

《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

第八冊

Volume 8

2007年12月

December 2007

From:
Date: Oct 10, 2007 14:10
To: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
Cc:
Subject: (no subject)

Dear Sir/Madam,

The best time for electing the CE by universal suffrage should be going through a transitional phase and attaining universal suffrage after 2017. It is unwise to have universal suffrage in 2012. It needs time to prepare for the universal suffrage especially when people are not familiar with universal suffrage. Composition and size of the nominating committee should be constituted by more than 800 members, e.g. expanding the membership to 1200-1600. Method of nomination should be two to four candidates at most.

Options for forming LegCo by universal suffrage should be increasing the number of seats representing District Councils in LegCo. and attaining universal suffrage in phases after 2016.

Yours Sincerely,

Li Chun Yue

From:
 Date: Oct 10, 2007 14:07
 To: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
 Cc:
 Subject: 就政制展綠皮書表達意見

本人欲就政制發展綠皮書表達意見。先不說該諮詢文件中處處包含引導性的選擇，作為一個香港市民，有責任盡公民義務就香港政制發展表達意見。

行政長官

1. 提名委員會

人數方面，本人明白過多人數會對資源運用及選舉效率做成負擔，不過單單只有800人亦明顯不足，因為比例上只佔香港人口的萬分之一。就綠皮書中，本人選擇第三類多於800人組成提名委員會，按循序漸進原則可先加至1600人，而當中大多數(多於800人)應由三百多萬選民直接選舉產生，包括立法會議員、區議會議員，其餘則由一個參考現時選舉委員會的方式讓三百多萬選民直接投票選出。其後再視乎情況決定增加與否，包括考慮香港人口、選舉模式操作的效果和市民對此的反應。本人明白各不同界別對香港的重要性，但反對讓現時選舉委員會這些既得利益者繼續享有超然的地位和權利，行政長官提名權應讓市民分享且佔大多數，即使在提名委員會中由各界別組成的委員，也應該以個人票而非公司票或董事票，這樣才是真正代表該界別的選舉。

2. 提名方式

首先本人反對以參照候選人數目來按比例設定提名門檻。不過在現行方案中選擇第一個：10名或以上候選人。主要原因並不是希望看見百家爭鳴、眾多參選人的情況出現，而是認為提名門檻不應太高，因為每一位香港永久性居民只要符合基本法的條件，就應可以有機會參選特首，那些人當選並不應由制度來決定，而是由所有選民來決定。即使有些能力不足的人出來參選，香港市民其實有足夠的智慧和能力作最合宜的選擇。

3. 普選方式

普選方式當然由所有選民一人一票直接選舉產生行政長官，即使只有一位候選人同樣需要進行投票。至於方式上，我認為應採用多輪投票淘汰得票率低的參選人，直接選出具接受性的行政長官。由於普選是香港市民珍而重之的公民權利，而且香港市民亦有能力作出最恰當選擇，所以多輪投票較簡單多數制有效。

立法會

1. 普選模式

理所當然地是第一類方案：地區直接議席取代功能組別。功能組別是既得利益者，他們同樣是香港市民卻擁有一般市民沒有的選舉權和票值，是不能接受的。在具體建議中，我會選擇(1)的一人兩票方式，選舉立法會議員。而且在時間方面，應立即執行(2008年的可能性被人大否決，所以應在2012年進行新的全面直接普選)

路線圖及時間表

我認為應在2012年全面普選行政長官及立法會所有議員，即綠皮書5.19中的第1個方案。2012年無論如何也要普選立法會議員，而行政長官方面，當然亦是愈早愈好，但由於涉及與中央政府的關係，本應容許再作商議(記著：本人的意見是2012全面雙普選!!!)，不過由於基本法中立法機關沒有足夠的制衡能力約制行政，所以即使所有立法會議席由直接普選產生，亦難以約束行政機關。所以惟有由直接普選產生具接受性的行政長官才是對香港發展最有利的方案，而且也能讓中國以香港作為民主試點，使中國式民主有參考借鏡之處，讓國家在政制上的發展得以配合。

個人資料

姓名：KEI CHI HUNG

From:
Date: Oct 10, 2007 14:05
To: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
Cc:
Subject: 對於政制發展的補充建議

對於普選體制設計的意見:

