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A Promise or a Mockery?

After World War II, the Charter of the United Nations (Chapter XI, Article 73) demanded that member-nations in "the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognise the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount....."

Britain, with its new Labour Government at that time, appeared to be full of enthusiasm to carry out in the colonies the British traditions of constitutional government. In 1946, the people of Hong Kong were told that His Majesty's Government had "under consideration the means by which Hong Kong, as elsewhere in the Colonial Empire, the inhabitants of the Territory can be given a fuller and more responsible share in the management of their own affairs". In the twenty years since these statements were issued, business interests have succeeded in thwarting the principles of the United Nations Charter, and in hoodwinking successive British Governments.

On 21st April, 1966, Her Majesty the Queen said in the Gracious Speech: "Further steps will be taken to assist My peoples in the remaining Colonial territories to reach independence OR SOME OTHER STATUS WHICH THEY HAVE FREELY CHOSEN". (The emphasis is ours.)

Exactly two weeks before Her Majesty uttered those words, the people of Hong Kong had expressed their frustration by demonstrating against the rising cost of living and their exploitation by Government-supported monopolies.

To many people in Hong Kong, the words of the Queen's speech must have seemed a mere mockery.
Hong Kong, the Drug Colony

Vested interests that are determined to maintain the status quo of colonial-type government, plead that Hong Kong is "different". For this they give various reasons which will be dealt with in turn later.

The real difference between Hong Kong and other colonies is mainly that Hong Kong was set up originally to promote the drug trade with China. In the nineteenth century the Emperor of China pleaded with Queen Victoria not to destroy his people with opium. The Queen probably never saw the plea. Lord Palmerston and the drug-smugglers notably Mr William Jardine, made their own arrangements to force China at gun-point to cede Hong Kong. While drugs were illegal in China, drug-smugglers connived with Chinese traitors to continue the nefarious trade in human poison, Hong Kong being their base.

This drug trade has never ceased. Unsuccessful attempts were made to control it, and in 1940 it was declared illegal. Subsequent events indicate that drugs only became illegal when imported in small quantities, but that somehow big business in drugs went on almost unchallenged. The wholesale slaughter of people, including teenagers, throughout the world, continues to stem from Hong Kong, an entrepot for drug distribution. Hundred of thousands of Hong Kong people are also miserable slaves of drug-addiction.

That this trade is either officially supported or covered up in certain quarters may be deduced from the following records.

In the year 1963/64, a number of Hong Kong residents gave information on drug-rackets in the areas known to them. The Government had asked for such information. Those making profit in the trade decided to take action.

Between January and June, 1964, a number of men were arrested. They had all given information about drugs. They were taken before the dreaded "Deportation Tribunal" and convicted of various offences, chief of which was membership of "Triad" societies. (A Triad society is an unregistered society, sometimes political in background, sometimes criminal, but not necessarily either of these things.)

A Deportation Tribunal is wrongly so-called. Unless the
charges are political, no deportation takes place, and the prisoners are detained for indefinite periods.

These Tribunals take place in the Supreme Court, behind closed doors. One lawyer representing an accused person at such a tribunal said that he had, to his own consternation, been "advised" not to enter the court. "This is the usual procedure." The accused is unable to find witnesses for the defence; they are intimidated. The police do not have to bring forward real witnesses for the prosecution: in the words of the Colonial Secretary of Hong Kong, recorded later, "It is not the practice to expose informers". The accused is then faced with a Judge or Magistrate and two other members of the Tribunal. The Police, or professional police witnesses, give evidence for the prosecution. The sole evidence of the crime may be a single policeman or a professional police witness who may say: "I heard this man say he was a member of such-and-such a Triad Society". The accused is then detained, sometimes for years.

In 1964, the above-mentioned persons were detained in this way, and the stories of some of them are reproduced below; space does not permit the inclusion of all, but they are available.
"We were detained without a reason..."

1. The Testimony of Fung Man-kit

   (This letter was addressed as a Petition to the Governor of Hong Kong.)

   Your Petitioner, Fung Man-kit, was arrested by the Anti-Triad Bureau on 21st June, 1964, and was detained in prison for 16 months.

   The reason for his imprisonment was that when he was working for the Press he published in some Chinese newspapers articles revealing the corruption of Police Officers giving protection to gambling-stalls, and opium and heroin dens. Thus they had a grudge against him. The charges made on his arrest were only fabrications, and misleading.

   Your Petitioner worked for the newspapers for over 10 years, and the fact that he was a law-abiding citizen under the Hong Kong Government may be checked from his records with the News Publication Section of the Secretariat for Chinese Affairs. This will prove what his work has always been.

   In January, 1965, a petition submitting all the facts about his being victimised was submitted to Your Excellency, with a request for an open trial of his case in order that he might be exonerated from the charges against him. Then, on 9th August, 1965, he was to be deported from the Colony, and was sent to the border of the People's Republic of China, but owing to some formality not being completed, the deportation could not be effected.

   Then, on 28th August, he was brought up for hearing before Mr Justice Briggs, Puisne Judge, at the Detention and Deportation Advisory Tribunal appointed by Your Excellency. After the facts of his case had been investigated, it was announced in court that Your Petitioner would be released on the condition that he would be subject to police supervision for two years, that the case would be submitted to Your Excellency, and that your Petitioner would be given back his freedom in three or four weeks.

   However, no news of his release came through, and he wrote to
the learned Judge to inquire. On 1st November, 1965, a reply was received from the said learned Judge to the effect that your Petitioner's case, together with the reason for the release, had been submitted to Your Excellency on 3rd September, and again on 2nd October, but that no order for his release had yet come through.

Then, on 9th November, he was notified by the Superintendent of Stanley Prison that he would be further detained. This order was dated 22nd September, 1965, and it is most puzzling to understand why the police delayed it, resulting in the learned Judge giving your Petitioner an incorrect reply. Also, what is the reason in law for this continuous detention for no fixed period? This is just not justified.

Your Petitioner therefore humbly begs that his case may again be looked into clearly by members of the Legislative and Executive Councils, that some members may be nominated to visit your Petitioner in person, in the hope that justice may be done, and a fair verdict may be reached (a conviction if your Petitioner's guilt is proved, and a release if otherwise).

He prays that he may be given an early reply, and shall be forever grateful if his release may be effected as soon as possible.

(signed) Fung Man-Kit, Detainee 800,
H.M. Stanley Prison.

*****

2. The Testimony of Yu Kit

I, Yu Kit, aged 29, have been living in Hong Kong for more than 22 years, and have been educated up to Form 5 standard. I am married with three children, and I have to support my parents.

