, they will lose
their role as opposition and confer legitimacy on the governing team of the SAR
Government. Hence, for the sake of their very existence, they cannot afford to
act otherwise. So long as the existing system continues, President, I believe this
type of no-confidence motions will continue to make their way to this Council in
endless recurrence.

I also heard today many Members of the opposition camp make the same
remarks in the conclusion of their speeches: galvanizing and mobilizing more
members of the public to participate in the upcoming march organized by them.
Hence, many Members have wrapped up their speeches today with a reminder,
urging people to take to the streets on a certain date. Is that the objective of their
moving this motion today? I am sure the public will draw their own conclusion.

I so submit, President.
MR HUI CHI-FUNG (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan must wish to cool down the atmosphere and discourage people from participating in the rally. He pointed out that the no-confidence motion today is no big deal. Which Chief Executive in the past terms has not experienced it? The only point on which I agree with him is that the lack of confidence is common knowledge, and it is something which should arise. Why? Because they were returned by small-circle elections. Just now the President was mentioned, too. You were also returned by a small-circle election, elected with zero votes. The lack of confidence in you is thus just normal. Why is there no confidence in the Chief Executive? Returned by 777 votes at a small-circle election, she was almost entirely hand-picked by Beijing. The lack of confidence in her is common sense, is it not? It would fail ourselves if a no-confidence motion were not proposed, would it not? The general lack of public confidence in the Chief Executive aside, the moving of this motion at the level of the legislature carries the solemnity of the Legislative Council. It also represents a formal break-up between the Council and the Chief Executive. Chief Executive, we have thoroughly lost our confidence in you.

Actually, why have we taken this step? The people of Hong Kong may still remember that after Carrie LAM's assumption of office, we initially had some expectations on her, holding that she might be a "good fighter" well versed in the administration of Hong Kong. And she did not look like an underground member of the Communist Party of China ("CPC") because she was a remnant of the British-Hong Kong Government, right? But that is not the case. It turns out that she is even more awesome than an underground CPC member, rising to almost the same level as that of LEUNG Chun-ying. I refer to our hatred of her. I really wish to congratulate her. Carrie LAM antagonizes the people. She has become our foe.

I remember that initially, after her assumption of office, we had given her a chance. Even the Democratic Party described it as giving her the benefit of doubt, intending to look at her performance first. Why did public discontent cause Members to decide to formally fall out with her and propose the no-confidence motion today? Because the public and Hongkongers have got no leeway and can retreat no further. The issue of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") is imminent. Hong Kong is in fact "game over".
The evil deeds done by the Carrie LAM Administration in the past are too numerous to enumerate. For example, complementing the political mission from Beijing, she forced through the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link (Co-location) Bill which was unlawful and unconstitutional; introduced the National Anthem Law of the People's Republic of China, restricting people's freedom; and exhausted our public coffers to build artificial islands preferred by the Mainland. On the political front, she disqualified various Members of the pro-democracy camp unreasonably. Even citizens were deprived of their right to stand in elections, and all the dissidents were sentenced to jail. In a number of political incidents, the Department of Justice made various biased decisions not to institute prosecution. Members of the public would bear them in mind. The people of Hong Kong noted in their heart the unfairness in Hong Kong society and the partiality of the system. Although Hongkongers were well aware that Hong Kong was not a free and open society, they still did not find the need to propose a vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive and demand her to step down, as we are doing today.

But now she has crossed our bottom line. Where do Hong Kong's values lie? Hongkongers just wish to live in peace and work with contentment. Many pragmatic Hongkongers are reluctant to talk too much about politics. However, now that even the people's wish to live in peace and work with contentment and their personal safety are under threat, members of the public have got to come forward. FOO is even more evil than the other draconian laws in the past. It is also harsher than Article 23 of the Basic Law. We may be easily extradited to the Mainland for trial. Their allusion to the Taiwan murder case, as everyone knows, is just a lie, a most hypocritical excuse. Only hypocrites would have the face to say it. We all know this is a political mission. Now Carrie LAM has already stepped on the sidelines. Even the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Hong Kong and Macao Affairs Office of the State Council have stepped in personally.

I actually have wondered for a moment whether Carrie LAM really faces immense pressure, or any evidence against her has been grabbed, leaving her no choice but to follow Beijing's dictates. Has Carrie LAM ever hesitated and pondered for a moment whether the amendments to FOO are beneficial or disastrous to Hong Kong? Has such a thought ever flashed across her mind? If she did have a moment of hesitation, is CPC pointing a gun at her, forcing her to press ahead with the amendments to FOO, otherwise she would die or face serious consequences herself? Why does she betray Hongkongers, pushing
them to perils? If she still has a bit of conscience, taking into account the fact that she received education and became a high-ranking official in Hong Kong, and her present position and power are attributable to the system in Hong Kong, should she not consider her resignation? No one is pointing a gun at her, forcing her to press ahead with the amendments to FOO.

Hongkongers have no way out and can retreat no further. The existing deadlock faced by the Legislative Council owing to the amendments to FOO was entirely the Government's own making. The following political crisis was triggered by herself because she is bent on going her own way, disregarding the mechanism of the Legislative Council, insisting on submitting the Bill straight to the Council. The only thing Hongkongers can do is not to rely on a veto in the Legislative Council because the Council is a place where the public opinion is distorted. It is also a stage for the pro-Government camp and a venue for arbitrary passage of draconian laws. The only thing Hongkongers can do is to express public opinions by personally taking to the streets. I call on the people of Hong Kong to come forward on 9 June. Even if you are usually not concerned about politics, politics will come to you. For the ultimate freedom of Hong Kong, I implore Hongkongers to come forward on 9 June to oppose the draconian "China extradition bill" and the amendments to FOO.

MR KENNETH LAU (in Cantonese): President, I rise to speak against Mr Andrew WAN's motion.

First of all, I object to any political attack against the Chief Executive in the form of a motion of no confidence. Since the reunification, the opposition camp has proposed motions of no confidence in every Chief Executive. They have never had any confidence in the SAR Government. Opposing China and opposing the Government on every front has become the norm. This will only intensify the disputes in the Council and tear society apart, which is certainly not helpful to improving the relationship between the executive and the legislature.

In the less than two years since she took office in 2017, the Chief Executive has introduced drastic measures in terms of the economy and people's livelihood. The effectiveness of the administration is recognized by various sectors. A number of policies disputed over years have been implemented in a phased manner by the current-term Government. The Chief Executive has undoubtedly demonstrated great boldness in her administration. President XI
used this line to commend her for her responsible, proactive and pragmatic style of governance: "When she sets her mind to a goal, she does not go for what is easy; when she decides to take a task, she does not dodge what is difficult" and highly recognized the efforts of the SAR Government.

The opposition camp has used the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") to incite social sentiments and made a mountain out of a molehill, so as to snowball the controversies. They have even sought foreign influence from the United States, completely destroying "one country, two systems", "Hong Kong people ruling Hong Kong" and "a high degree of autonomy". On top of that, they have taken this opportunity to propose a motion of no confidence in the Chief Executive.

President, the amendments to FOO stemmed from the incident in which a Hongkonger absconded back to Hong Kong after having allegedly murdered someone in Taiwan. The Government is unable to extradite the suspect to Taiwan for trial due to the legal loophole of lacking a mutual legal assistance agreement between Hong Kong and Taiwan. In order to seek justice for the victim, Chief Executive Carrie LAM, after listening to the views from various sectors of the community, decided to introduce amendments in order to ensure that justice is done and the loophole in law plugged. The Government has the due responsibility and obligation to do so. Yet, such a simple issue was blown out of proportions, recklessly labelled and smeared by the opposition camp.

A few days ago, Secretary for Security John LEE met with the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce to explain the amendments and address the concerns of the business sector. We could see that the Government has worked very hard to give explanations on the Bill, fully accepted well-intentioned criticisms and comments and made every effort to improve it. Today, Mr Joseph LAU, former chairman of the Chinese Estates Holdings withdrew his application for judicial review in respect of the amendments to FOO in the hope of minimizing controversies within the community. I believe the opposition camp will have no more excuse to put anyone on the spot.

President, the capability and performance of the Chief Executive should not be evaluated solely on the basis of an individual incident. It is utterly absurd to use FOO to create conflicts and put the blame on the Chief Executive.
In the two years since taking office, Chief Executive Carrie LAM has demonstrated a pragmatic style of governance with a new mindset. Due to the long-standing land shortage in Hong Kong, soaring property prices have far exceeded the affordability of the general public and their hope of home ownership is dashed. In view of the pressing housing issue, the Chief Executive has responded proactively to people's housing demand by proposing the Lantau Tomorrow Vision in the Policy Address last year in order to address the long-standing difficult problem of land shortage and re-ignite people's hope through large-scale reclamation.

Was the Chief Executive unaware that the reclamation plan would become the target of attacks by the opposition camp? Did the Government not know that the opposition camp will mobilize environmental groups to oppose the reclamation? Nevertheless, the Chief Executive is still prepared to shoulder the responsibility, rise to challenges and plan for the future boldly and decisively. Her courage to go ahead with what should be done is commendable.

Moreover, despite the complexity and controversy of the abolition of the Mandatory Provident Fund offsetting mechanism which has generated heated discussions in society, the Chief Executive was committed to introducing an improved new proposal in order to minimize its impact on micro, small and medium enterprises while providing better retirement protection for nearly 4 million wage earners in Hong Kong. Is this what the opposition camp call "shirking responsibilities", "dereliction of duty" and arrogance?

The Chief Executive has never done anything unethical or unlawful since her assumption of office. On the contrary, she has risen to the challenges and exerted her best to do solid work for Hong Kong. She has also listened to the views of various sectors and sought consensus through active negotiations so as to achieve a win-win situation.

President, it is impossible for a policy to satisfy all stakeholders. As the head of Hong Kong, the Chief Executive can only do her best to balance the demands of different parties with the best welfare of Hong Kong people and the long-term interests of Hong Kong as the top priority. Society should focus on the actual effectiveness of the Chief Executive's efforts, instead of making pointless political attacks and speculations based on merely a few words.
I sincerely hope Honourable colleagues will stop ripping society apart and wasting time by stirring up political disputes. Lastly, let me reiterate that the New Territories Heung Yee Kuk, which I represent, will continue to support Chief Executive Carrie LAM and her team to administer Hong Kong in accordance with the law, uphold the "one country" principle and make good use of "two systems" so as to lead Hong Kong towards sustained development. Hence, we oppose the original motion and the amendment.

President, I so submit.

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): President, Chief Executive Carrie LAM said during her election campaign that she would resign if the majority public do not approve of her. At that time, I thought it was not her who has the say over a resignation, as the Central People's Government ("CPG") could disapprove of it. Back then, many people also queried whether she was in a position to make such a declaration to the public. Yet, at that time, I did not particularly doubt that the manifesto of resignation made by Chief Executive Carrie LAM was hypocritical. The problem now laid before us is that the latest public opinion polls show that the public no longer has trust in the Chief Executive, which I consider as irreversible and she should step down.

Hong Kong people who will take to the streets on 9 June do not aim to undermine the stability of Hong Kong, for they cherish Hong Kong and mean to let Carrie LAM know that the majority of people really do not agree with the existing policy in respect of the surrender of fugitive offenders. Members of the public take to the streets since they treasure Hong Kong, and through this we can let the various ministries and commissions as well as departments of CPG, including the Ministry of State Security or CPG's offices in Hong Kong—such as the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region—understand more clearly that there are huge public outcries in Hong Kong. If CPG does not withdraw this policy, or as a follow-up to the withdrawal of this policy by CPG, the Chief Executive may also need to quit for the sake of maintaining the stability of Hong Kong, just like Mr TUNG who resigned on the pretext of a pain in his leg.

President XI Jinping has emphasized since the 18th National People's Congress that Hong Kong has to maintain stability and there should not be dissension, whereas he hopes that Hong Kong will become the legal hub along
the Belt and Road and the financial centre in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area ("the Greater Bay Area"). Yet, the controversies arising from the current amendment exercise of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") fail to meet the expectation of President XI Jinping for Hong Kong to become an international legal hub and financial centre. As such, Chief Executive Carrie LAM has not implemented or properly implemented the grand strategy of the State, rendering Hong Kong unable to become the strategic centre along the Belt and Road. We see that the SAR Government, the Chief Executive, the Secretaries and Bureau Directors have turned a deaf ear to the views opposing the amendment of FOO. They even neglected the recommendations earnestly made by Prof Albert CHEN, a legal expert and member of the HKSAR Basic Law Committee. Added to this the despotic attitude of Carrie LAM in the Legislative Council recently, we have no choice but to urge CPG to keep a watchful eye at this important juncture.

The United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission has made a severe warning in respect of the special status of Hong Kong in its recent report. FOO is not only an internal issue of Hong Kong, but it also involves the international community and Taiwan. Added to this the concern of the governments and business sectors of various places, it is in fact necessary to consider this issue more comprehensively and from a higher strategic level. People with some common sense would also know that 28 member states of the European Union issued an official diplomatic demarche to the Chief Executive of Hong Kong, and we should not take it lightly. The United States-China trade negotiations have entered a critical stage. This is a pivotal point in the history of the State and Hong Kong, why should the Chief Executive and the Government stir up more troubles for the State at this moment? Why should they add this unstable factor to the China-United States relations, paying no regard to the feelings of Hongkongers and putting Hong Kong in such an uncertain and dangerous position?

