

Political Reform—My Note to LEGCO

2010-05-04

Although the governments has posted consultation on the political reform for the Legco election in 2012 and for the Chief Executive in 2017 during the past 4 months and has received thousands of comments, the bottom line has not changed much from the 2005 proposal for the 2008/2013 election cycles except that the Election Committee for the Chief Executive (CE) is now a smaller selected group, including some but not all elected District Council members and without demonstrating a clear and fair way in how the Election Committee from DC members is selected.

By transposing the democratic base of the District Council election to a selection process among the DC members for the 5 additional functional constituency seats only makes the publically elected district councilors 5 selected members in the Legco functional constituency. Without a democratic process that is open to all, it is very likely that the dominant political parties within the 18 council districts can control all the added seats, leaving highly qualified independent candidates without any political affiliation out in the cold. As a result this move can only serve the purpose of securing more support for the government at the expense of widening the gap of democratic participation. There is a reluctant to reduce the percentage of the functional constituency seats which often favor only the selecting groups. The recent minimum wage discussions by a Legco member from one of the functional constituency seat has but demonstrated a narrow self interest and the lack of concern for the general public, less the poor and the long term social harmony. In order to achieve universal suffrage, at the minimum, the functional constituency seats have to be reduced step-by-step, a position not even been mentioned by the government.

If we look at the time line of democratization of Hong Kong from the 1980's to the present. There has been progress in the democratization of the Legco seats, reducing appointed seats, increasing publically elected seats which goes hand-in-hand with increased participation by the public. Eight years from 1997 onwards, we have had the 2005 Political Reform proposal. Now in 2010, we have yet another Political Reform proposal which is very similar, if not a step backward, as compare to the 2005 proposal. Time has lapsed and if the government is honest and faithful in providing

universal suffrage (of electing the CE) by 2017 and is taking such an incremental steps towards democracy now, leaving a big gap between 2012 and 2017, would the government's next proposal able to take the lead for the great leap forward to meet the 2017 universal suffrage to elected the Chief Executive (CE) in 2017?

David Lai
Wan Chai District Councilor (elected)

政制改革之我見 —— 致立法會

2010/5/4

政府在歷時四個月的民意諮詢後，重申其 2010 年立法會選舉方法和 2017 年特首選舉方法，除了目前的特首選舉委員會規模較小之外，其底線與 2005 年提出的方法分別不大。

諮詢文件將區議會的民選基礎移植於區議員之間不記名的互選幾名立法會議員，並不能自動令立法會選舉加多點民主。若區議會的五個立法會議席並非由民主機制產生，結果極可能讓主導政黨控制十八區內的全部五個議席。獨立沒歸邊的區議員，無論他/她代表多少民意，都不能在議席上得到反映。此舉最終只會成為政府鞏固其在議會內的支持程度的工具；賠上的，卻是香港市民的廣泛民主參與。

在減少功能組別議席的問題上，政府一直舉棋不定。最近關於最低工資的討論，有位功能組別選出來的議員展示了他是如何的代表了狹隘的行業僱主利益，無視大眾和窮人福祉，妄顧社會長遠的和諧關係。要達致全面普選，功能組別的議席一定要逐步減少；但政府對此卻不置一詞。

回顧香港自上世紀八十年代至今的民主化進度，立法會議席的民主化〔包括減少委任議席、增加公開選舉議席〕，跟社會大眾參與日增是分不開的。回歸後八年，我們有 2005 年政改方案；2010 年，我們又有一個若非退步了，也只是跟 2005 年的政改方案相差不遠的方案。時間溜走了，如果政府真心誠意要在 2017 年實行普選行政長官，那麼，在 2012 年只作這樣的「政制向前走」，到 2017 年，政府是否有足夠能耐領導一次「政制大躍進」呢？

灣仔區議員(民選)
黎大偉