



放眼世界

立會加強保安 無礙公眾參與

中英社評

立法會行政管理委員會今日開會，討論保安問題；昨日，四十位建制派議員亦聯名去函立會主席曾鈺成，提出有關加強保安工作的三項要求。

立法會是本港唯一的立法機關，立法大樓位於添馬政府總部毗鄰，從憲政職能到所處位置，立法會都應該是一個嚴肅、寧靜和不能容許任意衝擊的地方。但是，就在上星期五，一批示威者強行進入大樓，佔據大堂，一度還企圖衝入議事廳，大批警員奉召到場控制場面，混亂中五名立會保安人員受傷。

立會首度被衝擊，保安紅燈亮起，激進反對派提出的「佔領立法會」將不再是一句口號，他們不諱言上周五的衝擊行動就是「佔會」預演。而立會一旦被「佔領」，後果絕不僅僅是會議要取消、運作被癱瘓，而是標示着激進反對派的違法亂港行動將會全面升級，特區政府的管治工作將進一步面對挑戰。

過去，遊行示威再亂也亂不到立會頭上，今天，這個作為本港法治標誌的堡壘已隨時可能「失守」被佔領，而更嚴峻的是，「佔會」的同時，政府總部以至更多重要機構和部門都已成為「佔領」目標，行動在「佔中」之日將會全面爆發，從而把本港的社會秩序和治安推入一個空前混亂以至崩潰的深淵。因此，對發生在上周五的「佔會」事件及相關的立會保安問題，各方絕不能低估其嚴重性和迫切性，其中一些想法或說法值得商榷，法治界線更不應被混淆。

毫無疑問，立法會的工作要向市民負責，立會大樓也不應該是重門深鎖的公眾禁地，但眼前事實是立法會的安全及運作正受到威脅，鬧事者謀求的並不是一般的關心和參與，而是要暴力、要衝擊、要佔領，這和一般安坐旁聽席上的市民又怎能



▲立法會是本港唯一的立法機關，立法大樓位於添馬政府總部毗鄰，從憲政職能到所處位置，立法會都應該是一個嚴肅、寧靜和不能容許任意衝擊的地方

相提並論、混為一談呢？

以上星期五發生的事件為例，以暴力撞開玻璃門衝入大樓、把保安人員推倒在地、和警員對峙搶奪「鐵馬」，然後手挽手「佔領」大堂的，是一批激進青年和示威常客，他們根本不是新界村民，對審議中的「新界東北發展規劃」可能連個東南西北也未有弄清，他們的到來就是為了衝擊、為了「佔領」，把他們拒諸門外，和市民對立法工作的知情權、參與權一點也沒有關係，相反，任由他們「佔會」得逞，立法工作癱瘓，才是對市民利益的損害。

而更必須指出及正視的是，正如律政司司長袁國強日前所指出，「公民抗命」必然違法，「佔領中環」也必然違法。一個明顯違法的行動，不能因其所謂「目的性」的「正確」而改變其違法實質。「佔領中環」是違法的、「佔領立法會」同樣

也是違法的，基本法相關條文列明：立法會議員會上發言不被追究、赴會途中不受逮捕，那麼，把議員依法行使議事職能的場所強行佔領，又豈會是不違法 and 可以接受的？「佔會」違法，什麼「真普選」與「和平佔中」的動聽口號都不能改變這一事實。

事實是，回歸以來，反對派已經把立法會變成政治爭拗場所，「長毛」、陳偉業、陳志全一夥捉蕉、「拉布」、撒陰司紙，更令立會尊嚴已幾乎掃地，眼下打着「本土派」旗號的激進反對派更企圖「奪會」、「佔會」，把台灣學生佔領「立法院」的一幕搬來香港上演。守衛立法會、維護立法尊嚴，首先是坐在這個莊嚴議事堂內的全體議員的責任，立會必須認真加強保安工作，不能任由「佔會」鬧劇發生。

2014-06-10

Legco tightening security does no harm to public participation

The Legislative Council Commission is meeting today to review security measures. Yesterday, some 40 pro-establishment lawmakers jointly signed a letter to Legco President Jasper Tsang Yok-sing, raising three demands on strengthening security measures at the Legco headquarters.

Legco is Hong Kong's sole legislative body. The Legco complex is adjacent to the Central Government Complex at the Tamar site. In view of either its constitutional functions or its location, the Legco should be a solemn and serene place not to be wantonly besieged. However, last Friday, a bunch of protestors forced their way into the Legco building and occupied the lobby, and even attempted to **storm into** the chamber. Police were called in to restore order. In the incident, five Legco security guards were injured.

This is the first time the Legco complex is broken in, which **sets off alarm bells** for its security. "Occupy Legco" advocated by radicals from the opposition no longer remains a slogan. They have declared in no uncertain terms that last Friday's action is a rehearsal of "Occupy Legco". Once Legoc is "occupied", not only its meetings have to be cancelled and operation paralysed, but it also signals the upgrading of unlawful and trouble-making activities by opposition radicals. And the SAR Government's administration will face further challenges.