From June, 1955 to June, 1959, I served in the Police Force as a Police Constable, and later I worked as a typist for the Universal News Agency. In 1960, a friend and I printed the "Hong Kong Today" Magazine, but we went bankrupt.
In 1963, I worked as a camera shop assistant at 322 Hennessy Road, Hong Kong. The working hours were very long, from 9 a.m. to 11 p.m., and I had one day off every two weeks.

In December of that year a friend of mine, Tse Kuen, came to see me, and he told me he was working as an informer for Assistant Superintendent Sutcliffe. Tse, an employee of the Shing Kar (Singer) Sewing Machine Company, held a British passport. He said that if I knew of any opium dens or gambling stalls in Kowloon, and informed him, I could earn money. I told him I had very little knowledge of that, but a friend of mine, Fung Man-Kit, who was a newspaper reporter, would be able to help him. Later I was persuaded to take pictures of opium dens and gambling stalls for him, and he paid me one dollar for every 2" x 3" picture. Tse took me to all these illegal places to take pictures.

Unfortunately, what I was doing was discovered by the Police and the operators of these illegal businesses, who work hand in hand with each other. I had been paid more than $500 by Mr Sutcliffe for my work, and he exhibited my pictures in court as evidence against illegal business operators, and he was very successful.

On 21st June, 1964, I was arrested by the Anti-Triad Society Bureau, charged, and appeared before the "secret court". The Court was told that I was a member of the 14K Triad Society, that I blackmailed opium dens and gambling stalls. A police witness, Lau Wai-Man, who, I knew, was a deportee but then worked as a police informer and professional witness for the police against those whom the police wished to charge, told the court that I once told him that I was a member of the 14K Triad Society. He also said that I had threatened the editor of the Ching Ying Daily. I would never be so stupid as to threaten a journalist who was no fool.

The Court only listened to the police and the "police witness", and I was detained for more than 20 months in Stanley Jail.

On August 28th, 1965, I appeared in the Supreme Court and the Judge told me that I would be free in about four weeks. But after eleven weeks, news came that I had to be detained indefinitely. I, along with others, staged a hunger-strike in protest.

Since my release, I still have to report to the Police once a
week, and must be home by 12 midnight. I have difficulty in finding a job. I would be grateful if you could prove I am innocent.

(signed) Yu Kit,
665, Block 16(K), Chai Wan R.E.
Hong Kong.

*********

3. The Testimony of Chan Ping-Kay

I, Chan Ping-Kay, live with my wife, five children, and my mother, at 6 Shing Wong Street, Central, Hong Kong. I joined the Hong Kong Special Branch of the Police in 1941.

Two days after the war ended, I reported for duty, and in December of that year, 1945, I was transferred to the detective division. I resigned in 1952. The two chief reasons for my resignation were:

1. I was told that I would be transferred to the uniformed police division and go on the beat in the street;

2. The owner of a restaurant in Central asked me to work for him, and he offered me a higher salary. He is my brother-in-law.

In 1956/57, a friend and I opened a garment factory, but we had to close because business was bad. From 1958-59, I worked as a "private eye" for a private detective agency; the following year I went back to the restaurant. From 1961-62 I worked as an investigator for the Hong Kong Payroll Security Corps.

When I was with the Police, I had arrested many people connected with the running of gambling-stalls and opium dens. I had also arrested many Triad Society members in Kowloon and the New Territories. After I left the police, as I have always hated Triad Societies, I often helped my former colleagues in their work.

I was arrested on 21st June, 1964, by the Anti-Triad Society
Bureau, and charged with being a fighter for the 14K Society, and with having been a member since 1941. This was the year I joined the Police, and they always thoroughly investigated every applicant joining the force.

I was arrested by detective Chan Hon-Ming and Wang Kar-Wai, and I was detained in Stanley Prison on 4th July, 1964. When I appeared in Court on 14th, 16th and 18th September, I denied all the charges laid against me, and I also denied that I knew Superintendent Sutcliffe.

On 28th August, 1965, I appeared in Court again, and the Judge ruled that I should be set free, but I should have to wait for a few weeks for the Governor's approval. I waited and waited, but finally bad news came that I had to be detained indefinitely. I, along with a few others, then staged a hunger-strike in protest. I was finally released on 23rd February, 1966.

I am now working as a clerk in an apartment house in Taipo, earning 150 dollars (less than £10) a month.

(signed)  Chan Ping-Kay.

**********
The Gass-Elliott Affair, 1966

Relatives of cases such as those already mentioned kept asking Mrs Elsie Elliott, elected Urban Councillor, to help them to get justice. She had been working on a similar case concerning one, Tsang Sang, for more than a year without getting anywhere near an investigation, when news came that a number of prisoners in Stanley Jail had gone on a hunger-strike to protest against unlawful detention.

Mrs Elliott rang up the Colonial Secretariat, and the Assistant Colonial Secretary confirmed that the men were detained and had staged a hunger strike. She warned that strong action would be taken if the men died. After that the men were forcibly fed, but no apparent action was taken either for their release or for their open trial. Between September and December, 1965, she appealed to the Colonial Secretariat no less than six times, but on no occasion did the answer promise an investigation of the complaints against unlawful detention.

With the permission of the Reform Club, Mrs Elliott then, on 1st February, 1966, proposed a Motion, seconded by the Senior Member of the Council, Mr Brook Bernacchi, O.B.E., J.P., O.C., Chairman of the Reform Club, drawing the attention of the Government to the complaints that threats of deportation were being used against law-abiding citizens. The Motion was a mild one, and gained the unanimous support of the appointed and elected members. The Chairman of the Council, a Government Official, stated that he had been "instructed" (later corrected to "advised") to oppose the Motion. All the Officials opposed, but the Motion was passed.

This Motion was given wide publicity, especially in the Chinese Press. Approval was expressed, though some Chinese newspapers criticised the Motion for its mildness, and said it should have called for an end to the Deportation Ordinance as it stood.

A fortnight later, residents of Hong Kong were shocked to see in large letters across their Sunday morning newspaper:

**COLONIAL SECRETARY BLASTS MRS ELLIOTT**

The Motion, and the correspondence that followed it, is of great
significance in revealing the malpractices that are shielded in Hong Kong. It is reproduced verbatim below.

I. Speech on the Motion by Mrs E. Elliott

In proposing this Motion, I am not unmindful of the words of the Attorney General, Mr Maurice Heenan, Q.C., at the opening of the 1966 Assizes. On that occasion, the Attorney General is reported to have said that if any deportation threats were being made in connection with minor offences, the threats were "entirely empty". The Attorney General reportedly went on to say that the Colony deportation regulations were put to only "limited use", and were "reserved for those cases where the protection of society demands their use".

I do not doubt that the original intention of the deportation regulations was the protection of our society in Hong Kong. I do not doubt that often such threats are empty, a kind of bogey to frighten the ignorant into obedience.