我認為合乎基本法第四十四條資格的人，在得到提名委員會(取消功能組別後的立法會)十名成員提名後，即可被確認為行政長官候選人，而每名提名委員提名人數不限。此舉看似門檻較低，但考慮到立法會議員身份地位識見，應不會造成太多候選人或有明顯不合適 成為候選人的情況。這方法既可為合資格候選人作初步挑選，又不會對選民選擇造成太大妨礙，是一個兼顧各方利益的辦法。

由於設有普選出來的提名委員會(取消功能組別後的立法會)作把關，「民主程序」將會成為架床疊屋之舉，浪費不必要的行政資源，我並不建議設立。

經提名委員會確認後的行政長官候選人，即交由合資格選民以一人一票方式選出他們屬意的行政長官，並提請中央任命。

市民
顏志全

From: wong kinson
Date: Oct 10, 2007 15:03
To: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
Cc:
Subject: 政制發展建議

政制發展建議

政制發展應以考慮香港長遠發展為出發點，應視為基本法或憲制性文件的一個延續，這是中央設計基本法時賦予我們權利的靈活性安排，我們一定要做好他，它應是一個適合香港長治久安的選舉安排(政治制度)的制度設計，因此可以像起草基本法時那樣，用一個公開透明的制訂模式，甚至几上几回，反覆琢磨，但今次有所不同的是香港人真正當家做主，而不是像回歸前一半港人/港英，一半大陸人共同參與的過程，現在由港人主導為主，但我們亦要適當地平衡中央和香港的利益。亦要設計好，中央與香港地方政府權力的分配問題，行政長官和立法會的合作安排/機制，市民/選民和行為長官/立法會議員的互動模式等等的安排，我們時刻都要記住如何發展出一套適合香港大環境的政治模式，要適合本地政治生態，合乎一國兩制的國情需要，亦要切合國際發展的大趨勢，集中要討論的問題，是香港人如何去為自己，選舉最有能力，最傑出的政治領袖的基本遊戲規則，同時亦是為國家提供合適的地方領袖的一種制度性安排。

基於以上的大前提，我們亦應有幾點堅持：

- 1) 堅持盡早實行民主選舉或普選
- 2) 設計可供往後 50 年或更長時間實行的政治制度
- 3) 照顧到市民，特區政府，中央政府的需求和憂慮的制度安排
- 4) 討價還價的過程盡量保持互相尊重，至少持有和而不同的胸襟，坦誠並積極地討論有矛盾/不同意見的地方，但盡量避免激化矛盾，要以解決問題為前提而不是產生更多枝節的問題並阻礙民主制度發展的進程

我們要懂得如何去保障市民有選舉自己領袖的權利，如何去確立合乎基本法規訂的香港市民，都有參選行政長官或立法會議員的公平機會，如何去制度化設計中央的對行政長官的實質委任權，如何去落實或豐富中央對行政長官的罷免權的內容，市民對行政長官極度不滿時如何啟動罷免程序的內容！以上所說的都是四種權力的制度性安排，1)選舉權 2)被選權 3)委任權 4)罷免權，前兩種是要來保障市民和香港方面的權利，後兩種是要來保障中央對香港主權權威實行的具體安排，當中亦有香港市民對當政者不滿時，提出自救的憲制性安排。


如果可以進一步研究，當然是選舉權和委任權有衝突時，我們有什麼樣的創意性安排，當然我們都相信香港人是非常務實的，中央抗拒的候選人可以很肯定香港人是不會選的，因為這對香港的前途發展是沒有益處的，與自身利益相違背的事，我們是不會做的。現在我們要想多一步的是如果我們真的選了一個中央政府絕對不同意的人時，我們應怎麼辦，我們又有什麼機制去保障中央的實質委任權，同時又有什麼機制去約束中央的委任權。舉一個例子，如果中央認為所選出的行政長官是不適當人選，打算不委任，他亦要向港人解釋，說明原由，亦要通過某種機制，例如建議現任行政長官提請立法會進行不信任動議，宣佈如何重選等事宜，此舉是要維護香港高度自治的慣常做法，如果有關不信任動議不獲通過，中央可以進一步提議上全國人民代表大會進行不信任動議，當然要達到此一程度，其實是很嚴重的地步的了，除非中央認為當選人不能進行有效管治，甚至有證據證明當選人會危害到國家安全。

