

“Culture bureau”¹

Compiled by Joanna Lee Translated by Sue Lai

2012 was the election year for the Chief Executive of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR). Three Chief Executive candidates, namely Leung Chun-ying, Henry Tang Ying-nin and Albert Ho Chun-yan, proposed that there should be a “culture bureau” in the new administration (to commence operation from July 2012). Their proposals triggered heated discussion in the culture sector on the architecture of the bureau, the terms of reference, and the candidates for the secretary for culture. Experienced members of the culture sector recalled that twenty years ago, the Hong Kong Arts Development Council (HKADC) was established according to the same objective of the “culture bureau” proposed by the Chief Executive candidates. For two decades, the establishment of a “culture bureau” could not be materialised so the sector looked eagerly forward to its potential set up. Leung Chun-ying was elected Chief Executive in March 2012 yet his proposed administration structure comprising of “5 Secretaries-14-Bureaux” was not approved by the Legislative Council (LegCo). The proposal for establishing a “culture bureau” was shelved.

Information:

- Local newspaper. For details of newspaper coverage please see Chinese version.

2012/01

- **On 11 January**

Albert Ho Chun-yan, a candidate for the Chief Executive, suggested that there should be a “culture bureau” in the next administration to develop a territory-wide arts and cultural policy and should consolidate resources currently dispersed in different government departments. He urged the government to better nurture the young cultural practitioners, and stressed that the West Kowloon Cultural District project must be developed with the support of the culture sector, while its property development portion had to be contained in its current scale.²

- **On 18 January**

Over 20 culture practitioners, including Danny Yung, Yuen Siu-fai, Lau Tin, Simon Wong, Ma Jiahui, Dung Kai, May Fung, formed a “Cultural Concern Group”, and jointly signed an open letter to the three Chief Executive candidates. They appealed to the next Chief Executive to deploy more public resources to culture and arts. *Ming Pao Daily News* reported that the Cultural Concern Group raised four suggestions in the letter:

1. The new SAR government should set up a senior, “bureau-level” institution for cultural matters;
2. Within a year after taking office, the new SAR government should propose a “cultural blueprint”. The blueprint should be backed up by comprehensive cultural studies led by a committee with local academics and researchers as core members;
3. The new SAR government should dedicate sufficient resources for the materialisation of the “cultural blueprint”;

4. The “cultural blueprint” should cover cultural exchange and cooperation, and cultural and arts education issues in the Mainland, Hong Kong, Macau, and Taiwan.

One of the promoters of the open letter, Simon Wong, Artistic Director of “Ming Ri Institute for Arts Education” told *Ming Pao Daily News* that unlike the Mainland, Macau and Taiwan, Hong Kong was the only city without an office dedicated to cultural matters: “Problems result (because of this deficiency.) Take the West Kowloon Cultural District as an example. We make our cultural decisions based on the recommendations of foreign consultancy firms, but their findings are often inconsistent with the actual needs of the people in Hong Kong.” Therefore, Hong Kong must have a cultural administrative agency with local roots. Simon Wong felt that (Home Affairs Bureau) officials were “problem-solving administrators”, while cultural undertakings required forward-looking visionaries. The Home Affairs Bureau was not qualified to handle cultural matters. There should be a “culture bureau” in Hong Kong.

2012/03

- On 15 March

Chief Executive Candidate Henry Tang issued an open letter to the Electoral Commission and the public, noting that being a successful, international financial center, he saw no reason why Hong Kong should not also be a world class arts and cultural hub. He pledged that, if being elected, he would regard promoting Hong Kong’s cultural and creative industries as the city’s core and long-term development strategy. He felt that the freedom of speech and publishing in Hong Kong positively supported the nurturing of local artistic talents, and attracted those from the Mainland and Asia. He recommended establishing a “culture bureau” run by experts from the arts and cultural sector. The bureau should be responsible for policy formulation and implementation relevant to arts and culture as well as the creative industries, including film, design, performing arts and publishing. He believed that the “cultural bureau” should bring arts into the community and schools, to strengthen the role of the District Councils in arts and culture promotion, to provide resources for young artists and arts groups to conduct community arts programmes, and to develop new, community-facing cultural facilities, such as libraries and museums. The government should also design policies that encourage collaboration of schools, arts organisations and the creative industry to come up with arts-related curriculum and internship.⁴

- On 27 March

Leung Chun-ying began to line up his governance team after being elected the fourth Chief Executive of HKSAR. Ma Fung-kuok, former chairman of HKADC and who had assisted in drafting Leung’s cultural platform, was seen as a likely candidate for the secretary for culture. Ma Fung-kuok told *Sing Tao Daily News* that he had not heard of any news regarding the “appointment” and would not respond to any suggestive inquiries.