There was a time years ago when I too, should have disbelieved if I had been told that these threats were not just "empty threats". I used to work amongst what were then called "refugees". I often heard them complain that if they spoke against anything the Government did, or if they reported malpractices, they would be in danger of deportation. I laughed off such statements as hearsay, and always told the people to disregard that kind of talk. They were not convinced; and now it is I who am not convinced that such threats are always just hearsay, or empty

It is commonly said that the threat of deportation is used thousands of times a day. I am prepared to believe that this may only be hearsay, or, at worst, in many cases the threats are intended as bogeys to frighten obstreperous hawkers. Even so, it is deplorable that ignorant people should be unduly frightened into obedience. Besides, such threats can be used to cover up malpractices, and for this reason alone, are to be deplored.

In the past two years, however, I have found that these threats are used in all seriousness, and I should like to quote three examples known to me personally, in which threats were used in connection with serious offences; in one case, the threat was carried out.
One case concerns a hawker, who was alleged to have been seriously injured by an officer of the law. (His rib was broken.) Though I did not see the offence against the hawker committed, I did see the commotion that resulted, and the anger of the bystanders against the officer who had inflicted the injury. In view of the serious nature of the injury, I engaged a solicitor to investigate the case. I accompanied the solicitor to find witnesses. The witnesses were numerous, amounting to dozens of people. They were all angry, but when asked to appear in court as witnesses, they said it was impossible. On being pressed for a reason for this lack of civic spirit, they said they had been threatened. The hawkers standing in the vicinity of the incident had been photographed and each one warned that if they took any part in any court proceedings against the accused officer, they would be deported and their families would suffer; moreover their stalls would be confiscated. No one dared to stand as witness, and the case failed. One man, not a hawker who originally said he saw the incident and would appear as a witness, was imprisoned under the deportation regulations a short time before the case was heard. He was charged with being a member of a Triad Society. This may or may not have been true. It seems almost certain that many citizens are forced to become Triad members; they are thereby frightened into crime protection; those who fail to carry out their oath of secrecy to the Triad Society soon find themselves in trouble. I can vouch for the truth of this case. It is not second-hand information; I worked closely with the solicitor on the case.

An even more serious use is being made of these deportation regulations to frighten witnesses from reporting drug rackets. From the mouth of a police inspector who works on drugs, I have it that anyone giving information about drugs is at once suspected and is investigated as a potential blackmailer-informer. I personally know a woman who reported drugs, and she was certainly not a blackmailer.

After giving information which she had carefully collected because she felt it her civic duty to do so, she was arrested, and made to report daily at the Police Station. She gave information as to which police officers were involved in the street where she lived. The case was a big one, and it recently appeared in the Press. The woman should have been the principal witness, but she was forbidden to enter the Court on pain of deportation. She did not appear in the court, and the small fry were convicted; none of the police involved appeared in the dock.
These threats may be dubbed "empty threats", but at least they were enough to pervert judgment in two cases.

Now let me mention a case in which the threats were not empty. A man informed the police of a heroin racket in his neighbourhood. Others supported him at first, until he was arrested under the deportation regulations. I have checked this case very carefully with the help of a European ex-police inspector and two solicitors. Several facts have come to light which should be viewed with great alarm. The others gained courage when they saw that their comrade was imprisoned, and for nearly two years they have tried to show the case to be one of framing. Some who witnessed for the prosecution say that they did not have any serious charge against the man, and that they were taken to some building in a covered car; they did not know where they were, and they did not actually have to speak. One man refused to give false witness, though he was offered a favour to do so. No witnesses for the defence were called. The solicitor for the defence was excluded from the majority of the hearing; he expressed grave concern about it but could do nothing. This man, for whom I have tried for nearly two years to get a public trial, was one of those who recently went on a hunger strike. Perhaps these men can find no other way of protesting against injustice.

These deportation regulations are said to be for the protection of the public. Yet if each case is examined, it will be found that the men under detention are (in my experience at least) all little men. Many of them have tried to report crime, and have been accused of blackmail and triad activities. None of these men are big enough to be involved in the biggest crime of all, drug importation and manufacture, crimes much worse than blackmail.

Threats of deportation make a wonderful weapon for the organisers of crime. What better weapon could any master criminal possess than to be able to pay a few false witnesses, threaten real witnesses, and have his informant tried secretly where he knows even the solicitor will have no say, and where he knows the Magistrate and the other members of the Tribunal have no means of checking the truth of the charges brought against the victim?

Mr Chairman, our motion is limited, dealing only with THREATS of deportation. If we, as a responsible civic body, will express our concern to the Government that some civil servants are
using their positions to express threats of deportation against law-abiding citizens, I should sincerely hope that the Government would then review the position and see that more harm than good is being done by regulations that admittedly deprive human beings of the most elementary right, the right of public trial. It is bad enough that such action must take place in political cases, but when it appears evident that these regulations are now being used by the most vicious elements as a shield to protect organised crime, it is surely time to consider whether the danger of such a law is not greater than the protection it provides the public.

This is a matter that must be the concern of every citizen, and for that reason I have no hesitation in bringing it to the notice of my colleagues; I ask you to support the Motion, in the name of justice.

The day after the passing of this motion in the Urban Council, one of the secretaries from the Colonial Secretariat rang up asking for Mrs Elliott to give the names of the persons mentioned in the three cases. Hoping that at last some action would be taken in the cases, Mrs Elliott gave all the names and information she could. Soon after, the following attack was made on her by the Colonial Secretary, Mr M. D. I. Gass. The attack was sent to her by letter, and at the same time given to the Press for publication in full.

Soon after, and by the end of February, the prisoners had been set free, without open trial or explanation.

2. The Colonial Secretary Attacks

Colonial Secretariat,
Hong Kong.
12th February, 1966.

Madam,

I would refer to my letter to you dated 1st December, 1965.
2. My attention has now been drawn to a speech made by you in the Urban Council on 1st February, 1966, on a subject outside the scope of the business of that Council. In that speech you saw fit to make three allegations of a most serious nature against Government servants, presumably relying on the shield of privilege which is available to Urban Councillors when acting bona fide for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the Urban Council Ordinance. Such conduct on your part can only result in a loss of confidence by the public in the Police Force with a resulting reduction in the effectiveness of the efforts by that body to maintain law and order.

3. As a result of an enquiry addressed to you by my officers, the three cases to which you refer have been identified, and I am now in a position to dispose of some of your statements as being false or misleading.

In the case of the hawker claiming to be injured by an Officer

You state: "I did see... the anger of the bystanders against the officer who inflicted the injury".

You also state: "No-one dared to stand as witness and the case failed".

