



放眼世界

兩大主流民意 「泛民」必須面對

中英社評

香港研究協會昨日發表最新民調結果，六成三被訪者認為立法會應該通過政府提交的普選方案，並認同普選方案較現行特首產生辦法更民主。

認同五百萬人投票較一千二百人選委會更民主，認同立法會應按照民意決定投票取向，此兩點意見，在已公布的各項民意調查中可說已清晰可見，支持度都在六成或以上；特別是前者，五百萬人投票較一千二百人選委會更民主，更已幾乎不存在任何異議。

而更重要的是，兩點主流民意，與港人社會一貫的理性、務實和對民主權利的理解是一致的，一點也不會令人覺得奇怪，更不存在什麼牽強附會的可能。

首先，五百萬人投票較一千二百人選委會民主，其理是三歲小童也不難明白。當然，普選辦法方案存在提名委員會和「入閘」、「出閘」的環節，參選人要獲得十分一提名推薦才能「入閘」，參選人則要獲得提名委員會過半數提名才能「出閘」成為候選人，才會去到五百萬合資格選民「一人一票」的階段。這裡面，一定的甄選過程確實是存在的，這一來是由於基本法的規定，二來也是為了要確保候選人須符合愛國等基本條件而不致出現「不獲任命」的困局。但無論如何，最終五百萬合資格選民確確實實是每人手上都可以拿到一張選票，而最終決定兩到三個候選人何人能當選的是五百萬選民而不是一千二百名提委，即假如提委會的「出閘」得票次序是A、B、C，選民也完全可以不管排序，按自己「心水」把票投給B或C而不投給



最新民調結果顯示，六成三被訪者認為立法會應該通過政府提交的普選方案

A，提委會是一點也不能左右選民意志的，五百萬人的投票確確實實就是一個百分百民主的過程。此點是毫無疑問和不容否定的。

因此，一貫靈活、務實的香港市民，認同普選方案較現行選委會辦法更民主，認同普選的確是向前進了一步——儘管這一步未必完全如理想，但一步就是一步、總好過原地踏步，是已毋須再作爭拗的。不同機構、團體的民調在此點上得出幾乎一致的結論，即認同「袋咗先」，是完全可以理解的，相反，有票不要、不「袋咗先」，倒不是香港人的習慣和特性了。

事實是，「泛民」對普選可以有一百個否定，但也無法否認五百萬人投票較選委會更民主、更符合港人意願這一事實；而他們堅持「捆綁反對」的唯一後果，就是把五百萬選民好不容易到手的一票搶走、把港人來之不易的選舉權剝奪掉！而他們之所以這樣做，只是為

了擔心、不滿自己不能「出閘」、不能選上而已。如此為一黨一己之私而斷送普選、犧牲五百萬選民的投票權利，「泛民」必須給全港市民一個說法和交代，否則就等着日後「票債票償」吧。

至於主流民意的第二個取向：立法會應該按照主流民意投票，道理更是「一字咁淺」了。議員由地區或界別選民選出，在政制架構上是民意代表或「代議士」，某種程度上他們其實並不代表他們自己而只是代表選民，選民才是「老闆」。而歷來反對派議員在議會內外所做的一切，遠至反對二十三條立法、近至眼前的「拉布」，不都是假民意之名而行嗎？怎麼，如今在普選特首這一重大議題上，他們卻把民意拋到九霄雲外，「企硬」要反對到底，不給方案通過？如果選民還不及時顯一下「老闆」的威風，也未免太「沒規沒矩」，慣壞這些騎到民意頭上的「代表」了。

2015-04-28

Pan-democrats must face the mainstream public opinion

The latest public opinion poll by Hong Kong Research Association, released yesterday, shows 63% of the respondents agree that the Legislative Council (Legco) should pass the government's political reform proposal, and that the proposal is more democratic than the existing method for selecting the Chief Executive (CE).

That an election with voting by five million voters is more democratic than by a 1,200-member Election Committee and that Legco members should follow public opinion to cast their votes, these two viewpoints are clearly supported by 60% respondents or more in various public opinion surveys released hitherto. On the former in particular, that voting by five million people is more democratic than by a 1,200-member Election Committee, there virtually is no dispute.

More importantly, these two views in the mainstream public opinion are in accord with Hong Kong society's prevailing rationality, pragmatism and understanding of democratic rights. Hence they are not surprising and leave no room for making any strained interpretation.

First of all, even a three-year-old child would have no difficulty to understand that voting by five million voters is more democratic than by a 1,200-member Election Committee. Surely, there are procedures in the proposal such as the formation of the Nominating Committee, "recommendation for nomination" and "nomination". A contender can be "recommended for nomination" by one tenth of the Nominating Committee members, and a person so "recommended for nomination" must have the support of at least half of the Nominating Committee members to become a candidate. Only after the candidates are nominated can the five million qualified voters elect the CE—elect from among them by "one person one vote". In this process, there indeed exists certain screening. For one thing, this is stipulated in the Basic Law. For another, this is to ensure that a candidate meets the basic requirements such as being patriotic so as to avoid the embarrassment of a CE-election being not appointed.

