

package is not absolutely ideal, the Meeting Point thinks that it is acceptable. The long-term target of the development of a democratic government is not merely for a fully elected legislature. What is more important is that the Chief Executive should be directly elected. If we totally ignore the constraints of reality, we can even propose a Private Member's Bill on direct election of the Governor. Thus we can see that terms like "half democracy", "one-third democracy" and so on are only emotive terms. Under the condition that the Government is executive-led while the Governor is appointed by the British Government, we can say that the Legislative Council direct election in fact only signifies limited democracy. Such kind of sentimental debates actually serve no purpose. I think that we should keep calm and respect one another.

I would like to talk about the United Ants' advertisement on Tuesday which criticized the stance of the Meeting Point and urged the public to make telephone calls and fax to us who are Members from the Meeting Point, requesting us to support Miss Emily LAU. I received two telephone calls and a facsimile. I discussed in detail with the two callers why our stance would be one of abstention rather than support. It turned out that the two callers were totally unaware of the 20 directly elected seats provided for in the Basic Law. After I passed that information, they began to understand our stance and know the incident better. I strongly emphasize that although our stance will still be under attack, we will continue to stick to our point of view. I believe that we are looking at the development of democracy with due regard to principles. It is neither the case that we are seeking to have democracy overnight nor that we are bent on achieving democracy today or within this one and a half years in total disregard of what will happen after 1997. I think that either case is irresponsible. We have to take a far-sighted view. The path of democratic development in Hong Kong is all along rugged. Mr LEE Wing-tat has just mentioned the social campaigns in the past, which I have also participated in, at least 10 odd years ago. But how come we are having different views today? Do these differences justify the accusations that we are not democrats, that we have changed stance, that we have attempted to cross over to the opposite side but failed? I deem that such accusations are not acceptable and thus I make a response here to the expressed views of that small group of people in the United Ants. I think that this will undermine the unity of the democratic camp. Rather than wasting so much effort criticizing the democratic camp, they should pool their efforts to figure out how to get the Basic Law amended.

Mr President, with these remarks, the Meeting Point will abstain from voting on this motion.

MR MARTIN LEE (in Cantonese): Mr President, no one would really like to be criticized or bothered.

It seems that recently an organization has been bothering the United Democrats of Hong Kong quite frequently. In fact I do not mind it at all. On the contrary, I welcome what they do because a true believer in democracy will

respect every piece of criticism from others. If they criticize us just because they think that the line we follow is not democratic enough, why should we not welcome that? After all, we are the democrats. As a matter of fact, no one in Hong Kong dare say that democracy is not good for Hong Kong. However, a large group of people, including some Legislative Councillors, say that we should not go too fast. We should keep a slow pace instead. Actually, I am very disgusted with such arguments. When the goal is obviously a good one, why should we not achieve it earlier?

About a month ago, I had a debate with the Chairman of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment of Hong Kong (DAB). He spent 10 minutes to explain why their political party was called DAB, and why their kind of democracy was needed for the betterment of Hong Kong. After his 10 minutes' speech, it was my turn. In fact, it would have taken me just a few seconds to explain. What was the point of saying so much? The English short title of that party is "DAB", meaning "Democracy according to Beijing".

Some people say that democracy is out of place in Hong Kong and that we should not transplant the type of democracy practised in Europe or the United States to Hong Kong or China. I am particularly disgusted with such opinion. Mr President, let us forget Europe or the United States. Let us look at Asia. As a matter of fact, very few countries in Asia do not have direct elections. There are direct elections in countries and areas like Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia, India, Pakistan, the Philippines, South Korea and Taiwan. What kind of defects have we Chinese or Hong Kong people suffered which inhibit us from enjoying democracy like the other Asian people? Actually those who make these comments are insulting us Chinese. Why should we be worried now? In the eyes of the Chinese leaders, the Bill that we have just passed is already a departure from the Basic Law, let alone the proposal of the United Democrats of Hong Kong, which calls for 30 seats to be returned by direct election. Even though we have passed the proposal today, it does not conform to the Basic Law. Since nonconformity will result in any case, it will be better for the convention of the Basic Law to vanish. And with the convention of the Basic Law disappeared, why do we not take this opportunity to implement democracy? Will it do any harm to Hong Kong? It is a pity that up till now, everybody thinks that this proposal is worth supporting, except the Meeting Point, which has reservation (but it has not stated the reasons, except for the Basic Law). The Basic Law is the reason suggested by the Meeting Point. Mrs Selina CHOW has delivered a very brief speech. I wonder if she was feeling sleepy as her speech was incredibly brief. She only mentioned that stability and prosperity were the reasons. I think those who say that Hong Kong will have no stability and prosperity if all the 60 seats in the Hong Kong legislature are directly elected are very irresponsible and they have no grounds at all. Besides, Mrs CHOW left the Chamber after finishing that statement. Of course I cannot request that she must stay here. I myself go out from time to time, but I will at least give my justifications.

Mr President, we cannot blame anybody if we do not seek democracy now. At present, has anybody said that we are not allowed to put democracy into practice? The Chinese Government has already mentioned that whatever we do, it will be the same, meaning that we might simply go ahead to try practising democracy, but it would come to an end on 1 July 1997. It is tantamount to what they are saying to Governor PATTEN that he might go ahead to pass that proposal but it would come to an end on 1 July 1997. In fact, we do not know whether it will come to an end until three years later. Even if it will end, what harm will it cause to us? At least we can let the people of Hong Kong, China and the whole world see that we Hong Kong people are actually qualified to practise democracy. Are we lacking confidence in ourselves?

MR SZETO WAH (in Cantonese): Mr President, a full-page advertisement was recently placed in the newspapers, casting doubt on the moral courage of the United Democrats of Hong Kong (UDHK). As a member of the UDHK, I cannot remain silent, particularly when it comes to matters involving morality. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that he is not in a position to discuss moral courage because he is still young. I am older and I think, though still not senior enough, I am in a slightly better position to do so than Mr LEE.

Moral courage may take many different forms. Advocating a lofty goal shows one's moral courage and adhering firmly to the goal is also a manifestation of one's moral courage. Moreover, never giving up one's lofty goals in face of dire adversity and difficulties demonstrates all the more one's moral courage. I mentioned in yesterday's debate that whatever the outcome of the voting on the political reform proposal may be, my fellow brothers and sisters and I are going to carry the fight through to the end. We are, firstly, fearless of verbal attack; secondly, fearless of living in poverty; thirdly, fearless of imprisonment and fourthly, fearless of decapitation. This is moral courage. We are going to forge ahead with our goals and fight for every inch of land even against dire adversity. I consider a demonstration of moral courage better than talking glibly about lofty ideals. On the one hand, we must have moral courage to face fearlessly people who have a million soldiers and also tanks at their command and can order their soldiers to fire their machine guns. On the other hand, we are not afraid of being misunderstood by others in times of difficulties. This is also a demonstration of moral courage.

It was mentioned in Mr Martin LEE's speech yesterday that we had to take back our "sword" because some people wanted to borrow our "sword" to kill others, so to speak. When we were considering taking such an action, many people advised us that this might lead to misunderstanding and added that even our own fellow brothers and sisters might misinterpret our action. Then, should we do it or not? If we have real moral courage, with the overall interests of the territory and the one step forward the democracy movement could be brought in our mind, we should take this course of action. A man with a higher level of moral courage would not be afraid of being misunderstood, but would always look from an overall perspective and be willing to suffer all