The Court record shows that, in fact, in support of the hawker's case, his daughter and two other hawkers did dare to stand as witnesses and give their evidence. The case did not, therefore, fail because of the absence of witnesses, but because the magistrate, having heard evidence on both sides, decided that the officer was entitled to acquittal.

You state: "One man... who originally said he saw the incident and would appear as a witness was imprisoned under the Deportation Regulations a short time before the case was heard".

One potential witness, and presumably this is the one to whom you refer, was convicted before the ordinary criminal courts on a charge of possession of dangerous drugs and was sentenced to seven months' imprisonment. He was available to be brought to give evidence in the case prosecuted by the hawker, but no application was made by the hawker's solicitor for this to be done. He was at no time the
subject of deportation proceedings.

In the case of the woman who gave information to the Police concerning drug offences.

You state: "She gave information as to which Police Officers were involved in the street where she lived."

"...none of the Police involved appeared in the Dock."

*In a signed statement given by this woman to the Police, she did not identify a single Police Officer as being involved in the case. Police investigation on which the successful prosecution was launched did not disclose a prima facie case against any Police Officer.

You state: "The woman should have been the principal witness, but she was forbidden to enter the court, on pain of deportation."

At the time when the case commenced the whereabouts of the woman were not known. In her statement to the Police she had indicated that she was not willing to give evidence or to attempt to pick out suspects in identification parades. Even if she had been willing to give evidence it is unlikely that she would have been called by the prosecution because, among other reasons -

(I) it is not the practice to expose informers; and

(II) the information she had given was not available in the form of evidence obtained by Police observation.

You state: "After giving information,... she was arrested, and made to report daily at the Police Station."

This woman gave her information to the Police in December, 1963. She was arrested in July, 1964. The case had begun in May. This arrest therefore was in no way connected with her role as a potential witness.

*Note Witnesses are asked to sign statements in a language they do not understand. (English)
You state: "She did not appear in court, and the small fry were convicted."

The gravity of their offences and the extent to which they were involved, as principals, is reflected in the sentences which were imposed, and these varied from five to seven years' imprisonment.

In the case of the man who informed the Police of a heroin racket and was thereafter arrested.

This man was not arrested because he had been giving information to the Police. *You have not produced any information concerning any prior threats.

You state: "No witnesses for the defence were called."

If this man or his solicitor had chosen to call any witnesses, they would have been heard by the Tribunal.

4. The remainder of your statements are not sufficiently detailed to identify individuals or to establish the places and times when things are supposed to have happened. You have been told repeatedly, and I reiterate once more, that if you know of witnesses willing to come forward in support of any allegations, your duty is to give this information to the appropriate authority or to myself, and also to encourage these witness to perform their part. I trust that in such a case there would be no suggestion that the authorities would seek to victimise witnesses whose names and intentions were known to you in advance.

5. As is normal, any such complaint made by you or any other member of the community backed by first-hand evidence, will in the first instance, be investigated by the department immediately concerned. On the basis of the report of such investigation, Government will decide what further action, if any, is called for.

6. In view of the publicity which was accorded to your speech in certain

*Note  The Commissioner of Police had refused to listen when told of such threats in February, 1965.
Hong Kong newspapers, I am arranging for this letter also to be made public.

I am, Madam,
Your obedient servant,
M. D. Irving Gass,
Colonial Secretary.

...........

This letter raised a furore in the Press, especially the Chinese and non-government-influenced Press. People urged Mrs Elliott to repeat the charges outside the Council, to see if Mr Gass would dare to take action. In an interim reply, Mrs Elliott repeated the charges, stating: "It did not enter my mind for one moment that I might be shielded by Urban Council privilege... since my letters to you and my articles in the Press in recent months have given you ample opportunity to bring the matter into the open court... I have no intention of tying your hands." She ended by saying: "I assure you too that I have no fear of any threats, since justice and truth must eventually prevail."

A solicitor was then engaged to check the three cases mentioned in the Urban Council, and on 12th March, 1966, the following reply, drafted by the solicitor, was sent to Mr Gass:

The Colonial Secretary,
Hong Kong.

Sir,

I have received your letters dated 12th and 26th February. (The latter was a reminder.)

Dealing first with the case of the hawker who alleged he had been assaulted by a police officer, it is impossible for anyone who has consulted the Court records as you claim to have done to write in the way you have written without laying himself open to the accusation of quoting selectively from them in order to mislead the public and damage my reputation. I care nothing for the latter, but I am amazed that you
should have cheapened your office and so damaged the Government by concealing facts which, if disclosed, would have destroyed the basis of your argument.

You state in your letter, "The Court record shows that, in fact, in support of the hawker's case, his daughter and two other hawkers did dare to stand as witnesses and to give their evidence." I am sure you would not use the word "dare" merely because I did so in my speech; you claimed, and I quote from your letter, to be in a position to dispose of some of my statements as being "false or misleading". The Court record in fact shows that the hawkers in question both had to be subpoenaed in order to ensure their attendance at Court. The relevant evidence of one of them as shown by the Court record is as follows:

(I have omitted evidence relating to the alleged assault)

"...Yes, I saw the inspector some days later at the market.... He spoke to me at my stall. He said to me, "If you go to Court and give evidence as a witness, ten days after I will have you arrested to Stanley and deported after a month. Deportation is something of which I am afraid.... He came to my stall and threatened me twice. I know these are serious allegations. I am not telling lies.... Yes, he threatened to have me arrested and deported.... Yes, he threatened me for fear I might instigate other people.... The stalls on my left and right knew about this. I did not go to the Police about this. It did not occur to me to report this to the police station because I was afraid the procedure would be tedious. No, I did not discuss this threat with anybody. The inspector did threaten me.... No, I would not have come to Court to give evidence if not subpoenaed. I would not have come because I do not know what the four-eyed man would do to create trouble. I mean the inspector. He wears spectacles. I request Your Worship to protect me. I am afraid."

According to the dictionary, the verb "dare" means either to have courage or impudence; I am sure you would not suggest that it is impudent to give evidence against a police officer. If you think that that witness's evidence shows that he came to court freely, that he dared to do so, then our understanding of the English language is very different; it is quite apparent that you selectively quoted from the court record, omitting all that was inconvenient or embarrassing to you. An untruth can be as much a matter of omission as a positive statement, and I am left with no alternative but to regard you as a person who is prepared to
mislead the public by suppressing material facts within his own knowledge. It may be that this has resulted from imperfect information being given to you; if that is so, you will, I am sure, take full responsibility for the letter you signed.

