

Judicial Independence and the Rule of Law in Hong Kong

Edited by

Steve Tsang

Director, Asian Studies Centre

Reader in Politics, and

Louis Cha Senior Research Fellow

St Antony's College

Oxford



香港大學出版社

HONG KONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

Hong Kong University Press
14/F Hing Wai Centre
7 Tin Wan Praya Road
Aberdeen
Hong Kong

© Steve Tsang 2001

ISBN 962 209 539 9

First published in Great Britain 2001 by Palgrave Publishers Ltd.
This soft cover edition published by Hong Kong University Press
is available exclusively in Asia.

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
Antony Rowe Ltd, Chippenham, Wiltshire

Contents

<i>Preface and Acknowledgements</i>	xi
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xiii
<i>Notes on the Contributors</i>	xv
1 Commitment to the Rule of Law and Judicial Independence	1
<i>Steve Tsang</i>	
An uncertain beginning	2
Continuity and changes	12
2 The Rule of Law and Criminal Justice in the Nineteenth Century	19
<i>Christopher Munn</i>	
The decline of the Supreme Court's criminal jurisdiction	21
Summary justice, preventive justice and state-created crime: the Magistracy	29
Alternative justice	33
Executive interference in sentences	39
Did the rule of law matter?	43
3 Judicial Independence under the Basic Law	48
<i>Byron S.J. Weng</i>	
Judicial autonomy of the SAR	49
The principle of judicial independence	50
Application of the laws of the SAR	55
The interpretation of law and judicial review	58
Jurisdictions of the SAR courts	66
Pertinent international factors	67
The hypotheses	69
4 The National Security Factor: Putting Article 23 of the Basic Law in Perspective	73
<i>Hualing Fu</i>	
Introduction	73
National security and criminal law	74
The political context of Article 23	76

Crimes (Amendment) (No.2) Bill 1996	78
Official Secrets ordinance	80
Connection with foreign political organizations	82
National security	85
Keeping the common law tradition	87
Democratic conception of Article 23	88
The limits of Article 23	90
Conclusion	91
5 Individual and Institutional Independence of the Judiciary	99
<i>Peter Wesley-Smith</i>	
Introduction	99
Theory	99
The Basic Law	104
Appointment and removal of judges	108
Financial Security	111
The independence of non-regular judges	115
Institutional independence	120
Other aspects	123
Conclusion	125
6 Prospect for the Due Process under Chinese Sovereignty	132
<i>Johannes Chan</i>	
Equality before the law	132
Who decides to prosecute?	137
Independence and impartiality of the judiciary	141
Conclusion	150
7 Freedom of the Press and the Rule of Law	157
<i>Richard Cullen</i>	
Introduction	157
Overview of the media in Hong Kong	158
The regulatory framework	161
The judiciary and the media	163
Prevailing influences	168
Conclusion	173
8 Prospects for the Rule of Law: the Political Dimension	180
<i>Leo F. Goodstadt</i>	
The Hong Kong environment	181

Expectations and apprehensions	185
The Chinese environment	186
Defining the SAR's legal system	190
Conclusions	194
<i>Index</i>	202

Notes on the Contributors

Johannes Chan is Professor and Head of the Department of Law, University of Hong Kong. His main publications include: *General Principles of Hong Kong Law* (with Albert Chen and others) (1999); *Media Law and Practice* (with Kenneth Leung) (1995); *Human Rights and Public Law: a Hong Kong Sourcebook* (with Andrew Byrnes) (1993); *The Hong Kong Bill of Rights: a Comparative Approach* (with Yash Ghai, 1993); and *Human Rights in Hong Kong* (1990).

Richard Cullen is Professor and Head of the Department of Business Law and Taxation at Monash University. He was a Visiting Fellow in the School of Law at the City University of Hong Kong in 1998. His main research areas include media law, comparative public law and taxation law. Among his more recent publications are: *Media Law in China* (1996) (with H.L. Fu); 'Seeking Theory from Experience: Media Regulation in China' (1998), *Democratization*, 155 (with H.L. Fu); and 'Freedom of the Press in Hong Kong' (1997) *Internationales Asienforum*, 29.

Hualing Fu is Assistant Professor in the Department of Law, University of Hong Kong. His research interests include the criminal justice system, constitutional law, and human rights in China. He has published widely on these topics in journals including *The China Quarterly*, *Democratization*, *Policing and Society*, and *The Journal of Chinese Law*.

Leo F. Goodstadt was the Hong Kong government's chief policy adviser as Head of its Central Policy Unit (1989–97). He previously served as a consultant economist to several financial institutions with substantial Asian assets, as Deputy Editor of the *Far Eastern Economic Review*, and as a Lecturer at the University of Hong Kong. He has published widely on economic and political trends in China and Hong Kong. He is author of *China's Watergate: Political and Economic Conflicts* (1979), and *Mao Tse Tung: the Search for Plenty* (1972).

Christopher Munn holds a doctorate from the University of Toronto. He had taught at the University of Toronto and at the University of

Hong Kong. He has published a number of articles on politics and the law in early colonial Hong Kong. His book *Anglo-China: Chinese People and British Rule in Nineteenth-Century Hong Kong* will be published in 2000.

Steve Tsang is Reader in Politics and Louis Cha Senior Research Fellow at St Antony's College, Oxford University, where he is also Director of its Asian Studies Centre. His main publications include: *Democratization in Taiwan: Implications for China* (with Hung-Mao Tien) (1999); *Hong Kong: an Appointment with China* (1997); *Government and Politics: a Documentary History of Hong Kong* (1995); *In the Shadow of China: Political Developments in Taiwan since 1949* (1993); and *Democracy Shelved: Great Britain, China and Attempts at Constitutional Reform in Hong Kong* (1988).

Byron S.J. Weng was until 1999 Professor and Chairman of the Department of Government and Public Administration, the Chinese University of Hong Kong. He has published extensively on the politics, law and foreign policy of the PRC, Taiwan and Hong Kong. He had also served on the Law Reform Commission and the Central Policy Unit in the Hong Kong government, and on the National Unification Council and the Mainland Affairs Council in the ROC government. His current research focuses on relations among the PRC, Taiwan and Hong Kong.

Peter Wesley-Smith was until 1999 Professor of Constitutional Law at the University of Hong Kong. His best-known work is *Unequal Treaty 1898–1997* (revised edn 1998), and he has also authored *Constitutional and Administrative Law in Hong Kong* (2nd edn 1994), *An Introduction to the Hong Kong Legal System* (3rd edn 1998), and *The Sources of Hong Kong Law* (1994). He is now living in rural New South Wales.

1

Commitment to the Rule of Law and Judicial Independence

Steve Tsang

In spite of its cosmopolitan character Hong Kong remains essentially a Chinese city. What sets it apart from the People's Republic of China (PRC) more than anything else is the existence of the rule of law and an independent judiciary. They are generally accepted in Hong Kong as the most important legacy of 156 years of British imperial rule.¹ They are also seen as the cornerstone for the future of Hong Kong as a Special Administrative Region (SAR) in the PRC which retains a Leninist political system.² The inherent contradictions between the latter, in which the supremacy of the Communist Party cannot be challenged, and Hong Kong's liberal and capitalist system are real. In an important sense whether Hong Kong can maintain its own system and way of life, as provided for in the Sino-British Joint Declaration of 1984 and enshrined in the Basic Law for the Hong Kong SAR (1990), will depend on the survival of what underpin them – the rule of law and an independent judiciary. Equally significant is the commitment on the part of the SAR – the government, the judiciary and the people – to upholding these two principles once they are no longer guaranteed by the built in supremacy of the British legal and judicial systems before July 1997.

The importance of the rule of law and an independent judiciary as the cornerstone for Hong Kong's future is such that most people tend to take it for granted that they had always worked perfectly well in British Hong Kong. As Christopher Munn makes clear in Chapter 2, this is a gross simplification. The development of both in the crown colony of Hong Kong has to be put in historical perspective. The great emphasis which has been laid on them by senior officials of the SAR government since the handover also needs to be put into context. Leo Goodstadt is right in highlighting in Chapter 8 the reality that the

continuation of the rule of law and judicial independence have been hailed by the SAR government not least because Hong Kong has not developed democracy and, in its absence, it is advantageous to, and politically astute for, the administration to focus public attention upon them rather than on the issue of democratization. There is also a question of how Hong Kong's common law tradition and judicial system can coexist or dovetail the socialist and Chinese legal system in the PRC.³ This is strictly speaking a matter to be governed by the Basic Law. However, as Byron Weng aptly explains in Chapter 3, it is unrealistic to expect the Basic Law alone to safeguard the rule of law and judicial independence in the SAR since the Basic Law is a piece of legislation in a country with a different legal tradition. It is also a country where the respect for the constitution has been haphazard at best and where the Maoist axiom of 'politics in command' remains a fact of life.