Until now, no demonstrations or protests, however chaotic they may be, have affected the Legco. Today, this place symbolising the stronghold of the rule of law in Hong Kong could possibly "fall" and be occupied at any moment. More seriously, at the same time when the Legco is occupied, the government headquarters and more important institutions and departments would also become their occupation targets. Such actions are likely to take place together on the day of "Occupy Central" to push Hong Kong's social order and public security into an abyss of unprecedented chaos and even collapse. Therefore, the seriousness and urgency of last Friday's "Occupy Legco" incident and problems with Legco security exposed must not be underestimated. In this regard, some opinions are debatable, and the demarcation of the rule of law must not be blurred.

No doubt, the Legco is responsible to all citizens and the Legco complex should not be a heavily locked restricted area inaccessible to the public. But the problem right now is that the security and operation of the Legco is under threat, and the trouble makers do not care about participation but want to be violent, to attack and to occupy. How can they be **mentioned in the same breath** with citizens quietly setting in the Public Gallery?

Taking Last Friday's incident for example, those who violently pushed open the glass doors and forced their way into the Legco building, pushed down security guards, confronted police officers trying to break barricades, and then "occupied" the lobby hand in hand, are a bunch of radical young people and professional demonstrators. They are not villagers from New Territories, and know nothing about the North East New Territories Development Planning in deliberation. They came just to break in and occupy. Hence keeping such radicals out of the Legco complex does no harm at all to citizens' rights to know and to participate in legislative works. On the contrary, letting such radicals wantonly "occupy Legco" to paralyse the legislature really hurts people's interests.

What should be pointed out and given attention is that, as the Secretary for Justice Rimsky Yuen Kwok-keung pointed out earlier, "civil disobedience" is **bound to** involve in violation of the law, and "Occupy Central" is also bound to violate the law. An obviously law-breaking action cannot change its nature of violation of the law just because it claims its purpose is "correct". "Occupy Central" violates the law, and likewise "Occupy Legco" violates the law. Relevant articles in the Basic Law stipulate that Legco members "shall be **immune** from legal action in respect of their statements at meetings of the Council"; and "shall not be subjected to arrest when attending or on their way to a meeting of the Council." Then, how is it possible that forceful occupation of the

venue where Legco members exercise their legislative duties does not violate the law and is acceptable? No touching slogans such as "For True Democracy" or "Peacefully Occupy Central" can change the fact that "Occupy Legco" violates the law.

As a matter of fact, since Hong Kong's handover, the opposition has turned the Legco into a place for political antagonism. Long Hair, Albert Chan Wai-yip, Raymond Chan Chi-chuen and their ilk throw bananas, filibuster and throw Hell Money, seriously damaging the dignity of the legislature. Now, the radicals from the opposition camp further attempt to "Take Over Legco" and "Occupy Legco", trying to copy the show of Taiwanese students occupying the Legislative Yuan in Hong Kong. To guard the Legco and to safeguard the legislature's dignity is, in the first place, the responsibility of all lawmakers sitting in this solemn chamber. The Legco must conscientiously strengthen its security measures to prevent an "Occupy Legco" farce from happening again.

10 June 2014

WORDS AND USAGE

Storm in (to some place) (phrasal verb) – To burst into some place angrily. (衝進，強行進入)

Examples: 1. The terrorists stormed into the school and took dozens of students and their teachers hostage. 2. Tom stormed in, shouting at everyone.

Set off alarm bells (idiom) – To warn of trouble and the need for action. (拉響警報，亮起紅燈)

Examples: 1. If you say that something sets off alarm bells, you mean that people are starting to feel worried and suspicious. 2. The report about worldwide climate change should set off alarm bells in every community.

Mention in the same breath (idiom) – If you talk about two people or things in the same breath, you mention them together because they are similar. (相提並論)

Examples: 1. I do not see how you can talk about poetry and music in the same breath. 2. They should not be mentioned in the same breath.

Bound to do sth (idiom) – Certain to do something; destined to do something. (必定要…，肯定會…)

Examples: 1. Tom's bound to do a good job. 2. We are bound to tell the truth.

Immune (adj.) – Not subject to an obligation imposed on others; exempt. (豁免，不受…影響)

Examples: 1. Journalists, he insisted, must be immune (= protected) from prosecution. 2. The senior members of the group appeared to be immune from arrest.