Before this case came to court, the same witness made a statutory declaration on 10th July, 1964, to the effect that he had been threatened with deportation if he gave evidence in connection with the alleged assault. I now enclose a copy of it. Two days after I made my speech in the Urban Council, this same man was visited by a policeman at about 10 p.m. Presumably this policeman was acting on superior orders; he asked the man to recall, as far as he could, the evidence given in the Magistrate’s Court and, in particular, whether he had been subpoenaed. The man confirmed that he had been. With the Court record being available for inspection, this seems a quaint way to conduct inquiries but it does make even worse your claim that this man had "dared" to give evidence. I also enclose a further statutory declaration made by this man. I have now ascertained that I may have been wrong when I said in my speech that one other witness was detained under the deportation regulations; the solicitor, who alone knew the facts, was away from Hong Kong at the time. (See footnote*)

The fact remains that there is a statutory declaration in existence to the effect that the threat of deportation had been made to a potential witness - the gist of my complaint.

I would, in passing, refer to the daughter whom you mentioned as having "dared" to give evidence. So that it may be realised what weight can be attached to her "daring", I think it should be pointed out that at the relevant time, she was ten years old.

*Note There were, in fact, two non-hawker witnesses who offered evidence of having seen the kicking. Both of them were soon after in prison, but as one could not be traced it was presumed he was under deportation. The solicitor refrained from using either as witness, as their imprisonment would have discredited them as witnesses. The hawker had a hospital record to show rib injury. The case finally failed on a technical point, as to how many kicks had been administered. The writer is convinced that the police officer would have been convicted if all those who saw the incident had dared to speak.
(The next passage of the letter tells how this hawker witness was later penalised by having the goods from his stall seized soon after for no apparent reason, while the hawker who complained of being injured was arrested, taken a distance of about four miles, and released to have to push his barrow back home, no charge having been laid; the latter was simply told that the inspector whom he had charged with kicking him had ordered his arrest.)

I now turn to the second case I mentioned in my speech, that of a woman who, in December, 1963, gave information to the police which eventually resulted in a successful prosecution for "narcotics offences". You say in your letter that because she was arrested in July, 1964, and the case had "begun" in May, this shows that her arrest was in no way connected with her role as a potential witness.

I am sure you are right in what you say, but would you please give me the reason for this woman's arrest as she has never been told. Is it not a fact that the case was not concluded until the following September, and that it would have been possible for her to be a witness at the time of her arrest? It seems that a policeman, whom she had met the previous March when she showed him a convenient observation point to watch for "narcotics offences", arrested her in July, 1964. This policeman took the woman first to one then another police station and eventually she was detained overnight in Kowloon City Police Station. The next day she was taken to *Li Po Chun Chambers, where a European inspector complained that she had not reported to him regularly. Although she pointed out that she had been specifically told on 17th March, 1964, that it was no longer required of her to give the police further information, she had to report at Li Po Chun Chambers on the succeeding days of that week every morning at 9 a.m., and she was not allowed to leave until 5 p.m. On the first day she had to produce bail of $100 at Yaumati Police Station. On the Saturday of that week, **she signed a statement and her bail was returned to her at Yaumati Police Station. This procedure seems curious to say the least of it.

Notes *Anti-Narcotics Bureau.

**This indicates the pressure under which witnesses have to sign statements.
You say in your letter that this woman did not identify a single police officer as being involved in the case. I am told that when she reported that she had pointed out to a police constable on the beat that he was walking by people who were openly committing "narcotics offences", she was laughed at; on 17th March, 1964, when she reported the activities of a Chinese police sergeant which she thought were suspicious, she was asked to give no further information.

There is in your letter one instance where you seriously misquoted me on this case. I never suggested that she was arrested to prevent her giving evidence. In my speech I said, "The woman should have been the principal witness, but she was forbidden to enter the court, on pain of deportation." This fact she has confirmed to me since the date of my speech.

As far as the third case is concerned, it is obvious that here we shall never reach any consensus of opinion as I am convinced, but you are not, that the man in question was framed. You will be aware that on February 16th, he was released from detention after having been detained for 25 months with no criminal charge ever having been laid against him. I have no doubt that his detention was legal but it does seem remarkable that it was only after one Supreme Court Judge, whose recommendation for his release from detention was rejected by the Governor had resigned from the Deportation Tribunal, that this man was eventually released. If the charges against him were justified, then he must still be a danger to the community. The fact that he has been released would seem to argue otherwise, but yet it took 25 months for the matter to be concluded.

(Then follows a paragraph about a technical point in his release)

In your letter you state that if any investigations were to be made into any of my allegations, they would in the first instance be made by the department immediately concerned. I presume that the misinformation in your letter was as a result of investigation by the "departments immediately concerned".

In your letter of 26th February, you expanded upon what you had said earlier concerning the shield of privilege. If my speech was a proper speech to have been made in the Urban Council, then surely it is for this very reason that privilege exists. If, on the other hand, it was
not a proper speech to have been made, then there is no question of privilege arising. If the words of your letter of 17th February did not constitute a threat, I should be glad to know what they did mean, and what was the purpose of your saying them.

Yours faithfully,

E. Elliott.

..............

It should be pointed out that the South China Morning Post, a newspaper which always supports the Establishment, and which gave headline publicity to Mr Gass's now famous "blast" at Mrs Elliott, gave only a brief summary of her answer, and failed to print the full text of the reply when requested.

..............

The Colonial Secretary replied to the above letter on 28th April, after Mrs Elliott reached London. She has therefore been unable to check the accuracy or otherwise of what the Colonial Secretary has stated. She would, however, point out the following:

In all correspondence, the Colonial Secretary carefully skates around the substance of the Motion, that threats of deportation were used. He refuses to give the reason why the woman was arrested after giving information on narcotics, on the grounds that it would "be improper to damage her reputation". Yet the woman herself was neither charged, nor given the reason for her arrest!

In his final reply the Colonial Secretary offers to investigate any of the matters mentioned in Mrs Elliott's reply, on her furnishing more information. As he had claimed to have made an investigation before his strong "blast", it seems a little late now to offer an investigation.

The Colonial Secretary (Hong Kong) has consistently asked for information, but refused to consider it when given. When the Reform Club made a serious report on crime, he said the charges were too general
and should be more specific. When Mrs Elliott was specific, he charged
that the allegations were "false or misleading".

Yet the Hong Kong public knows what is going on, and is afraid to
ask for investigation, or justice. The writer is, at the time of writing,
allegedly being framed on a charge of having paid young rioters to throw
stones and commit violence. Boy demonstrators, who claim they were
forced to plead guilty to violent rioting, allege that they were viciously
beaten by the police to force them to sign statements to the effect that
they were paid to riot. One youth arrested in connection with the riots
said he was forced by police to sign his name on 21 sheets of blank paper.
Ordinances Postponed

1. **Commissions of Inquiry Ordinance, 1966**

Hard on the heels of this episode in which a number of so-called deportees were released, came the new Commissions of Inquiry Ordinance, 1966. How far it was intended to cover up existing cracks in the Deportation Ordinance may never be known. But close the cracks it would have done.