2012/04

- On 6 April

Chief Executive-elect Leung Chun-ying proposed in his political platform for a “cultural bureau” to be responsible for “formulating and implementing cultural policies, mentoring and supporting the cultural organisations in Hong Kong”. Au-Yeung Shing, lecturer of Cultural and Religious Studies of The Chinese University of Hong Kong, told *Hong Kong Economic Journal* that back in 2003, the Culture and Heritage Commission submitted a proposal to the then Chief Executive Tung Chee-hwa. The Commission, led by Chang Hsin-kang, positioned Hong Kong’s culture as “diversity growing out of one root”. Back then there was apprehension that that positioning paved way for patriotic education. Cultural activities following this positioning would be for the sole purpose of nurturing patriotism. Au-Yeung believed that such concerns were still valid as culture practitioners still saw the possibility of “culture” being used

as a political tool to instill affinity to the Communist Party. Artist Lam Hon-kin felt that there was an emerging trend of political censorship to works of arts. He also commented that government's annual funding for the arts and culture was only about HK\$4 billion and was inadequate for cultural development in its pure sense. He therefore was inclined to believe that the proposed "culture bureau" was just a propaganda machine for the Central Government.⁶

- **On 13 April**

Ada Wong Ying-Kay, Executive Director of "Hong Kong Institute of Contemporary Culture", wrote in *Ming Pao Daily News* on the positioning consideration for the proposed "culture bureau". "When the two Urban Councils were disbanded twelve years ago, the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) took over the management of cultural matters in Hong Kong. However HAB has done almost nothing to tackle the lack of a proper "cultural policy". Resources allocation remained to be biased towards performing arts while visual arts and literature were belittled. The HAB is just an execution body. It lacks a think tank. It invests on hardware but ignores the development of qualified manpower. It has the vision of 'building a cultural district' which is not supported by well thought-out plans or strategies. The Leisure and Cultural Services Department sits under the Culture Branch of the Home Affairs Bureau, led by a deputy secretary with three PAS staff. The Culture Branch operates under lean human resources while having to manage a large amount of tedious undertakings." She did not see the future "culture bureau" as a large-scale operation but had to work across different policy areas, which required the support from heads of various government departments. Wong doubted if that would work because the "cultural bureau" was not charged with the authority to deploy resources of other departments. The secretary for culture, being an advocate of intangible values may find himself in a wrong place in the current bureaucratic environment. The success of the "culture bureau" is dependent on a paradigm shift. The entire government administration had to incorporate cultural viewpoints in their policies so as to achieve a balance among economic, cultural and social development needs. Wong also pointed out that the current arts funding policies did not promote Hong Kong's arts development in its true sense. She was skeptical whether the future "cultural bureau" would have the will power to change the rigid and bureaucratic arts funding mentality. She appealed to the cultural sector to initiate more discussion on the proposed "cultural bureau."⁷

- **On 19 April**

Sing Tao Daily News reported that Chief Executive-elect Leung Chun-ying had met up with representatives from "Economic Synergy", "Professional Forum", "Liberal Party" and "Five Scattered People" over the past two days. Leung explained to them the reasons for proposing a "culture bureau". Sources revealed that the proposed administration restructure had to be motioned at LegCo latest by May so that it could be approved by July. Lam Tai-fai of "Five Scattered People" said he did not oppose to the setting up of the bureau. Jeffrey Lam of "Economic Synergy" said he could not yet decide his position without knowledge of the restructure framework. Lau Kin-yeung Miriam, Chairperson of Liberal Party, said that as Leung Chun-ying did not explain clearly the scope of responsibilities of "cultural bureau", the Party was not sure whether to support it or not.⁸