The amendment of FOO has already led to serious contradictions and dissension in Hong Kong and 4 June is coming soon. It is estimated that tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of people will gather and take to the streets on 9 June and 1 July subsequently, and whether the processions will end up peacefully is still an unknown, bringing about an unstable factor which is as serious as the situation of the procession on 1 July caused by the introduction of the National Security (Legislative Provisions) Bill by former Secretary Regina IP in 2003. The decision and administration of the Chief Executive regarding this
matter involves the policy towards Taiwan and the Hong Kong-Taiwan relations as well. It has not only hurt the feelings of the Taiwanese people, but also further weakened their confidence in "one country, two systems", which will even affect the general elections and overall situation of Taiwan in the short term. Therefore, at this moment of life and death, it is really necessary to examine the situation in Hong Kong from a higher strategic level and from the perspective of state leaders.

Despite the fact that it is a critical juncture for the China-United States relations, I still hope that the leaders of CPG in charge of Hong Kong affairs will instruct the various ministries and commissions of the State and the SAR Government to submit a comprehensive assessment report that carries an accurate judgment and decision on issues such as the political, social, legal aspects and international relations of Hong Kong. Carrie LAM said that we had been acting like an ostrich in respect of FOO in the past two decades, whereas President XI Jinping has been upholding the insistence on ruling the country by law in recent years. In fact, the Communist Party of China has implicitly implied that China was not adequately ruled by law in the past. Is it the most appropriate timing now to implement the surrender of fugitive offenders with the Mainland and to integrate with the judicial system of the Mainland? At the very least, this amendment to FOO carries an indefinite retrospective effect, which can be traced back to the Cultural Revolution, the period during which the People's Republic of China was established, and even the numerous unjust, false and erroneous cases in the past 10 years when ZHOU Yongkang served as a member of the Politburo Standing Committee and the Secretary of the Political and Legal Affairs Commission.

From the perspective of Hong Kong people, Carrie LAM is no longer qualified to serve as the Chief Executive. She has ignored public opinions and failed to understand the feelings of the public, thereby further weakening the public's confidence in "one country, two systems". From the perspective of CPG, she has stirred up more troubles towards the United States, provoked separatist tendency in Taiwan, plunged Hong Kong into serious instability, and ruined the grand strategy of the Belt and Road Initiative and the Greater Bay Area. It is useless if the Chief Executive only has a loyal heart. She should be capable and possess an international vision as well as being able to implement CPG's policies on the overall situation. Having failed all this, resigning from office will be an honourable retreat.
MR DENNIS KWOK (in Cantonese): President, I am very grateful to Mr Andrew WAN of the Democratic Party for proposing this motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive". This is perfect timing. It is really necessary for us to put forth this motion.

Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan pointed out earlier that we had proposed this motion because we did not accept "one country, two systems". Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan has overstated the case. We accept and support "one country, two systems", and we hope that the implementation of "one country, two systems" in Hong Kong will become increasingly successful. Regrettably, this is not the case in actuality. As for the low approval rating of the Government led by Carrie LAM which we see now, I believe she herself must also consider this shameful. As a number of Members mentioned earlier, when Carrie LAM took office, she said she hoped to mend the social rift and improve the relationship between the executive and the legislature and hoped that the people of Hong Kong will hold hopes and confidence in the administration of the SAR Government. As for the pro-democracy camp, when the work of the Chief Executive is in the interest of the public, we will support the Government's administration, and we will exert our level best to improve the relationship between the executive and the legislature. In this connection, I have a clear conscience.

Regrettably, I notice that the rate of mutation of the SAR Government of the current term, particularly Carrie LAM, and corruption by power has been much faster than it could have been imagined by anyone. As the famous saying of Abraham LINCOLN goes: Any man can face adversity, but in order to test a man, give him power. I believe this saying is most obvious when applied to Carrie LAM, and it aptly demonstrates why a person will undergo such drastic changes. When she indulged herself in power and when President XI held her hand walking down the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge and told others to give way, this is the time Carrie LAM was carried away by power. When it comes to power, she thinks she can have her own way, she can ignore the opposition of the people of Hong Kong and she can turn a deaf ear to the strong opposition and opinions of the international community. She considers that she and John LEE are always correct whereas the rest of the world are definitely wrong and do not understand the case.

In the handling of the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill") this time around, Carrie LAM has prominently displayed her failure to pursue
"WeConnect" and the inadequacy of "We cannot connect". In what ways is she unable to connect? What are the issues we do not understand? Chief Secretary for Administration, during the Chief Executive Election, she stated repeatedly to the effect that: I do not need to rely on the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the Hong Kong SAR ("LOCPG") to canvass votes, for I trust "one country, two systems", "Hong Kong people administering Hong Kong" and "high degree of autonomy". Yet, what we see now is LOCPG making high-profile and blatant requests for all members in the pro-establishment camp to go to LOCPG to take instructions. Neither do they need to think nor do they need to listen to opinions, for all they need to do is to go to LOCPG to take instructions. Now, I am telling Dr Priscilla LEUNG that she needs not think about the Bill and she needs not pretend to be a person who has her own thoughts and ideas, for she needs only support the Bill and the Government will make no concession as LOCPG has already ruled out that option.

Is this what they call overall jurisdiction and has "one country, two systems" remained not bent or distorted? What about the remark about it being unnecessary to rely on LOCPG to secure votes? Does Carrie LAM now regret having made such a remark back then? Even if the Government can have the Bill passed, the so-called prestige in governance of the current-term Government will be wrecked by her. She should not put the people of Hong Kong, all the interests of Hong Kong and our significant status as a financial centre at stake merely for her own prestige in governance. Yet, this time around, Carrie LAM has loaded up her chariot with all these.

In which other aspects have she failed to connect? She talks about improving and mending the relationship between the executive and the legislature, so as to avoid confrontations which used to prevail at the time of LEUNG Chun-ying and paralyse the operation. But now, Carrie LAM is more awesome. She dares to take the unprecedented move of introducing an extremely controversial Bill to the meeting of the Legislative Council direct, which Mr Abraham SHEK also considers not a desirable approach. Certainly, since LOCPG has already stated that the Bill must be passed, Members from the pro-establishment camp and the pro-Government camp dare not make any remarks even if they can think independently. This is the scenario in Hong Kong where the improvement of relationship between the executive and the legislature is claimed to be pursued under the governance of Carrie LAM. This is the second aspect which she fails to connect.
The third aspect which she fails to connect is that she continues to turn a blind eye to the opposition expressed by the large number of Hong Kong people and the international community. When the Chief Executive initially took office, she bragged about enhancing Hong Kong's status in the international community. She has made frequent visits to various countries and taken part in various activities like playing golf. Yet, when 20-odd countries of the European Union, the United States, Canada and other countries pointed out the impracticability of the Bill altogether, she dared to say that they were all wrong and simply ignored their views. In this case, from now on, Carrie LAM should stop swaggering in the international community, claiming that she represents Hong Kong and has the highest authority, for she is not qualified to say that. Though others have already told her clearly where the problems lie, she chose not to listen. In that case, she only has one way to go and that is the Greater Bay Area (The buzzer sounded) …

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

MR AU NOK-HIN (in Cantonese): Since the first day I assumed office as a Member, I have placed my manifesto on my desk. It has been my belief that the manifesto of a political figure contains his or her pledges, and whether or not he or she can honour these pledges determines if that person walks the talk. Regrettably, our Chief Executive Carrie LAM … when I was preparing the speech for this motion, I specially returned to my office to print a copy of her "WeConnect" leaflet. As I only have seven minutes of speaking time today, I can only, based on this manifesto leaflet, review with all Honourable colleagues what work she has done since assuming office.

The manifesto leaflet mentions people's livelihood. This Chief Executive truly places an emphasis on people's livelihood—let me do a review with all Honourable colleagues in these seven minutes. First, as regards transportation, she has proposed "providing relief, enhancing convenience", including lowering long-haul fares, introducing free Wi-Fi services in station areas of the MTR Corporation Limited ("MTRCL") and developing more effective non-peak concessions to reduce crowding by MTRCL. Since she has taken office, MTR incidents have frequently occurred, whereas compensating fare concessions are only provided on holidays. Indeed, MTRCL has devised and introduced
non-peak concessions, which are actually implemented in such a manner. Should it be regarded as the fulfilment of her manifesto pledge? As we can see, many problems have arisen with both the Shatin to Central Link ("SCL") project and the governance of MTRCL. Has she honoured her pledges made in terms of transportation back then?

Carrie LAM, instead, made quite some efforts in housing. She has proposed the introduction of "Starter Homes" and to "consider allowing owners of Home Ownership Scheme flats with unpaid land premium to let their units [through social enterprises]". Despite adjustments in the existing policies, which may not be identical to her original proposals, such measures have basically been implemented in the direction proposed by her. There is still an initiative she advocated—we can say that she has honoured her pledge—that is the establishment of a professional-led task force to comprehensively review all feasible options of increasing land supply, i.e. the grand debate on land supply. Consequently, the grand debate on land supply has likewise created a new controversy in society: Why does the Government not use the many brownfield sites or adopt other land supply options but has to, as the first step, forcibly take forward the development of the East Lantau Metropolis and sizable reclamation for the construction of artificial islands?

Carrie LAM has not only proposed a large-scale reclamation programme—if such reclamation is done in keeping with the usual policy it would be justifiable, but it is the other way round actually—but even "ditched" Stanley WONG. Initially, the Government proposed the development of 1 000 hectares of land for the artificial island of the East Lantau Metropolis, but she changed the area to 1 700 hectares in the Policy Address, which was undoubtedly a slap in the face of Stanley WONG and the parties involved in the grand debate on land supply. She even had to "pick a fight" with her own governing team—she is a "good fighter" indeed.

As regards medical services, need I say more? Prof Joseph LEE must have much grievances to get off his chest later on. Carrie LAM has proposed in her manifesto leaflet expeditiously implementing the $200 billion 10-year Public Hospital Development Plan. Has the Government allocated an additional $200 billion to the health care system? If so, the health care system today will not be so overloaded. She said $200 billion—more than $200 billion. I do not know how many billions of dollars in total have been dumped down the drain for reclamation to build the artificial islands. As regards "[formulating] long-term
professional healthcare manpower policy", Honourable colleagues can think about on their own whether such work has been accomplished. Need I say more?

In terms of social welfare—if Mr SHIU Ka-chun is not serving his time in the prison, he would definitely come forward and "have a fight"—she has proposed in the leaflet "[discussing] with [the] social welfare sector how to optimise Lump Sum Grant arrangements". Honourable colleagues can ask every social worker in the social welfare sector or Secretary Dr LAW Chi-kwong what work the Government has undertaken in respect of the Lump Sum Grant Subvention System. Lump Sum Grant is the very thorn that epitomizes social workers' discontent with the policy.

Moreover, regarding expeditiously "[implementing] improvements to the Old Age Living Allowance", the Government has messed up the initiative of making the cash handout. Will the Government please refer to how John TSANG administer the cash handout back then. On "[setting] up a Children's Commission", I had a discussion on this topic just yesterday. Who is the Chairman of the Commission on Children? Exactly Chief Secretary for Administration Matthew CHEUNG. Yesterday, I asked his subordinates—as similar commissions in other countries or places are independent organizations bearing accountability—when will genuine democratic elements be incorporated into the organizational structure of the Commission on Children in Hong Kong? I asked him not to continue to assume the chairmanship of the Commission, which should be given to another person. Yet they did not even answer when it could be done, just like there is no timetable for universal suffrage in Hong Kong.

When it comes to environmental protection, she proposes "[establishing] a Harbourfront Authority to manage sustainable development of a world-class harbourfront for the enjoyment of the public and tourists". The Government intends to build an artificial island off the waters of Kau Yi Chau to connect the artificial island to the Western Pier by reclamation. That is their "harbourfront mentality": connecting other islands with Hong Kong Island. That is how they will do it. Moreover, there is another proposal: "[ensuring] that Hong Kong achieve the goal of reducing waste by 40% in 10 years". In this connection, perhaps the Government should ask its governing team how it filibustered during the discussion on municipal solid waste charging and how it delayed the entire discussion on municipal solid waste charging in the relevant bills committee.
On the subject of education, given the time constraint, I can only bring up a matter most relevant to myself, that is "[converting] short-term contract teaching posts to permanent posts". Honourable colleagues can ask Dr Helena WONG or other Members who teach at universities exactly how many contract posts have been converted into permanent posts. The fact is the Carrie LAM Administration has done nothing to this end.

Today, many Members have mentioned the controversy over the amendment to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance and I need not say anymore about it. I only want Honourable colleagues to take a look at this "WeConnect" leaflet. As Chief Executive, Carrie LAM has not honoured the pledges she made in this leaflet. Moreover, the leaflet also demonstrates her priorities in administration, because it is an introductory leaflet and so she would definitely list the most important items for consideration by the 1 200 members of the Election Committee.

Among so many areas: people's livelihood, education, youth—I do not have much time to discuss the aspect of youth but the most laughable is that she has suggested enhancement of young people's participation in policy discussion. I am now the youngest Member in the Council and indeed it is not my wish. If YAU Wai-ching and Nathan LAW had not been disqualified, as they are younger than me, they would be the youngest Members. But they were disqualified right after taking office. However, most importantly, no mention of constitutional affairs is made in her manifesto leaflet. The Chief Executive has not indicated in her manifesto how much she wishes to amend the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance and plug the loopholes in the laws. She does what people do not want her to do, but fails to do what they want her to do. That is our Chief Executive. I shall stop here.