In spite of all this, the five million qualified voters eventually will each indeed have a voting ticket in hand, and it is these voters instead of the 1,200 Nominating Committee members who will ultimately decide who will be elected. For, even the Nominating Committee nominate three candidates A, B and C in order of preference, voters can completely ignore the order and cast their votes to whoever they prefer, such as B or C instead of A. And there is no way for the Nominating Committee to influence the voters' decisions. Voting by five million voters thus indeed is a fully democratic process. This is without a shadow of a doubt and undeniable.

Therefore, Hong Kong citizens, who are always flexible and pragmatic, agree that the political reform proposal is more democratic than the existing method of selecting the CE, agree that this is a step forward in democratisation. Although this step may not be completely ideal, yet one step forward is one step forward, better than marking time on the spot. There is no need to dispute about this. Public opinion surveys conducted by various institutions and organisations have reached almost the same conclusion that the public agree to adopt the reform proposal first. This is entirely understandable. On the contrary, it is not Hong Kong people's habit and character to refuse accepting the voting tickets offered instead of pocketing them first.

As a matter of fact, pan-democrats could veto such universal suffrage one hundred times, but can hardly deny that fact that voting by five million voters is more democratic and more in keeping with Hong Kong people's aspiration than voting by the Election Committee. The only outcome of their insistence on "banding together in opposition" is to grab away the hard-to-come-by voting tickets from the five million voters and deprive Hong Kong people of their hard-to-come-by right to vote! And they are doing this just because they are afraid and discontent that their contenders may not be able to be nominated and elected. As such, the pan-democrats want to forfeit universal

suffrage and sacrifice five million voters' right just for their own private ends. For this, they owe Hong Kong people an explanation. Or they surely can expect to be punishment by voters with their votes.

As for the second inclination in the mainstream public opinion that Legco members should follow the mainstream public opinion to cast their votes, the reason is even simpler. Lawmakers are elected by voters of geographical or functional constituencies, and thus are representatives of people's will in the political structure. To a certain extent, they in fact represent their voters instead of themselves. Voters are their "bosses". Isn't it the case that so far the opposition lawmakers have been doing whatever they do inside and outside the chamber, from opposing the legislation on Article 23 of the Basic Law some time ago to the current "filibustering", in the pretense of public will? How come when it comes to such a major issue of electing the CE by universal suffrage, they would rather completely forget people's will and stand firm to block the proposal from being passed? Voters would behave too badly if they declined to show their power and prestige as the "bosses" in time but continued to spoil these "representatives" keeping an upper hand over people's will.

WORDS AND USAGE

For one (thing) (idiom) – As the first of several possible instances.
(首先，一方面，一來)

Examples: 1. I find many aspects of your proposal to be inadequate; for one thing, you don't specify where you'll get the money.
2. Everything seemed to go wrong; for one, we had a flat tire, and then we lost the keys.

In hand (idiom) – In one's possession or control.
(在手上，在掌握中)

Examples: 1. The police had the situation well in hand.
2. I still have some money in hand. Have no fear.

Without a shadow of a doubt (idiom) – Without the smallest amount of doubt.
(毫無疑問，不容置疑)

Examples: 1. I am certain that I am right, without a shadow of a doubt.
2. This is without a shadow of a doubt the best film I have seen all year.

Mark time (idiom) – To do nothing but wait; to march in one place without moving forward.
(原地踏步，消磨時間)

Examples: 1. I'll just mark time till things get better.
2. Do you expect me to just stand here and mark time?

Grab sb/sth away (from sb/sth else) (phrasal verb) – to snatch someone or something away from someone or something else. (搶走，奪走)

Examples: 1. Tom's aunt grabbed the dirty candy away from him before he got it in his mouth.
2. I grabbed away the meat from the dog.



時事英語

香港人並不快樂？

「聯合國可持續發展行動網絡」(The UN Sustainable Development Solution Network – SDSN) 4月23日在紐約公布了《2015年世界快樂報告》(The World Happiness Report 2015)。這是該組織繼2012年首份報告後所發表的第三份報告。

香港在今年報告所涵蓋的158個國家和地區中排名(rank)第72，較2013年下跌了八位。新加坡排名第24，遠遠拋離香港。中國(內地)排名第84，上升了九位；台灣排名第38，上升了四位。如何衡量一地人民的快樂感，報告採用一套非常複雜的標準，包括人均國內生產總值(per capita GDP)、社會支持(social support)、健康壽命預期(healthy life expectancy)、生活抉擇的自由(freedom to make life choices)、慷慨程度(generosity)和對貪腐的觀感(perceptions of corruption)等範疇的量化指標，其加和最高為10分，代表最快樂。香港今年的得分是5.474，比2013年的5.523低0.049分。港人的快樂感為何如此之低？這個問題值得大家深思。