- **On 21 April**

Ma Ngok, Associate Professor, Government and Public Administration Department of The Chinese University of Hong Kong, expressed his worry that the sole purpose for establishing the proposed "information technology bureau" and "culture bureau" was for ideological management. He was concerned that the two bureaux were to exercise greater control through political works. Tanya Chan from Civic Party indicated that while information on the policy area of the "culture bureau" was not yet available, her expectation of the bureau would be for it to have a deep understanding of what "culture" covered, to define Hong Kong's cultural position, as well as to see to the implementation of cultural policies.⁹

- **On 26 April**

Oriental Daily reported that the Deputy Chief Secretary for Administration was proposed to oversee three policy bureaux handling policy areas of manpower, including Education Bureau, Labour and Welfare Bureau, and the proposed “culture bureau”. News sources reported that Law Fan Chiu-fun Fanny, Director of Chief Executive-Elect’s Office, had met a number of key players in the Pro-Establishment Camp to lobby for their support for the administration restructure. She was also setting up meetings with independent LegCo Members and the Pan-Democracy camp, to introduce them to the rationale of the restructuring and proposed architecture.

- **On 30 April**

Ma Fung-kwok, member of the Hong Kong delegation to National People’s Congress, who assisted Leung Chun-ying in writing his cultural platform, told *Sing Tao Daily News* that “cultural policy go beyond providing arts programs. It should bear the social responsibility of promoting harmony and solidarity.” He felt that the government should play a stronger leading role to push forward policy implementation in a society burdened with disturbance. Ma suggested that cultural policies should cover provision of entertaining arts programs at a basic level. Then the policies would instill a set of values to the community through works of art and programming. He disagreed with the comment that the “culture bureau” was in essence a “propaganda department”. He felt that the entire society could benefit from the values the “bureau” promoted.¹¹

2012/05

- **On 4 May**

The proposed new government administration structure was approved by the Executive Council. The new administration would be made up of 14 bureaux headed by 5 Secretaries. The two newly added deputy secretaries would share the work of the Chief Secretary for Administration and Financial Secretary. The deputy Chief Secretary for Administration would be dedicated to coordinating the formulation and implementation of policies related to human resources, including education, manpower planning development and cultural policy. The newly added “culture bureau” would take over the current Leisure and Culture Services Department, WKCD Project Management Team, Create Hong Kong and Commissioner for Heritage’s Office, and others.¹²

- **On 8 May**

While Ada Wong, Director of the Hong Kong Institute of Contemporary Culture, was suggested by unrevealed sources to be the secretary for “culture bureau”, she refused to reveal whether she would join the government or not. She said in a radio program, “no comment on a personal issue”. She hoped that there would be someone in the new government with enthusiasm, courage, and knowledge of culture to formulate cultural policies. She noticed an encouraging sign of the government showing attention to the cultural and creative industries in recent years. Yet the business circle had shown little support for cultural development in the past and she hoped to see that changed in the future.¹³

- **On 9 May**

Sources commented to *Ming Pao Daily News* that Ada Wong’s position was considered weak in the mainstream art circle, so it might be difficult for her to become the secretary for culture. Sources also said that Ma Fung-kwok was more interested in running for the LegCo election so that he could keep the membership of the Hong Kong delegation to National People’s Congress. Therefore the chance of him being appointed the secretary was slim.¹⁴

- **On 10 May**

Danny Yung, Chairman of Hong Kong Institute of Contemporary Culture, told *The Sun* that he did not see the “culture bureau” becoming the “central propaganda department” because the cultural sector in Hong Kong was not made up of a bunch of yes-men and they did not just do what was told. Allan Zeman, Chairman of Ocean Park, supported the establishment of “culture bureau”, but he felt that the value of the bureau should not be measured overnight. It should be given six to twelve months to prepare the blueprint. Even if the bureau might seem ineffective on its outset, it should be given the space to do its proper work and should not be quickly abolished.¹⁵

- **On 11 May**

“Factory Artists Concern Group” convened “HK Cultural Sector Joint Conference 2.0” and made an in-depth study of the architecture and policy area of the proposed “cultural bureau”.¹⁶