There is no space here to repeat the Bill in full, but clauses are quoted to show that it was a retrograde step in democratic free institutions and human rights. Section 4, Paragraph (i) gives the Commission of Inquiry the power to "exclude from the inquiry or any part thereof any person including any person implicated or concerned in the inquiry and his legal representatives"; Paragraph (j) of the same Section gives the Commission power to "prohibit the publication or disclosure by any person attending before the Commission of all or part of the material received by the Commission".

Section 6 (1) states that "Any person whose conduct is the subject of an inquiry, or who is implicated or concerned in the subject matter of the inquiry, shall, subject to the provisions of paragraph (1) of Section 4, be entitled to be represented by a barrister or solicitor at the inquiry, but such right shall entitle the person or his legal representative to hear only such evidence or see only such articles or documents as the Commission shall decide."

But, most wonderful of all is the provision for "extra-territorial rights" for Government servants: (Section 6, Para. (3) "The Governor, any Government department and any public officer shall notwithstanding any of the provisions of this Ordinance be entitled to be represented at the inquiry by a legal officer, or by a barrister or solicitor who may -

(a) address the Commission on any matter on which he is so instructed by the Colonial Secretary or by the Attorney General, and

(b) produce evidence in such form as the Commission may permit on any matter."
These regulations are in fact already being applied in Detention cases, but this appears to have been an attempt to rush through a Bill to make such actions legal. The attempt was the more suspicious in that it was made during the Budget Debate, when everyone was intent on discussing the new taxes.

When the attention of the barristers was drawn to the Bill, they acted swiftly and ruthlessly. Within a few days petitions were signed, and at the eleventh hour the "Bill of Injustice" as it was labelled, was postponed.

Public confidence was deeply shaken by this attempt. Public confidence would be more shaken if all the facts of the cases already quoted could be brought into the light of day.

One man, Sun Wong, who is able to name the persons to whom he paid bribes for protection of gambling, but who was framed when he could no longer pay, is still under detention. It is difficult to trace his whereabouts in prison, but in a letter dated 16th March, 1966, the Commissioner of Police stated that he "is detained by virtue of a Warrant for Further Detention issued by the President of the Deportation and Detention Advisory Tribunal under Emergency (Deportation and Detention) Regulations, 1962, pursuant to the Governor's Warrant for Arrest and Detention under the Deportation of Aliens Ordinance." The man is 63 years old, and has lived in Hong Kong for 59 years. He is still considered an alien in a predominantly Chinese community! His crime? He knew too much about corruption and could no longer co-operate with the police. As the man has not been tried he is, under British Law, still innocent. But not in Hong Kong. There a man is guilty when he is innocent - and without a trial.

2. Pharmacy and Poisons Bill, 1966

This time it is the medical profession that has stepped on a Bill that requires the closest investigation by the British Government in London.

According to newspaper reports on 12th May, 1966, the second and third readings (usually done at one sitting) were postponed "in order to consider and include into the Bill recommendations from the medical professions". The doctors apparently have objected to having no representative of their profession on the Pharmacy Board, and the Bill was
stated to have "a lot of gaps". The drugs coming before the Board would include dangerous drugs.

Some doctors gave even higher priority to the fact that the Bill's controls excluded poisons to be exported to purchasers outside the Colony. Some have the uneasy feeling that these drugs are sold uncontrolled to Macau, and then "filter back into the Colony".

The charge is a serious one and requires strict investigation.
Other Cases waiting for Investigation

Besides the cases of alleged injustice already given in detail in the preceding pages, the following persons have also demanded that they be given a fair investigation or trial:

Open trial required:

Mr Tsang Sang of Ma Shim Pai Village, Tsuen Wan, whose case is referred to in the Gass-Elliott Dispute.

Mr Cheung Loi of 809 Hoi Pong Street, G/F, Cheung Chau Island, who was also accused of being a member of a Triad Society because he had in some way helped to report drugs.

Mr Tai Kwok Lam of 333 Block 21, Wong Tai Sin R.E., who was arrested after reporting drugs, joined the hunger-strike protest, and demanded an open trial but was ignored.

Mr Chan Yin of 127 Sun Shing Road, Shek Wu Market, Sheung Shui, who was dismissed from the police after reporting corruption, and arrested after informing on drugs.

Investigation into Unlawful Dismissal of Civil Servants

Mr Alan Ellis of 12A Kin Fung Mansion, Austin Avenue, Hong Kong, recruited in London to the Hong Kong Police Force in 1963, services discontinued after he reported certain malpractices.

Mr Cheung Chai Ming dismissed after reporting the arrest of seven prisoners on drug charges, of whom five were allegedly released unlawfully by the officer-in-charge.

Mr X, Chinese ex-Policeman now living in London wishes to remain anonymous, though his name and address are available; he fears losing his job. He reports eight police dismissed without proper reason, and failure to give proper investigation into the allegation that they were scapegoats.

Numerous cases of miscarriage of justice due to fixing of
evidence by police also await investigation, e.g., the case of Tsang Sau Yung, whose ten year old child was sold to a man, made to work, and raped. Evidence was so arranged that the man was only put on bond, while the mother was falsely alleged to have signed a statement saying she had beaten the child and caused her to run away.

Other cases include accidents in which evidence of careless driving, or of driving and killing a child in a road closed to traffic await investigation. The Hong Kong Traffic Police ignore all such protests, and the Hong Kong Government never makes investigations into complaints.

A Royal Commission of Inquiry or Parliamentary Inquiry will find thousands of these cases, but under the present system in Hong Kong, none of the complainants would dare to lay a charge; to ask the Government to investigate would produce no result.

Human rights are being flouted, and there is no redress as all abuses are protected by the Government system, which includes beatings, corruption, perjury and intimidation.

Note Several civil servants at present in Government employment in Hong Kong have offered to give information to a Royal Commission of Inquiry, but they would be unwilling to speak to any member of the Hong Kong Government, as no action would be taken, and they would lose their posts. The number includes Policemen.

Even the Judiciary is muzzled, in spite of declarations to the contrary; their position is no more free than that of civil servants. Barristers have to renew their certificates every year, and can have them refused on the decision of a single judge, according to the 1962 Ordinance.
Is the Colony of Hong Kong "different"?

For more than a century the business politicians of Hong Kong have staved off constitutional reform by crying that Hong Kong is different, and wants to keep the old colonial status quo.

It is true to some extent that Hong Kong is different in that, like Gibraltar, she is not an entity; Hong Kong is only a chip off the great country of China, and more than 95% of her people are Chinese. Hong Kong could not therefore become independent without creating another Chinese Government, which would be intolerable to Peking.