至於立法會選舉，我建議循兩種不同渠道，標準選舉議會領袖，1) 地區性 Geographic 2) 專業性 Professional，但兩種都要透過普選產生，而不是局限於小圈子選舉。因此我們有一半議員是專業的從政人員(政客)，專注地區性或居民福利事務，亦有另一半是個別行業的翹楚，運用專業知識為香港出謀獻策。功能組別可以取消，但參與選舉的可以專業界別去取得參選資格。這其實可以和分區選舉一樣，由選舉委員會去界定某一區的候選人是否合乎資格，確定候選人在該區居住，同樣選舉委員會亦可以去界定專業區別的候選人是合乎資格，是否在該行業工作！另外每一個市民亦可以登記成為 3-5 專業組別的選民，視乎他過往從事的工作類型，但選議員就只可以選一個，亦要登記成為某一選區的選民，那即是說每一個市民都有普選的兩票，一是投給行政長官的，另一是他屬意或從事的專業界別的參選人，專業組別 3-5 個個別組別的安排是試乎每個人一生中大約從事多少個不同專業範疇的考量，另外如果沒有從事該行業，但屬意某一個行業的候選人，亦可以在選舉委員會登記成該專業組別的選民，那麼專業組別的議員除了面對本身業界的訴求，亦要面對普羅選民，大大擴大民意基礎和認受性。在 30 個專業組別議員當中，同一個組別最多只能有兩人當選，而每一個候選議員的票數都由高至低排列，如 1-30(或 1-50)名得票最高的都要公佈，另外選舉界別要縮減至 15 個左右，亦要確保每一個組別，最高票數的那人，有一個議席，即使是 30 甲不入亦要讓他當選，餘下的 15 席就由最高票數的專業組別議員補上，但每一個組別不能超過兩人，如果認為自有相當的知名度但可能是在首兩名以外的，可考慮地區直選，舉一例子，如果法律界或醫學界，人材輩出，要避免硬撼，可以另謀出路！

P.S.重點內容總結如下(SUMMARY)

- 1) 盡早實行雙普選
- 2) 設計好選舉/政治制度的遊戲規則
- 3) 諮詢可以有第二輪,第三輪,甚至几上几回,但要在兩三年內完成所有設計和程序
- 4) 可考慮取消功能組別 (FUNCTIONAL), 但保留專業職能參選 (PROFESSIONAL)的界別劃分, 同樣以普選形式(和分區選舉一樣)選出議員

提交人: Kinson S.K. Wong (Hongkonger)

From:
 Date: Oct 10, 2007 14:17
 To: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
 Cc:
 Subject: Views on "Green Paper on Constitutional Development"
 Attachments:  views.pdf (125 KB)

To: Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau,

Attached is the my view on the Green Paper on Constitutional Development in pdf format. If there is problem reading it, the following is the same contents.

My views include 2 parts. Part I is to answer those major questions mentioned in the Green Paper. Part II is other views on the Green Paper. Please note that the answer in Part I represent my choice when views in Part II touch on subjects related in Part I.

Regards,

WL Chung

=====

Part I

On the election of Chief Executive by universal suffrage:

I) I think 2012 is the time to start CE election by universe suffrage.

- The green paper described this option as 'direct to' 2012 is not correct. The clock for starting should at least dated back to 1997. According to what the HKSAR government had done, that were related to 'gradual and orderly progress', it was true that there was no progress or intermediate steps. Because the HKSAR government had neglected its job on this and had done absolutely nothing before 2005. However the 'actual situation' is different. The CE, since 1997, was performed poorly according to the HK people. In 2003, the HK people's tolerance had reached the limit and used common people's 'universal suffrage' method to request a change in a peaceful and sensible way. The actual situation is the CE was changed and the government started to do something or did something a bit faster in 2005. In summary, the actual situation is we had gone through a painful step in 2003. So we cannot say we are direct to 2012. Universal suffrage is based also on the quality of the people to supervise the CE. The 2003 experience also showed that HK people had the quality to do the do and so is ready for universal suffrage.

II) I think the size of the Nomination Committee should be much more than 800.