An uncertain beginning

The record of China's handling of relations with Hong Kong since the handover appears to suggest it has basically respected the maintenance of the rule of law and judicial independence in the SAR. Indeed, since July 1997 the Chinese authorities have been much less vocal and interventionist over events in Hong Kong than previously. This was the result of an order issued by Jiang Zemin, Chairman of the PRC and General Secretary of the Communist Party, by which he prohibited heads of government ministries, their equivalent departments in the Communist Party, provinces and special municipalities from interfering into affairs of the SAR.⁴ The issuance of this order and its being enforced are useful to illustrate the actual implementation of the 'one country, two systems' policy. The enforcement of this order was greatly assisted by the careful positioning of the Chief Executive of the SAR in the hierarchy of the state bureaucracy and the Communist Party in China as a whole. As soon as the SAR was founded, its Chief Executive was given the rank of a Vice-Premier or State Councillor, one bureaucratic grade above that of a minister in Beijing or a governor in the provinces.⁵ Even in the all important party-state relations a similar special arrangement was made. In terms of its importance, the SAR ranks equal to the special municipalities of Beijing, Tianjian and Shanghai whose party chief is of Poliburo rank. In order not to put a party man senior in rank to Tung Chee-hwa in the SAR Beijing deliberately appointed a mere member of the Communist Party's Central Committee, and not of the Poliburo, to head the Party's Work

Committee in Hong Kong. This party head, Jiang Enzhu has also been instructed to operate under the cover of his public duties as Director of the local branch of the Xinhua News Agency rather than like a normal party secretary in a special municipality. This anomaly is undoubtedly intended to prevent lower ranking PRC cadres from putting pressure on the higher ranking SAR Chief Executive and thus minimize any attempt by them to further their selfish personal, provincial or departmental interests. This is also in line with Beijing's established policy towards Hong Kong which is to exercise maximum flexibility within the rigid framework of protecting the sovereignty of the PRC and the supremacy of the national interests as defined by the Communist Party leadership.⁶ The continuation of this basic policy represents the commitment on the part of Beijing to give the SAR reasonable scope to uphold the rule of law and judicial independence.

The survival and prospering of the rule of law and judicial independence do not depend solely on Beijing's policy and actions, however. They are also dependent on the commitment of the SAR. This is reflected in the protection against abuse in the name of national security which is examined by Hualing Fu in Chapter 4, the state of institutional protection which forms the focus of Peter Wesley-Smith's inquiry in Chapter 5, respect for upholding the due process which Johannes Chan scrutinizes in Chapter 6, and an independent and free press which is analyzed by Richard Cullen in Chapter 7. They are further affected by events within the SAR, such as the approach and behaviour of its judiciary, law officers and the executive branch. In this regard Hong Kong has a mixed record in its first two years as the SAR.

In the celebrated and controversial case concerning the SAR courts' handling of the right-of-abode of illegitimate children born to at least one parent who has such right in Hong Kong, the Court of Final Appeal (CFA) ruled on the basis of the law in January 1999 and ignored the very serious political and other practical problems which its ruling would cause. Under the Basic Law children born to Chinese citizens who are permanent residents of Hong Kong are deemed to have the right of abode.⁷ What is not clear are whether children born out of wedlock or before their parents acquired the right of abode can enjoy the same right, and whether the Court should secure an interpretation from the National People's Congress (NPC) or its Standing Committee on the relevant provisions in the Basic Law, which will be binding on the Court.⁸ On the first two questions the Court ruled in favour of the children. With regard to the last the Court decided that it did not need an interpretation from the NPC. Indeed, it worked on the basis that it

had the authority 'to examine whether any legislative acts of the NPC are consistent with the Basic Law and to declare them to be invalid if found to be inconsistent.'⁹ By its ruling the Court disregarded the prevailing local public opinion and the views of the SAR government which opposed letting in hundreds of thousands of mainland migrants.¹⁰ It also faced a torrent of criticisms from the Chinese authorities which accused it, above all, of attempting to challenge the NPC's authority to interpret all ambiguous provisions in the Basic Law.¹¹

The strong reactions from Beijing raised the prospect for either a constitutional crisis involving the jurisdiction of the CFA or a decision of the Court being overruled, subverted or otherwise set aside by the PRC or by the SAR executive branch acting under instructions from Beijing. This potential constitutional crisis was averted in February 1999 by a compromise worked out between the governments of the SAR and the PRC. Under this arrangement the SAR government asked the Court to 'clarify' its ruling. In response the Court declared that it accepted the NPC as the supreme law-making body of the land and did not question that authority though it did not alter its ruling.¹² Whether the CFA ruling is sound according to the law or not, it was widely and rightly accepted in Hong Kong as a positive landmark development in protecting the rule of law and judicial independence.¹³ Since Beijing accepted the compromise and the ruling of the Court was allowed to stand, this dispute did not in a strictly technical sense undermine the rule of law or the independence of the judiciary in Hong Kong.

The SAR government's albeit pragmatic intervention to defuse the situation did raise the question whether this may reflect a pattern of executive actions that will eventually undermine the rule of law, however.¹⁴ This issue is examined further in Chapter 3 by Weng.

To begin with, the SAR government suggested sometime in 1998 to the CFA that before the latter rendered its final judgment it should seek a binding interpretation of Articles 22 and 24 of the Basic Law from the NPC Standing Committee.¹⁵ This action was no doubt taken to protect what it saw as the best interest of the SAR, as it realized the political sensitivity of the case and deemed it politically advantageous to pre-empt a development which could lead to a confrontation with the PRC authorities. However well intentioned this might have been it still casts a shadow over the priority set by the Justice Department and the government as a whole – do they put the law or political considerations of the day first?

What is more worrying is that about two months after the danger of a constitutional crisis was removed, the SAR government reversed course and sought to set aside the decision of the CFA when it calculated that this decision could result in up to 1.67 million mainland Chinese being able to exercise the right of abode and settle in Hong Kong over a period of seven years and thus put what it called 'a very heavy – even unbearable – burden' on the SAR.¹⁶ In order to pre-empt this worst case scenario the Chief Executive Tung announced in May 1999 that he would try to reduce what he saw as the negative impact of the Court's decision, by either seeking an amendment to the Basic Law or asking the NPC Standing Committee to reinterpret the Basic Law.¹⁷ Whether the SAR government's calculation of the likely number of immigrants is sound or not, there is no doubt that the Court's decision will result in at least hundreds of thousand Chinese being able to claim the right to live in the SAR and thus generate enormous pressure on housing, education, health and other social services.¹⁸ This is a daunting challenge for a metropolis of 6.5 million already suffering from one of the highest population pressures in the world. The magnitude of this problem is not the real cause for worry, however.

It is the manner by which the SAR government handles the issue which may pose a serious challenge to the rule of law. Instead of devoting itself to devise policies and make plans to deal with the implications of the decision of the CFA, as is normal in a common law jurisdiction, the SAR government seems to have dedicated itself to seek ways to circumvent what it no doubt believes to be an ill conceived decision of the Court. Hence, the government has chosen to scare the population into rejecting the implementation of the decision of the Court by hailing the worst possible scenario as if it were a certainty. It dismissed out of hand the possibility of making arrangements to regulate the settlement of those people concerned in a reasonable manner, which will on the one hand recognize their right of abode and on the other hand allow the SAR scope to deal with a large and steady inflow of people.¹⁹ The alleged need for the SAR to overturn in effect the decision of the CFA also seems to be based on dubious premises. The government has apparently not taken into account several crucial considerations. First, the movement of people from the PRC to the SAR is regulated not only by the SAR but also by the border control exercised on the PRC side. Given the PRC authorities' hostility to the CFA decision and long established policy in controlling internal migration it is doubtful that all the illegitimate offspring of Hong Kong residents

will be allowed to leave the mainland freely for the SAR. Second, it is questionable that a decision of the SAR Court is legally binding on government organizations in the PRC. Third, the PRC simply does not have the institutional infrastructure to deal with a massive migration of this kind since this is a new demand generated only as a result of the SAR Court's ruling at the end of January. Unless the PRC government will devote significantly more resources to deal with the issue, about which there is no indication, there will almost certainly be a long delay for applications to leave to be processed. Fourth, the estimated figure is highly problematic as it includes, for example, those who are not yet born or conceived but are believed to be eligible on the basis of the fertility rate of the prospective immigrants.²⁰ Likewise, the SAR government has reportedly compiled data on those eligible but indicated that they have no intention to relocate to Hong Kong, but suppressed the data and simply worked on the assumption that all who are entitled to will in fact migrate.²¹ Finally, the illegitimate offspring will also need to establish proof of parentage. With so many imponderables the SAR government's projected pressure on Hong Kong's society and resources seems exaggerated. If the pressure were not such that it would be a matter of survival, why had the SAR government proposed to take such an extraordinary course which would undermine the rule of law? Does this not reflect the basic attitude of the government and a lack of commitment to uphold the rule of law?