MR KWONG CHUN-YU (in Cantonese): President, we are here to discuss this motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive" proposed by Mr Andrew WAN today because the Chief Executive has insisted on forcing through the fugitives law.

I have noticed that over the past couple of days, various sectors of the community have initiated signature campaigns, and signatories from the education sector have abounded like flowers blossoming everywhere. We have
seen participation from over 170 schools, and allow me to read them out here:
(1) Alumni, students and teachers of King's College; (2) Alumni, teachers and
students of St. Louis School; (3) Teachers, alumni and students of Salesian
English School; (4) Alumni, students and teachers of Diocesan Boys' School;
(5) Alumni of Diocesan Girls' School; (6) Alumni, students and teachers of
St. Joseph's College; (7) Alumni, students and teachers of True Light Middle
School/Girls' College; (8) Alumni of Ying Wah; (9) Alumni of St. Mary's
Canossian College; (10) Students, alumni and teaching staff of S.K.H. Tsang Shiu
Tim Secondary School; (11) Alumni, students and teachers of La Salle College;
(12) Alumni and students of Tsuen Wan Government Secondary School;
(13) Alumni, students and teaching staff of Sing Yin Secondary School;
(14) Alumni and students of Queen's College; (15) Alumni, teachers and students
of Queen Elizabeth School Old Students' Association Secondary School;
(16) Alumni of St. Joseph's Anglo-Chinese School; (17) Alumni, students and
teaching staff of Po Leung Kuk Vicwood K. T. Chong Sixth Form College;
(18) Alumni and students of St. Paul's Co-educational College; (19) Alumni,
teachers and students of SKH Lam Woo Memorial Secondary School;
(20) Alumni and students of Tseung Kwan O Government Secondary School;
(21) Students, alumni and teaching staff of S.K.H. Lam Kau Mow Secondary
School; (22) Teachers, students and alumni of Shun Tak Fraternal Association
Schools; (23) Alumni, students and teaching staff of St. Mark's School;
(24) Alumni of Yu Chun Keung Memorial College; (25) St. Francis' Canossian
College, Carrie LAM's alma mater; (26) Alumni, students and teachers of Wah
Yan College, Hong Kong; (27) Alumni, students and teachers of St. Stephen's
College, Stanley; (28) Alumni and students of St. Francis Xavier's College and
St. Francis Xavier's School, Tsuen Wan; (29) Alumni and students of Heep Yuun
School; (30) Alumni, students and teachers of CNEC Christian College;
(31) Alumni, students and teaching staff of Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Kap
Yan Directors' College; (32) Alumni, teachers and students of St. Peter's
Secondary School; (33) Current teachers and students, and alumni of Sha Tin
Government Secondary School; (34) Alumni and students of Kiangsu-Chekiang
College (Shatin); (35) Teachers, students and alumni of Hong Chi Morninghill
School, Tsui Lam; (36) Alumni and students of St. Paul's College; (37) Alumni
and students of Our Lady's College; (38) Alumni of Baptist Lui Ming Choi
Secondary School; (39) Alumni, students and teaching staff of Wah Ying
College; (40) Alumni, students and teachers of Maryknoll Convent School
(Secondary Section); (41) Alumni, students and teachers of Buddhist Sin Tak
College; (42) Alumni, teachers and students of Pui Ying Secondary School;
(43) Students, alumni and teaching staff of Tuen Mun Catholic Secondary School; (44) Past teachers and students of Queen Elizabeth School; (45) Current teachers and students, and alumni of Tin Shui Wai Government Secondary School; (46) Alumni of Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Wong Fut Nam College; (47) Alumni of Belilios Public School; (48) Alumni of Wah Yan College, Kowloon; (49) Alumni of Tang Shiu Kin Victoria Government Secondary School; (50) Alumni and students of St. Paul's Secondary School; (51) Alumni and students of Po Leung Kuk Lee Shing Pik College; (52) Alumni, students and teaching staff of St. Rose of Lima's College and St. Rose of Lima's School; (53) Alumni, teachers and students of St. Clare's Girls' School; (54) Alumni, students and teaching staff of Choi Hung Estate Catholic Secondary School; (55) Alumni, students and teaching staff of CNEC Lee I Yao Memorial Secondary School; (56) Alumni, current students and teachers of Rosaryhill School; (57) Alumni, students, teachers and former teaching staff of Clementi Secondary School; (58) Alumni, teachers and students of Carmel Divine Grace Foundation Secondary School; (59) Alumni, teaching staff and students of Hong Kong Chinese Women's Club College; (60) Alumni, students, teachers and former teaching staff of HKICC Lee Shau Kee School of Creativity; (61) Alumni, students and staff of Pui Ching Middle School; (62) Alumni, students and teachers of SKH Lui Ming Choi Secondary School; (63) Alumni, teachers and students of N.T. Heung Yee Kuk Yuen Long District Secondary School; (64) Alumni of Holy Trinity College; (65) Alumni and students of Kwun Tong Government Secondary School; (66) Alumni, students and teaching staff of Shau Kei Wan East Government Secondary School; (68) Teachers, students and alumni of Po Leung Kuk No. 1 W.H. Cheung College; (69) Teachers, students and alumni of C C C Ming Yin College; (70) Teachers, students and alumni of Cheung Chuk Shan College; (71) Alumni, students, and teaching staff of Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Li Ka Shing College; (72) Alumni, teaching staff and students of Queen's College Old Boys' Association Secondary School; (73) Alumni, students and teaching staff of Pooi To Middle School; (74) Alumni and students of Shung Tak Catholic English College; (75) Alumni, students and teaching staff of Shun Lee Catholic Secondary School.

I wish to tender my apology to everyone in the education sector who is putting down his or her signature online. I cannot read out the names of all the secondary schools in my seven minutes of speaking time because the number of signatories from schools is ever growing like flowers blossoming across the territory. Their objective is to oppose the "China extradition law". Members,
these are live public opinions. They are telling us that this Chief Executive has acted perversely against the public sentiments and neglected the most important line that has been underpinning the core values of Hong Kong and, that is, the line of "one country, two systems".

President, even if I used up all of my speaking time I could still not read out all the signatories from the education sector. From this we can see how angry society is, and we have never seen this phenomenon before. But each and every one of these signatories stands for the voices of the people. We, being Members of the Legislative Council, must bring these voices into the Legislative Council and convey them to the Chief Secretary for Administration, to the Chief Executive and to the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. These voices are not made up by us (The buzzer sounded) ... No "China extradition law"!

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr KWONG Chun-yu, please stop speaking.

PROF JOSEPH LEE (in Cantonese): President, if I am not mistaken, this is the third time that I will vote on a motion of no confidence in the Chief Executive in the course of the 10-odd years I have been a Legislative Council Member. Each time, there were various reasons. Nevertheless, if we look at this instance, just now, a Member said that about two years ago, the manifesto of the Chief Executive talked about "WeConnect". "WeConnect" means that there are many public livelihood issues waiting to be resolved. Just now, I listened carefully to the opening speech delivered by Chief Secretary for Administration Matthew CHEUNG at the start of the debate. He spent 20 to 30 minutes talking about how the Chief Executive had connected with us in the last couple of years, what work she had undertaken and he also mentioned various situations, as though issuing a report card setting out the many things that have been done in respect of people's livelihood.

However, several weeks ago, I also heard some Members say that the Chief Executive was incapable of solving the problems related to the "three big mountains". Just now, I asked Dr Helena WONG what the "three big mountains" were because I could not quite remember them. It seems they are the MTR Corporation Limited, the Link REIT and the housing problem. According to the speech delivered by Chief Secretary for Administration Matthew CHEUNG, it seems many issues have been resolved, with the exception of "the three big mountains".
Of course, I believe the reason for our proposing this motion of no confidence today is not how good a job the Chief Executive has done in respect of the people's livelihood or how many problems she has been unable to solve. All these matters can readily be seen. However, if we review the so many good things on the report card that took the Chief Secretary 20 or 30 minutes to read out just now, we can see that in fact, as quite a number of Members have pointed out, there are still many livelihood issues outstanding. She has indeed "connected" with us but in doing so, it was not entirely satisfactory. Mr Dennis KWOK also mentioned another word, that is, "disconnect", just now. If I may venture to translate it into Chinese, it is "沒有與我們同行(not walking together with us)". If we borrow the Chief Executive's expression, this is the situation now.

Let us see what has actually happened. This is not really clear and it seems various parties have made different claims. Perhaps we can look at public opinion surveys. I read the newspaper today and it so happened that two public opinion polls have just been published. The first one was conducted by the Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies ("HKIAPS") of The Chinese University of Hong Kong ("CUHK")—the newspaper carried a detailed report on this, so let me cite from it briefly—the latest public opinion poll conducted by CUHK shows that the public's performance rating for the Chief Executive was only 48.1 on average, so this is very low as it is less than half. As regards the trust in the SAR Government, that is, the level of trust in the officials led by the Chief Secretary for Administration, it has also fallen drastically and is just slightly higher than 30%. From this public opinion poll, it can be seen clearly that the trust of the general public in the Chief Executive and the SAR Government is not high and has dropped a great deal. The level of trust has started to fall. This is the public opinion poll conducted by HKIAPS of CUHK.

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

Of course, one public opinion poll is not enough. I leafed through the newspaper and found that there was another public opinion poll, that is, the one conducted by the University of Hong Kong ("HKU"). HKU conducted a similar survey within this period of time and the results have been published. In it, the satisfaction with the Chief Executive is 44.7, that is, less than half. As regards the trust in the SAR Government, it has fallen to -28%. Of course, people like
us, who conduct academic research, are sensitive to such figures but in this debate, I will not try to discuss any academic analyses. However, it can be seen clearly that the public opinion polls conducted by the two universities—of course, if you wish to talk about whether or not they have sufficient credibility or the sampling methods, these are academic discussions and I am not going to dwell on these—they both happen to point out the fact that if the Chief Executive is really "connected" with us, why is it that within this period of time, both the level of trust and the satisfaction or support have all experienced a decline? This is why I think the Government must do some self-examination.

Certainly, the Chief Secretary for Administration talked a lot about the report card of the Chief Executive just now and we also raised many issues, like the "three big mountains" and Mr AU Nok-hin even said that she had failed to deliver on many aspects. However, would these matters cause such drastic declines, to such low levels, in the trust in the Chief Executive and the SAR Government? Obviously, it can be seen from various articles that this is strongly related to the amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO"), which were proposed all of a sudden by the SAR Government or the Chief Executive herself.

As far as I know—I do not know if this is correct—when the Chief Executive proposed the amendments to FOO, she also expected this to be a livelihood issue. Why? According to my understanding and your explanation, the cause of this matter is the murder case that happened in Taiwan and it was hoped that by taking such a step, this matter can be resolved as soon as possible. This is a livelihood issue and if she can really "connect", no problem would arise. However, the problem is that no sooner had this proposal been rolled out than, there were many doubts, and many issues could not be resolved. Even now, the Chief Secretary still cannot tell me whether, in the event that the amendments are passed, the murder case in Taiwan can be dealt with, so that justice can be done to the murdered woman. This is untenable. There are far too many doubts and queries, so this is not feasible.

I reckon that, initially, the authorities wanted to solve the problem through a more pragmatic and livelihood-related approach but now, it has turned into a political issue. While having my meal, I talked with Dr Helena WONG about one issue, that is, we often wish to take some pragmatic measures but after doing so, the political implications may turn out to be very great. I wonder if this point has been considered, yet I will not make any speculation about it.
However, from the two public opinion polls mentioned just now, it can be seen that both the Chief Executive and the SAR Government have suddenly become disconnected with us, not walking together with us. They have failed to see that there are actually many problems and too many doubts concerning this matter. In retrospect, on this matter, why was China deliberately left out before the reunification, that is, no extradition can be made to China? Because this is a deliberate arrangement, a firewall. This is not being an ostrich, not a loophole and not an oversight. Now, the proposal was put forward but you could not solve the problems, so in the end, you took the step of bulldozing it through the legislature by tabling it for Second Reading and Third Reading in the Legislative Council Meeting. You surely have enough votes to pass the Bill because we do not have enough people but still, the problems cannot be solved, so a very strong reaction from the public has been triggered.

The Chief Executive once said, to this effect: "If one day, I feel that the trust of the public in me is inadequate or not good enough, I will consider if I should step down as the Chief Executive." I believe this is precisely what the Chief Executive and her team need to think over now. Even if you disregard the political consequences, in reality and in economic terms, no matter what you say about collusion with foreign forces or whatever, the United States, the European Union and Germany have all said that if the Bill is passed, there may be risks and in that case, they will do something to protect their own interests. This will impact on Hong Kong as a financial centre and also on the Hong Kong economy.

However, at this stage, it seems both the SAR Government and the Chief Executive are incapable of solving the problems, nor can they allay the doubts. In the end, they said, "Do not worry, after the passage of the Bill, no political fugitives will be transferred to the Mainland and only criminal offenders will be." But do not forget that prisoners of conscience can also be extradited to the Mainland under criminal procedures. All these problems make us feel that the Chief Executive is no longer "connected" with us. For this reason, in proposing this motion of no confidence today, it is hoped that the Chief Executive can do some soul-searching. Should you ponder over it and "connect" with us again by withdrawing the amendments to FOO?