- HKSAR has ~ 7 million people. We should not let too few people (less than 801) to restrict our choice of the CE of HKSAR. For the fairness principle, everyone should be given equal chance to nominate the one he wants to. I think the proposal of the democratic legislators to include elected district councilors is a good approach to build up the committee. Similar approach should be used to further increase the size to 1% of HK population. Make sure to avoid the pit fall that the representative ratio should be even. That mean it is unfair for suggesting one to representative 6 millions while another one to represent only 10.

III) I think there should not have a limit to the number of candidates nominated.

- On one hand the number of candidates will be limited by the number of committee, the cost of being a candidate and many other considerations. On the other hand, setting a limit will more or less give a sense of black hand control. As the need and risk of no limit is small, why bother to do it.

On election of the Legislative Council by universal suffrage

IV) I think 2012 is the time, in fact too late, for LC universal suffrage.

- LC election experience started well before 1997. We have experience of hold back of progress in 1997. We also had followed the 2 steps before 2007 defined in the Basic Law. In actual situation, we have too many steps to universal suffrage. We should count from those steps before 1997. That is the actual situation. The actual situation also include an extreme LC election after the 2003 events. It shows that we are mature enough to have extreme legislator, e.g. Mr Leung Kwok Hung, in Council without affecting the Council's function nor the Council's relationship with Central government. That is an experience that other may take a long time to learn. But our actual situation is that we are there and are ready.

V) I think functional constituencies should be remove completely and their seats should be replaced by directly elected geographical constituencies.

- The role of FC is to provide the expertize of the corresponding fields to the LC. But there are too many side effects.

* The FC legislator can vote on fields that they are not their expertize, in actual situation in most of the case. There are too many cases that these noise legistors even overrule the result of the directly elected legislators who are the broadly representative group.

* Most FCs represent a very small group of people, but they have extra vote in the LC. That is unfair to those only have one vote.

* Some FCs are composed of 2 to 4 so called related functions in order to justify as an FC. But this lost its original role as the corresponding legistor cannot advise the LC for the FC group as the subject is not the expertize of that legislator.

* Worse more, those with money can easily get more vote by paying the membership of some organization of some functional group.

- Instead of being legislators, I suggest they are just temporary advice group.

Part II

Other views on the Green Paper

Item 1.09

The HKSAR Government is firmly committed to promoting democratic development in Hong Kong gradually in accordance with the Basic Law. In taking forward Hong Kong's constitutional development towards the ultimate aim of universal suffrage, the HKSAR Government put forth, in October 2005, a package of proposals for amending the electoral methods for the 2007 CE election and the 2008 LegCo election.

View: This is an obvious contradict statement. There is no commitment at all because nothing happened before the 8 years between 1997-2005, nothing happened until the CE was requested to be changed. Then hurry a proposal to press the LC to choose.

Item 1.11

Although the package received the support of the majority of the public and more than half of all LegCo Members, when the public proposed package was put to vote at LegCo in December 2005, it was not endorsed by a two-thirds majority of all LegCo Members as

required by Annexes I and II to the Basic Law.

View: The tone of this section is questionable. It looks to me that the Government try to shift the responsibility to others. What I think is that it is less important whether that proposal is accepted or not. The so called changed was not significant. What is more important is whether there are sufficient discussions and attention in the public. If not, that is a

failure of the Government. If yes, the public gain the experience which is a basis for the universal suffrage.

Item 2.09

Thus, any proposed amendments must comply with the provisions of the Basic Law. Amendments to the design and principles of the political structure prescribed in the Basic Law must not be contemplated lightly.

View: The tone of the last statement is weird in the context and is mis-leading. If proposed amendments comply with the provisions of the Basic Law, why they cannot be 'contemplated lightly'. On the other hand, the Basic Law is the 1st version and change is normal for continuous improvement and to reflect to changes in the world over time. It should be changed without hesitation when it is necessary or needed. That is also why there is procedure to change it.

Item 2.31

(i)... It should not require any amendments to the main provisions of the Basic Law;

View: This is a mis-leading statement. We can always change the Basic Law when it is necessary.

Item 2.31

(iv) the option should stand a good chance of being accepted by the CPG.

View: This is mis-leading. It is not practical to guess what is accepted by and what is not accepted by CPG. Anyone can guess if Leung Kwok Hung, the LC legislator, is accepted by CPG. On the other hand, CPG also want to know that we really want. So what we should do is to choose what we really want.