- **On 12 May**

A number of local newspapers reported that the Central Government had formally rejected the idea of appointing Ada Wong, Director of the Hong Kong Institute of Contemporary Culture Centre, as the secretary for culture. It was believed that the rejection was due to Wong’s affinity with the Pan-Democrats and the Central Government was uncomfortable with her taking the rein of Hong Kong’s cultural policy-relevant. Ma Fung-kwok’s inclination to run for LegCo election in September was also reported. Some in the cultural sector believed that if neither Wong nor Ma were to serve as the secretary for culture, there would be the need to look for candidates from retired senior government officials or Vice Secretaries.¹⁷

On the same day, HK Cultural Sector Joint Conference 2.0 initiated a forum to discuss the architecture and policy area of the proposed “culture bureau”. The forum attracted over 100 culture practitioners. The representatives of Joint Conference would attend the public hearing of administration restructure on 19th May to express their comments. Chow Chun-fai, Chairman of Factory Artists Concern Group, said the “culture bureau” should focus on creating a cultural space. He proposed strengthening civil participation and the incorporation of cultural dimension on policy formulation. He also suggested the new bureau to collaborate with the Education Bureau to promote cultural education.

HK Cultural Sector Joint Conference 2.0 drafted a “Proposed blueprint for culture bureau under the 2012 new Government administration structure – Policy area and structure of culture bureau” comprising of ten requirements for policy areas, including the protection of cultural freedom and rights; support for cultural diversity and cultivate local identity; promotion of inter-bureaux cultural perspectives implementation; advocacy of civil-driven cultural dimension; development of arts; popularisation of arts education; creation of cultural space; development of arts economy; development of community culture; and conservation of cultural heritage.

Chan Ching-kiu Stephen, Professor of Cultural Studies of Lingnan University felt that if Hui Hiu-fai Florence was to become the secretary of culture as described by news sources, her success in that role would lie in whether she could work across the bureaucracy with her deep knowledge of the government structure while respecting the professionalism of the cultural sector. Civic activists Chan King-fai thought it would be “quite a piece of good news” if Hui were appointed the Secretary.¹⁸

- **On 13 May**

Chan Ching-kiu Stephen, Professor of Cultural Studies of Lingnan University said that even though he and others had fought for more than 20 years for the establishment of a bureau for culture, he would not welcome the bureau without knowing more about what purpose it served. Artist Chow Chun-fai echoed Chan’s unease, saying that “the future ‘culture bureau’ may not be exactly what we want”.¹⁹

• On 14 May

Oscar Ho, Programme Director of MA Programmes in Cultural Management, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, said during his interview with *Hong Kong Economic Journal* that the future secretary for culture should defend the cultural rights of the people of Hong Kong, including freedom of speech and of creativity. Otherwise the “culture bureau” would be nothing but a resources allocation machine.

Ho was a member of the first Strategy Committee of HKADC. He recalled that while being as a non-governmental organisation, HKADC actively discussed Hong Kong’s cultural policy and defended its cultural rights. “In those years, HKADC voiced out its opinions on controversial cultural issues, such as when the private parts of the sculpture “David” being covered. However, HKADC lost its professional credit with the declining quality of its members and the disappointing incidents that followed. HKADC dared not even show its support to the artists’ petition on the issues concerning Article 23 and copyright laws. It has degenerated into a penny institution”, Ho said.

Ho attributed the failure of the implementation of “2003 Development Direction of Cultural Policy Report” to the bureaucratic administration. “The civil service system requires officers to be re-posted every three years. Most Administrative Officers tend to be conservative during the posting. The best achievement is to have no achievement. Officers without strong views are considered appropriate candidates. That is why we still describe our culture as ‘where East meets West’ after all these years. High-visibility events with no long-term impact are also favoured by these officials who are just concerned with leaving a mark on their career history”.²⁰

On the same day, *Apple Daily* reported that Chief Executive-elect Leung Chun-ying intended to appoint incumbent Deputy Secretary of Home Affairs Bureau, Florence Hui, as the proposed secretary for culture. The cultural sector was shocked by the news; some said Mathias Woo, a culture commentator, had sent a letter to the Chief Executive-elect’s Office to express his dissatisfaction with Hui taking office. Chow Chun-fai, one of the conveners of HK Cultural Sector Joint Conference 2.0, admitted that the sector knew very little about Florence Hui, “(we) only know that she works at the Home Affairs Bureau. We have no idea of her past achievements”. Chow was worried that Hui possessed the “AO” (Administrative Officer) working style. He said, “If the cultural bureau repeats ADC’s mistakes and focuses only on the deployment of resources, then no matter how good your idea is, it will never be realised”.²¹

