



香港城市大學
City University
of Hong Kong

香港九龍德輔道中
Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon,
Hong Kong

Constitutional Development Task Force Secretariat
Constitutional Affairs Bureau
3/F, Main Wing
Central Government Offices
Lower Albert Road
Central
Hong Kong

28 May 2005

何立仁
人文及社會科學學院院長
政策研究講座教授
Ian Holliday MA (Cantab)
MPhil (Oxon)
DPhil (Oxon)
Dean
Faculty of Humanities
& Social Sciences
Prof (Chair) of Policy Studies

Dear Sir/Madam

Constitutional Development

At the Annual Meeting of the Hong Kong Political Science Association held at Chinese University of Hong Kong on 7 May 2005, Dr Michael DeGolyer (Professor of Government and International Studies, Hong Kong Baptist University) conducted a survey of members' views on constitutional development in Hong Kong. Before completing the survey, members were informed that the aggregated results would be forwarded to the Hong Kong SAR Government as part of its consultation exercise on constitutional development.

Subsequently, Professor DeGolyer assembled a report on the views of the 23 individuals surveyed at the Hong Kong Political Science Association Annual Meeting. On 24 May 2005, he submitted the report to the Council of the Association. On 27 May 2005, the Council endorsed the report and resolved to forward it to the Government on behalf of the Association.

As President of the Hong Kong Political Science Association, I am therefore writing to send you Professor DeGolyer's report. I would be grateful if you would accept it as part of the Government's constitutional development consultation exercise, which runs until 31 May 2005.

Best wishes.

Yours faithfully

(Signed)

Professor Ian Holliday
President
Hong Kong Political Science Association

Hong Kong Political Science Association
Member's survey on constitutional reform options

Survey conducted at Hong Kong Political Science Association Annual General Meeting 7 May 2005. For comparison of professional member's responses to the public and to Functional Constituency members, see below. Submitted by the Chair and members of the Constitutional Reform Standing Committee to the President and Board of the HKPSA.

Q1. In principle, do you support or oppose direct election of the Chief Executive?

83% Strongly support
17% Support
none oppose

Q2. If you support, When would you implement direct election?

70% In 2007 (third election)
26% 2012 (fourth)
4% 2017 (fifth).

Q3. If you oppose, what is your MAIN or MOST IMPORTANT reason for opposing direct election of the Chief Executive?

None opposed

Q4. In principle, do you support / oppose to enlarge the number of members of the Chief Executive Election Committee?

50% Strongly support
18% Support
14% Oppose
9% Strongly Oppose
9% No opinion

(Most opposed members wrote in they opposed enlargement since they wanted EC abolished.)

Q5. Would you find the following options for reforming the CURRENT 800-MEMBER CHIEF EXECUTIVE Election Committee acceptable or unacceptable (in %)

	Very unacceptable	Somewhat unacceptable	Somewhat acceptable	Very acceptable	No opinion	Don't Know
Replace with direct election	90	5				
Appointed by Beijing officials	65	20	5			10
Keep 800 members elected from various groups	25	35	20		10	10
Expand to 1,600 members	25	10	40		10	10
Add all 400 elected District Council members to EC	20	20	35	15	10	
Expand to all registered functional constituency voters	20	5	35	25	15	
Replace with universal suffrage direct election by all HK voters	5		5	90		

Q6. Which of the 7 options would you most prefer?

- 0 Replace EC with direct appointment by Beijing officials
- 0 Keep 800 members elected same manner as now
- 0 Expand to 1,600 members
- 0 Expand to 5,000 members
- 4% Add all 400 elected District Council members to EC
- 4% Expand to all registered functional constituency voters
- 91% Replace with universal suffrage direct election by all HK voters
- 0 No preference/don't know

Q7. In 2002, the Election Committee members nominated and elected the Chief Executive. Would you prefer:

- 4% Make no change
- 57% Making Election Committee a C.E-candidate nominating body only
- 4% Making Election Committee a C.E-candidate electing body only and have LegCo members nominate
- 9% Making Election Committee a C.E-candidate electing body only and have a set number of registered voters to nominate
- 26% No preference/Don't know

Q8. Should the following practices be forbidden or allowed?