Of the two options which the SAR government initially put on the political agenda in Hong Kong – to amend the Basic Law or ask the NPC to reinterpret the Basic Law – the Chief Executive chose the latter.²² This is highly problematic. According to Article 158 of the Basic Law the power to interpret does rest with the NPC Standing Committee but it is supposed to do so on the basis of a request from the SAR Courts – not from the SAR government. The really controversial issue is whether the CFA had the right to decide not to seek an interpretation on the issues at hand. Whether the Court was right or not in this matter it adjudicated without requiring interpretation. (The rule of law does not imply the Courts never make mistakes, but if they do such mistakes should be rectified through the due process – not by executive fiat.) This being the case it is questionable if the SAR government has the constitutional right to request an interpretation clearly with an intention to side-track the decisions of the Court. In the common law tradition the only situation for the CFA to change its mind (or, in this case, request an interpretation) is for a new case that

presents new and significant evidence to justify a change of judgment being put to it – not a matter within the remit of the Chief Executive. The other option, amendment of the Basic Law, is at least constitutionally viable, though it can only be done by the full NPC, which is not scheduled to meet until around March 2000. In any event the Chief Executive's proposal amounts to subverting, or at least setting aside, a decision of the Court duly arrived at on the basis of the law. By choosing to invite Beijing to relieve it from its obligations under the Basic Law the SAR government is, despite its rhetorical commitment, resorting to an expedience with little or no regard to upholding the rule of law.²³

The irony in this incident is that there is no evidence to suggest the SAR Chief Executive has acted under pressure from Beijing. He almost certainly took the initiative on his own accord, or on the advice of his law officers, though the views of Beijing had undoubtedly been taken into account as well. What is particularly worrying is one of the considerations which the Justice Department appears to have based its advice to the government. In the *South China Morning Post*, Deputy Law Officer R. Allcock made the following disconcerting comment on this matter:

Under the common law, the ultimate power to interpret the law is vested in the judiciary. However, Hong Kong is part of the People's Republic of China, which has a civil law system. Under the mainland's system, the ultimate power to interpret statutes is vested in the NPCSC.²⁴

However incredible it may seem this view of the Deputy Law Officer does appear to represent that of the SAR government, as the Justice Secretary herself publicly states that the replacement of the Letters Patent and the Royal Instructions by the Basic Law has resulted in 'an earth-shaking change in the most fundamental part of this legal system'.²⁵

This development raises the question of whether the SAR government has the intention to uphold all the rights given to the SAR by the Basic Law, including Article 8 which specifically stipulates that the common law – not the civil or socialist legal – system should be maintained. It is ironic that in the first two years of Hong Kong as the SAR the threat to the rule of law has come more from failings of the SAR government than from interference from the Leninist party in control of the PRC. If the SAR government's bowing to political and

socio-economic considerations in the illegitimate migrants case is but an isolated exception, it will not constitute a pattern of executive actions and its significance should be assessed accordingly. By setting this incident against the record of the SAR government's handling of a few other cases a pattern does appear to exist, however.

To begin, there was the widely reported case concerning the trial and execution of a gangster leader Cheung Tze-keung, popularly known as Big Spender, in the PRC in 1998. Cheung was a Hong Kong citizen who committed, among various serious offences, the kidnapping of two business tycoons, Walter Kwok of the Sun Hung Kai group and Victor Li, son of Li Ka-shing, in Hong Kong. Neither Kwok's nor Li's family reported the kidnapping to the Hong Kong Police. However, they apparently asked for help from Chairman Jiang Zemin, which led to the arrest by the PRC police of Cheung and his gang.²⁶ Together with his gang Cheung was put on trial in the Guangzhou Intermediate People's Court, in spite of the fact that he was a Hong Kong citizen who was alleged to have committed crimes against other Hong Kong citizens in Hong Kong. Given the almost certain outcome of such a trial in a PRC court – conviction and swift execution – Cheung's counsel and family asked the SAR government to seek his return to face trial in Hong Kong. However nasty a criminal Cheung might have been he undoubtedly had the right as a Hong Kong citizen to expect to face justice in a Hong Kong court for crimes he was alleged to have committed locally. The SAR government ignored the pleas of Cheung's lawyer, family and human rights advocates and declined to seek his return.²⁷ The government had apparently chosen not to press the issue in order to avoid confronting the PRC. Although this was probably an astute political move in the context of maintaining good PRC-SAR relations, it raised two serious questions. Does this case imply Hong Kong citizens who commit criminal offences within the SAR can – contrary to Article 18 of the Basic Law – be subjected to the Chinese Criminal Code should they be arrested in the PRC? Furthermore, does the politically astute move on the part of the SAR government mean that, in cases where it is politically expedient, it in effect concedes it cannot be expected to stand up for the human rights of SAR citizens who may have incurred the wrath of the Chinese government or top leaders and thus find themselves in trouble with law enforcement agencies in the PRC?

The 'Big Spender' case should also be seen in the context of how the SAR government dealt with another somewhat similar case. This one concerns a PRC citizen Li Yuhui (Lee Yuk Fai in Hong Kong usage). Li

worked as a Feng Shui master and allegedly committed five murders in Telford Gardens in the SAR but was apprehended in the PRC. Similar to the Big Spender case the SAR government refused to secure his return to face justice in Hong Kong. What happened to Li subsequently was no surprise. He was convicted and executed in Guangdong.²⁸ Whether he should have been tried in the PRC instead of in Hong Kong is debatable. The case for trial in the PRC is essentially based on the extraterritorial reach of the Chinese Criminal Code, which gives PRC Courts the right to try a PRC citizen who committed an indictable offence overseas.²⁹ However, under Article 18 of the Basic Law the Chinese Criminal Code should have no application in the SAR since the Code is not one of those PRC national laws specifically listed in Annex III of the Basic Law.³⁰

Any doubt that this provision of the Basic Law can override the extraterritorial jurisdiction of the Chinese Criminal Code should be dispelled by the very special nature of the Basic Law which was promulgated to found the SAR. The Basic Law is clearly meant to resolve anomalies or discrepancies in law between the PRC and the SAR inherent in the 'one country, two systems' principle in favour of the SAR practice. This is based on the same principle upon which the constitutionality of the Basic Law itself is established. Under various provisions of the PRC Constitution the existence of anything like a SAR is prohibited. Article 1, for example, stipulates specifically and clearly that the PRC 'is a socialist state under the people's democratic dictatorship' and the 'sabotage of the socialist system by any organization or individual is prohibited'. This is reinforced by Article 5, which 'upholds the uniformity and dignity of the socialist legal system' and adds that 'no law or administrative or local rules and regulations shall contravene the Constitution'. Since the capitalist Hong Kong SAR committed to the common law is neither socialist nor conducive to upholding the socialist legal system in the PRC, it would have been logical that the creation of the SAR is prohibited by the Constitution. However, this problem is, according to all Chinese legal authorities, resolved by Article 31 of the Constitution.³¹ This article authorizes the establishment of SARs in which their systems 'shall be prescribed by law enacted by the National People's Congress in the light of the specific conditions'. In the same spirit that Article 31 can override the other articles of the Constitution and make the establishment of the Hong Kong SAR constitutional, Article 18 of the Basic Law ought to take precedent over the applicability in the SAR of the extraterritorial scope of the PRC Criminal Code. Li should therefore

have been prosecuted and tried in the SAR only for the crimes which were wholly committed there. Similar to the Big Spender case, this incident raises the questions of whether, and indeed why, PRC courts have the authority to try a person for crimes committed in the SAR and whether the SAR's Justice Department prefers to abdicate its responsibilities in a criminal case if it might lead to a negative political reaction from the PRC?