• On 15 May

Mathias Woo told *Apple Daily* that he would release a joint statement with a number of people in the cultural sector within days, strongly opposing to the appointment of Florence Hui as secretary for “culture bureau” for her lack of relevant experience. Woo pointed out that Hui had a financial background. She rarely expressed her viewpoints as the Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs. He felt that the new administration was stubborn to appoint Hui who had neither recognition in the cultural sector nor knowledge on how to properly deal with different kinds of cultural works. Cultural worker Gumgum said that her fellow practitioner felt unease with the news about Ada Wong being “toppled” by Pro-Establishment Camp because of her political stance; while the inexperienced Florence Hui was preferred because of the Pro-Establishment Camp support. The cultural sector would be quite upset should such an appointment was confirmed.

Kam Nai-wai, member of Democratic Party requested the Legislative Council Panel on Home Affairs to hold a special meeting to discuss the purpose of the establishment of “culture bureau” as well as the criteria for secretary candidates. Lars Nittve, Executive Director of M+, welcomed the plan of setting up “culture bureau”, but would not comment on the candidates.²²

• On 16 May

Chief Executive-elect Leung Chun-ying said the establishment of “culture bureau” was the result of consultation with the cultural and other sectors over the past two to three years. He denied any political motives associated with the appointment of the secretary for culture but would not disclose any appointment decision at this stage.²³

- **On 18 May**

Artist Lee Kit told *South China Morning Post* that he was concerned that the proposed “culture bureau” for Hong Kong would be turned into a political tool for cultural censorship.²⁴

- **On 19 May**

Legislative Council held a public hearing for the restructuring proposal. A number of cultural practitioners voiced their opposition to the “layman” Florence Hui taking charge of cultural affairs. Leung Po-shan of the HK Cultural Sector Joint Conference told *Apple Daily* that the cultural sector had had great expectations on “culture bureau”. However Chief Executive-elect Leung Chun-ying did not clarify the policy vision and only released a 1-page introduction of the “culture bureau”. No wonder some were worried that the bureau was for ideology control after all. She said that Hui was not a suitable candidate. If the secretary appointment was not supported, there might be a great pushback from the sector. She said the cultural sector hoped Leung Chun-ying could take time to attend public forums and face the public.

Mathias Woo agreed Hui was a “layman” and unqualified as the first secretary for culture. He found Ma Fung-kuok and Ada Wong better options. Clifton Ko, member of the Election Committee of cultural sector, thought that Hui should be given a chance to prove herself. Ada Wong said in a radio program on the previous day that the key concern was not about who being the secretary but how cultural policies would be implemented. She suggested that the community should participate or even lead the formulation of cultural policies.

Johnny Woo Wai-Man from “Hong Kong Repertory Theatre” supported the establishment of “culture bureau” because he thought that was hitting the nail on the head. Independent practitioner Law Nga-wing was worried that “culture bureau” would become a tool for ideology control. She said it was unwise for the government to use the “culture bureau” as a chip to push through the new administration structure. Wong Chun-kok, representative of Factory Artists Concern Group, questioned the effectiveness of “culture bureau” in cultural development or is it just another HKADC?

Fanny Law, Director of Chief Executive-Elect’s Office emphasised to the press that the bureau would safeguard cultural freedom and facilitate the development of the cultural industry. She was being asked after the conference about the cultural sector’s concern on Florence Hui’s appointment. Law said that “it is unrealistic to expect any single individual to possess all the cultural knowledge required”.²⁵

- **On 20 May**

Designer Freeman Lau told *Ming Pao Daily News* that he would not welcome Florence Hui taking charge of cultural policies. He said for many years the development of arts in Hong Kong had lagged behind other Asian countries. Hong Kong now needed a leader who was familiar with the direction and operation of the sector, and knew how to promote culture and education. “We cannot afford the time for someone to start from the beginning of the learning curve”. Another mountainman, the artist who designed the campaign logo for Chief Executive-elect Leung Chun-ying, supported the establishment of “culture bureau”, but made no comment on the secretary candidates.²⁶