Item 3.20

There are also views that, if the composition of the nominating committee is to be based on that of the Election Committee, the electorate base of the nominating committee should be expanded, for example, replacing 'corporate votes' with 'director's votes' or 'individual votes'. Furthermore, there are views that while maintaining the four sectors, new subsectors should be added, such as women and youth subsectors, in order to balance the interests of different strata of society

View: I think the CE is for the HK people, not the corporations. We should not give political power to corporation. There should not be corporate or organizational members. Every committee member should be individual. In fact, for the corporation member, it only means the owner has the final say. That means those with money has the final say! As it is nomination, it is more important to give everyone in the corporation has the a voice.

Item 3.27

...the requirement of 'nomination by the nominating committee in accordance with democratic procedures'

View: I think 'nomination by the nominating committee in accordance with democratic procedures' does not mean any form of filtering. If it filters, the committee is no longer nomination, it is a filtering committee.

Item 3.29 and 3.30

View: I think there is no need to have a nomination threshold. I don't think quality of candidates is an issue because they still need to get votes from public. On the other hand, if there is no threshold, it will encourage more participations and competition. At this stage, participation is more important.

Item 3.39

View: (i) I prefer simple one round election to start with.

(ii) I think election is required even if there is only one candidate.

Item 4.12

(ii) FCs can meet the interests of different sectors of society, which is consistent with the principle of 'balanced participation'

View: I totally disagree with this. And I believe the opposite is true. It is unfair that someone has more votes than the other. And the FC group screw the interest of others.

Item 4.13

including voters who are currently not entitled to vote at FCs. In other words, each voter will elect LegCo Members on the basis of 'one-person-two-votes' one to return directly elected GC Members, and the other to return FC Members.

View: It will effectively be cheating for 'one-person-two-votes' unless there are sufficient numbers in this no-function FC group, say 20.

Item 5.02

as the proposed package for the 2007/08 electoral methods put forth by the Government in 2005 was not passed by LegCo, we have missed the chance to take forward the constitutional development. According to the principle of gradual and orderly progress, universal suffrage should not be attained in one go.

View: The package proposed in 2005 is too hurry that there is not sufficient time for discussion. I think we have missed the chance for a thorough discussion in the HK then.

Item 5.0.3 and 5.0.4

View: 5.0.3 is the actual situation apply to 5.0.4

Item 5.11

... an 'executive-led'

View: being 'executive-led', the executive authorities take responsibilities for the development to universal suffrage. I heard too many times that they complaint people of not giving suggestions on the how to this and that. These were excuses because it is their responsibility as 'executive-led'. Executive authorities should give to solution in any form, e.g. promotion or 'actively' consult all parties or the public. Whenever there are no solutions, it is always their responsibility. Cannot shift to others and blame on others as excuse.


Item: 5.18

if universal suffrage for the CE is to be implemented first, there will be significant changes to the political structure of the HKSAR. Hence, it will not be appropriate also to implement

universal suffrage for LegCo at the same time in 2012, as this may introduce elements of uncertainty to the structure of both the executive authorities and the legislature of the HKSAR.

View: The CE and LC operate independently. This allows changes to either parties, no matter if the changes are at the same time or not, will not affect the normal operation of either parties. So implementation of universal suffrage of both CE and LC can be at 2012 comfortably.

—End of Views—

From:
Date: Oct 10, 2007 14:19
To: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
Cc:
Subject: doc.
Attachments:  特區政制.doc (26 KB)

供參閱.

致

政制及內地事務局

※關於行政長官及立法會選舉制度的意見※

本人為香港永久居民，一名歷代祖輩已在本地生活繁衍的土人。

九七回歸，是歷史不幸的反正，是中華民族奮鬥的必然結果。

『基本法』是香港社會繼續向前發展的依據和保障，亦是規定香港政制邁向現代民主選舉的首部法典。任何政制發展的模式、步驟，均須根據；一、兼顧社會各階層利益；二、有利於資本主義經濟的發展；三、循序漸進；四、適合香港實際情況的幾項原則。