Thank you, Deputy President.
MR LUK CHUNG-HUNG (in Cantonese): Today, Mr Andrew WAN has proposed the motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive". As regards this motion, I must really draw a long sigh. It is a very bad demonstration in the Council. As a matter of fact, over the past year and more, the Chief Executive has given the best treatment to the Democratic Party, to the envy of even many Members from the pro-establishment camp, as the Government has taken on board many suggestions from the Democratic Party and adopted a friendly attitude towards them. However, "the tree craves calm, but the wind will not subdue". The true colours of the opposition camp that opposes for the sake of opposition never change despite the Chief Executive's friendly gesture. Accordingly, the opposition camp in Hong Kong is not the so-called loyal opposition in the parliaments of foreign countries, which are democracies of a high quality.

The loyal opposition is loyal to the country and the people, and loyal to the source of power within the establishment. But the opposition camp in Hong Kong has formally become the "blind opposition". What is the "blind opposition"? It opposes anything and everything the Government proposes, because the worse the Government's performance is and the poorer people's livelihood, the more political power they will garner to beef up themselves. Certainly, sometimes the Government will blunder, then they would certainly seize the opportunity to magnify such blunders to the fullest extent, particularly anything related to the Mainland and the country, and demonize them to the fullest extent.

Defending "one country, two systems" does not mean completely no exchange and interaction. However, the opposition camp wishes there is a gulf that can never be bridged and wants to build an increasingly tall wall to segregate us from the country and the Mainland. As shown in the issues surrounding the co-location arrangements and the amendment proposed to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance for the purpose of plugging loopholes in law—people all know it does not target the Mainland alone—they attacked the Government by demonizing everything. That is the true nature of the opposition camp, and also that of the motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive" today.

At any rate, a vote of no confidence in a political figure should be cast out of categorical dismissal of him, not because of opposition to individual policies proposed by him. Be it gross deficiencies in personal competence, integrity or political ethics, or deviation of allegiance to the people or the country, all such should be reasons for a vote of no confidence in a political figure or chief.
However, what we have heard the opposition camp utter today is nothing but dismissal tantamount to political murder to denigrate the work undertaken by the Chief Executive in respect of education, health care, people's livelihood, etc., over the past year and more—I especially approve of her efforts in identifying land sites. Of course, the Lantau Tomorrow Vision is another example of matters that the opposition camp attacks and demonizes. The Government has clearly stated that it will adopt a diversified and multi-pronged approach to identify land sites, including brownfield sites. But they still falsely accused the Government of being unwilling to use brownfield sites. They simply make false accusations and oppose for the sake of opposition. When the opposition camp points one finger at others, they actually points three at themselves. I wish to tell them that many people also distrust the opposition camp—the "blind opposition".

Let me first talk about filibustering. Filibustering has become more serious in the Finance Committee and the Public Works Subcommittee than before. This year, the Finance Committee has only approved funding of $8.8 billion for public works projects, only 5% of the total $170 billion. And the discussion time has increased by 33% compared to the past—last year, which was not too long ago. The discussion time in the Public Works Subcommittee has even significantly risen by 54%. We have noted that while some controversial issues certainly require more time for discussion, even some simple and straightforward items, such as the construction of a primary school, would be discussed for more than two hours. The opposition camp asked questions anytime and anywhere on some matters related to policies but absolutely not directly related to the items under discussion. They only wanted to hinder the following agenda items, causing obstruction in policy implementation and delays in many tasks. Afterwards, when people accuse the Government of handling issues slow, they could conversely criticize the inefficiency of policy implementation by the Government.

Next, as regards the amendment to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO"), the opposition camp knows full well the background and reasons for making the amendment. Many of them are barristers or have a legal background, but they disregard justice and make use of the historical reasons and some Hongkongers' lack of understanding of and trust in the Mainland Government in raising alarmist talk to deceive Hongkongers. In particular, they regarded the judicial system of Hong Kong which is internationally renowned and credible as a rubber stamp. Did such behaviour of them not affect investor confidence? They even brought in the high-profile intervention of foreign
countries, particularly the United States and Europe, including the United Kingdom. Now, when Hong Kong is caught up in the trade war between China and the United States, they have committed such acts with ulterior motives.

On the subject of the China-United States trade war, we cannot ignore the international environment. Have they made consideration and voiced their views in the position of the country and Hong Kong? For example, the United States President mentioned last year that Chinese have been having a good time for long and so it was necessary to employ some means to harm the Chinese economy. Mr Alvin YEUNG of the Civic Party actually stated his agreement to such a notion in the United States, even saying that China is the culprit of the trade war and seconding TRUMP's claim that the United States is the victim.

The MENG Wanzhou incident last year was a considerable sensation. The United States arrested MENG Wanzhou on unwarranted grounds. As regards this incident, Mr Gary FAN of the Neo Democrats acted like he had stumbled on a treasure and crazily piggybacked on it, even suggesting the Immigration Department ("ImmD") had arbitrarily issued passports to MENG Wanzhou, in an attempt to defame ImmD. Moreover, another high-ranking official of the United States said that the United States Government will work with anyone as long as it serves American interests, regardless of human rights. He also claimed that Americans are the most adept at lying, cheating and stealing, and it represents the glory of the American experiment. Who said such things? That is the incumbent Secretary of State, Mike POMPEO. POMPEO has lately been showing a great deal of respect for the Democratic Party and greeted them in a high profile. In the final analysis, it shows that Americans have resorted to all possible means and been using them as a pawn to cripple our country and, by way of politicizing the amendment to FOO, cripple the country and Hong Kong.

Actually, foreign countries, including the United States, have enacted many laws to restrict political figures from colluding with foreign countries. There is the Foreign Agents Registration Act in the United States, which governs whether politicians will receive "illicit funds" or commit acts detrimental to national interests (The buzzer sounded) … I find it necessary for Hong Kong to enact similar legislation, Deputy President.
DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LUK Chung-hung, your speaking time is up. Please stop speaking.

MR SHIU KA-FAI (in Cantonese): Deputy President, the topic under discussion today is the motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive" proposed by a non-establishment Member.

Deputy President, I am a new Member who joined the Legislative Council only this term. As many other pro-establishment colleagues have said, the Government seems to have targeted the wholesale and retail constituency that I represent on many issues in this term. I have often engaged in heated debates with the Administration in Panels on issues such as the export control of powdered formulae. It is clear that there is a sufficient supply of powdered formulae in the market, yet the Administration is reluctant to lift the control.

In terms of E-cigarettes and heat-not-burn cigarettes, these products have become a trend. They are available in many countries in the world and prove to be less harmful than conventional cigarettes, yet the Administration insisted on banning them.

Insofar as person-to-person telemarketing calls are concerned, the Administration insisted on regulation by way of legislation even though it is well aware that legislation on this will only bother the business sector as calls from the Mainland may continue to disturb Hong Kong people.

As for the beauty industry, the Administration seeks to apply a cooling-off period and impose regulation on cosmetic devices. These measures will make the operation of the entire industry difficult, while in fact, the problem only boils down to a very small number of unscrupulous trade practitioners.

It is needless to mention the importation of labour. We have stated repeatedly that various industries are facing a manpower shortage, yet the Administration … the situation has become better recently as the Secretary said he would give it consideration proactively. The wholesale and retail constituency that I represent is not contented with these situations. Nevertheless, does that mean I have to cast a vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive?
I believe she as the head of SAR has to strike a balance between the views of stakeholders. Take the issues that I have just mentioned as examples. From my standpoint, I strongly oppose the measures. But some Members may fully support them from the populism angle. In such case, do those populist Members have to protect the Chief Executive and prevent the motion of no confidence in the Chief Executive from being passed?

Every Member is free to express his or her views in the Chamber, but they must be based on facts. As the Chief Secretary for Administration said in his opening remarks, the Government will listen to views founded on facts. Hence, I hope Members will hold rational discussions, instead of having no confidence in everything. According to a Member, this is a baptism that every Chief Executive has to go through in order to serve in office. Every Chief Executive has to go through a motion of no confidence.

A motion of no confidence in Mr CHAN Kin-por, Chairman of the Finance Committee, was also moved last Monday. I understand this way of political expression under the electoral system in Hong Kong, but is it actually helpful? I believe it will be more useful if the time is spent on discussing practical issues.

I think this discussion is triggered by the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill"), on which the Second Reading debate will resume in the Council on 12 June when we will hold a discussion. I believe today's debate is a prelude to that as Members have all been speaking on the Bill.

Since last month, I have conducted a questionnaire survey to consult the opinions of 85 trade associations in the wholesale and retail constituency that I represent. Interim findings show that 82% of the responding trade representatives agree to/support the Bill, while some disagree with it, of course. I have also asked them why the support rate is so high. It is because most of the trade associations do business in Hong Kong only, not in other countries. They asked me in return: Is corruption permitted? I did not know how to answer them. However, a small number of trade members do have business dealings in other places or in the Mainland and I appreciate their concerns.

Therefore, the Liberal Party had conveyed the experience and concerns of the industry to the Administration and the Security Bureau when the Bill was first introduced, urging the Administration to give explanations rationally and make
appropriate amendments, so as to instil public confidence in the Bill. I believe this is what we should do rationally. The SAR Government has to give explanations to the public.

Just now, I heard some Members say that there are some 200 schools opposing the Bill. Mr KWONG Chun-yu, in particular, could not finish reading out the whole list in seven minutes. In fact, I heard people talk about this on another occasion yesterday and I was really shocked that so many schools opposed the Bill and placed advertisement against it in the newspapers. It was indeed worrying. Certainly, I made it a point to verify what had happened immediately. I looked at the petitions by the schools opposing the Bill and they were all in the same format: "The teachers and students of a certain school have the following comments on the Bill", and then there were the signatures. However, above the signatures, there was a footnote indicating that the petition did not represent the position of the school, nor did it represent the position of the teachers or all the students. I really felt quite puzzled about this. Whom do these people represent actually?

The signatories attended or worked in this school, but they do not represent the position of the school. That is equivalent to someone stating that he does not agree, does not understand or does not like the Bill, while at the same time declaring which school he attended. This way of expression worried me a lot initially, making me believe that there was such strong opposition. My alma mater secondary school or schools in other areas are against the Bill, too. Why is it so strange? My school is one that "loves the country, loves Hong Kong". Upon taking a closer look, it turned out that not many students opposed the Bill after all. The majority of the students have not indicated their stand. Therefore, we have to make things clear, or else Hong Kong people would be puzzled.

Moreover, some Honourable colleagues said that the Chief Secretary for Administration only talked about addressing the issue of public toilets. Frankly, in the speech of the Chief Secretary of some 20 minutes—members of the public may listen to the recording again—an account was given on the work done by the Administration since the Chief Executive assumed office. The whole speech … (The buzzer sounded) …
MR IP KIN-YUEN (in Cantonese): Deputy President, just now Mr SHIU Ka-fai mentioned petitions from schools. We know most of them were initiated by alumni. When the alumni initiated a petition, they were aware that it was an expression of their personal stance. The personal stance expressed by each signatory does not represent the school. Neither does it represent certain teachers or student groups. Each of them have presented their own views. I consider it invaluable because they have expressed to society their stance on the relevant issue in their names. I very much hope that the Government can listen to them carefully, ponder why the alumni of some 100 schools have taken the initiative to create a platform for more alumni to participate in the petitions, and pay heed to these views.

Deputy President, back to the question today, i.e. the motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive", when Chief Executive Carrie LAM stood in the Chief Executive Election, she said (I quote), "Hong Kong has [also] been experiencing social conflict and economic slowdown during the past few years, causing many people to become concerned and even discouraged. I pledge to rebuild a harmonious society and restore confidence in our Government. Government policy implementation must be more closely aligned with public opinions." (End of quote) Had these words been honoured to the letter, I believe the various controversies would not have arisen recently.

How can public confidence in the Government be restored? In my view, the Carrie LAM Administration did carry out some work in the early period, but regrettably, it failed to carry it through. Let me emphasize that the discussion on the question of confidence today is not about having no confidence in Carrie LAM's ability and determination. Rather, it is an expression of a lack of confidence in whether she can uphold "one country, two systems" and such core values as the rule of law and freedom in Hong Kong, particularly when her recent approach in the issue of amending the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") has caused many people to lose their confidence and trust in the Carrie LAM Administration.
In retrospect, we must admit that in the initial period after her assumption of office, Chief Executive Carrie LAM had indeed done a lot of solid work to deal with livelihood issues. She also made efforts to improve the relationship between the executive and the legislature. For example, for the education sector to which I belong, right after her assumption of office, she proposed increasing the recurrent expenditure by $3.6 billion. She also rolled out priority measures to alleviate the problems which had plagued the education sector in the past. Moreover, she set up the Commission on Children chaired by Chief Secretary for Administration Matthew CHEUNG, expanded the scope of subsidies for drugs for rare diseases, increased maternity leave and paternity leave, etc. We also saw that she proactively increased the frequency of the Chief Executive's Question and Answer Session in the Legislative Council with good intentions. We considered it beneficial if such practices could be maintained. She also deliberately evaded the question of legislating for Article 23 of the Basic Law, finding the need to wait for a better timing. At least she knew we should not touch certain politically sensitive issues at this juncture. Instead, the focus should be put on the people's livelihood. Her score in the first half year after her assumption of office reached 59.7 on average, far higher than that in the LEUNG Chun-ying era. This had indeed eased up the social atmosphere for a long period, which was not full of tension as in the past.