But it is untrue to say that the people are content with nineteenth century colonial business government. Though the law-making councils have been increased in the number of members, they are still the same people, Big Business. Not one of them represents the ordinary run of Hong Kong's population. Not one of them has been "freely chosen", to quote from the Queen's recent speech.

Hong Kong is at the moment being run by a handful of civil servants and a handful of wealthy, influential families, determined to preserve for themselves as much as possible of the prosperity of the Colony. The rest are like dogs who may, if they wish, pick up the crumbs that fall from the masters' tables. If they do not like that, they can "get back to China", regardless of where they were born.

Various arguments have been put forward as to why Hong Kong is "better" as an anachronism in the midst of modern industrial progress. These arguments are dealt with in the pages that follow; fundamentally there is only one argument for maintaining the status quo: it suits those who hold the purse-strings.

Argument Number One

"China would not like it." 

On what this argument is based it would be difficult to conceive. That China could not tolerate an independent Hong Kong on her doorstep, with the possibility of another power entering, is understandable. No one has asked for that.
Could China honestly complain if efforts were made to give the less-privileged Chinese people a fairer deal? She would hardly be likely to admit to such sentiments, though undoubtedly there are a few fanatics, as in all political parties, who would rather see the people suffer than see them happier under anything but their own ideology. This is probably not the sentiment of the Chinese Government.

From time to time China is jibed for allowing this "fester ing sore" (Hong Kong) right on her doorstep. She would at least be free from that taunt if Hong Kong were to clean up. It is commonly believed that China welcomes the British in Hong Kong because it gives her a back-door for trade. Judging by the prosperity of Chinese concerns in Hong Kong (partly because they supply the kind of goods the Chinese like and partly because the prices are reasonable and the service good) one would scarcely imagine that China would object to any changes that would make her less vulnerable to taunts of neglecting her own people in Hong Kong.

Argument Number Two

"If Hong Kong has representative government she will become a battleground for Nationalist and Communist elements."

If Hong Kong became independent that would most certainly happen. Under continued British rule it would not happen. China would not wish it at the moment for the reasons already given. The Nationalists would have no more power than at present. Those who came to Hong Kong with the Nationalist Government are now almost 20 years older, and some are dead. Many have lost hope in a Nationalist return, though a few still continue to hope. Half the population is under the age of twenty, and can remember nothing of the reasons for political struggle in China; they are more likely (as recently demonstrated) to be a danger to the colony if their lot continues to be that of the underprivileged. Hong Kong should foster a spirit of loyalty to Hong Kong and its people, a sense of civic responsibility, a feeling of belonging. Without this kind of civic teaching, education is hollow, only a tool for money-making and selfishness.

If no attempt is made to give some measure of self-determination and self-respect to our young people, we shall in the future not hear cries of "Down with Communism" or "Down with Nationalism", but it
will be as has already been heard in recent riots, "Down with colonialism!" Those who used the term probably did not know its meaning. Have they heard it used by their elders in connection with oppression and injustice? It would be strange, in Hong Kong's atrocious circumstances if they had not!

**Argument Number Three**

"The people of Hong Kong are not ready to take part in political life. They show no interest."

This argument seems to contradict the one used as argument two. Yet the same people will offer both arguments (vide certain English-language newspapers), which seems to suggest that any argument will do if one is determined to prove a theory.

No, the Hong Kong people will never be interested in politics if we keep them like beasts of burden. They will, however, still understand what human rights are, and eventually they will demand them. They are not informed on the principles of socialism or other ideologies unless they have been to high-school, and even then, these politics seem far removed from their lives.

But the people do understand when they are being treated unjustly, being robbed of their rights; and after all, what is that but politics?

It sometimes seems that Hong Kong would be better to have representatives who do not stand for any political ideology, but who are chosen for their principles, their dedication to the people, their personal integrity. This would, in fact, not only work for the welfare of the people, but would satisfy those who still fear politics in Hong Kong. However, one cannot lay down rules. The people know those who treat them justly, and recent elections indicate that they choose personalities rather than parties for the Urban Council.

**Argument Number Four**

"If Hong Kong had representative government, would not the rich people take away their wealth from the Colony."

This is a very common, but very doubtful argument. It may take
some expert economist to judge. Or maybe the experts miss what the amateurs see.

The kind of people who might remove to other places (if there are any other places left to go) are not the kind whose money is really of benefit to Hong Kong. They are sending the bulk of their profits abroad and not ploughing them back into the colony. We do not belittle the fact that they are making employment, but local people could do just as well, and for less profit, and they would be more likely to use their profit in the colony.

Hong Kong is at the moment run largely by monopolies which waste a lot of money on overseas investment, and on the high salaries of overseas staff. Hong Kong should encourage local industries run by local people. Hong Kong should encourage technical education for local people. The universities should offer courses that would provide local men for government posts, saving greatly on salaries now paid to expatriates, expert and otherwise.

Since 1843, Hong Kong has always been the city of gold for outside prospectors to drain out the money; now it should become a self-contained colony with its eyes on internal development for the local people.

Argument Number Five

"Hong Kong will revert to China in a few years' time, so why worry about constitutional changes?"

This is, to say the least, an argument of the ignorant. Hong Kong Island was ceded to Britain in 1843 and Kowloon in 1860. No arrangements were made for these two parts to be returned to China. The New Territories were leased in 1898 for a period of 99 years, and are due to revert to China in 1997.

In the thirty-one years between, anything could happen. For one thing, man may be on the moon. Hong Kong cannot be left to rot until then. It is doubtful if the people of Hong Kong will endure even another decade under present conditions.

China has made no demand for the return of the three entities known as the Colony of Hong Kong. What will happen in 1997 remains
to be seen: a whole generation lies between. And what kind of generation will it be? This is the matter that should concern the British Government.
What has hindered Hong Kong's constitutional development?

There can be only one answer to that question: Big Business.

From the inception of the Colony, in 1843, successive Governors have studied the question of how Hong Kong should be governed.

Sir John Davis said when he was Governor in 1844: "It is not possible to nominate to seats on the Councils anyone except officials, because almost every person possessed of capital who is not connected with government is employed in the opium trade." (Endacott, "Government and People in Hong Kong", Page 40)

Bonham, when he was Governor, however, was on good terms with the merchants, and he began the system that has continued ever since, for the Governor to appoint unofficial members to the Councils. The first two were Jardine and Edger. From that time there was always a representative of Jardines, and he came to be known as "the member for East Point".

In 1855, Governor Bowring requested an elected element, and said that "action should not be delayed until the need of reform produced a popular clamour". He could just as easily have said the same words a hundred years later, or yesterday, since there is still no elected member; there has been a popular clamour of discontent too. Instead, in Bowring's time, more heads of merchant houses and influential persons were appointed. This antiquated practice has continued up to the present day.