- **On 21 May**

During the Home Affairs Panel of the Legislative Council meeting, Civic Party legislator Tanya Chan asked Fanny Law from Chief Executive-Elect’s Office what background and qualities the new secretary for culture should possess. Chan said, “If the undersecretary has such a low reputation in the cultural sector, the chief executive-elect must think twice”. In the meantime, Hui received backing from Professor Lee Chack-fan, a board member of the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority. In a radio program, Hui said that

professional knowledge and field experience were not mandatory for one to become the secretary. “The cultural sector does not only need arts professionals, but also other talents who can organise resources and sort out a holistic development direction. Whoever becomes the culture chief will uphold the city’s respect for freedom of creation”. Hui also said she “is an active participant in cultural and arts affairs”, and had held discussions with the sector on various issues.²⁷

- **On 22 May**

Artist Yung Ning-tsun Danny, who assisted in drafting Chief Executive-Elect culture platform, said to *South China Morning Post*, “the new minister should have experience in cultural policymaking and creative industries, and understand the promotion of culture and innovation”. He said Hui had experience in neither of these areas. Since leadership and co-ordination with other government bodies would be crucial for the future “culture bureau”, Danny Yung said it was important to find the right person to head the bureau and a strong team to back the secretary’s vision.²⁸

- **On 26 May**

Florence Hui attended “The Elephant Man” concert by Chung Ying Theatre Company. Ko Tin-lung, Artistic Director, Chung Ying Theatre Company said on the same occasion that he supported Hui to serve as the secretary for culture. Ko said Hui had sit on a panel advising the Trade Development Council on its annual book fair, and he had every confidence in her. Hui did not respond to any question at Kwai Tsing Theatre, but in another interview with “Now TV”, she described the importance of commercial support for arts development. She said commercial arts donation in Seattle amounted to an equivalent of about HK\$1 billion per year, while that in Hong Kong was only about HK\$100 million. There was room for increase.²⁹

- **On 30 May**

Chin Wan wrote an article in *Ming Pao Daily News*, saying that the “culture bureau” proposed by Leung Chun-ying was nothing more than just an arts bureau or an arts council. He suggested restructuring and upgrading the existing HKADC to an arts council while privatising cultural venues, so that it had jurisdiction over Leisure and Cultural Services Department and acted as the statutory funding and advisory body. He added that, “the secretary for culture does not have to be an artist or an intellect, but must be able to manage cultural discourse so that the Council and the media could discuss and debate on cultural issues in the right perspective. She must lead the debate towards a level of value judgment that the entire society would be concerned about. The secretary for culture should possess vision beyond administrative nonsense such as distribution of resources or to strike a balance between conservation and development or to listen to the views of the public, etc.”³⁰

2012/06

- **On 2 June**

A poll conducted by the University of Hong Kong’s Public Opinion Programme this week revealed that 21.4 percent of the 518 respondents favoured Ada Wong Ying-kay as the secretary for culture. Undersecretary for Home Affairs Florence Hui polled 7.3 percent, and Former Arts Development Council Chairman Ma Fung-kwok was backed by 3.6 per cent of respondents.³¹

- **On 7 June**

Dr Patrick Ho Chi-ping, Former Secretary for Home Affairs, put forward his views of “cultural policy” in a local newspaper. He believed that “culture policy” should be understood as a cluster of public policies, which carried important cultural implications. First, the “cultural bureau” should be dedicated to policies supporting creativity and the arts. Second, a new bureau should focus on heritage

policies. Third, the “cultural bureau” should provide input to the formulation of education policies. Fourth, media policy also needs the contributions of a new “cultural bureau”. Fifth, the new “cultural bureau” should consider developing more creative industries in Hong Kong. Sixth, due to Hong Kong’s bilingual society, the “cultural bureau” should involve itself in language policy. Seventh, a new “cultural bureau” will be involved in policies and issues surrounding religion, philosophies and core values.³²

- On 9 June

Hong Kong Economic Journal reported that the government submitted a funding application document to the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council on 8th June. The document showed that the budget for salaries and expenses related to the 134 positions of new “culture bureau” for the year 2012-2013 would be HK\$800 million. The monthly salary of the secretary would be HK\$298,115 and for the deputy secretary would range between HK\$193,775 to HK\$223,585. Six more permanent headcounts were to be subsequently added.³³