Another case which is equally problematic concerns the decision by the Secretary for Justice Elsie Leung not to prosecute Sally Aw, Chairman of the Sing Tao Group which publishes an English language newspaper the *Hong Kong Standard*. (See also Chan's analysis in Chapter 6.) Three senior executives of the Sing Tao Group were prosecuted and jailed for fraud, for inflating the circulation figures of the *Hong Kong Standard* in order to boost advertising revenue in 1998, but Aw herself, named as a co-conspirator, was not prosecuted. This caused an outcry in the SAR. Speculation circulated as to the reasons for her special treatment. They include allegations that she was spared because she is a member of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, an advisory body to the PRC government, or because the Chief Executive had previously served on the board of Sing Tao. Reacting to public pressure Secretary Leung explained that Aw was not prosecuted because it was not in 'the public interest' to do so since prosecution might lead to the collapse of her business empire. Leung elaborated on her reasoning by saying that 'apart from the staff losing employment, the failure of a well-established, important media group at that time could have sent a very bad message to the international community.'³² Whether the Secretary for Justice acted entirely on the basis of her own judgement or not, her decision and reasoning have raised two important questions. First, does this not set a precedent which will encourage the super rich to ignore the law in Hong Kong provided they are major employers with an international profile and, thus, raise the prospect that the legal system will treat the rich and the poor differently? Second, does this not make a mockery of Article 25 of the Basic Law, by which 'all Hong Kong residents shall be equal before the law'?

While the four cases above have shown a pattern of behaviour which raises doubt as to the determination of the SAR government and its ranking law officer to uphold the law rather than yield to political considerations, except for the illegitimate immigrants case there is no evidence that the PRC government has put pressure on the legal or judicial process in Hong Kong. Even in the illegitimate immigrants

case what pressure Beijing applied at the time of the Court of Final Appeal's ruling was put on the SAR government rather than on the judiciary directly. Does the record of the PRC government in the first two years of the SAR therefore provide reasonable grounds to suggest it demonstrates sufficient commitment to the maintenance of the rule of law and judicial independence in the SAR?

Although the self-restraint which the PRC government has exercised so far should be recognized, it also needs to be put in context. In three out of the four cases examined above, the SAR government had gone out of its way to avoid any development which might provoke the PRC into taking actions against the judicial system in the SAR. The exception was the Sally Aw case, for which there is no tangible evidence to suggest the Secretary for Justice had acted to placate the PRC government. The reluctance of the SAR government to do anything about the Big Spender and Telford Gardens murder cases were clearly meant to neutralize any concern the PRC government might have in terms of any challenge from Hong Kong about the legality of its actions. Even in the illegitimate migrants case, once the PRC authorities indicated its displeasure over the alleged challenge by the CFA to the sovereign authority of the NPC, the SAR government promptly took the initiative to broker a compromise which Beijing accepted. However, as Wesley-Smith argues in Chapter 5, the public criticism of the Court's decision by quasi-government officials in the PRC 'came perilously close to infringing judicial independence' and the whole incident did 'a good deal of damage ... to the dignity and independence of the court'.

Nevertheless, in a strictly technical sense, neither was infringed upon. The PRC's record so far confirms that its policy towards Hong Kong has continued to be governed by the principle of exercising maximum flexibility within a rigid framework. While this remains true, the lack of direct interference into the legal and judicial processes in the SAR from the PRC is also, above all, because the PRC government has no reason or need to interfere. The SAR government has studiously made sure of that. The assumptions which the PRC authorities took in the Big Spender and the Telford Gardens cases remain a cause for concern. In neither case did the PRC authorities appear to feel restrained by Article 18 of the Basic Law which excludes the application of the PRC Criminal Code to the SAR. The fact that the SAR government has never raised this issue with Beijing does not mean it is not important.

All in all the record of Hong Kong in its first two years or so as the SAR is a mixed one. On the one hand the independence of the

judiciary has continued. The CFA has proved its mettle by resisting the temptation to bow to political and other considerations, even in the particularly controversial case of the illegitimate immigrants. On the other hand the SAR government and its Justice Department have on balance demonstrated a lack of determination to uphold the rule of law though they essentially respected the independence of the judiciary. The real commitment to the rule of law and judicial independence from the people of Hong Kong has just been put to the test. Their responses to the Chief Executive's move to circumvent the decision of the CFA over the illegitimate migrants case will provide good indication of their sense of commitment. The SAR government has so far disguised the issues and most people in Hong Kong have not yet realized that if they want to maintain the rule of law as the cornerstone for their future, they will have to be prepared to pay a price, which is that if the Court has ruled strictly in accordance with the law its decision must be respected, even if it should have undesirable social or economic consequences.

Continuity and changes

How does this mixed picture of the SAR's commitment to the rule of law and judicial independence compare to the record of British Hong Kong? What do the differences amount to in reality? Does this mixed picture mean the rule of law and judicial independence still form the cornerstone of Hong Kong's future?

A useful starting point for looking at these questions is Munn's meticulously researched critical survey of the imperfection in the rule of law in the early years of British Hong Kong (see Chapter 2), which helps to put things in better perspective. It is important to remember that while Munn has documented several different ways by which the rule of law was circumvented, or set aside, in the first half-century of British administration, he nevertheless concludes that 'the rule of law still set the standards for government and justice in the colony'. One should also not lose sight of the fact that since the nineteenth century the world has changed and so have the standards and the public expectations of the standards in the rule of law, whether in Hong Kong or in the common law world at large. Despite the somewhat bleak account of early justice given by Munn, an imperfect start to the rule of law does not necessarily mean it cannot take root and flourish later. The rule of law can eventually thrive provided there is an institution or an authority higher than the local government which will provide

a redress to abuses. In the colonial period it was the existence of supervision from London, where its democratic government often checked excesses or rectified specific failings by colonial officials or judicial officers, that had resulted in, for example, administrative meddling and the miscarriage of justice.

In this new era when Hong Kong is a Chinese SAR, for which a high degree of autonomy is guaranteed in writing, the higher authority for this purpose is neither Britain, the old colonial master nor Beijing, the new sovereign power. It is or, at least, ought to be the Basic Law. Although the Sino-British Joint Declaration also provides for the rule of law and judicial independence in Hong Kong to be protected it is the Basic Law which ultimately matters. It is not only the legal instrument to turn the agreed principles in the Joint Declaration into reality but is also the constitutional instrument for the SAR – the ultimate point of reference for any dispute between the executive, legislative and judicial branches in Hong Kong. How effective it can be in replacing the role played by Britain before 1997 remains to be seen. In Chapter 3 Weng highlights the limitations which the Basic Law has for this purpose. In addition to a careful examination of the inadequacies of the Basic law, for example, in only preserving the independence of the courts and not of individual judges, he carefully analyzes in some detail the first major test of the Basic Law as the ultimate defender of the rule of law and judicial independence. As explained briefly earlier this involves the case of the right of abode for the illegitimate immigrants from China. On the basis of his research he concludes that while Hong Kong's government system was 'entrenched in the tradition of the rule of law and the principle of judicial independence ... there is little ground to assert that the principle of judicial independence will be upheld in the SAR as it was in the British period'.

As the constitutional instrument protecting the rule of law and judicial independence in the SAR, one issue which can cause serious reservation concerns its provision on national security – a cause which can be used to justify undermining these two principles on the ground of exigency. The relevant provision in the Basic Law is Article 23, which Fu examines in depth in Chapter 4. He not only gives the historical context for the inclusion of Article 23, which was essentially Beijing's response to the Tiananmen incident of 1989, but highlights the fact that even under British Hong Kong there was a body of law which could have met practically all the legitimate requirements for national security under Article 23 in a common law jurisdiction. It is worthy of note that despite the long existence of some fairly draconian

pieces of legislation, such as the Emergency (Principal) Regulations (1949) which could make it 'possible for the Hong Kong government, at least in principle, to abuse its extensive emergency powers in conditions which elsewhere would not have justified the use of such powers',³³ checks from London and self-restraint exercised by the government in Hong Kong had prevented serious abuse under the British. It is possible, as Fu argues cogently, to reconcile concerns over national security and the protection of human rights. A basic change that has happened in this connection inherent in the handover of sovereignty is the replacing of democratic and human rights respecting Britain by the authoritarian PRC where neither the rule of law nor respect for civil and political rights can be taken for granted. This difference is fundamental to the concern that Article 23 can neutralize the other elements protective of human rights in the Basic Law. It underlines the need to ensure the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary in the SAR. The fact that despite the modification of Article 23 and the passing of the Crimes (Amendment) Bill in 1997 incorporating 'secession' and 'subversion' as criminal offences into Hong Kong's body of law, the SAR government has not given notice to bring this amendment into effect and has not come under pressure from Beijing to do so is significant. It is further testimony to Beijing's adherence to the principle of exercising maximum flexibility within a rigid framework in matters dealing with the SAR.