I still remember that the first policy address presented by Carrie LAM mentioned (I quote), "While the Government fully respects the functions of the Legislative Council to exercise checks and balances on the executive authorities, we hope that through co-operation, we can reach consensus on issues that are controversial and yet strategically important for the long-term development of Hong Kong." (End of quote) This is what she said. However, in handling this amendment exercise of FOO, the Government simply requested us to submit views in writing in 19 days and then considered itself as having completed the public consultation process, ignoring public concerns about the amendments to FOO. Neither did it take the initiative to conduct exchanges with the political parties and groupings in the Legislative Council. Such a change is a grave problem because she no longer avoids the politically sensitive issues. In respect of this highly sensitive political issue, her approach has been most inappropriate.

Deputy President, we understand that the Chief Executive holds a most special position in the constitutional system in Hong Kong, having to strike a balance in administration amid the gaps under "one country, two systems". The
people of Hong Kong really have great expectations on her, hoping that she can uphold the "high degree of autonomy" as well as such core values as democracy, freedom and especially the rule of law in Hong Kong. This is crucially important. Hence, on this issue, we cannot approve of the Chief Executive's performance lately.

The amendment to FOO has seriously impacted "one country, two systems", causing concerns to each and every Hongkonger about themselves, their relatives and their friends. Foreigners doing business in Hong Kong also worry whether some day they will be suddenly extradited to the Mainland for trial. It will deal a severe blow to the entire system of the rule of law in Hong Kong.

Deputy President, during the course of marketing the amendment to FOO, Carrie LAM repeatedly emphasized that the reason for our opposition was funded on misunderstanding, a lack of understanding or we had been misled. I need to stress that everyone has seriously looked into this issue, and 12 venerated members of the legal sector presently or formerly serving as Chairman of the Hong Kong Bar Association have expressed their opposition. Now members of the whole community have been mobilized, with participation from alumni and housewives in petitions. I very much hope that the Chief Executive can act in a consistent manner, dealing with the livelihood issues in Hong Kong properly and refraining from expending any more effort on the amendment to FOO. I will maintain the attitude of "calling a spade a spade" (The buzzer sounded) … in respect of the inappropriate approach related to FOO …

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr IP Kin-yuen, your speaking time is up.

MRS REGINA IP (in Cantonese): Deputy President, after listening to the speeches of a number of pan-democratic Members, I found it amazing how they put all the blame on the Chief Executive. The situation is comparable to, if not more serious, than my promotion of the National Security (Legislative Provisions) Bill ("the National Security Bill") back then. The fact that they attributed all guilt and responsibilities to one person really compels me to speak.
Just like the case when the Administration promoted the National Security Bill back then, many fears are based on lies. For instance, I was shocked to hear Mr WU Chi-wai falsely accuse Mr Jeffrey LAM, who is not present now, of selling properties in preparation for exit. Is Mr Jeffrey LAM going to be a fugitive? Those remarks are grossly irresponsible.

Just now, I also heard Mr KWONG Chun-yu mention the number of schools and alumni who will report to the Independent Commission Against Corruption. I am glad that Mr IP Kin-yuen made the clarification that those statements were made in their personal capacity to express their own views and not issued with the approval of the schools after formal discussions. However, as a professional in education, Mr IP, I hope you will make it clear to the alumni that it is the responsibility of schools to teach students to consider matters independently and from multiple perspectives in a fair and objective manner, especially since we promote general education which you are in favour of retaining. Have these alumni associations and schools conducted any consultation before jumping to those declarations of their opposition to the amendments to the Fugitives Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") on the Internet? The pan-democratic Members scolded the SAR Government for conducting a consultation of only 20 days, yet, have these alumni associations consulted their alumni, debated and listened to arguments of both sides before making the statements? I am most sceptical about it. Hence, I urge the pan-democratic Members to refrain from making false accusations.

I would like to clarity a few arguments heard just now. Some Members claimed that the British-Hong Kong Government excluded China from FOO on purpose back then. I certainly would not rule out the possibility that some Britons harbour arrogance and prejudice against our country as they have always adopted a holier-than-thou attitude and looked down on our country due to the different systems. However, the fact before us today is that the United Kingdom, a long-established democracy, is in chaos now and its democratic system may soon collapse. Nonetheless, I must point out that FOO passed back then did not include any part of China because, first, the British-Hong Kong Government did not have the time to discuss with China and conduct consultations; second, due to the short tenure of the British-Hong Kong Government back then, it was in no position to negotiate with Beijing. Hence, this responsibility was passed to the SAR Government.
I have heard so many pan-democratic Members keep smearing the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill"), calling it the "China extradition law" and claiming the firewall between China and us will be destroyed upon the passage of the Bill, etc. I wish to point out that, in 1999, in my capacity as the Secretary for Security, I reported to the Legislative Council in an upright manner that I would go to Beijing to negotiate with the authorities for an agreement on the surrender of fugitive offenders. Michael WONG should remember that as he was the Deputy Secretary for Security then. The Legislative Council was aware—actually it urged—the Security Bureau to do so as we were unable to extradite CHEUNG Tze-keung back to Hong Kong for trial. Surely, no one sought to bring charges against him either. Many Members of the Legislative Council at the time were conversant practitioners at law who are the mentors of some Members here now. They understood that a surrender agreement with China was necessary to combat cross-boundary crimes, such as stockpiles of arms, kidnapping, drug trafficking and drug manufacturing, or even more serious crimes such as money laundering and cyber-attacks nowadays. Our surrender arrangement was modeled on the international norm. There are Fugitive Offenders Orders between Hong Kong and the United States, as well as with Germany. If Members of the opposition camp consider an agreement with China so unreliable, then why have they not expressed concerns over human rights when such agreements were signed with countries whose judicial systems ranked way below Hong Kong, such as Indonesia, Sri Lanka and the Philippines?

It can then be seen that all their lies target our country. They are actually the ones who sabotaged "one country, two systems" and instigated international attention. Who frequently visited the United States to raise so many queries and tell so many lies? According to them, any ordinary person in Hong Kong will be surrendered sitting at home, which is utterly absurd. Deputy President, the Government has reiterated repeatedly that offenders are extraditable only under the double criminality principle, meaning the offence has to be punishable in both Hong Kong and the Mainland or Hong Kong and India in order for an extradition to be enforced. Moreover, the surrender procedures are very complicated. If the Bill is passed, the issuance of a certificate by the Chief Executive for triggering the surrender procedures will be an administrative decision subject to judicial review. Furthermore, under section 12 of the existing Fugitive Offenders Ordinance (Cap. 503), in applying for an order of committal, the Administration has the duty to inform the person concerned his right to make an
application to the Court for habeas corpus. The existing legislation also excludes any political offences or politically-related surrenders and affords suspects many safeguards on humanitarian grounds.

Members of the opposition camp are the ones who have been spreading fears and lies in society and instigating international attention. Therefore, I find this motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive" totally groundless. On behalf of the New People's Party, I express our firm opposition to the motion.

MR TOMMY CHEUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, in recent years, Members of this Council have proposed motions of no confidence time and again, be it at the Finance Committee, the House Committee or the meetings of the Legislative Council. The subjects of these motions of no confidence include the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Finance Committee and the President of the Legislative Council, as well as various government officials, and even the Chief Executive as in the motion today. I think the public may become disinterested when such motions are proposed repeatedly, and I wonder if Members are aware that such a practice has become indiscriminate. The Liberal Party disagrees with this hasty approach. On the contrary, we consider it necessary to be cautious in handling this motion of no confidence, for the allegation of no confidence is a very serious one. Unless a serious fault is involved, Members should not support such a motion casually.

Undeniably, over the past period, the Chief Executive has tilted towards the labour sector, introducing measures not conducive to the business environment, and the Liberal Party representing the business sector is unhappy with many issues. My party comrade, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, has pointed out some of these issues, so I will not repeat them. Yet, he has not mentioned the extension of maternity leave and paternity leave, the abolishment of the offsetting mechanism of the Mandatory Provident Fund System, the levying of a vacancy tax and the resumption of the golf course, and so on. We are discontented with these policies. Yet, shall we put forth a motion of no confidence because the policies of the Government differ with our views?

As for the amendment of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, the Liberal Party has no reason to cast a vote of no confidence due to this issue. Throughout the course, the Government has accorded considerable respect to the Liberal Party with a sincere and positive attitude, which I have never experienced
in my 19 years of service as a Member of the Legislative Council. Regarding
the point about the short consultation period, I think if no one reads the
consultation paper submitted and the paper is just left there for three years, it will
not be useful no matter how long the consultation period is. I can tell Members
that during our meetings with the Secretary, the Government has been very
proactive. Since I could not gather six members of our party to attend the
meeting, the Government met with us separately in three sessions. In each
session, the Government met with veteran party members and the Honorary
Chairman, and so on, to let them put forth different questions. Since the
Government considered any delay inappropriate, we have had six meetings within
one month. We have presented many worries expressed by the business sector,
and the Government has responded proactively and explained the Bill to various
chambers of commerce. In fact, I have long since pointed out on public
occasions the misgivings and worries of the business sector and that we hoped to
have more understanding and further explanations. I am not saying that there
are significant problems with the Bill, yet the Government has to explain the case.
Regarding the approach for handling the Bill, I have mentioned on the radio that
the Bill reminds me of a remark, which I have a strong impression, and that is,
"There is nothing to fear except fear itself". Many friends in the pan-democratic
camp, as well as those opposing China and stirring up troubles in Hong Kong,
like to spread this kind of fear. On the other hand, it is true that the Bill is
difficult to understand.

In the course, the Liberal Party hoped that the Government could delete
10-odd items of offences, yet only 9 items have been deleted. At that time,
many members from the business sector worried that provincial and municipal
procuratorates would make requests for extradition of offenders to Hong Kong,
we thus proposed that extradition requests must be made by the Supreme People's
Procuratorate in Beijing. Yet, the authorities have not yet responded to this
request. In fact, in the initial draft of the Bill, it is stated that extradition is
allowed for offences liable to one year's imprisonment, and we consider the
one-year imprisonment threshold too low, as it will cover a lot of offences.
Back then, we did not know that the Government would delete nine items of
offences in the Schedule, so we proposed raising the threshold to seven years of
imprisonment. The Government swiftly responded that the seven-year threshold
was difficult to implement, for many problems could not be addressed under the
arrangement. Yet, the Government swiftly responded that there was no problem
raising the threshold to three years' imprisonment.
In fact, the significance of the course of consultation lies not in the length of consultation but proactive responses, which means when we express our worries to the Government, the Government should respond proactively. It is May now and it has been three-odd months since the Government introduced the Bill in February. The Liberal Party put forth our worries at an early date. Hence, before the Government submitted the Bill to the Legislative Council for First Reading, the Government had already responded to and accepted many of our requests.

I often say that politics require compromises. Friends from the opposition camp adopt an overbearing attitude in every aspect. They will only accept their own views. More often than not, they adopt the nitpicking attitude, and if they see anything they dislike, they will make hubbub and move the goalposts. Many of the views expressed by Mrs Regina IP just now are what I wish to say deep down in my heart. She is more eloquent than me, so I will not repeat them here. I agree with her remarks. I would like to remind Honourable colleagues from the pan-democratic camp that they are now resorting to verbal violence and physical violence in the legislature, and they are scolding government officials, Members and colleagues from the Secretariat. I think they should behave themselves. Regarding these words and deeds of their colleagues, I think they should propose a motion of no confidence in them. They do not have dominance over all issues simply because they are returned by election. The legislature has its own culture which we should respect and there is verbal civilization which should not be abused.

DR JUNIUS HO (in Cantonese): Deputy President, I find myself caught in a little conflict after reading the motion on "Vote of No Confidence in the Chief Executive", i.e. Mrs Carrie LAM, proposed by Mr Andrew WAN and the nonsensical amendment proposed by Ms Claudia MO. Should I lend them my support? To start with, I will explain why I consider the amendment proposed by Ms Claudia MO nonsensical. That said, there are some merits with this motion which make me find it quite attractive.

I would firstly talk about their point which is senseless. Members from the pan-democratic camp are often insightful, but they have put their insights on the wrong aspects, frequently giving rise to an exactly opposite effect. Whilst they have done a lot, they act like "a hunchback man pounding rice"—we can only see their buttocks move but the rice does not become white—which means that they have made a lot of efforts, but they have not come round. They have
proposed a motion on vote of no confidence on many occasions to attempt the impossible. Why can they not be a bit more candid and discuss with us, so that we can deal with her together after reaching a consensus? Yet, they are so narcissistic and self-willed, presuming that they can achieve it with the 20-odd votes in their hands. Yet, the reality of the political situation is that they do not have such an ability, then why do they still have to make so many gestures?

