



Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal
Matters (Amendment) Bill 2019

To: PID <pid@legco.gov.hk>
From: Hubert Woo <[REDACTED]>
Date: 05/17/2019 07:38PM
Cc: ceo@ceo.gov.hk
Subject: Re: Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters (Amendment) Bill
2019

Dear Sir,

Please remind the all members of the Legislative Councils are required to swear to uphold the Basic Law under Article 104.

Before they pass the captioned amendment, they must be clear that the amendment complies with Article 5 and Article 11 of the Basic Law. If any of them has any doubt, he should ask the Chief Executive to seek an interpretation under Article 158.

With best regards.

Hubert

-----Hubert Woo <[REDACTED]> wrote: -----
To: pid@legco.gov.hk
From: Hubert Woo <[REDACTED]>
Date: 05/11/2019 08:12PM
Subject: Fwd: Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters
(Amendment) Bill 2019

Begin forwarded message:

From: Hubert Woo <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters
(Amendment) Bill 2019
Date: May 11, 2019 at 3:59:04 PM GMT+8
To: ceo@ceo.gov.hk

Dear Madame,

You said in the Legislative Council that all the guesses why China was excluded from the extradition ordinance in the past, was nonsense.

May I have the true reason behind it? We are not told by the Drafting Committee of the Basic Law and the previous three Chief Executives. The "burial of your head into the sand" was a deliberate act during the last 22 year. Your Secretary for Security is a genius and he has awoken up. Perhaps you can enlighten me and the Hong Kong public why it was not disclosed to us. You must be properly prepared before you went to the Legislative Council. So far, I have not heard your explanation nor see it reported in the news.

Please tell your private secretary to give me the explanation immediately. I am sure you want all people in Hong Kong to know about it.

With best regards.

Hubert

On May 9, 2019, at 6:59 PM, Hubert Woo <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Madame,

I refer to your conversation in the Legislative Council today.

What you told the Legislative Council today is not common knowledge. Don't you think that information should be disclosed to the Hong Kong public beforehand so that the so called "nonsense" would arise.

We were not informed of the "truth" by the three previous Chief Executives. Why there was such a delay? If you did not go the Legislative Council today, the "truth" will never be known.

May be this is another joke from the executive.

With best regards.

Hubert

On May 9, 2019, at 10:07 AM, Hubert Woo <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Madame,

I write to thank you for the free jokes from the captioned amendment. It dawn onto me why people in Hong Hong live so long because they are given jokes particularly from the government officials every day.

These topics are:

1. Animal rights are higher than human rights. (20 days and 3 months)
2. According to the Secretary fo Security that the government had buried its head in the sand for 22 years so that the members of the Drafting Committee of the Basic Law were idiots.
3. Secretary for Justice who claimed to be an expert in building law, and had the unauthorized building works in her properties, said all suggestions were not feasible.
4. The comments from the US Congressional Commission and the letters to the legislators from the International Chamber of Commerce

would not have any impact on the Hong Kong's business environment according to the Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development.

5. We may have the opportunity to witness the farce in the Legislative Council on the coming Saturday. The administration should never involve in a political fight. It is the convention that the longest serving legislator shall serve as the chairman.

I do not know what will be coming. It is more entertaining than any other show.

With best regards.

Hubert

On May 7, 2019, at 4:04 AM, Hubert Woo <
[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Madame,

I would like to add the following to my messages.

President Xi repeated many times the the Basic Law would not be changed or modified. You sworn under under Article 104 to uphold it.

Under the principles in "Catholic Diocese of Hong Kong v Secretary fo Justice" the government may develop and improve. The shortage of doctors and nursing staff, the shoddy construction works, and the prosecutions of dishonest use of computes, etc. may be developments but definitely not improvements.

Your duty is preserving the pre-Handover systems. The above scandals are definitely not improvements and therefore against the Basic Law.

Are you quite sure the captioned amendment is definitely an improvement under the Basic Law?

With best regards.

Hubert

On May 6, 2019, at 3:51 PM, Hubert Woo <
[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Madame,

I would to add to my message that

the Basic Law provides a “check and balance” among the Executive, legislative and the Judiciary. However, Xi said that there should be a co-operation of the three parties. The Communist Party should stay supreme like the British Parliament.

The captioned change appears to give you the power above the legislative and judiciary. The amendment is therefore against the Basic Law.

With best regards.

Hubert

On May 4, 2019, at 10:51 AM, Hubert Woo <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Madame,

I refer to the article “Legco adviser quizzes govt change on fugitive law”.

It means only one thing that you as the Chief Executive fails to brief the legislative council on the captioned legislation. The excuse is that the legislation was urgent!

You may not see the agony of the Chinese refugees coming from China in the 1950-70 but you must have seen the squatters on the hillsides over Hong Kong. You must realize that most of the Hong Kong population are refugees or the descendants of refugees from China. They are afraid of the Communist China.

You did not plan to stay in Hong Kong permanently. This why your children were in public schools in the United Kingdom holding UK passports.

With best regards.

Hubert

On Apr 30, 2019, at 8:12 PM,
Hubert Woo <

[REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Patty,

I am sad to say or naive to believe that the present Hong Kong Government is a democracy.

"Democracy is a direct self-government, over all the people, by all the people, for all the people."

In spite of what is said in the newspapers and television, and people protesting in the street, our "elected" Chief Executive still wish to enact the captioned law.

If there were a loophole, it would be here in Hong Kong for over 170 years (150 years of Colonial Rule and 22 years of SAR). The loophole was a murder in Taiwan.

Why this was not dealt directly with Taiwan?

Why China is bought into it? It is well known that China could do what she wants without the captioned legislation. May be this is a face-saving exercise.

With best regards.

Hubert

On Apr 30, 2019, at 8:25 AM, Hubert Woo <

[REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Patty,

May be you should read "Take a step back from extradition rush" in the Standard today.

With best regards.
Hubert

On Apr 29, 2019,
at 9:42 AM,
Hubert Woo <

[REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Patty,
Please also read "法網還逃" by "曾鈺成" on am 730 today. i am not the only one against the captioned law.

With best regards.
Hubert

On Apr 29, 2019,
at 8:58 AM,
ceo@ceo.gov.hk
wrote:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your message. Where appropriate, we will give you a reply. Thank you. (This is generated by an auto-reply)

program
me.)
本辦公室
已經收到
你的電
郵。如有
需要，我
們會作出
回覆。謝
謝。(此為
電腦自動
發出的
訊息。)

Chief
Executive
's Office
行政長官
辦公室