瑞士膺全球最快樂國家

瑞士(Switzerland)以7.587分成為全世界最快樂的國家，其次依序是冰島(Iceland)、丹麥(Denmark)、挪威(Norway)、加拿大(Canada)、芬蘭(Finland)、荷蘭(Netherlands)、瑞典(Sweden)、新西蘭(New Zealand)和澳洲(Australia)。有人說過「寒冷地方是快樂家園」(colder countries are often home to the happiest people)，此幽默(humorous)說法看來不無道理。美國排名第15，引起美國傳媒諸多評論。

世界上最不幸的五個國家是多哥(Togo)、布隆迪(Burundi)、台灣譯為「滿地」(Madagascar)、敘利亞(Syria)、貝寧(Benin)和盧旺達(Rwanda)。除敘利亞外，其餘四個都在非洲。該報告說今年是人類的水分嶺(a watershed for humanity)，因為在九月舉行的紀念聯合國成立70周年的特別大會上，各國首腦將會正式接納「可持續發展目標」(Sustainable Development Goals, SDGs)，而「幸福和安樂的概念」(The concepts of happiness and well-being)將有助於朝此方向前進。

亦然



走出校園

桃李不言，下自成蹊

——敬悼鄭滋斌教授

驚悉香港城市大學中文及歷史學系鄭滋斌教授上月20日病逝，不覺悲從中來，欲發數言哀悼。筆者與鄭教授只有數面之緣，談話不多，對他的認識主要來自別人的看法。提起鄭教授，幾乎有口皆碑，讚頌他學識淵博、品格高尚。先生不足60而逝，除了「天妒英才」，真的想不到其他感慨。

文史哲無所不精

先生服務高等教育逾25載，始於嶺南學院，中經公開大學，歸宿於城市大學。筆者在嶺南學院肄業時，先生剛轉職他校，無緣受其教誨，遺憾三載。課餘常聽到學兄學姐談論先生為德。先生醉心國學，文史哲無所不精，尤專擅古文，據聞其博士論文便以文言寫成。當時先生課餘在他校兼教古文短期課程，嶺南學生紛紛報讀，以續前緣。

筆者長年間先生之名而未見其人，畢業後每逢農曆新年都到胡師詠超家拜年，數次在胡師家中見到滋斌先生，交談數句，至今記憶猶新。後來先生擔任嶺南大學社區學院校外考試委員，筆者再有機會與他接觸，他審閱試卷認真而有見地，對本院中文各科考試擬題貢獻良多。滋斌先生大半生從事高等教育，弘揚中國文化，桃李滿門。筆者與先生談不上熟悉，但正如司馬遷在《史記·李將軍列傳》中所說：「天下知與不知，皆為盡矣。」「桃李不言，下自成蹊」是李將軍一生的概括，也是鄭先生學生的寫照。願鄭滋斌先生安息！

嶺南大學社區學院高級講師 梁勇



開卷有益

哈佛圖書獎頒予逾460學生

哈佛大學香港校友會舉辦的「哈佛圖書獎」今年踏入第11年，主題為「連結」。今年請來教育局局長吳克儉主禮。嘉賓講者立法會秘書處秘書長陳維安、紀錄片《爭氣》監製何靜瑩及Chocolate Rain創作總監麥雅雅，向在場460多名來自158間中學之獲獎學生，分享其社交網絡如何影響人生的重大決定，以及他們如何利用社交網絡以積極的方法影響社會。

哈佛香港校友會今年新設「哈佛圖書獎獎金」，資助四名頂尖的本地中學生報讀哈佛暑期課程。出國留學可以對個人成長，以及學術和職業生涯帶來深遠影響，也對個人建立世界觀、事業發展及自信有積極作用，這正是校友會對四名獲獎同學的寄望。在數百名獲提名「哈佛圖書獎」的學生中，有119名申請獎學金。候選人皆由其學校提名，再由校友會獎學金委員會經過甄選，最後選出四名優勝學生。這些學生感興趣的學術範疇由氣象到歷史，以至國際關係等。獲獎學生不僅以文章回應今年「哈佛圖書獎」的主題，即社交網絡對他們的創造力和個人發展的影響，亦在會見評審時述說自己的夢想、經歷過的逆境，以及個人志向等。

獲得首屆「哈佛圖書獎獎金」的四名學生，包括港大同學會書院的陳衍汶、沙田循道衛理中學的周德煊、浸信會呂明才中學的劉瓊恆和藍田聖保祿中學的Kaur, Parmeet。陳衍汶以Tracy Morgan的說話為座右銘：你讓人展顏歡笑，是一件很美好的事。周德煊確信我們所有人都有義務去引發改變，這項獎學金標誌着我邁向目標的一步，就是令社會變得更好。身為基督徒的劉瓊恆選擇宗教課程，因為他相信嘗試新事物，一些他從未在書本或課堂中學習過的、不熟悉的知識。畢竟我相信在哈佛嘗試新事物、接受新挑戰，走出我的安樂窩，可以獲益良多。Kaur, Parmeet接受參加哈佛中學暑期課程，考驗自己，訓練溝通技巧，以至個人得以成長。

「哈佛圖書獎」將資助學生報讀為期七周的哈佛中學暑期課程，他們將置身於歷史悠久的哈佛校園及宿舍，與來自世界各地的學生一同學習及生活。