Compared to the early years of British Hong Kong when it was treated by many of its residents as a kind of a colonial frontier town at a time when the rule of law in Britain itself was less well developed and entrenched than now, the SAR has the great advantage of having inherited a wealthy and sophisticated community in which an independent judiciary functions healthily and the rule of law is well established after 156 years of practising the common law. As Wesley-Smith explains in considerable detail (see Chapter 5) an entire infrastructure exists to buttress the institutional and individual independence of the judiciary and the rule of law, which were so much more tenuous in the nineteenth century. In his careful, detailed and perceptive study of the many different factors that affect the independence of judicial personnel and institutions, Wesley-Smith brings out clearly both the continuity and the changes between Hong Kong as a Crown Colony and a Chinese SAR. A basic issue which stands out in his inquiry is the simple fact that few, if anyone, questioned the many and various arrangements in place before the prospect of a transfer of sovereignty loomed because they were deemed to be consistent with

British experiences, but that they have become subjected to more searching standards as that prospect became a reality. The differences in the legal and judicial traditions in China and in a British jurisdiction, and the lack of confidence in the former, account for this shift.³⁴

How well will the common law culture of Hong Kong, slowly but steadily acquired under British rule, survive and develop now that it is a Chinese SAR? A critical test of Hong Kong's commitment is the respect for the due process in the courts and by the government. Chan reviews in Chapter 6 a few particularly interesting and significant cases in the SAR. He points out that at first the Courts seem to have taken a restrained view of their role in cases where major government policies appeared to be at stake. They include the court's handling of the illegitimate migrants case before it eventually reached the CFA which, as explained earlier, took a much more robust stance than its lower courts. If Chan's concern over the courts' assertion over their independence can basically be laid to rest by the CFA's bold ruling over this case in January 1999, the same cannot be said of the SAR government. Chan's dispassionate and judicious study of various cases, including that of the non-prosecution of Sally Aw and the Xinhua News Agency (a PRC state organ that serves as cover for Communist Party's Work Committee) for what appeared to be a clear breach of the law, provide serious cause for reflection and concern.

The future of the rule of law and judicial independence also depends on the community's commitment, which is most effectively reflected in the existence of a free press. The role of the media is particularly important in Hong Kong since it still does not have a democratic political system and, in accordance with Annex II of the Basic Law, cannot have one before 2007. As Cullen explains in Chapter 7, Hong Kong had a free and very vibrant media under the British, which has survived the change of sovereignty. Nevertheless, the issues of press freedom and self-censorship in the formative period of the SAR are not simple ones. They are more than just a matter of whether the courts uphold the freedom of the press or whether the SAR government starts to infringe upon it, or if the PRC government has started to put pressure on the local media tycoons, though they are all important and relevant questions. They also depend on economic, financial, business or management calculations in the media world. Here, as Cullen highlights, even senior members of the press can prove a problem. The attack launched by the publisher of the *Mirror* magazine on Radio Television Hong Kong in March 1998 is a case in point. It is important to recognize that the judiciary is a key agent in maintaining the

freedom of the media, and a free press, in turn, has a vital role to play in supporting the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary. Whether this somewhat symbiotic relationship can develop into a virtuous circle in the new political environment of the SAR remains to be seen.

This brief survey of Hong Kong's commitment to the rule of law and judicial independence suggests that while the community as a whole is keen, often taking it as an article of faith, the same cannot be said of its government after the change of sovereignty. Despite its public rhetoric the SAR government seems to support them more for pragmatic calculations than as a matter of principle. As Goodstadt aptly observes in Chapter 8, expressing verbal commitment is useful to the SAR government as it distracts public attention from the retrogression in democratic development following the handover, helps to maintain business confidence, and reassures the general public that their way of life has not changed. The PRC government has likewise accepted this state of affairs out of utilitarian considerations. Beijing is keen to make a success of the takeover for prestige and for practical reasons. It sees the existence of a stable legal order as the key to the economic miracle of postwar Hong Kong. It is prepared to keep this going, as Hong Kong makes a vital contribution to the success of economic reform on the mainland, and its legal order serves as a useful point of reference to Chinese reformers who want to build up a legal system which will ensure political stability amid rapid, major economic changes in an authoritarian political order. The extent of Chinese pragmatism in this matter was reflected in the negotiations which they had with the British in setting up the CFA in the twilight years of British rule. However, the PRC government's handling of the Big Spender and the Telford Gardens murder cases as well as the ruling by CFA over the illegitimate migrants demonstrates the harsh reality. Despite its policy of non-interference, the PRC government does not understand what the rule of law in Hong Kong means; certainly not the principle that it is there to protect the rights of individuals rather than to further government policies. Thus, the continuation of the rule of law and an independent judiciary in the first two years of the SAR is no ground for complacency. As Goodstadt aptly highlights vested interests and the SAR government, if not the PRC government itself, must join with the general public in Hong Kong and display a commitment beyond rhetoric and expediency which is rooted in genuine respect for the principles before the rule of law and judicial independence can really entrench themselves in the SAR.

Notes

1. See, for example, Ming Chan, 'The Legacy of the British Administration of Hong Kong: A view from Hong Kong', *The China Quarterly*, no.151 (1997), pp. 567–82.
2. For the defining characters of a Marxist–Leninist system as a distinct subset of the world's political system see Archie Brown, *The Gorbachev Factor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 310.
3. *Yiguo Liangzhi Chongyao Wenxian Xuanbian* (Beijing: Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe, 1997), p. 306 (speech by Qian Qichen).
4. *South China Morning Post (SCMP)*, 2 July 1997 (Jiang's speech at the SAR establishment ceremony); Guo Shiping and Qian Xuejun, *Jiuqi hou Zhonggang Xinguanxi* (Hong Kong: Taipingyang Shiji chubanshe, 1998), p. 53. The head of state in the PRC is in Chinese 'Chairman of the state' though it is often translated into 'President' in English.
5. Steve Tsang, 'Changes in Continuity: Government and Politics in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region', *American Asian Review*, Vol.XV, no.4, Winter 1997, pp. 51–2.
6. For a detailed examination of this policy, see Steve Tsang, 'Maximum Flexibility, Rigid Framework: China's Policy Towards Hong Kong and its Implications', *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.49, no.2, Winter 1996, pp. 413–33; and Steve Tsang *Hong Kong: An Appointment With China* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1997), especially pp. 132–55.
7. *The Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China* (Hong Kong: Government Printing Department, undated), p. 23 (Art. 24).
8. *Immigration Department Annual Report 1997/1998* (Hong Kong: HKSAR Immigration Department, undated 1999), pp. 55–6.
9. Quoted in Frank Ching, 'Judgement Call', *Far Eastern Economic Review (FEER)*, 18 February 1999, p. 21.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 20–1.
11. Albert H.Y. Chen, *The Court of Final Appeal's Ruling in the 'Illegal Migrant' Children Case: Congressional Supremacy and Judicial Review* (Law Working Paper no.24), (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Law Faculty, 1999), p. 1.
12. Alkman Granitsas, 'Compromising Issue', *FEER*, 11 March 1999, p. 20.
13. Albert H.Y. Chen, *The Court of Final Appeal's Ruling in the 'Illegal Migrant' Children Case: A Critical Commentary on the Application of Article 158 of the Basic Law* (Law Working Paper no.23), (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Law Faculty, 1999), p. 1. Chen is a leading advocate that the Court was wrong in its judgment.
14. Granitsas, 'Compromising Issue', *op. cit.*
15. Frank Ching, 'Inviting Trouble', *FEER*, 21 January 1999, p. 23.
16. Frank Ching, 'Scare Tactics', *FEER*, 13 May 1999, p. 18.
17. Rachel Clarke, 'Tung to seek law change to beat \$71b migrants bill', *SCMP*, 6 May 1999.
18. For a sceptical view of the SAR government's calculation see, for example, 'True test of the SAR's mettle', *SCMP*, 7 May 1999.
19. *Right of Abode: The Solution*, paper tabled by the SAR government at the