部份人士對香港歷史半解，對祖國國情無視，妄想把一些西方政客的價值觀強加香港社會。他們一旦得逞，將是『基本法』的毀棄，必然導致內地政制的君臨，所有具誠意的參政人士，切須慎思！

具體而言；

一：行政長官的選舉方式，應在歸納本次諮詢結果後，擬訂幾個全面具體的方案，經廣泛討論，倘能就其中方案達成共識，當可在2012年實行普選。若無共識方案，則應推遲。

二：立法會的選舉方式，應在行政長官實行普選後，擬訂幾個全面具體的方案，經廣泛討論，倘能就其中方案達成共識，當可在2017年實行普選。若無共識方案，則應推遲。

上述程序，完全符合循序漸進的原則，每走一步，必有得著。不搞大躍進，無需擔負倒退和震盪的風險。

民主無疑是促進發展的動力，但不能無限加速。就像開車的速度要看路況，絕不能採用超越實際環境的速度，否則，其終局必定車毀人傷。

市民：張滿全

2007/10/10

From:
Date: Oct 10, 2007 14:14
To: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
Cc:
Subject: (no subject)

Some main opinion:

Regarding the election of Chief Executive:


- The nr. of nominating committee members – should be more than 800.
- The threshold to become a candidate – as low as possible.
- There should be universal suffrage as early as 2012.

Regarding the LegCo:

- The functional constituencies seats should be replaced with district-based seats returned through direct election,
- and have universal suffrage as early as 2012.

Best Regards,

Albert Wong

From:
Date: Oct 10, 2007 14:34
To: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
Cc:
Subject: Green Paper on Constitutional Development
Attachments:  071010_Hank.PDF (43 KB)

Please find attached my submission re the Green Paper. Henry Tsang

October 10, 2007

Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau
3/F Main Wing, Central Government Offices
Lower Albert Road
Hong Kong
Attn: Mr. Stephen Lam

Dear sirs,

Before discussing my view on the options set out in the Green Paper, I must commend you for putting a reasonably comprehensive and well thought out consultation paper. I sincerely hope that shortly after this consultation process the public in Hong Kong can come to a reasonable consensus and the SAR government on behalf of us can convince the Central government that a large majority of Hong Kong people are responsible citizens and we will elect the most appropriate CE and legislators to run Hong Kong under an universal suffrage system. In fact, I believe some of the more outrageous existing legislators who were elected either through small self-interested functional constituencies or due to protest votes will no longer likely be elected.

Options for electing the CE by universal suffrage

Composition and size of the nominating committee:

I favor the third type of options of constituting it by more than 800 members, particularly by way of expanding the membership to include the directly elected District Councils members.

Method of nomination – number of candidates:

I favor the second option by keeping eight candidates at most.

Method of universal suffrage election after nomination:

I favor one-person-one vote by all registered voters with a simple majority system.

Roadmap and timetable:

I strongly favor the first option of forming the nominating committee directly in 2012 to attain universal suffrage.

Options for forming LegCo by universal suffrage

I favor first type of options and am open-minded about the electoral method.

Roadmap and timetable:

I favor the first type of options of attaining universal suffrage in one go in 2012, but may be willing to accept attaining it in phases in 2016.

Yours truly,

(Signed)

Henry Y.W. Tsang

From:
Date: Oct 10, 2007 14:37
To: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
Cc:
Subject: My Opinion on the Green Paper on Constitutional Development

Dear Sir,

I think we should democratize as soon as possible.

Regarding the election of Chief Executive:

- The nominating committee should have as many members as possible, and definitely should have more than 800 members.
- The threshold to become a candidate should be as low as possible. Among the choices in the Green Paper, the one that allows 10 or more nominees is the best.
- There should be universal suffrage as early as 2012.

Regarding the LegCo:

- We should replace functional constituencies seats with district-based seats returned through direct election,
- and have universal suffrage as early as 2012.

Best regards,

Joe MAN

From:
Date: Oct 10, 2007 14:40
To: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
Cc:
Subject: Views on universal suffrage in Hong Kong

Dear Sir,

As a Hong Kong citizen for over fifty years, I would like to offer my views on the "Green Paper on Constitutional Development" as follows:

I fully support the community aspiration of implementing universal suffrage in Hong Kong by the year 2012. In my opinion, Hong Kong is more than ready to implement universal suffrage for electing the Chief Executive and forming the Legislative Council by 2012.