A petition for constitutional reform signed by Hong Kong rate-payers in 1894 was opposed by the merchants, including Keswick, head of Jardines.

It is significant that in 1889, William Keswick (whose family is related closely to the Jardines), Sir Alfred Dent, and some retired officials, set up the China Association in London, and according to Endacott, an authority on Hong Kong, "For long the China Association had the ear of the Foreign Office." (Page 125) It is also significant that in the pages of Hong Kong's history, the question of drugs and
corruption keeps cropping up; on all occasions the reformer against corruption seems to have come off badly. Hong Kong has never been known for high morals, and that, not just of the Chinese; it is even more true of the Europeans.

To come closer to our own time, a valiant effort was made by Governor Sir Mark Young, immediately after World War II. Wide public interest was shown in the Governor's plan to reform both the Urban Council and the Legislative Council. But like all who talk of reform, Sir Mark Young was apparently not pressed to stay and see the plan through; he retired in 1947. Endacott remarks: "It is quite clear that the British colonial authorities retained confidence in the traditional mode of assessing public opinion through the unofficial members of the Legislative Council". (Page 186)

The Young Plan was finally defeated by the intervention of D.F. Landale of Jardines, and Sir Man Kam Lo who "doubted how far these public bodies (the Reform Clubs) represented the views of a substantial section of the community". (Page 191) Obviously to him, the "community" meant only the few families represented in the Legislative Council. His views coincide with those held today. Very few people in Hong Kong qualify to be included in "the community"! Except, of course, when work is involved!

In 1952, the Reform Club stressed "that no real constitutional advancement can be expected until there are reforms in the Legislature and elections to the Legislative Council".

In 1960, the Reform Club and the Civic Association made united representations to the Colonial Office in London. The effort met with no success, being opposed by the same people.

Successive official visitors to Hong Kong on behalf of the London Government have been informed that Hong Kong does not desire to change the status quo. These visitors have always been taken to "the right places" by "the right people". They have concluded, as Lord Lansdowne did in 1963, that the present system is "workable". Says Endacott, "The judgment however rests on the assumption that being "workable" is the sole criterion and ignores the fact that in the long term, government can be based only on the alternative of popular consent and the security forces." (Page 243)
Hong Kong does, in fact, depend upon the security forces to protect the government from the people in times such as 10th October, 1956 and 6th April, 1966.

Under what special mandate of heaven does Britain deny entirely any right of self-government to four million people?
Results of Malpractices and Non-representative Government

Anyone who labours under the illusion that non-democratic Government ever works should closely study the results of the dictatorial police state, Hong Kong. Shakespeare must have known something of this when he talked of "the delays of office", but Shakespeare lived in feudal times.

Licences and permits for anything may be delayed until such time as the victimised public has paid squeeze. Honest civil servants find themselves completely frustrated and either leave public service or become lifeless yes-men. There are exceptions, but few. Cases of corruption appear frequently in newspapers, but the readers should not be deceived: these are sometimes only scapegoats to convince the gullible short-term residents (mostly European) that stern action is being taken. Some of those convicted for drug-addiction are paid to stand accused, and some are charged for the purpose of victimisation, as undoubtedly was the case of a witness in the Gass-Elliott argument.

One Department requiring immediate investigation is the Immigration Department, which apparently makes its own regulations on the spur of the moment, and which is notorious throughout the Far East. Complaints of discrimination against Hong Kong citizens in other Far Eastern countries also need investigation. The Hong Kong Government does not protect the local people against such humiliations.

Books could be written on the numerous petty and well as large payments that have to be made by citizens before they can get their just rights. The Government denies them all, and demands such proof as would require a receipt for bribes from the receiver. The public is always wrong, the Government always right.
Miscellaneous Complaints

Again these are too numerous to be described in detail. The administration of the Government is grossly inefficient, though there are some heads of departments, and some officials in departments, that stand out as splendid exceptions. How frustrated such officials must feel can only be imagined; they are not permitted to speak up, and would soon be fired if they did. Meanwhile the work on social progress advances slowly: too much time is wasted on illegal activities, too much money goes into private pockets.

There are still children without education, probably as many as 20 per cent of them. Education for the rest is not free and not compulsory. Money wasted or drained from the Colony could pay for education of primary standard for all.

While half the population lives herded together like animals in something like 12 square feet per adult person, thousands of new flats stand absolutely empty, because the Government allows them to stand free of rates while empty presumably in order to protect the landlords' demands for high rent.

The people are encouraged to keep their money safe in the banks, but the Government will not make sure that the banks are safe for the people's money; in case of failure, the culprits make off with the people's savings, while the people lose their life's savings and are without means of redress.

Tenants in the large blocks of flats and tenements are frequently cheated by landlords who charge maintenance fees but do no maintenance work. The Government does not demand that the buildings should be maintained in decent repair or state of cleanliness; the factor system for divided buildings has not been put into practice. Many of the landlords live abroad and exploit the tenants but put nothing into the colony. While theoretically the Government can demand certain standards of cleanliness and safety from fire, in practice very little is done; one is left wondering why the colony maintains so large a body of civil servants.

While it is easy to criticise civil servants for failure to carry
out their work, it must also be stated that very little incentive is offered to local civil servants; they can never hope to reach top posts or top salaries; these are reserved for ex-patriates, qualified or otherwise. Frustration leads to discontent or corruption all too often.

While no one could expect a complete clean-up, since no government is perfect, the public of Hong Kong has the right to expect that the Government will function for the good of the whole. But the people have no representatives. Government officials and their appointees have responsibility towards no one. Officials remain only two-and-a-half years before going home on leave, and they are often in the colony only for a few years' term, or they retire at 55. One can almost hear some of them saying, "Apres moi...!"

The choice is then left to the British Government in London. The Hong Kong set-up clearly has no intention of making any constitutional reforms, and will continue as long as it can to use as its colleagues only "safe" people who can be trusted to look after their own business and family interests. The Hong Kong Government has shown clearly that it has no intention of trying in any way to stop the drug traffic or to take strong action on corruption, especially where higher civil servants are involved. The Hong Kong Government has always discredited anyone who attempted in any way to claim the right of the local people and other underprivileged to any share in their own affairs.

If the British Government continues, as it has for 123 years, to listen to the voice of Big Business in Hong Kong, and neglect the voice of the people and of local small business, it will find another colonial problem on its hands; by then it will be too late, and the name "Britain" will be hated as a name that stands for oppression and all that is contrary to our concept of "British Justice" (if such a commodity still exists).

A Royal Commission of Inquiry, or a Parliamentary Inquiry is therefore urgently needed to investigate abuses of power and crime protection in Hong Kong. Moreover, the British Government must take the "further steps" promised for colonial territories by Her Majesty the Queen at the opening of Parliament, on 21st April, 1966.