 Read Message  Back to: [Inbox](#)

From: ...
Date: 2004/02/23 Mon AM 09:35:03 CST
To: views@cab-review.gov.hk
Subject: CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

    Move To: [\(Choose Folder\)](#) 

A1. As a comparison, the Prime Minister of UK is appointed by the Queen but the Queen always appoint the leader of the party who win the election.

By a similar token, we would expect the Central Government to appointed the CE elected by the people of Hong Kong.

That said, the Cental Government's concerns over loyalty is very valid. These should be dealt with in the candidate nomination stage rather than the appointment stage. It is politically incorrect to go into a situation where it is the Central Government against Hong Kong. This situation should not exist.

A2. Every country resists external political influence. It would be a political scandal, say, for a US presidential candidate to accept donation from another country. By the same token, we would not expect SAR CE candidates to accept donation from external political influence. If such activities are proved to exist, then they should be properly dealt with and the legislation to install such protections take time and political effort. However if such activities are pure hypothetical, the people of Hong Kong may become impatient. Practical should mean whether we have real threats and whether we have given enough thoughts to deal with the real threats. There is a danger trying to deal with hypothetical threats as they would be seen as excuses and the measures to deal with hypothetical threats may jeopardise our future effort to deal with real threats.

A3. The current system favor capitalists to become political leaders. Unfortunately capitalists are no politicians by training and hence they lack some appreciation of the role of non-profit making parties which should receive as much political attention as the capitalist, if not more.

The capitalist view costs more in monetary terms while

politicians are trained to view costs more in totality
ie the social and philosophical terms are also
considered.

I think our Chief Executive Tung has learnt over the
years and the current CE is a much better politician
than he was 7 years ago.

I think (2) of A3 is unnecessary. Anything too favor
the capitalist may only give them a temporary benefit.
If the harmony and balance of the society is
disturbed, it would back-fire to the capitalist
system.

B1 We should trigger (a)

B2 Yes, we should face any difficulties now. Any
avoidance would under-mine the legitimacy and
therefore the power of the CE. If we need a CE who
can handle our difficulties, we should deal with the
difficulties now and give him/her the support he/she
needs.






B3 The Legco would be useless if the CE has the
support of the people but the Legco does not. Hence
the Constitutional changes should move in tandem.




B4 There is a degree of urgency here. The SAR
government is in a way made limp by the current
political system. We should learn from the lesson and
at least enough changes to get the momentum going and
credibility back.

B5 We should take a pragmatic view here. 2007 can be
inclusive or exclusive of 2007 itself so long as the
people of Hong Kong and the Central Government can
agree on it. Again I do not see the Central
Government and Hong Kong people on opposite side.
Anything that favour stability of Hong Kong should be
favoured by the Central Government as well.

I am surprise you even asked.

Hoi

    Move To: 

   Back to: [Inbox](#)

[Help](#)