Why do I consider the amendment proposed by Ms Claudia MO nonsensical? They said that no consultation was conducted on the amendment of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO"), which would bring the 7.3 million Hong Kong people into injustice. Our "comma writer", Mr KWONG Chun-yu, even read out the names of the 60-odd schools and organizations, claiming that they all opposed the amendment exercise. Why do I say that Mr KWONG Chun-yu is a "comma writer"? Because he would stop after saying one or two sentences, and then stopped again after saying another couple of sentences. On the whole, it seems that he has depicted a very comprehensive picture to us, but it is misleading. Fortunately, among the 20-odd Members, one of them is more conscientious, and it is Mr IP Kin-yuen. The Chief Executive has allocated more than $7 billion to the education sector which he represents, so he has not forgotten his origin and therefore must speak the truth: Only some of the alumni of those schools hold such a view, and they do not represent the schools. It is so fortunate that he made that point. If people can express opposition in the name of an organization or school, there will then be a group of people raising opposition in Stanley. We should not be one-sided and misleading when we speak, yet they are eager to act like "a hunchback man grounding rice"—doing so many things but all efforts are in vain.

When it comes to this point, they say in a high profile that it is dangerous to amend FOO, for it will lead to the extradition of all the 7.3 million Hong Kong people to the Mainland overnight. They treat us as fugitive offenders; it is really unfair to us. They often have a guilty conscience because they have done evil deeds. For instance, they took the initiative to visit Washington, Munich or Berlin … I have not yet asked them; I will write to Mr Dennis KWOK and Mr James TO later to ask them what they have said at those places. They often ask for verbatim records of the meetings of the legislature, and since they claimed that they had spoken on behalf of Hong Kong people, would they please provide me with a full transcript. Who paid for their air tickets, on which row they sat on the aircraft, who sat next to them, were they male or female, and did they have
blond hair? They must give a full account of all details. We have the right to know what they said during their visits to foreign countries since they claimed that they represented Hong Kong people.

More than 55 countries around the world, including those in Europe and Asia, have entered into extradition agreements with the People's Republic of China. Hong Kong has returned to China for 22 years, but it has not yet entered into such an agreement. We are now merely completing an unfinished mission in history by deleting the exception clause and removing nine out of the 46 items of offences in response to the demand of the business sector. The amendments are just so simple, but they have portrayed them as a big catastrophe. It seems that all of the people of the schools and organizations will suddenly be arrested and surrendered to the Mainland once the amendments are passed, and people will even be unable to go to school then, so they might have to study at the Peking University or the Tsinghua University by then. This is definitely misleading the public. They even made a big fuss to encourage members of the public to take to the streets. Do they think that the people do not have to work? It is alright to entertain them once or twice, but they would take to the streets on every issue. Do they have any other new ideas apart from organizing processions every year? As such, I consider that the motion proposed by them absolutely groundless.

I appreciate very much the performance of the Chief Executive in the last week (i.e. 22 May). She was so awesome, and so courageous to take forward the amendment of FOO. The legislative amendments should certainly be pursued in fact. Disregarding all their comments, she now insists on taking forward the legislative amendments by overcoming all the difficulties. It is very good. In addition, she no longer needs to consider the social atmosphere, nor does she need to care about the Eight-Power Allied Forces, the so-called diplomatic demarche issued by the European Union. Anyway, she is doing what she ought to in the meantime, acting like the brave and the benevolent who are invincible. She is so great and I applause for her. I then asked her, since it took only one month to complete the amendment of FOO, could we enact legislation for Article 23 of the Basic Law? Yet, the Chief Executive indicated that such a vision was getting farther and farther away from her imagination. She pointed out this contradiction, rendering my confidence in her to somewhat shatter suddenly.
Therefore, I find myself caught in a little conflict in respect of this motion on vote of no confidence. She has the guts to pursue the amendment of FOO, but the enactment of legislation for Article 23 of the Basic Law is the constitutional responsibility of Hong Kong, why can she not adopt the same standard on it and call together the 43 Members to take forward the exercise? They often say that "everyone would kneel down before the whistle of Grandpa", so let us kneel down and let them see it. We now have the wind at our backs as we have 43 votes, thus if we still do not take forward the enactment of legislation for Article 23 of the Basic Law in the sixth Legislative Council, shall we enjoy this advantage again in the next term?

In view of this, I am somewhat impressed by this motion on vote of no confidence, but I am still not sure if this is merely an incitement or I am really impressed. I may abstain on this motion later. Thank you, Deputy President.

DR PRISCILLA LEUNG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, the motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive" is under discussion today. When it comes to motions of no confidence, we must revisit the contentions between the late Prof XIAO Weiyun and former President of the Legislative Council, Mrs Rita FAN, back in 2004. Back then Mrs FAN granted permission for a no-confidence motion to be debated in the Legislative Council in respect of Elsie LEUNG's handling of the Sally AW incident. Prof XIAO Weiyun said that he had put up with it for a long time, and he said this only in 2004, that under Article 64 of the Basic Law, actually this Council is not allowed to propose a motion of no confidence in officials and the Chief Executive—this view was made openly, and Members can refer to the news reports—and therefore, some people commented quite humorously that Prof XIAO Weiyun had been tricked by a colon. Members can take a look at Article 64 which consists of a colon, and it does not empower the Legislative Council to propose a motion of no confidence in officials and the Chief Executive.

In spite of this, after the permission was granted by former President of the Legislative Council Rita FAN, a no-confidence motion has been proposed against the Chief Executive or officials for almost 10 times so far, as also mentioned by a number of Honourable colleagues earlier on. Other motions of no confidence have also been proposed one after another, including a motion of no confidence in the Chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee. From the angle of the constitutional system, I must make it clear that even though a motion of no confidence is passed by us in this Council, it will not lead to the stepping down of
the Chief Executive because there is no constitutional basis for it under the Basic Law. To make the Chief Executive resign, only Articles 50 and 52 of the Basic Law can be invoked for this cause. Go back and take a look at them.

I have listened to the speeches made by many Members on this motion of no confidence in the Chief Executive. Except for a few Members—I think Mr IP Kin-yuen has given her the benefit of doubt—most of the other Members had spoken as if they were speaking on a motion encouraging the public to take to the streets on 9 June. So, my view is that after the Occupy Central movement in 2014 and the Mong Kok riot, the opposition camp, no matter how hard they tried, were unable to find a pretext because many of their supporters were disappointed and frustrated. Then, after making a great deal of efforts, there was finally the co-location arrangement and they wanted to use it to stir up troubles but this wish again vanished with the passage of the legislation on the co-location arrangement and the Express Rail Link. Now the public are already adapting very well, and we have not seen any abuse of powers as they cautioned then. I can assert that the opposition camp has time and again misjudged the situation. Regarding this motion of no confidence proposed by them, actually several Members, such as Mr James TO, did have expectations for the Chief Executive, though we might be disappointed because when the Chief Executive assumed office, she did say that she did not quite wish to touch Article 23 of the Basic Law, nor did she wish to touch the constitutional reform. Actually she very much wanted to avoid these controversial issues in the hope that the livelihood issues could be addressed effectively.

Let me come back to this issue. My judgment is that the Government has underestimated the situation. Not only has the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("SAR") underestimated the situation, but the whole world and probably even the Chinese Government have also underestimated the situation because the international struggle started by the United States, the China-United States trade war, and even the vigour of the suppression of Chinese enterprises are astonishing. In February when these signs had not yet emerged, and when everyone was thinking that the stock market could rise to 30,000 or 32,000 points and did not wish to sell their stock even then, the SAR Government introduced the amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance. From the legal and political perspectives, actually this is a most ordinary issue. Earlier on Members also mentioned that in 1999 there was the case of CHEUNG Tze-keung, in 2004 there was the case of Telford Gardens, and
then there was the SNOWDEN case in 2013 and the case of MENG Wanzhou in 2018. Actually these issues are no new issues at all. However, they are, after all, a question of political trust.

Last Friday I had the chance to meet with representatives of the Parliament of Canada. I asked them whether there would be a fair trial for Ms MENG Wanzhou because according to my judgment, this very case involves the China-United States trade war, and even TRUMP has said so with no qualms. I asked them if they would consider her a political prisoner and hence refrain from surrendering her to the United States. They said to me with certainty, "You have to trust our country where common law is practised. In Canada, we uphold common law, and presumption of innocence." In reply, I asked them, "Then why do you not trust our courts in Hong Kong?"

The opposition camp will certainly cite the news report today about three senior Judges expressing their concerns on the sly. I am most disappointed with these three Judges. Ever since the first day I studied law I have known one thing and that is, under the legal system of Hong Kong, and even during the colonial era, why are Judges allowed to enjoy security of tenure? The purpose is to make them free from pressure. Even the colonial government in the past could not exert political pressure on the Judges. They are different from their counterparts in some states of the United States because the Judges there have to run for their office and canvass votes for their appointment, and in spite of this, the judgments made by Judges in the United States may still differ from the views of TRUMP.

The representatives of the Parliament of Canada said that the Judges in Canada may also hold views that are different from those of the Government and that their Judiciary is independent, and this explains everything. Our Judges absolutely have the ability, status and authority, and our practices for the surrender of fugitives are in line with common law and international conventions, and we also uphold the principles of giving the accused the benefit of doubt, presumption of innocence, and so on. Why is it that our Judges are described by politicians in foreign countries as having to kneel down and worry about being pressurized by China? Even if there would be pressure from China, so what? TRUMP has also exerted pressure on the Judges. The United States Government may also feel unhappy about Patrick HO being given such a light sentence. This just happens all the time. Every one of them is under pressure, and this is the case for any person holding office of a Judge.
I think these concerns are only a false alarm. Under the system of Hong Kong, the Judges are protected from political pressure. I also expect that regarding future requests from the Mainland or other jurisdictions, the Court in Hong Kong may probably make different determinations ultimately. This is just normal, and there will not be any problem, just that the opposition camp has successfully transformed this issue from a legal issue to a political controversy within Hong Kong, which has eventually enabled them to bad mouth Hong Kong successfully, distort the law and then precipitate an international political struggle. And just as they expected, the Central Government has to come forth and take a higher profile in expressing its support and then they can term it as intervention by the Central Authorities. All places in the world can express their views, but only the Central Authorities cannot express their views, according to them.

Initially, I questioned whether Members in the opposition camp are opponents clumsy like pigs. Now I would say that they are not. I think they are wreaking havoc wilfully and maliciously. They are making use of this issue to ruin Hong Kong. (The buzzer sounded) … Deputy President, I so submit.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr Priscilla LEUNG, your speaking time is up.

MR CHAN HAN-PAN (in Cantonese): Deputy President, it is in fact very strange for the Democratic Party to propose a motion on "Vote of No Confidence in the Chief Executive". It is because the incumbent Chief Executive held out an olive branch to the Democratic Party when she took office, which has been a much-told tale up to now since its establishment.

I still remember seeing in the news that every member of the Democratic Party was smiling at the Chief Executive, and they also took selfie and shook hands with her. When no one made a bid during the auction, the Chief Executive then made a bid and donated some money to them to avert the embarrassment. They can turn around 180 degrees in an extremely short period of time, at a speed even quicker than a chameleon. Certainly, the move of the Democratic Party today is not even worthy to be described with expressions such as chameleon, "crocodile tears", etc. Yet, while the Democratic Party proposes a motion on vote of no confidence, are they really worthy of our trust?
It can be seen from the past deeds of the Democratic Party that they oppose for the sake of opposition. There are abundant examples revealing that their actions have betrayed their words. Today, I would like to take this opportunity to revisit a few incidents with Members. They initially opposed the infrastructure project of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge ("HZMB"), and they denounced on lips and pen the co-location arrangement at the West Kowloon Station of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link ("XRL"), in which they even made use of the "stapler incident" to immediately plunge the public into panic. Everyone was so frightened about them being arrested by the public security officers at the West Kowloon Station and tortured with a stapler. In fact, it was found that they had fabricated the incident. Certainly, after the commissioning of these infrastructure projects, they acted at once and strongly supported them. Here I have a leaflet on a tour of visiting the two infrastructure items in one go: "HZMB, depart from Hong Kong; XRL at West Kowloon, direct to Hong Kong", but I have not yet organized such kind of tours. In addition, they also took XRL for the "Mini Direct Links" at Xiamen. Their acts today are in stark contrast to the way they gnashed their teeth back then. A political party that opposes for the sake of opposition can be considered as a "paper tiger", for they have no vitality and are not qualified to propose the motion under discussion today.

Speaking of qualification, Mr WAN, who has proposed the motion today, is even less qualified. I gave my colleagues a difficult question yesterday: Has anyone in history ever done what Mr WAN did in the past? Opposing the construction of XRL, he was the first to organize a tour for riding on XRL which was subject to the co-location arrangement. Once he discovered that the 50-odd volunteers who had supported him for many years might not support him anymore, he abused the reporting mechanism and attempted to revoke their voter qualification and sent them to court. He did not show any mercy to those local residents who had worked diligently for him for many years to build up his position. As the saying goes, "one should remember the grace bestowed on one for a thousand years", but he can be even so heartless to those local residents who have known him for so long, so how would he treat the Chief Executive? Therefore, my colleagues racked their brains and just now they finally came up with the only one historical figure who had done similar things, and it is LU Bu. What actually did LU Bu do? I am not going to elaborate on it due to the time constraint, but I hope Members can spend some time to check the doings of LU Bu in the past.
I listened to Mr WAN very attentively when he proposed the motion just now, but what I heard was devoid of content, unjustified and nonsensical, whereas his allusion to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance was even full of lies. This is consistent with his practice in the past 20-odd years: distorting everything. I do not wish to waste Members' time here, but I would like to quote the advice to the opposition camp given by Prof Anthony CHEUNG, former member of their party, in the newspaper. He hoped that the opposition camp would get rid of the old mindset of always utilizing the conflicts between the Mainland and Hong Kong but establish a new discourse. Yet, they are playing the same old trick today.