- Legislative Council House Committee special meeting on 25 May 1999, paragraph 7.
20. Ching, 'Scare Tactics', pp. 18–19.
 21. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
 22. Jimmy Cheung and Angela Li, 'NPC likely to intervene', *SCMP*, 7 May 1999.
 23. The NPCSC duly accepted the SAR government's request to reinterpret sections under Articles 22 and 24 of the Basic Law at the end of June 1999. Chris Yeung, 'NPC lays down the law', *SCMP*, 27 June 1999.
 24. R. Allcock, 'NPC's Standing Committee must decide', *SCMP*, 19 May 1999.
 25. Angela Li, 'Justice chief's view of law branded "terrifying"', *SCMP*, 22 July 1999.
 26. Frank Ching, 'Another Place, Another Crime', *FEER*, 5 November 1998, p. 26.
 27. Cheung was executed shortly after his appeal was dismissed. The execution verdict was returned not for the kidnapping but for firearms and smuggling offences for which he was also charged and prosecuted.
 28. 'Regional Briefing', *FEER*, 29 April 1999, p. 17.
 29. See Richard Cullen and H.L. Fu, 'Some Limitations in the Basic Law Exposed', *China Perspectives*, no.22, March/April 1999, pp. 54–7.
 30. Margaret Ng puts her case on a different basis. M. Ng, 'Fundamental Questions Raised by the Trial of Cheung Tse Keung and Others', *Policy Bulletin*, no.9, February/March 1999 (Hong Kong), p. 3.
 31. See, for example, *The Basic Law*, p.94 (Decision of the NPC on the Establishment of the Hong Kong SAR); and Xiao Weiyun (ed.), *Yiguo Liangzhi yu Xianggang Tebie Xingzhengqu Jibenfa* (Hong Kong: Wenhua Jiaoyu chubenshe, 1990), pp. 63–5.
 32. Quoted in *The Financial Times*, 5 February 1999.
 33. Steve Tsang (ed.), *Government and Politics: A Documentary History of Hong Kong*, Volume 1 (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1995), p. 53.
 34. For an excellent exposition of the Chinese legal tradition, see Philip C.C. Huang, *Civil Justice in China: Representation and Practice in the Qing* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996).

Index

- Acts of state, 66–7, 192
Adaptation of Laws (Interpretative Provision) Bill, 152
Administrative Guideline on National Security, 86–7
Administrative Secretary *see* Chief Secretary of Administration
Admiralty Court, 21
airport (project), 188, 191
Allcock, R., 7
Amnesty International, 86
Apple Daily, 55, 161, 166, 172
Appropriation Ordinance, 112
Arrowsmith, 88
Article 23 (of the Basic Law), 13, 68, 73–92, 162
Asian Wall Street Journal, 159
Asia Television, 160
Asian financial crisis, 168, 172
Attorney General, 24–5, 35, 41, 86, 139–40, 166, 181
Attorney General v Lee Kwong-kut, 163
Audit Commission, 50
Australia, 74, 111, 163
Aw, Sally, 10–11, 15, 69, 138, 170
- Ball, Henry, 40
Bank of China, 188
Bar Association, 62, 81, 83, 147
Basic Law, 1–6, 8–11, 13, 15, 48–70, 73–92, 99, 104–111, 119, 123–4, 126, 133–7, 147–8, 150, 152, 157, 162, 173, 181, 183, 191, 193–6
Amendment of, 5–7
Committee for, 56, 58–60, 65
Consultative Committee, 60
Drafting Committee, 60
interpretation of, 4–6, 52, 58–60, 62, 64–5
BBC, 159–60
Beijing, 2–4, 7, 11, 13–14, 16, 48, 54, 60, 63, 68–9, 77–8, 81–2, 91–2, 123, 152, 159–60, 168, 170–2, 186
Beijing Statement of Principles of the Independence of the Judiciary, 101, 109–11, 121–4
Big Spender case (*see* Cheung Tze-kueng)
Bill of Rights, 77, 82, 85, 89, 99, 124, 126, 136, 141, 148, 150, 163–7
blasphemy, 87–8
Bokhary, Kemal, 54
Bond, Alan, 139
Bonham, George, 27
Bowring, John, 30, 35
border control, 5
branding (as punishment), 35, 41
British government, 164
British rule, 1, 12–16, 19–43, 75, 77, 160, 180–2, 184–6, 195–6
Broadcasting Authority Ordinance, 161
Browne-Wilkinson, Lord, 145–6
Business Registration Ordinance, 138
- cadet officers, 30–1
Caldwell, Daniel, 23, 39
Canada, 74, 91, 114, 126, 163–4, 167–8
Supreme Court of, 99–100, 115, 119
Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedom, 99, 164, 167
Canton, 26, 36
Case of Proclamations, 134
Censorship, 161
Census and Statistics department, 65
Central People's government, 50–1, 57, 60–1, 63, 66–8, 73, 123–4, 133–5, 138
Certificate of entitlement, 62, 147, 149
Ceylon, 20
Chan, Chief Judge, 149
Chandler v DPP, 88

- Charles I, 132
 checks and balances, 52
 Chen, Albert, 62
Cheung Lai Wah v Director of Immigration, 148, 151-2
Cheung Ng Sheong Steven v Eastweek Publisher Ltd, 165
 Cheung Tze-kueng, 8-11, 16, 67, 69
 Chief Executive, 2, 5-7, 10, 12, 51-2, 63, 65-7, 69, 77, 80, 83-6, 102-3, 105, 107-12, 114-17, 119-20, 122-5, 138, 171, 182-4
 in Council, 114
 Chief Judge, 52, 54, 102, 108, 112, 118, 121
 Chief Justice, 20-1, 37, 39, 52, 54, 65, 101-3, 108, 110-12, 114-15, 119-25, 184
 Chief Secretary of Administration, 112, 182, 196
Chim Shing Chung v Commissioner of Correctional Services, 165
China Daily, 159
China Mail, 26, 33-4
 Chinese Criminal law, 8-9, 11, 75-7, 87, 162
 Chinese Extradition Ordinance (1889), 38
 Chinese legal system, 2, 7, 61
 traditional system, 20, 24
 Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, 10, 171
 Chinese policy towards Hong Kong, 2-3, 11, 14, 16, 168, 180-1, 185-9, 195
 Chinese Revolution (1911), 42
 Chinese tradition, 167, 173
 Ching, Henry, 54, 142
 Chow, Kenneth, 86
 Civil liberty, 73, 75-6, 83, 90-1, 186
 Civil Service branch, 112
 cold war, 75
 Colonial Office, 29, 31-2, 35, 41-2
 Common law, 2, 5-7, 12-13, 15, 55-8, 74-5, 86-8, 102, 105-6, 113, 123, 132-4, 141-2, 151, 161-2, 167, 174, 184
 Communist Party, 1-3, 73, 189-90, 194, 196
 Central Committee of, 2
 Work Committee in Hong Kong, 2-3, 15, 138
 Companies Ordinance, 138
 conflict of interest, 117
 Constitution, 48, 59-60, 63-4, 101, 111, 133, 141, 157
 respect for, 2
 constitutional crisis, 4, 6, 62
 Container Terminal No. 9, 188
 Control of Obscene and Indecent Articles Ordinance, 162
 Cooke, Lord, 142
 copyright, 163
 Correctional Services Department, 165
Council of Civil Service Unions v Minister for the Civil Service, 135
 counter-revolutionary, 74-6
 Court of Appeal, 56-7, 65, 67, 102, 140, 142, 144, 146, 149, 151, 165, 185
 Court of Final Appeal, 3-6, 11-12, 15-16, 50, 52, 54, 57-8, 60-5, 67, 102, 104, 106-9, 112, 119-20, 123-4, 150, 152, 187, 189, 191-6
 Court of Final Appeal Ordinance, 192-3
 Court of First Instance, 55, 102-3, 108, 112, 116-17, 119-20, 122
 Criminal justice, 22-3
 Crimes (Amendment) (No.2) Bill, 78
 Crimes (Amendment) Bill (1997), 14, 91
 Crimes Ordinance, 80, 162
 Criminal Procedure Ordinance, 137
 Crown, the, 132-6
 immunity, 133-4, 172
 Crown colony, 1
 Crown Lands Resumption Ordinance, 141-2
 Crown Proceedings Ordinance, 135
 Cultural Revolution, 189
 Davis, John, 20, 30, 34-5
 defamation, 163, 165
 Defamation Ordinance, 163
 Democratic Party, 78, 80, 84
 democratization, 2, 76, 78, 180-2

