



Submission No. 78

TITRON INDUSTRIES LIMITED  
Room 1109-11, West Tower  
Shun Tak Center  
200 Connaught Road Central  
Hong Kong.  
Telephone (852) 2547 3022  
Facsimile (852) 2540 6376

Submission from Titron Industries Limited

To me, the debate on article 23 so far, appears to have shed more heat than light, more rhetoric than substance.

There is so much hyperbole, used by some opponents of the proposed security laws that it is difficult to discern the technical points raised.

I am anxious to see that efforts of public officials are channeled effectively towards the building of a stable, secure and free society in Hong Kong.

As all enlightened countries in the developing and developed world I am familiar with (including the USA) have national security laws it is a gross exaggeration to say that Hong Kong will be severely damaged if it enacts such laws as has been claimed. In fact, countries have their own respective perceived threats and they enact appropriate security laws to protect, not to damage, themselves.

Post 9-11 the USA has swiftly enacted the USA Patriots Act which I believe is, in a sense, a great deal more stringent than the laws proposed under the blue bill, to deal with its perceived threat.

Clearly Hong Kong too needs securities laws like every place else to protect its way of life from those who may seek to undermine it.

I believe the efforts to enact security laws as proposed by the blue bill deserves in principle support.

We are living under 1 country, 2 systems, and there is an obligation under Basic Law for Hong Kong to enact a set of needed security laws.

Efforts to challenge that reality only waste a lot of energy and they also create a fractious society, and in the end slows Hong Kong's political evolution.

I urge all parties to engage in rational debate to help forge a set of security laws that can best serve Hong Kong.

Ronald Lye