They assert that "China extradition law" is very dangerous as people would risk being surrendered to the Mainland, yet I notice that they have organized sight-seeing tours quite frequently. Just now I enquired with other Honourable Members on whether it was feasible to organize a tour for riding on XRL at a fee of $999, and I got the reply that the price was more or less correct. One can hence imagine that they also possess rich experience as they probably organize such tours very often. In view of this, Deputy President, I oppose to this frivolous and unreasonable motion on vote of no confidence proposed by Mr WAN and the Democratic Party today.

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

DR HELENA WONG (in Cantonese): Deputy President, Chief Executive Carrie LAM has been in office for two years, yet her approval rating has slid drastically. Back then, the Democratic Party invited her to the anniversary dinner of our party, but now, Mr Andrew WAN has proposed a motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive". I believe Carrie LAM has never seen it coming.

Dr Priscilla LEUNG mentioned just now that Carrie LAM might have underestimated the political situation. I agree with this judgment of hers. Today, the Chief Secretary for Administration has spent half an hour setting out the good deeds and merits of the policies implemented by the SAR Government under the leadership of Carrie LAM, which include the improvement of public toilets—during our lunch earlier, we wondered if the Chief Secretary would also include animal welfare in his list. Regarding the focus of the debate today, I
believe that when the Democratic Party initiated the discussion, it did not aim to focus on the good or bad deeds of the Government in various policy areas. This is not the core of the debate. Members should understand that the crucial trigger of the motion on vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive is the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation. (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill"). The entire incident is a matter of no confidence in the political aspect.

(THE PRESIDENT resumed the Chair)

Why do we lack confidence in the Carrie LAM Administration politically? I believe there are several reasons. First, as Dr Priscilla LEUNG said, Carrie LAM has underestimated the situation in the international arena, and more so, her political judgment is problematic which has prompted her to make the wrong political judgment. Like many Members, I took out the pamphlet Carrie LAM used in the Chief Executive Election and studied it carefully today. I discover that among the many items in her manifesto, there is no mention of the amendment of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance. Is it due to the unexpected Taiwan homicide case that the Government has to introduce the amendments on which successful negotiation has failed in the past 20-odd years? As Mrs Regina IP pointed out earlier, she had visited Beijing to discuss the legislation but the negotiation was unsuccessful eventually. This issue has remained unsettled for some 20 years. If so, why would Carrie LAM submit the Bill to the meeting of the Legislative Council for Second Reading suddenly in such a swift manner?

In fact, Mrs Regina IP should have learnt a hard lesson. Back then, when she promoted the controversial National Security (Legislative Provisions) Bill, the Government just gave a few months to the legislature, hoping that the consultation work could be completed and the Bill passed within the summer. At that time, the approach also aroused anxiety. Regarding the present Bill, did the Government underestimate the situation in the beginning, thinking that the Bill merely targets fugitives and the public would have no fear because they are not fugitives? Is this what the Government thinks?
In the case of stock investment, if we made a wrong judgment in timing, we might suffer losses, yet it would only cost our own money. Nonetheless, as the Chief Executive leads Hong Kong as a whole, if she makes wrong judgments in political issues, implements some controversial laws carelessly and disregards public opinions, it is a most serious case. Besides, the incident as a whole does not merely involve an inaccurate political judgment. The Government keeps making repetitive remarks, saying that the amendments aim at plugging the loophole and that the issue had not been addressed by the Government in the previous terms so the Government cannot play ostrich and must handle the issue properly. However, we do not agree that this is a loophole. In our view, negotiations in the past failed because of the worry that the legal system in Hong Kong may not be protected under "one country, two systems".

Just now, Dr Priscilla LEUNG queried why the opposition camp does not trust that courts in Hong Kong could play the gatekeeper and why we do not trust that Judges of Hong Kong enjoying security of tenure will not subject to political pressure. Yet, the scope of power of Judges lies in the power conferred on them under the Bill. They may only have the power to examine the prima facie evidence, but not the power to conduct investigations and trials. As for the proposal for "Hong Kong citizens to be tried locally", the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the Hong Kong SAR ("LOCPG") has already said "No". In other words, offenders will be extradited to Mainland China to stand trial. Moreover, the public also doubt if the Chief Executive can play the gatekeeper, for the Chief Executive is also appointed by the Central Authorities but not elected by the people by "one person, one vote". Hence, the two so-called "gate-keeping" arrangements can in no way serve such a function.

Some people query that we do not trust the Judiciary of Hong Kong. At issue is not that we lack trust in the Judiciary but whether "Hong Kong citizens can be tried locally", but this arrangement is not allowed at present. Our prevailing concern is extradition to China, where suspects will be extradited to the Mainland to be tried by the judicial department there. Regrettably, in the debate today, I have not heard Members from the pro-establishment camp mention their confidence in the Mainland judiciary, the high degree of judicial independence of the Mainland, the protection of the human rights of suspects under trial, the suspect's access to defence counsel, the separation of politics and laws, the access to fair trial, the right to appoint lawyers and the right to be visited by family members, and so on.
In the past two to three decades, the judiciary in the Mainland might have changed slightly. Yet, have those changes raised the judiciary to a level which we can rest assured that suspects or fugitives can be sent to the Mainland to stand trial? Their legal system differs significantly from ours, where lawyers appointed by defendants are arrested on some occasions. This is exactly the case of human rights lawyers. I highly respected these Mainlanders. They fight for justice and assist certain people to lodge complaints, yet they turn out to be arrested and imprisoned. In the face of such a system, we can hardly rest assured in extraditing the so-called suspects to the Mainland for trial. Hence, this is a matter of human rights. Some people suggest that observers may be sent to the Mainland to monitor whether the human rights of suspects extradited are assured. Yet, who can we send to monitor these cases? Even if we send Secretary for Justice Teresa CHENG, no one in the Mainland will heed her. In fact, it is possible that observers may also disappear.

In gist, Carrie LAM has not merely made an incorrect political judgment, for her integrity in politics is also in question. Has she upheld "one country, two systems" properly? In the incident, we see that she is extremely reckless and ignores public opinions. This time around, not only the pro-democracy camp have views, 130 000 people have taken to the streets in protest. Even the business sector, legal sector, judicial sector, foreign envoys and the education sector have expressed their views. Yet, the Government simply regards these views as nonsense and refuses to heed public opinions.

As for the present case, is it that "Grandpa" has blown the whistle and Carrie LAM and the pro-establishment camp are brought to their knees to make the Bill passed swiftly? In fact, the Bills Committee concerned was only set up on 12 April and the Bill was read the First time on 3 April. Yet, the Government now proposes bypassing the Bills Committee to present the Bill to the Legislative Council direct on 12 June. This practice is absolutely undemocratic.
("SAR") Government. Secondly, just now after her lengthy speech, Dr Helena Wong called on the people to join the upcoming procession. What a pity that the Legislative Council does not have a platform for charging advertising fees. Otherwise, today it could have made a lot of money. In particular, on Ms Claudia MO's appeal just now, I believe the Legislative Council could have charged a considerable amount of advertising fees.

Nevertheless, I saw that the Chief Secretary of Administration had seriously made good preparations for this motion and spent 30 minutes giving his initial response. Certainly, it is a good thing that the Chief Secretary has worked so seriously, but now there is a popular saying, "If you get serious, you will lose." They kept smearing the Chief Secretary, who kept pointing out what work the SAR Government had done to improve people's livelihood. But basically, they will not listen because they do not trust the Chief Secretary or the Chief Executive. We all understand that in the foreign legislatures, the proposal of a motion of no confidence in an official, the president or the state leader is a serious accusation or a serious issue. In our legislature, however, be it the Chief Executive of various terms, or the President of the Legislative Council, the Chairman of the House Committee, or even the Chairman of the Finance Committee or that of the Public Works Subcommittee, I believe as long as someone bears the title of "President" or "Chairman", he will face a no-confidence motion in the future. Did the person concerned really commit such a heinous crime that he has to face a no-confidence motion? If the principle or standard put forward by the pan-democratic Members applies, I believe every Member of the pro-establishment camp here might have to face a no-confidence motion once. Hence, I wish to tell the Chief Secretary that there is no need to be too serious. "If you get serious, you will lose."

Besides, I wish to make a brief response. Today our subject matter is not the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO"), but Honourable colleagues have made use of this motion to bring up this issue for discussion. I think there are two points we have to make clear to members of the public. First, the pan-democratic Members wish to hype up FOO to gain some political capital. One point is loud and clear. The Central Government has openly expressed its support for amending FOO. The pan-democratic Members criticized this as intervention. Yet they met with American and German officials, making untruthful remarks. After their return, they did not inform Honourable colleagues in the Council what they had discussed. Is there no problem with
what they did? This is double standard. Why did they say it is OK and no problem for foreigners to make comments, but when the Central Government said something, they said it is unacceptable and criticized it as intervention?

Just now Dr Helena WONG said FOO or the murder case in Taiwan did not accentuate any loophole in the laws of Hong Kong, whereas former Director of Public Prosecutions Ian Grenville CROSS said this is a loophole which needs to be plugged. Should we believe Mr CROSS, or Dr Helena WONG? I guess we already have an answer in our minds.

Some Honourable colleagues also said that the amendment to FOO is a betrayal of Hong Kong. I find it most ridiculous. They made a "pilgrimage" to the United States with a great fanfare. It was betrayal of not only Hong Kong but also China.

With these remarks, President, I oppose this no-confidence motion.

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

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Andrew WAN, you may now speak on the amendment. The time limit is five minutes.

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): President, in these five minutes, I will focus on responding to Ms Claudia MO's amendment. Certainly, in this course, I may also explain why I agree or disagree with Ms Claudia MO's view. I will also respond to other Honourable colleagues' remarks.

Just now an Honourable colleague …

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WAN, in these five minutes, you should only speak on the amendment …
MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): President, I know. I am just speaking on the amendment.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): ... rather than responding to other Members' speeches. Please speak on the amendment.

MR ANDREW WAN (in Cantonese): President, I know, but when I respond to the amendment and explain why I support it, I need to cite examples as illustration, right? Because they are wrong and Ms Claudia MO is right. President, I can put it this way, can I not?

President, just now an Honourable colleague mentioned that there is something wrong with the content of my motion, so Ms Claudia MO needed to propose an amendment. But I think this warrants a clarification, since the content presented by me is simply the basic formulation of a no-confidence motion. However, I certainly also agree with Ms MO's amendment because she has put it much clearer. I see that her amendment mainly comprises several points, including a forceful remark that Carrie LAM has paid no heed to Hongkongers' concern about the defective legal system of the Mainland. This is indeed the fact. So I agree with it. I also find certain Honourable colleagues' remarks baffling. Why did some people say we are exaggerating, making an issue of the subject and encouraging opposition to China? I remember that Mr Jeffrey LAM also seemed to say such things just now. I find it very weird because just a few days ago, I watched him strongly oppose the present proposal with other people on the television. I wonder if he himself is, like he said, making an issue of the subject, encouraging opposition to China and exaggerating. I will not bother to talk about whether he has sold his assets because it does not matter. Those are his own assets, and their disposal is his choice. However, one should speak with fairness. Ms Claudia MO's remark is right. What the Government or Carrie LAM is now doing has caused all our worries about the legal system on the Mainland to surface. Therefore, Honourable colleagues of the pro-establishment camp are most honest in their deeds. It is only practical to take action. It has been fully illustrated.

Another salient point in Ms Claudia MO's amendment is, as she has underlined, the proposed amendments to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance will erode Hong Kong's "high degree of autonomy" and freedom. This is precisely a
guarantee and undertaking made to Hong Kong by "one country, two systems". Just now some Honourable colleagues said we do not recognize "one country, two systems". Such a remark is wrong. I agree with what Ms Claudia MO said, President. We are precisely defending "one country, two systems". "One country, two systems" has vested in Hong Kong this different status, allowing us to have independent judicial, social and economic systems. Hence, I do not understand why Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan said that we do not recognize "one country, two systems". We are precisely defending it. I hope he will be clear on this point. If he understands it, I hope he will vote for Ms Claudia MO's amendment later, since he also supports "one country, two systems".

Another point in Ms Claudia MO's amendment, which is the middle part, states that the Chief Executive has disregarded the public opinion demanding for the withdrawal of the proposed legislative amendments, and remained adamant about amending the legislation, bringing a negative impact to society. This is exactly the problem of tearing society apart as mentioned by me in my speech, breaking the promise made by Ms Carrie LAM to Hong Kong society during the Chief Executive Election and before her assumption of office. For this reason, I consider Ms Claudia MO's notion in line with the spirit of my original motion and the purpose of my speech. I agree with it.