- Deng Xiaoping, 168, 189
 Dicey, A.V., 58, 136
 Diplock, Lord, 135
 directorate pay scale, 112
 Directorate (Legal) Pay Scale, 112
 Disaffection Act 1934, 88
 District Court, 103–4, 106–9, 119
 District Judge, 103, 107–8, 112, 118–19, 122
 district watch, 36–7
 due process, 3, 6, 15, 132–52
- East and West*, 170
Eastern Express, 160
 emergency power, 43, 57, 76
 Emergency (Principal) Regulations (1949), 13
 Emergency Regulations Ordinance (1922), 162
 England *see* United Kingdom
 English criminal law, 22, 24, 28
 equality before the law, 132–7
 Eu, Audrey, 83–4
 European Convention on Human Rights, 148
 exchange fund, 183
 Executive Council, 142
 Executive interference, 39–43, 49, 51–2, 61, 101
 Executive–legislative relations, 51
- fair trial, 23
Far Eastern Economic Review, 159
 Feng Shui master case *see* Li Yuhui
 Feng Xiliang, 159
 Film Censorship Authority, 161
 Film Censorship Ordinance, 161
 Finance Committee, 121
 Establishment Committee of, 112
 Financial Secretary, 112, 121, 183
 flag desecration case, 57
 flogging, 28–9, 31–3, 40–2
Fok Lai Ying v Governor in Council, 141, 151
 Foreign Office, 33
 freedom of association, 35
 freedom of information, 81, 161
- Gang of Four, 189
- Gao Yu, 169
 Giordana, 172
 Godfrey, Mr Justice, 142
 Governor-in-Council, 24, 39–40, 133, 141
 Griffiths, John, 181
 Guangzhou Intermediate People's Court, 8
- Habeas corpus*, 19, 143–4, 146, 151
Hardial Singh (case), 145–6
 Hennessy, John Paul, 30–1, 41–2
 High Court, 52, 54, 102–4, 106–10, 112, 119–21, 142, 165–7, 174
 High Court Ordinance, 116
 Ho Kai, 20
 Holworthy, W.W., 36
HKSAR v Ng Kung-sui & Another, 57, 67
 Hong Kong Affairs Adviser, 79
 Hong Kong Alliance in Support of the Patriotic Movement in China, 84, 86
 Hong Kong Film Festival, 170
 Hong Kong government (British), 14, 21–2, 27, 36, 69, 78, 83, 143–4, 146, 162, 193
 inventory of, 188–9
 Hong Kong Journalist Association, 81
 Hong Kong Immigration (Amendment) (No 2) Ordinance, 61
 Hong Kong Immigration (Amendment) (No 3) Ordinance, 62, 147–50
 Hong Kong and Macao Affairs Office, 63, 78
 Hong Kong permanent residents, 146–7, 149–50
 Hong Kong Police, 8, 30, 33, 37–9, 42
 Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, *see* Special Administrative Region
Hong Kong Standard, 10, 69, 138, 159, 170
 human rights, 8, 14, 78, 83–6, 88, 185–6, 189

- illegal immigrants case *see* right-of-abode case
 Immigration Department, 147–8
 Immigration Ordinance, 143, 146, 148, 152, 161
 Immigration, Director of, 62, 65, 143–4, 146, 149, 151, 185
 imprisonment, 27–8, 40
 Independent Commission Against Corruption, 50, 165–6
 India, 20
 Institutional protection, 3, 14, 99–100, 115, 119–24
 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 57, 68, 77, 81, 83–6, 89, 148, 150
 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 68
 Interpretation and General Clauses Ordinance, 132, 134, 162
International Herald Tribune, 159
 interpretation of law, 58

 Jardine Group, 188
 Jiang Enzhu, 3
 Jiang Zemin, 2, 8
 Joint Liaison Group, 54, 81
 Judges, 50
 appointment of, 49, 52, 53, 99, 102–3, 107–11, 118–19, 122
 conditions of service, 49, 53, 111–12, 125–6
 definition of, 105–7
 financial security, 100, 111–15
 immunity, 123–4
 independence of, 53, 99–100
 non-regular, 99, 101–3, 106–8, 119
 performance of, 121–2
 protection of, 49, 53, 105
 removal of, 49, 51–2, 99–100, 108–11, 118, 122
 security of tenure *see* removal of
 Judicial Administrator, 119, 121, 125
 judicial autonomy, 49–50
 Judicial committee (of the PRC), 53
 Judicial Council, 118
 Judicial interference, 49, 52–5
 Judicial officer, definition of, 101–3
 Judicial Officers Recommendation Commission, 101–3, 107–10, 112, 114–15, 118–19, 121–2
 Judicial Officers (Tenure of Office) Ordinance, 107–8, 110, 117
 judicial review, 49, 58, 60–1, 63–4, 87, 89, 148, 151
 Judicial Service Commission, 107–8
 Judicial Studies Board, 122, 125
 judiciary, relations with media, 163–7, 169
 jurisprudence, 163
 Justice of Appeal, 102, 107–8, 112
 Justice Department, 4, 7, 10, 12, 50, 54, 58, 69
 Justice, Secretary for, 7, 10–11, 63, 65, 67, 79, 84, 109, 112, 123, 137–40, 171, 184

 Keith, Mr Justice, 143, 148, 150
 Kennedy, Arthur, 40
 Keswicks, 188
 Kilpatrick, Robyn, 86
 Kilmuir Rules, 124
 Korean War, 75, 90
 Kowk, Walter, 8
 Kwok A-Sing case, 43

 Lai, Jimmy, 161, 172
 Lau, Emily, 69, 80, 138, 171–2
 Lau Siu-kai, 79
 Law Reform Commission, 79
 laws applicable in SAR, 55–8
 Lee Yuk Fai *see* Li Yuhui
 Legislative Council, 42, 51–2, 54, 58, 65, 73, 78, 81, 81, 85, 92, 106, 112, 123, 139, 162, 170–1, 173, 182, 185, 192, 195
 reforms of 1991, 77, 191
 legislative interference, 49, 101
 legitimacy, 43
 Leninist political system, 1, 7
 Letters Patent, 7, 77, 133
 Leung, Elsie *see* Justice, Secretary for
 Leung, Lawrence, 185
 Li, Andrew *see* Li Kwok-nang, Andrew
 Li Foon Sin, 60
 Li Ka-shing, 8