時人名句



◀特首梁振英強調不能容忍有人以非法、暴力、非和平及衝擊這些地方的方式來表達意見

社會不容暴力表達意見

一批反對新界東北發展計劃的市民，早前在舉行財委會會議期間在立法會大堂靜坐示威，更有一批激進示威者衝入立法會大堂，致多名保安人員受傷，最後由立法會秘書處報警，驅趕示威者。40名建制派議員亦聯署譴責當日示威人士，要求立法會行政管理委員會檢討處理手法。立法會主席亦對示威者的暴力行為予以譴責，翻看錄影帶並決定是否追究闖入立法會人士的法律責任。立法會行政管理委員會決定實施五項臨時措施，防止闖入立法會事件重演。

衝擊立法會事件後，民建聯、經民聯、工聯會、新民黨、自由黨等40名建制派議員，聯署譴責當日示威人士，又向多名受傷立法會職員表示慰問，並要求立法會行政管理委員會檢討處理手法，研究限制嚴重違規人士再訪。建制派議員要求跟進事件中，有沒有人觸犯刑事罪行，要求調查立法會是否有「內應」。

議員對行政管理委員會提出3項要求。第一，嚴肅檢討處理是次事件的手法，和現行的保安及公眾管理安排，包括應否容許示威者進入大堂內示威，以及如何處理不聽管理人員勸喻的人士的做法等；第二，針對有人聲稱進行「佔領立法會」制訂應對措施，加強大樓的保安，並研究限制嚴重違反規定的公眾人士再來訪；第三，跟進事件是否有人觸犯刑事罪行，追究立法會職員受傷的責任，以及調查有否議員助理違反規定，「私放」示威者入大樓。

行政長官梁振英：

香港社會有很多遊行、示威、集會，絕大多數都是合法、和平，強調不能容忍在社會裡任何地方，包括公共地方、政治體制內的一些機關重地及立法會和政府總部，有人以非法、暴力、非和平及衝擊這些地方的方式來表達意見。香港有充分的和平集會及表達意見的自由，希望大家能夠利用好。

發展局局長陳茂波：

立法會的保安是立法會的事情，我深信立法會會有合適的處理。

立法會主席曾鈺成：

我理解建制派議員關注立法會大堂不是示威區，而當日沒有第一時間清場和報警，是考慮不同因素。只會在緊急情況下，如大樓內出現人身安全問題等，而立會保安無法自行解決事件，並經行管會批准後，才會報警求助，但如警方執行職務期間，有任何不適當行為，警方則要為此負責。

新民黨主席葉劉淑儀：

財委會一度警鐘誤鳴，有議員要求休會，須徹查是否根本安排晒，希望當晚腰斬會議，秘書處下次應提早請警方協助。要追究立法會是否有內應，為何有示威者可以混進大樓。

立法會議員梁美芬：

立法會大堂變成示威區「非常之危險」。立法會保安管理出現嚴重問題，必須檢討，以迅速處理欲入大堂的示威者，拖延會令事件惡化，如在村民靜坐期間便勸喻他們離開，否則可強制性指示，要求保安清場。

民主黨主席劉慧卿：

立法會大樓內不是示威區，希望市民尊重。

立法會內會副主席和行管會委員湯家驊：

當日秘書處曾致電給我，我同意報警，並願意為這決定負責。

立法會議員黃國健：

衝擊行為已成常態，秘書處是次處理有不當，希望日後有關方面要加強防止衝擊的措施。

護衛及物業管理從業員總會主席楊慧嫻：

事件反映立法會秘書處對暴力事件敏感度不足，應變能力低，希望制訂指引訂明什麼情況下應立即通知警方，並設立應變措施。



時事英語

發電「燃料」知多少？

政府就發電燃料組合的公眾諮詢期明天（6月18日）結束，期間引起較大爭議的是，香港是否應向內地買入部分電力以減少本地的碳排放（carbon emission）。

電（electricity或electrical power）是一種能（energy），而「發電」（electricity generation）就是將其他可用的能源轉化為電能（electrical energy）。這類能源叫做發電燃料（fuels for generating electricity），燃料組合就是fuel mix了。

最原始的發電燃料是煤（coal），用煤做燃料的發電廠英文叫做coal-fueled power plant，所發的電就是electricity generated by coal，簡稱coal electricity。現在也有不少發電廠使用石油（petroleum）或天然氣（natural gas）作燃料。煤、石油和天然氣是動植物深埋地底千萬年後形成的碳氫化合物（hydrocarbon），所以通稱為「化石燃料」（fossil fuel）。化石燃料是不可再生能源，「用少見少」；它們也是碳排放的「元兇」。

不少國家也大力開發水力發電（hydraulic electricity generation），即在河流築壩蓄水，利用水位落差的勢能（potential energy）來發電。水力發電本身不產生污染，但在截流築壩卻有破壞生態環境（eco-environment）之虞。中國已在長江三峽（Three Gorges）建成世界上最大的水電站（hydropower station）。也有一些國家利用核能（nuclear energy）來發電。本港有部分電力供應便來自深圳的大亞灣核電站（nuclear power plant）。現在，一些有條件的地方也致力於開發風力（wind power）和太陽能（solar energy）發電。風力和太陽能應是最乾淨的能源（clean energy），但受限於自然條件和較高成本，尚難取代其他發電燃料。

發電站發出的電必須通過電網（electrical/power grid）輸送給用戶。在香港，發電和電力輸送（electricity transmission）合二為一，分別由兩家電力公司負責。但在內地，兩者卻分開操作，電站發電賣給電網公司，再由後者輸送賣給用戶。而能賣電給香港的是「中國南方電網公司」（China Southern Power Grid（CSG））。亦然