2012/07

- On 9 July

The LegCo could not come to a decision on the proposed administration restructure before its summer adjournment. Lam Cheng Yuet-ngor Carrie, Chief Secretary for Administration, announced that the meeting agenda for the Finance Committee of the LegCo would be rearranged. Livelihood issues would come before the restructure deliberation. She admitted that the restructuring proposal might not be approved by this LegCo Session and that the “culture bureau” and the two deputy secretary positions could not be set up.³⁴

¹ Editor’s note: “culture bureau” is put in quotation mark and in small caps throughout the document as it has remained a proposed idea or a subject of discussion and has not been materialised as part of the current government administration.

² News coverage, *Apple Daily* A08, 11 January 2012

³ News coverage, *Ming Pao Daily News* D04, 18 January 2012

⁴ News coverage, *Wen Wei Po* A08, 15 March 2012

⁵ News coverage, *Sing Tao Daily News* A04, 27 March 2012

⁶ News coverage, *Hong Kong Economic Journal* A08, 6 April 2012

⁷ News coverage, *Ming Pao Daily News* D04, 13 April 2012

⁸ News coverage, *Sing Tao Daily News* A06, 19 April 2012

⁹ News coverage, *Hong Kong Economic Journal* A12, 21 April 2012

¹⁰ News coverage, *Oriental Daily* A23, 26 April 2012

¹¹ News coverage, *Sing Tao Daily News* A04, 30 April 2012

¹² News coverage, *The Sun Daily* A06, 5 May 2012

- ¹³ News coverage, *Hong Kong Commercial Daily* A17, 9 May 2012
- ¹⁴ News coverage, *Ming Pao Daily News* A18, 9 May 2012
- ¹⁵ News coverage, *The Sun Daily* A06, 10 May 2012
- ¹⁶ News coverage, *Ming Pao Daily News* D06, 11 May 2012
- ¹⁷ News coverage, *Oriental Daily* A27, 12 May 2012
News coverage, *The Sun Daily* A06, 12 May 2012
- ¹⁸ News coverage, *Sing Tao Daily News* A09, 13 May 2012
News coverage, *Tai Kung Pao* B11, 14 May 2012
- ¹⁹ “C.Y. in plea to push through restructuring”, *South China Morning Post* EDT5, 13 May 2012
- ²⁰ News coverage, *Hong Kong Economic Journal* A14, 14 May 2012
- ²¹ News coverage, *Apple Daily* A04, 14 May 2012
- ²² News coverage, *Apple Daily* A04, 15 May 2012
News coverage, *Wen Wei Pao* A22, 15 May 2012
News coverage, *The Sharp Daily Hong Kong edition* V03, 15 May 2012
- ²³ News coverage, *Sky Post* P06, 17 May 2012
- ²⁴ “Art HK accolade for city’s Lee Kit”, *South China Morning Post* CITY1, 18 May 2012
- ²⁵ News coverage, *Apple Daily* A04, 19 May 2012
News coverage, *Ming Pao Daily News* A08, 20 May 2012
News coverage, *Oriental Daily News* A27, 20 May 2012
“No ‘propaganda department’ for HK”, *South China Morning Post* EDT5, 20 May 2012
- ²⁶ News coverage, *Ming Pao Daily News* A04, 21 May 2012
- ²⁷ “Culture chief must have street cred, lawmakers say”, *South China Morning Post* CITY1, 23 May 2012
- ²⁸ “Critics round on ‘outsider’ tipped to run ‘culture bureau’”, *South China Morning Post* EDT3, 04, 22 May 2012
- ²⁹ “Arts veteran backs Hui for culture”, *South China Morning Post* EDT3,04, 27 May 2012
- ³⁰ News coverage, *Mong Pao Daily News* D04, 30 May 2012
- ³¹ “Public favours art critic as culture chief, poll shows”, *South China Morning Post* CITY3, 04, 2 June 2012
- ³² “Do we have a cultural policy?”, *China Daily Hong Kong version* H03, 7 June 2012
- ³³ News coverage, *Hong Kong Economic Journal* A08, 9 June 2012
- ³⁴ News coverage, *Hong Kong Daily News* A03, 10 July 2012