

《政制發展綠皮書》
公眾諮詢報告

Report on Public Consultation on Green Paper
on Constitutional Development

附錄三
公眾意見
Appendix III
Public submissions

第六冊
Volume 6

2007年12月
December 2007

寄件人:
日期: 2007年10月6日 20:41
收件人: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
副本抄送:
標題: Green Paper on Constitutional Development - comments

Dear Sir or Madam,

I have studied the Green Paper and the following are my comments:

General

Hong Kong's constitutional system should meet international standard. By that, I mean the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. I note paragraph 2.20 of the Green Paper where it is stated that "a reservation was made reserving the right not to apply sub-paragraph (b) of Article 25 of the [International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights]." However, there is no reason why, when considering constitutional reform, we should not aim to meet this standard. The starting point ought to be that we should attain the standard and it is only if there are insurmountable difficulties that we consider alternatives. The Green Paper does not seem to use this as a starting point and generally speaking, I find its scope and ideas quite limited as it tries to work its way backwards from our current system.

It is not helpful that the Government makes certain assertions and frames them almost as facts or universal truths. For example, it seems that the Government finds universal suffrage incompatible with the "unique circumstances" of Hong Kong. What is so "unique" about Hong Kong as to warrant deviation from fundamental principles of human rights? Would deviation be of real benefit to Hong Kong? Perhaps if the Government explains this further, it may spark a more constructive discussion and we may be able to consider the best way forward after understanding the Government's concerns.

In addition, the Government seems to be worried that Hong Kong's stability and its economic development will suffer if universal suffrage is attained as (although it is not spelt out like this in the Green Paper) corporates will no longer be given undue weight in influencing policies. I would urge the Government to consider whether, with Hong Kong's best interest in mind, corporates should continue to have special treatment constitutionally. Just because the system was not fixed in the past does not mean that it is the best way to continue going forward. I suspect Hong Kong's competitiveness and credibility will dwindle if we continue to favour certain corporates over the interest of the society as a whole.

Election of Chief Executive

This should be done through universal suffrage by 2012.

Regarding the nominating committee, the crucial question seems to me to be how it is formed and not the size. I find the options available in the Green Paper limited and the best option of all of those would be by the Legislative Council members provided all the members are elected by universal suffrage. There should be a limit on the number of candidates unless there is a two-tier voting by the public so as to ensure that the person ultimately elected has a proper mandate. On the other hand, the number of candidates should only be limited if the members of the nominating committee are sufficiently representative.

I do not find the current Election Committee "broadly representative" and therefore, I do not agree that the composition of the nominating committee should be established by reference to or expansion or slight adjustment of the Election Committee.

Election of Legco members

This should be done by 2012. I believe we should abolish functional constituencies.

Thank you for considering these comments and suggestions.

Yours faithfully,
Janet Ng

寄件人: Tsang Kwok Leung
日期: 2007年10月6日 22:41
收件人: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
副本抄送:
標題: 回應政制發展綠皮書

本人對政制發展綠皮書有以下意見：

1. 2012首先實行立法局普選，2017才實行政長官普選。
2. 普選行政長官的提名委員會，應由不少於2000人組成提名委員會。
3. 提名委員會除原先800名選舉委員會外，再加上約400名民選區議員及香港主要行業如會計界，建築界，教育界，工程界，保險界，地產界，金融界，飲食界，零售界，資訊科技界，旅遊界，社工界，運輸界之工人代表並按比例分配。
4. 立法局功能組別應該保留，但席數不應多於全部議席的四分之一 (如立法局總議席數為60，功能組別最多為15席)，再由全港市民以1人2票方式選出。
5. 行政長官提名最少有80名提名委員會提名，再由全港市民1人1票選出。

Tsang Kwok Leung

06-10-2007

寄件人:
日期: 2007年10月6日 23:44
收件人: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
副本抄送:
標題: 回應對《政制發展綠皮書》的意見

就《政制發展綠皮書》的意見，我認為香港政府必須：

1. 立即落實及推行2012年普選行政長官及全體立法會議員。
2. 盡快修改《基本法》以配合普選行政長官選舉及全體立法會議員；
3. 取消提名委員會制度，並交由全港市民共同參與。我們認為所有合資格選民均有權提名行政長官（參照立法會及區議會議員參選條例），行政長官必須由市民一人一票選舉產生。
4. 取消立法會內的功能組別議席，立法會內全體議員應由市民一人一票選舉產生。
5. 重新推出政制發展綠皮書：其內容必須包括（1）港府就政制發展的具體建議；（2）港府就雙普選所擬定的時間表及路線圖，然後再交公眾諮詢和討論。港府應於發表第二份綠皮書後，才提出其對政制發展的最終建議。

姓名：(署名來函)

(編者註：來信人要求以不具名方式公開)

From: Eirc Chu
Date: Oct 6, 2007 23:47
To: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
Cc:
Subject: 五十年不變

局長先生:香港要五十年不,2047年後再 諮詢普選,給未來政府決定吧.

From:
Date: Oct 6, 2007 23:55
To: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
Cc:
Subject: Selection for Roadmap and timetable for CE and Legislative Council

Dear Sir / Madam,

I would like to select the following option as my idea in Green Paper on Constitutional Development:

Chapter Three

3.10 Third type of options & 3.18 (iii) & (iv)

3.31 Second type of options: 8 candidates at most

Chapter Four

4.09 Second type of options

Chapter Five

5.15 (i) (a) & (b)

5.16 (ii) & 5.19 (ii)

5.20 agreed

Best Regards,
Lotto

本人意見如下：

1. 本人認為 2017 年較為適合普選行政長官。
2. 本人認為，先易後難，先普選行政長官，循序漸進再普選立法會。
3. 立法會功能組別應保留，各界都要均衡參與。
- 4.

余嘉莉上

10 月 06 日

(已簽署)