	Should be forbidden	Should be allowed	No preference	Don't Know
Chief Executive and EC members to be party members	4	91	4	
Principal Officials in Exco to be members of a party	9	78	13	
Principal Officials in Exco to be Legco members	26	61	13	
Legco members to be Exco members (without ministerial responsibilities)	4	75	23	

Q9. In principle, do you support or oppose direct election of all Legco seats?

- 96% Strongly support
- Support
- 4% Oppose → Go to Q 11
- Strongly Oppose → Go to Q 11
- No opinion
- Don't know

Q10. If you support, when to implement?

- 82% In 2008
- 14% In 2012
- In 2016
- 4% Later election

Q11. If oppose, what is/are your main reason(s) for opposing?

"FC's represent legitimate interests of important sectors of the economy."

Q12. Do you support/oppose continuing the practice of allowing business & professional groups special influence in government decision-making via Functional Constituencies?

	Strongly support
4%	Support
39%	Oppose
52%	Strongly Oppose
4%	No opinion
	Don't know

Q13 Would you support/oppose setting up the FCs elected representatives into a separate body from Geographic Constituency elected representatives like the Senate in US or House of Lords in UK?

4%	Strongly support
39%	Support
13%	Oppose
26%	Strongly Oppose
13%	No opinion
4%	Don't know

Q14. Do you support/oppose changing the current rules allowing 16 members of either GC or FC to stop (veto) a bill into requiring all LegCo bills to pass by a simple majority vote of all members?

43%	Strongly support
9%	Support
4%	Oppose
30%	Strongly Oppose
13%	No opinion
	Don't know

Q15. Do you support/oppose increasing who has a right to vote in FC elections?

57%	Strongly support
26%	Support
	Oppose
4%	Strongly Oppose
13%	No opinion
	Don't know

Q16. Do you support/oppose increasing competition in FC elections?

68%	Strongly support
18%	Support
	Oppose
4%	Strongly Oppose
9%	No opinion
	Don't know

Q17. 30 FCs are elected most by 1st past post from single seat constituencies. Would you support / oppose regrouping FCs into related multi-seat constituencies, for example, put lawyers, accountants, and medical seats into one big professionals FC with say, 4 seats?

- 9% Strongly support
- 22% Support
- 26% Oppose
- 9% Strongly Oppose
- 17% No opinion
- 17% Don't know

Q18. The Basic Law says the ultimate aim is to elect all Legco members by universal suffrage elections (universal suffrage means all adults have right to vote, no further qualification such as being a member of a profession or special group is allowed). The NPC wants LegCo to stay half FC/half GC in 2008, but in 2012 we may be allowed to change this ratio, so when should FCs be abolished? And should it be all at once or step by step?

61% All at once WHEN? INSERT DATE _____

Open ended, written in responses on when:

2005	2007	2008	2011	2012
15%	8%	31%	8%	38%

- 26% Step by step
- 4% Should not be abolished
- 4% No opinion
- 4% Don't know

Q19. If answer to Q18 is 2 (STEP BY STEP) above, what should percent of FC's be in

Six respondents gave the following steps/dates for step by step reduction:

2012

0%	25%	40%	50%
1	1	2	2

2016

0%	30%	50%
2	2	2

2020

0%	20%
4	2

Q20. Currently all 30 GC seats are proportionately elected by lists from 5 GCs. In 1995, 20 GCs seats were elected by first past post in 20 GCs. Which do you support or oppose?

a. Proportional elections by lists as now

Strongly support	Support	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	No opinion	Don't know
15%	20%	45%	10%	10%	

b. Go back to 1st past the post elections and add more geographic districts

Strongly support	Support	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	No opinion	Don't know
38%	24%	14%	9%	14%	

Q. 21 SEX 87% Male 13% Female

Q. 22 Age Range 24-64 Average: 45

Q. 23 Years in academic career Range 1-32 Average 13

Q. 24 Rank:

- Under-graduate student
- 9% Post-graduate student
- Instructor/RA.
- Assistant Lecturer
- 4% Lecturer
- Senior Lecturer
- 27% Assistant Professor
- 9% Associate Professor
- 22% Professor
- 4% Chair Professor or Senior Administrator
- 9% Other position (Please specify: journalist, community activist/businessman)

Total surveyed: 23 members present at AGM on 7 May 2005 at Chinese University of Hong Kong