I have noticed another point in her amendment which states that the proposed legislative amendments will "facilitate the Mainland to suppress dissidents". She thus proposed an amendment to Carrie LAM's no-confidence motion. I think this has also spoken my mind. Recently, we have seen many people who should not comment on the legislative amendments come forward to give instructions, including WANG Zhimin, the Director of the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. He has summoned quite a number of Honourable colleagues of this Council. President, I did not count how many there were, but this is actually a very serious situation, contravening the fundamental spirit of "one country, two systems" mentioned just now. For this reason, I agree with this reminder of Ms Claudia MO. This absolutely should not be done. Certainly, I see that under the existing severe political intervention by the "Western District", Ms Carrie LAM has kept her mouth shut. I wonder if it is because, as an Honourable colleague said just now, as soon as Beijing blows the whistle, everyone will comply immediately, and she dares not make any specific response.
In the remaining several dozens of seconds, I wish to raise one point about the amendment. President, the condemnation in the amendment is mainly about the consequent political impact. Just now Chief Secretary for Administration Matthew CHEUNG uttered a bunch of achievements of the Government, including such work as improvement to public toilets. He stopped short of mentioning rodent disinfestation and planting of trees. In my view, however, these are irrelevant to the main question and not to the point. On the contrary, Ms Claudia MO's amendment has rightly expressed the spirit of this no-confidence motion proposed by me, which is the need to defend "one country, two systems" and the core values of Hong Kong, and uphold the rule of law in Hong Kong. I have noticed that today, some Judges have also come forward to express their stance. I hope Honourable colleagues, especially Dr Junius HO, will vote (The buzzer sounded) … for …

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

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION (in Cantonese): President, I would like to reiterate that the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("SAR") solemnly opposes the motion on "Vote of no confidence in the Chief Executive" proposed by Mr Andrew WAN and the amendment proposed by Ms Claudia MO. I now focus on responding to the comments or specious remarks made by Members during the debate.

First of all, I sincerely thank the many Members who spoke just now to strongly oppose the original motion and the amendment. They unequivocally support the amendment of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance ("FOO") which is aimed to plug the loopholes, combat serious crimes, uphold justice and the rule of law, and safeguard the security of society, such that Hong Kong will not become a haven for fugitive offenders. Meanwhile, I am also grateful to many Members for their positive comments on the political achievements of the incumbent Chief Executive, affirming her efforts and commitment, and doing justice to the Chief Executive, the team of accountability officials of the current-term Government and the civil service.

On the other hand, I must repeatedly stress that the amendment of FOO, same as other legislative amendment exercises, is led by the SAR Government. There is absolutely no political purpose and no hidden agenda. It is not tailor-made for the Mainland, nor is it a political mission. We initiated the
amendment exercise for a very simple reason, that is, to safeguard the rule of law, uphold justice, combat fugitive offenders and ensure that Hong Kong is a safe city. During the process, we will ensure that the mechanism encompasses comprehensive and effective safeguards and barriers, and exercise strict control over it. Therefore, law-abiding citizens can absolutely rest assured and they should not be misled by rumours.

Given that the content of the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill") is relatively complicated, it is indeed not easy for the ordinary people to fully understand it. As we all know, the relevant Bills Committee of the Legislative Council has failed to function normally in the past few weeks, therefore the Government has been deprived of an effective, open and transparent tripartite platform that gives the Government the opportunity to interact, exchange ideas and discuss with Members thoroughly, and to clarify misunderstandings, deepen people's understanding and allay misgivings, and further eliminate the unnecessary fear. We do not have such an opportunity. In the meantime, some people with ulterior motives made plenty of exaggerated and untrue remarks as well as misleading statements in Hong Kong and overseas, and they even spread fear, leading to many misunderstandings and worries in Hong Kong and the international community. It is most unfortunate that they even made some unreasonable criticisms and accusations.

President, please allow me to make a brief response on four aspects here. First, some Members criticized the Central Government for interfering with the amendment exercise, intervening in Hong Kong, and undermining "one country, two systems". We absolutely disapprove of these claims. In fact, the Central Government's concern and support for the SAR's current legislative amendment exercise are a matter of course. The Central Government has been lending its full support to the HKSAR's successful implementation of "one country, two systems", steadfast upholding of the rule of law and effective cooperation with different countries and regions around the world, including the Mainland, Macao and Taiwan, to join hands in combating serious crimes.

Second, I would like to clarify and point out very clearly that some Members mentioned that the Mainland was excluded in the existing FOO and described it as the so-called "firewall" which was deliberately retained instead of being a loophole. I have to solemnly clarify that this is absolutely untrue. If Members have paid attention, they must know that our colleagues and the Chief
Executive said earlier that the purpose of enacting FOO before the reunification was to legislate for the localization of laws which were adopted in the British-Hong Kong era back then, with the aim of establishing an appropriate legal framework so that there would be a local law which could be applied after the reunification of Hong Kong to serve as a basis for Hong Kong to surrender fugitive offenders and negotiate surrender arrangements with other places. If Members have time, they can surf the Internet or go to the Legislative Council Library to check the Legislative Council Brief on the Fugitive Offenders Bill dated October 1996, in which this background is clearly explained.

Since China was not included in the arrangements for the surrender of fugitive offenders back then, FOO hence does not apply to requests for surrender of fugitive offenders between Hong Kong and other parts of China. Such an arrangement reflects the purpose of the localization of the Ordinance, instead of eliminating China deliberately to protect the human rights of Hong Kong people. This is a point on which I must set the record straight.

The third point that I have to clarify is that some Member quoted a report of Reuters today which raised queries on the roles and capabilities of the Court in gate-keeping. I must reiterate once again that the Court and the executive authority will perform their respective gate-keeping roles in respect of the surrender procedures. Being fair, independent and free from political influence, the Court of Hong Kong is an important gatekeeper in the surrender procedures. In fact, in the nearly 22 years in the past, the Court of Hong Kong has handled quite a number of cases in respect of the surrender of fugitive offenders and has all along been working well. The Court has accumulated extensive experience, so we have to trust the professional competence of our Judges. Moreover, Article 85 of the Basic Law clearly stipulates that—let me read out the original text—"The courts of HKSAR shall exercise judicial power independently,"—I must emphasize, "exercise judicial power independently"—"free from any interference. Members of the judiciary shall be immune from legal action in the performance of their judicial functions". It has clearly stipulated our judicial independence in that the Courts are completely independent and free from any interference.

Alleging arbitrarily that our courts would not make a vigorous effort in gate-keeping or querying its capabilities is disrespect for the Judiciary, which would also badly mislead the public. The Court should, when considering a surrender case, ensure that the request for surrender fully complies with the law,
the regulations under the relevant arrangements and the safeguards for personal rights. As a matter of fact, there are precedents in which the Courts of Hong Kong have refused requests for extradition on the ground of insufficient evidence.

The fourth point, which is also the last one I would like to clarify in relation to this issue, involves the doubt over prima facie evidence. Sufficient evidence means that the prima facie evidence is sufficient to prove the crime of the fugitive offenders, and such evidence is sufficient to warrant the case suspect's committal for trial in the Court of First Instance of the High Court, and this a very important point. That is to say, if the evidence adduced is admitted, a reasonable jury, properly directed, could convict the fugitive offenders on the strength of such evidence. There is a set of legal principles behind the ruling of a case to answer, whereas there are also case laws to follow. In fact, the requirements of prima facie evidence adopted by Hong Kong are the most stringent evidential requirements in extradition laws.

President, we will continue to work diligently and make enhanced efforts to explain the Bill to different organizations in the community so as to set the record straight, and to facilitate better understanding of its content by Hong Kong people, the business sector and the international community, with a view to eliminating the unnecessary suspicions held by various parties and dispelling their doubts about many issues. In fact, during the past two to three weeks, the team of accountability officials of the Government, including myself, has taken the initiative to contact different organizations and chambers of commerce. I can tell Members that their preliminary response is quite positive. After our detailed explanation, many chambers of commerce, including those of foreign countries, understand the entire amendment exercise, and some of them even agree to it, regarding it as an appropriate act.

At the meeting on 24 May, the House Committee of the Legislative Council agreed that the Second Reading debate of the Bill be directly resumed at the Legislative Council meeting on 12 June. We will certainly work harder during the debate to carefully explain the content of the Bill, especially the multi-tiered procedures in the relevant mechanism and the barriers in the judicial system to protect the rights of the parties involved. The Government will also spare no effort—I emphasize—to tie in with the arrangements of the Legislative Council, by attending any additional special meetings held by the Panel on Security to race against time and seize every opportunity to interact and exchange ideas with Members and do explaining to society. The Government hopes that the Legislative Council can engage in rational and pragmatic discussions.
President, please allow me to reiterate here that the Bill has clearly stipulated effective safeguards under which, in my own words, no surrender will be conducted under eight circumstances, whereas nine items of offences have been excluded and "three-tier barriers" have been established. The SAR Government will make vigorous gate-keeping efforts with a view to combating fugitive offenders, upholding justice and strengthening the rule of law.

As I pointed out in my opening remarks, the current-term Government under the leadership of the Chief Executive, the entire accountability team and the civil service have been working with unswerving fealty and full dedication to serve the public. We have made a lot of efforts in promoting economic development, improving people's livelihood and facilitating upward movement in society, whereas some interim achievement has already been made.

Just now some Members made fun of an example given by me—the Government and the Chief Executive responded expeditiously to the demand of improving the hygiene condition of public toilets—in illustrating that the Chief Executive is very much concerned about livelihood issues. In fact, I find it very strange because these Members must be out of touch with the general public, they are so unrealistic and know nothing about what is going on. One must know that the cleanliness of public toilets has been a problem in society for years, affecting not only the grass roots but also tourists. Therefore, we must understand that "no livelihood issue is too trivial". We must remember that Members are serving the public, and they cannot just focus on big issues and ignore the small ones.

President, I must point out that on the basis of good governance, the SAR Government of the current term, under the leadership of Chief Executive Carrie Lam, has been listening humbly to the criticisms and opinions raised by Members which are constructive and based on facts. Yet, we must sternly refute personal attacks and remarks disseminating rumours. It is deeply regrettable that Members have made a political gesture through the motion on vote of no confidence by denying the Chief Executive's commitment to serve Hong Kong with full dedication, disregarding the efforts made by the accountability team of the current-term Government and the civil service on various aspects under her leadership, as well as the achievements made in all aspects of our work. These criticisms are of no help to people's livelihood and the economic development of Hong Kong.
I hope today will be the last time that we are having a debate of a similar nature—it should be the last time, so that the Chief Executive and we, members of the Government team, can concentrate all our efforts to focus on new challenges. We believe and have confidence that with the concerted efforts of the Government, all sectors of society and the Legislative Council, Hong Kong will be a civilized, safe, affluent, benevolent international cosmopolitan city upholding justice and the rule of law with good governance and development potential. Under the leadership of the Chief Executive, the SAR Government will continue to "care", "listen" and "act" to interact, collaborate and connect with the general public to promote economic development and improve people's livelihood. We will also exert our best to uphold the rule of law, judicial independence, human rights and freedom in Hong Kong, which are the core values underpinning Hong Kong's success. We will certainly uphold these values to build a better Hong Kong.

With these remarks, President, I implore Members to oppose Mr Andrew WAN's motion and Ms Claudia MO's amendment. Thank you, President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now call upon Ms Claudia MO to move her amendment.

MS CLAUDIA MO (in Cantonese): President, I move my amendment.

The amendment moved by Ms Claudia MO (See the marked-up version at Annex 1)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That Ms Claudia MO's amendment 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 Claudia MO rose to claim a division.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Ms Claudia MO has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for five minutes.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

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

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-yiing, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan, Mr Kenneth LAU and Mr Tony TSE voted against the amendment.

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, 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, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, 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, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr Vincent CHENG and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan voted against the amendment.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 32 were present, 7 were in favour of the amendment and 24 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 33 were present, 15 were in favour of the amendment and 18 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the motion moved by Mr Andrew WAN 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 Andrew WAN rose to claim a division.
PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr Andrew WAN has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for five minutes.

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

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

Functional Constituencies:

Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr LUK Chung-hung and Mr KWONG Chun-yu voted for the motion.

Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr Martin LIAO, Mr POON Siu-ping, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan, Mr Kenneth LAU and Mr Tony TSE voted against the motion.

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

Geographical Constituencies:

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

---

2 Mr Christopher CHEUNG clarified after this meeting that at that time his voting preference was not recorded by the system. He actually opposed the motion.

3 Mr LUK Chung-hung declared after this meeting that at that time he had pressed the wrong button. He actually opposed the motion.
Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mrs Regina IP, 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, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr Vincent CHENG and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan voted against the motion.

THE PRESIDENT announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 31 were present, 8 were in favour of the motion and 22 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 33 were present, 15 were in favour of the motion and 18 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the motion was negatived.

SUSPENSION OF MEETING

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now suspend the meeting until 9:00 am tomorrow.

*Suspended accordingly at 7:11 pm.*
Annex 1

The marked-up version of the amendment moved by Ms Claudia MO (Translation)

That, on the issue of amending the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation, the Chief Executive has paid no heed to the grave concern of Hong Kong people about the Mainland's defective legal system, disregarded the public opinion demanding for the withdrawal of the proposed legislative amendments, and remained adamant about amending the legislation; the passage of the proposed legislative amendments will erode Hong Kong's 'high degree of autonomy' and freedom and facilitate the Mainland to suppress dissidents; in this connection, this Council has no confidence in the Chief Executive, Mrs Carrie LAM.

Note: Ms Claudia MO's amendment is marked in **bold and italic type**.