First of all, the citizens of Hong Kong constitute one of the most educated electorate in the world. This, coupled with the robust local mass communication industry, has made the citizens of Hong Kong very well informed of the election platforms of individual candidates. It is therefore widely believed that the people of Hong Kong can be trusted to make wise and rational decisions in an universal suffrage. With such an electorate, the Central Government could rest assured that no candidates with an anti-Chinese background or programme would be elected to Office.

Secondly, to implement universal suffrage in 2012 does not violate the principle of developing Hong Kong's political system progressively, as by that time the Hong Kong SAR Government would have been in operation for 15 years with its credibility and stability well established.

Thirdly, the political consequence of not meeting this community aspiration of implementing universal suffrage in 2012 is huge, as it would enhance the political apathy of Hong Kong people and seriously undermine their trust on the SAR Government and Central Authorities. That is something the patriotic people in Hong Kong would not like to see because this would mean a further diversion from the ultimate aim of constitutional development as set out in the Basic Law.

I hope the SAR Government could faithfully reflect the views of Hong Kong people to the Central Authorities and persuade the officials concerned to implement universal suffrage in Hong Kong as soon as practicable.

Regards,

(Name provided)

(Editor's Note: The sender requested anonymity.)

From:
Date: Oct 10, 2007 14:59
To: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
Cc:
Subject: Views on Universal Suffrage

Dear Sir / Madam,

Being a middle-class taxpayer, I totally support the views of implementing universal suffrage for both LegCo and CE as early as possible, namely 2012. Any compromise beyond this year is absolutely unacceptable!

Should there be a bottom-up representative Government and Legislative Council to rule this Pearl of Orient, its glory and glamour will continue to shine upon every one of us and our future generations!

Cordially yours,

HO Tak Sang, Hudson
TWGHs C Y Ma Memorial College

From: U Ngai
Date: Oct 10, 2007 14:49
To: <views@cmab-gpcd.gov.hk>
Cc:
Subject: 政制發展綠皮書公眾諮詢

我希望特區政府可以盡快落實雙普選，越快越好。

政制發展綠皮書公眾諮詢
意見發表

二零零七年十月十日

第1頁 / 共3頁

本意見書支持二零一二年行政長官及立法會以普及而平等直接選舉產生

第一段 香港未來政制發展必須符合以下條件

- 一 一國兩制 在一國為主之下，中央人民政府及香港特別行政區政府相雙方須確守基本法所定行事。
- 二 港人治港 中央人民政府除法定權責外，不應貿然參與制訂香港特別行政區內部事務。
- 三 高度自治 香港特別行政區須自行處理區內事務，不能倚賴中央人民政府協助；但中央人民政府擁有最終審批權。
- 四 循序漸進 代議政制由八零年代開始至零七及零八年，已催成熟；如今建議二零一二年全面普選，合符循序漸進的要求。
- 五 實際情況 開放社會上的各項事宜，從無統一意見。從各民意調查、選舉選票分佈顯示，香港民意多數支持盡快進行普選。
- 六 均衡參與 任何香港居民皆可參選及只可以一人一票選出立法會議員及行政長官，還有比這更均衡參與的麼？

第二段 二零一二年行政長官選舉制度

一 參選人資格

與基本法第四十四條所註相同，但須獲最少二百個

合資格選民提名。由八百位經一人一票選出的提名委員會委員投票確認，候選人數不多於五人。

二 選舉

以一人一票直接多數選出行政長官。候選人須獲總投票率一半或以上才能當選，棄權及廢票計算在內；否則最高得票兩位候選人即須進行第二輪投票，獲直接多數票者當選，棄權及廢票不計算在內。

三 任命

當選人須獲中央人民政府正式任命，方才成為候任行政長官。

四 重選

倘中央人民政府拒絕任命當選人，當選人隨即喪失當選資格。重選須以同樣程序進行；唯該不獲中央人民政府任命的當選人不能再次參選。

第三段 二零一二年立法會議員選舉制度

一 參選人資格

與基本法第六十七條所註相同。

二 議席數目及分組

議席數目維持六十或增至七十；分區直選及功能組別席數相等。

三 分區直選

維持現在的安排；或五個分區各新增一個議席。