- Li Kwok-nang, Andrew *see also* Chief Justice, 54, 65, 122
- Li Peng, 188
- Li Ruihuan, 171
- Li Tak-cheong, 39
- Li, Victor, 8
- Li Yuhui, 8–11, 16, 67, 69
- Litton, Henry, 54, 142, 144–6
- Loh, Christine, 81, 170–1
- London, supervision from, 43
- Lord Chancellor's department, 125
- MacDonnell, Richard, 20, 40–2
- McCarthyism, 90
- magistrate, 21–2, 28–33, 35, 37, 41, 103–4, 106–7, 109–10, 112, 120, 125, 171
- Major, John, 191
- Malaysia, 172
- Man Mo Temple, 37
- Manchu government, 35
- Mao Zedong, 189–90
- Marxist–Leninist legal doctrine, 194
- Marxist–Maoist preconceptions of colonialism, 188
- Master Pay Scale, 112
- Mathews, Jeremy, 86–7
- May, Charles, 37
- media, 157–61, 168–70, 172–4, 180
- Melville, Austin, 40
- Memorandum of Understanding on the new airport, 191
- Ming Pao*, 159, 165, 169, 170
- Ming Pao Newspapers v Attorney-General*, 166
- Minor Employment Claims Adjudication Board, 103, 106–7
- Mirror* magazine, 15, 169, 171
- Mortimer, Mr Justice, 150
- Mui tsai*, 37–8
- Murdoch, Rupert, 159, 170
- Namoa* (SS), 36
- National People's Congress, 3–7, 9, 48–50, 52, 56, 58–65, 67, 69, 77–8, 82, 91, 123–4, 134, 152, 171
- national security, 3, 13, 57, 73–92, 169
- national security offences, 75–6
- Nazareth, Mr Justice, 150
- New Zealand, 163
- Next* magazine, 172
- newspaper publishing, 157
- Ng Ka-ling, 123
- Ng Choy, 20, 30
- Nineties*, 160
- Official Secrets Act (British), 74–5, 80, 88, 162
- Official Secrets Act (Hong Kong), 80–1, 91
- 'One country, two systems', 2, 9, 56, 61, 63–4, 69, 76
- one-way exit permit, 146–7
- open door policy, 190
- orderly repatriation programme, 143
- Ordinance no.1 (1851), 25
- Oriental Daily*, 55, 161, 166, 174
- Oriental Press Group, 166–7
- overseas panel of jurists, 55
- Palmerston (Lord), 34
- pardon, 39, 51
- parliament, 19, 91, 134–6
- parliamentary supremacy, 135
- Patten, Christopher, 20, 77, 80, 82, 169–70, 181–2, 188
- Peace Preservation Ordinance, 42
- pension, 113–14, 125
- Pensions Benefits (Judicial Officers) Ordinance, 113
- People's Republic of China (PRC), 1, 5–8, 10–11, 14, 16, 50, 53, 132, 136, 138, 146–7, 157, 159–60, 167–9, 171–2, 174
- constitution of, 9, 56, 63–4
- laws applicable in SAR, 56–7
- sovereignty of, 3, 11, 67, 86, 187
- Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance, 138–9, 171
- Pinguo Ribao* *see* Apple Daily
- piracy, 22–4, 26–7, 33–6, 39, 43
- Po Leung Kuk, 37–8
- poisoned bread case, 43
- poliburo, 2
- political surveillance, 75
- police *see* Hong Kong Police

- Special Administrative Region (*contd*)
 Team Designate for, 193–4
 Standing Committee on Judicial
 Salaries and Conditions of
 Service, 111–12
 Star TV, 159, 170
 state immunity, 133–6
 State Council, 65, 78, 138
 state-created crime, 30
 subversion, 14, 68, 73–4, 76, 78–9,
 87–8, 162
 summary justice, 22, 43
Sun Daily, 55
 Sun Hung-kai, 8, 172
 Supreme Court, 21–4, 26–9, 33–5, 37,
 39–41
 Supreme People's Court, 50
- Ta Kung Pao*, 159
 Taiwan, 84–5, 87, 160, 169
 Tam, Maria, 62
*Tan Le Lam v Superintendent of Tai A
 Chau Detention Centre*, 143,
 151–2
 Tang, Henry, 84
 Telecommunication Ordinance, 161
 Television Ordinance, 161
 Telford Gardens case *see* Li Yuhui
Texas v Johnson 491 US 397, 57
 theft of state secrets, 68, 73
 Thomas, Michael, 139
 Thompson, John, 40
 Tiananmen (4 June 1989) incident,
 13, 68, 75–7, 92, 159, 187–8, 190
 Tianjian, 2
 Tibet, 87, 169
Tin Tin Daily, 170
 To, James, 81
 Town Planning Ordinance, 142
 transportation (as punishment),
 27–8, 39, 41
 treason, 68, 73, 75, 78–80, 87–8
 triad, 34, 172
 trial by jury, 21–2, 25–6, 43
 tribunals, 103–110, 112, 117, 120
 Tsang, Donald, 183
 Tung Chee-hwa *see also* Chief
 Executive, 2, 5, 84, 101, 171, 182
 Tung Wah hospital, 37
 two-way permit case, 65
 United Kingdom, 75, 88, 123, 125,
 133–4, 163, 187
 United Nations Convention (1950),
 143
 United States, 50, 83, 88, 123, 165
 Supreme Court, 57, 90
United States v Eichman 496 US 310,
 57
- Valente v The Queen*, 99, 101, 110,
 113, 115, 120
 Victoria goal, 27–8, 41–2
 Vietnamese boat people, 143–6, 151
- Wang Dan, 76, 78
 Wang Tao, 20
Wednesbury, 144, 151
 Wei Jingsheng, 76, 78
Wen Wei Pao, 159
 Wilson, David, 188
Window, 159
 Woolf, Lord, 163
 Wong-awah, 23–4
 Wong Yeung-ng, 166–7
 Wu Jianfan, 63
 Wu, Raymond, 62
 Wuang, Mr Justice, 164
- Xi Yang, 76, 80, 159, 169
 Xiao Weiyun, 63
 Xinhua News Agency, 3, 15, 69, 81,
 138–40, 171–2, 188
 Xu Congde, 63
 Xu Simin, 171
- Yang, T.L., 101, 124, 184
 Yee-aon, trial of, 25

- Police Commissioner, 85–7
 Police Force Ordinance, 162
 politics in command, 2
 Post Office Ordinance, 162
 Preliminary Working Committee, 81, 193
 Preparatory Committee, 59, 78–9, 86
 presumption of innocence, 30
 Press, 3, 15–6, 20, 39, 81, 91, 157–74, 186
 Press council, 174
 Prevention of Bribery Ordinance, 162, 165
 Preventive justice, 30
 Probate Registry, 120
 Prime Minister, 135, 187, 191
 Privacy Commissioner, 138–9
 Privy Council, 142, 145–6, 151–2
 Judicial Committee of, 163–4
 Provisional Legislative Council, 57, 67, 78, 83–4, 147, 172, 193–4
 Provisional Urban Council, 170–1
 public interest, 137–9
 Public Order Ordinance, 77, 82, 85–6, 91, 162
 public security bureau, 147
 Public Service Commission, 125
- quasi-judicial power, 52
 quasi-judicial tribunal, 51
 Quebec, 115
Queen v Beauregard, 100–1, 114
 Queen in Parliament, 133
 Queen Victoria, 20
 queue cutting (as punishment), 31
- R v Harris*, 140
R v Lippe, 115–16
R v Sin Yau-ming, 163–4
R v Town Planning Board, ex parte Kwan Kong Co Ltd, 164
 racist bias, 26, 31–3, 43
 Radio Television Hong Kong, 15, 160, 171
Re M, 134
 reciprocal extraterritorialism, 22
 Recorder, 115–17
 Registrar General, 38
 Registration of Local Newspapers Ordinance, 138, 161
Reference re Territorial Act, 117
 right of abode, 3–8, 11–12, 15–16, 49, 52, 57, 59, 61–6, 105, 146–50
 Roads (Works, Use and Compensating) Ordinance, 142
 Royal Instructions, 7, 39
 Royal Navy, 34
 Royal Prerogative, 139
- Second Opium War (1856–60), 31
 secession, 14, 68, 73, 78–80, 87
 Second World War, 75
 sedition, 68, 73–4, 78–80, 87, 90, 162
 self-censorship, 159–60, 168–9, 173–4
Secretary for Justice vs. Oriental Press Ltd. & Others, 55, 89, 166
 separation of power, 50, 58, 63–4, 104, 186
 Shanghai, 2
 Shao Tienren, 63
 Shaukeiwan murder case, 39
 Singapore, 25, 27, 172
Sing Tao Daily, 170
Sing Tao Evening News, 160
 Sing Tao Group, 10
 Sino-British Joint Declaration (1984), 1, 13, 48, 138, 190–1, 193
 Sino-British Joint Liaison Group (See Joint Liaison Group), 54, 81
 slavery, campaign against, 20
 Smale, John, 20, 37, 39, 43
Spycatcher, 164
 socialist legality, 189
 Societies (Amendment) Bill, 84
 Societies Ordinance, 77, 82–3, 91, 138
 South Africa, 90
South China Morning Post, 7, 159, 168
 Special Administrative Region, 1, 9–10, 13–14, 48–51, 53–5, 57, 59–61, 63, 67–8, 73, 76, 91–2, 104, 111, 123–4, 126, 147, 157, 160, 167–9, 173, 180–1, 184, 190, 193, 195
 government of, 2–8, 10–12, 15–16, 51, 57, 59, 61–2, 68–9, 80, 133–6, 152, 172, 174, 183, 196
SAR v Ma Wai Kwan case, 56