

in situ, including proper adjustments to the current works projects and designs of future projects to avoid damaging the existing structure of the Queen's Pier, so as to minimize the impact of works projects on the present site of the Queen's Pier."

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

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Two Members will move amendments to this motion. The motion and the two amendments will now be debated together in a joint debate.

I now call upon Mrs Selina CHOW to speak first, to be followed by Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, but no amendments are to be moved at this stage.

MRS SELINA CHOW (in Cantonese): President, the operation of the Queen's Pier was put to a stop on Thursday evening. According to the media, many citizens had gone to the Pier to take photographs as tokens of past memory. Even "Brother Fat" (CHOW Yun-fat), who rarely appeared on public occasions, made his appearance on the site to take a walk down memory lane. As a matter of fact, any person loves Hong Kong, including me, may have had this impulse. Fortunately, we can expect to see the Queen's Pier again in its original glory in the near future.

In all fairness, the Administration has learnt a lesson from the demolition of the Star Ferry Pier and submitted four proposals on the future of the Queen's Pier last month. The first two proposals provide for *in situ* preservation of the Pier requiring major alternations of the development planning; the third option provides for *in situ* reinstatement in the future by removing the Pier for the time being, with alternation of road alignments for such purposes. The fourth option provides for relocation of the Pier to a new location in its original condition by preserving its retainable parts.

The Government has held a number of meetings with professional bodies such as the Conservancy Association (CA), Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (HKIE), Association of Engineering Professionals in Society (AES) and Hong

Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA), and so on, to discuss these options. In the end, the four professional bodies unanimously agreed that *in situ* preservation of the Queen's Pier is impracticable both financially and technically apart from being time-consuming. This being the case, they are not opposed to the relocation proposal. These are all professional bodies representative of the sector to which they belong. In some ways, they are even more well-versed in the merits and demerits of each individual option than Members of this Council, and they are in no way less conscious in heritage conservation than we are. Therefore, their views should be adopted.

The Liberal Party also opines that the fourth option put forth by the Government, that is, the relocation option, is the most practical. Not only is this option the least expensive, more importantly, it will cause the least effect to the Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) project in its course of preserving the Queen's Pier.

Mr Alan LEONG urges that the Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China (the China Principles) endorsed by the Central People's Government in year 2000 should be adopted, but this is somehow contradictory to his consistent insistence on the principle of "one country, two systems". The Liberal Party is of the view that copying wholesale mainland principle to the SAR may not fully work. What is more, the citizens of Hong Kong may not feel at ease too. However, we might as well draw reference from some of the provisions and examine if some of them could be applied to Hong Kong. As Mr LEONG said just now, Article 18 in the first section of the China Principles provides that "conservation must be undertaken *in situ*" where practicable, but it does not mean that it must always be 100% *in situ* conservation. It is, after all, possible to employ the means of relocation of cultural heritage in the original condition for the purposes of major national construction projects. In other words, there is built-in flexibility in the China Principles and it is not true that each and every monument must be "conserved *in situ*" regardless of the cost.

As a matter of fact, there are actually precedents for "conservation by means of relocation" as provided in the China Principles. For example, as a result of the construction of the Three Gorges Dam, the Zhang Fei Temple located in Yun Yang Province in Chongqing, Sichuan will be submerged under the river. For conservation purposes, the Chinese authorities decided to relocate the temple for reassembly by dismantling the temple into different parts.

to the proposal on relocating the Pier. Weighing all the merits against the demerits, the Liberal Party holds that "relocation for reassembly" is the most preferable option.

However, we must point out that whether the Queen's Pier would be reassembled *in situ* or relocated for reassembly in a nearby place, by the time the reclamation project is completed, the Queen's Pier will be located at a distance from the waterfront any way, so should we rename it to "Queen's Pavilion" then? This being the case, the Liberal Party has got a proposal, and we suggest the dismantled parts of the Queen's Pier be reassembled in the new Central waterfront, so that it can continue to serve the people of Hong Kong.

The Liberal Party conducted an opinion survey late last month, which shows that among the 1 000 respondents, over 36% supported the idea of reassembling the Pier at the new Central waterfront. 32% of the respondents supported relocating the Pier to a place in close proximity to the City Hall, and approximately 30% of the respondents did not have any opinion.

The Liberal Party thinks that the best way of preserving the historical face of the Queen's Pier after all is to preserve its function as a pier. If the preserved Pier ceases to function as a pier, it would be unfortunate and devoid of its original favour. Having said that, the findings of the survey show that there are three major streams of opinion on this issue, indicating that a consensus has not been reached on where the Queen's Pier should be located. Yet, it at least has proved one point, that is, quite a large number of citizens identify with the view of the Liberal Party.

Since society has not reached a consensus yet, the impending consultation exercise to be launched by the Government will be very instrumental. In this regard, we wish the Government would remain open and candid and listen carefully to what the people have to say when consulting the public on siting and design for the relocation exercise. Meanwhile, the public should seize this opportunity to engage in rational discussion and make their voices heard. That said, we do not agree to the wordings of "conservation *in situ*" and "preservation" *in situ* as used in the original motion, our reasons being that they are neither practicable nor feasible, and that they would constitute major difficulties in terms of time, finance and technology to the detriment of the progress of the project.

to the proposal on relocating the Pier. Weighing all the merits against the demerits, the Liberal Party holds that "relocation for reassembly" is the most preferable option.

However, we must point out that whether the Queen's Pier would be reassembled *in situ* or relocated for reassembly in a nearby place, by the time the reclamation project is completed, the Queen's Pier will be located at a distance from the waterfront any way, so should we rename it to "Queen's Pavilion" then? This being the case, the Liberal Party has got a proposal, and we suggest the dismantled parts of the Queen's Pier be reassembled in the new Central waterfront, so that it can continue to serve the people of Hong Kong.

The Liberal Party conducted an opinion survey late last month, which shows that among the 1 000 respondents, over 36% supported the idea of reassembling the Pier at the new Central waterfront. 32% of the respondents supported relocating the Pier to a place in close proximity to the City Hall, and approximately 30% of the respondents did not have any opinion.

The Liberal Party thinks that the best way of preserving the historical face of the Queen's Pier after all is to preserve its function as a pier. If the preserved Pier ceases to function as a pier, it would be unfortunate and devoid of its original favour. Having said that, the findings of the survey show that there are three major streams of opinion on this issue, indicating that a consensus has not been reached on where the Queen's Pier should be located. Yet, it at least has proved one point, that is, quite a large number of citizens identify with the view of the Liberal Party.

Since society has not reached a consensus yet, the impending consultation exercise to be launched by the Government will be very instrumental. In this regard, we wish the Government would remain open and candid and listen carefully to what the people have to say when consulting the public on siting and design for the relocation exercise. Meanwhile, the public should seize this opportunity to engage in rational discussion and make their voices heard. That said, we do not agree to the wordings of "conservation *in situ*" and "preservation" *in situ* as used in the original motion, our reasons being that they are neither practicable nor feasible, and that they would constitute major difficulties in terms of time, finance and technology to the detriment of the progress of the project.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL — 2 May 2007**6549**

As regards Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming's amendment, due to the inclusion of the wording "conservation *in situ*", we opine that this will be causing undue delay to the necessary works, and therefore we do not support his amendment.

Thank you, President.