

GOVERNING HONG KONG

Administrative Officers from the Nineteenth Century to the Handover to China, 1862–1997

Steve Tsang



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 2007
First published 2007
Reprinted 2008, 2010

ISBN 978-962-209-874-9

This edition published by Hong Kong University Press is available in Mainland China, Hong Kong, Macau, North and South Korea.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Secure On-line Ordering
<http://www.hkupress.org>

Printed and bound by The Green Pagoda Press Ltd., Hong Kong, China.
From camera-ready copy edited and typeset by Oxford Publishing Services,
Oxford.

CONTENTS

Acronyms and Abbreviations	vii
Preface	viii
1. Governance in a colonial society	1
<i>Managing the expatriate community</i>	3
<i>Governing the local Chinese</i>	6
<i>Institutional inadequacies</i>	9
2. The cadet scheme	13
<i>Origins</i>	13
<i>From language cadets to bureaucratic high flyers</i>	19
<i>Impact on colonial administration</i>	23
3. Benevolent paternalism	27
<i>Learning about the Chinese</i>	29
<i>Life and work as a cadet</i>	33
<i>The making of an elite</i>	43
4. Effects of the Pacific War	51
<i>End of the colour bar</i>	52
<i>A new outlook</i>	58
5. Expansion	67
<i>From cadets to administrative officers</i>	69
<i>Ever expanding scope of government activities</i>	72
<i>The last of the old guard</i>	75
<i>Rapid growth and changes</i>	84

Contents

6. Meeting the challenges of a Chinese community	87
<i>Life and work of a modern district officer</i>	87
<i>The life and work of a CDO</i>	94
<i>Life and work at the secretariat</i>	99
<i>Life and work in departments</i>	104
<i>Fighting corruption</i>	110
7. Localization	114
<i>Colonial 'retreads' and transferees</i>	116
<i>Obstacles to local recruitment</i>	120
<i>Beyond the 'glass ceiling'</i>	125
<i>End of the gender bar</i>	131
<i>British mandarins or Chinese officials</i>	135
8. Meeting the challenges of modernity	139
<i>The McKinsey reforms</i>	140
<i>Accountability without democracy</i>	147
<i>Preparing for the end of empire</i>	152
9. An elite within the government	161
<i>Esprit de corps</i>	161
<i>Relations with non-administrative officers</i>	167
<i>Relations with London</i>	170
10. Inhibited elitism	181
<i>Intellectual brilliance versus good governance</i>	182
<i>An inhibited political centre</i>	188
<i>Wider implications</i>	191
Notes	196
References	216
Index	225

Chapter 1

GOVERNANCE IN A COLONIAL SOCIETY

In sharp contrast to what became of the government towards the end of British colonial rule, governance in the formative years of British Hong Kong was not a matter of pride for either the colonists or the British Empire. Immediately after it was founded as a crown colony in 1843 this easternmost outpost of the British Empire in Asia attracted few well educated individuals, highly qualified professionals, well-trained administrators or highly respected merchants not engaged in the opium trade. Most of the Europeans who went to Hong Kong in the mid-nineteenth century were adventurers, smugglers, merchants dedicated to making a quick profit, and sailors or soldiers who took discharge in the Orient. Even after the initial administration had been passed on from Sir Henry Pottinger, a career soldier who founded the colony, to Sir John Davis, a learned man known for his scholarship on the Chinese, governance remained a problem. Indeed, the situation did not improve substantially in the first two decades of British rule. There were few talents or qualified professionals among the colonists who could be recruited by the colonial administration to provide a high standard of government service.

The candid admission in a weekly newspaper, the *Hong Kong Register*, that early colonial Hong Kong was 'one of the most unenviable transmarine possessions belonging to her most Gracious Majesty', Queen Victoria, reflected the prevailing British view of Hong Kong in its infancy.¹ The reputation of this nascent colony did not improve much in the following decade. In the course of the

second Anglo-Chinese War, *The Times* still described it in terms of being 'always connected with some fatal pestilence, some doubtful war, or some discreditable internal squabble; so much so that, in popular language, the name of this noisy, bustling, quarrelsome, discontented, and insalubrious little island, may not inaptly be used as an euphonious synonym for a place not mentionable to ears polite.'²

The problems of governance in this British imperial outpost at the edge of the Chinese Empire were augmented by the non-existence of an established local elite. In most parts of Queen Victoria's steadily expanding empire, the local elite generally provided a ready-made network of collaborators that enabled a small number of British colonists to govern under some form of indirect rule. This did not apply to Hong Kong in its early years as it was itself originally a remote part of the Chinese Empire. Before the British arrived Hong Kong did not have in place either a formal local government or a well entrenched group of scholar gentry who would, as happened elsewhere in the Chinese Empire, constitute the local elite and provide informal government at the sub-county magistrate level. The rapidly rising Chinese population that followed British occupation consisted largely of new immigrants. By and large, they came from neighbouring Guangdong province and were mostly small shopkeepers, labourers, other economic migrants, the destitute, pirates, and people generally deemed to have come not from an honourable background. On the whole, respected and wealthy Chinese did not in this period have any desire to migrate to live under alien rule.

As a result the small colonial administration had to rely in its early years on ethnic Chinese collaborators who did not initially command high respect in either the small indigenous or the much bigger immigrant Chinese community.³ Their collaborators were Chinese who 'chose to follow the British to Hong Kong, which offered lucrative opportunities for collaboration'.⁴ They only emerged as the local elite after they had profited from the collaboration and acquired the means to rise above the labouring class.

In short, the challenge the colonial administration had to face was to get a few poorly trained or unqualified administrators to provide a decent level of governance in a multicultural, multiethnic and largely transient society. It had to govern the Chinese community as well because the latter could not be left to its own local elite. These demands were made more difficult because the hope that Hong

Kong would turn into a prosperous port supporting British trade in China did not materialize quickly. This meant that the colonial government had to operate within severe financial restraints, for it was financially dependent on the British Treasury for a subsidy and was therefore subject to tight Treasury control. Importing experienced and able administrators from Britain or elsewhere within the British Empire to rectify this situation was not an option, except at the top level. Governance in the first two decades of British rule had to operate within these constraints.

Managing the expatriate community

The number of expatriate British residents in Hong Kong was small, and merely increased from 158 when the British first took possession in 1841 to 618 in 1847.⁵ It did not exceed 1000 in the first decade of British rule and only got near 2000 in 1860. Despite their small number their assertiveness meant that they formed the focus of attention of the tiny colonial administration. The main driving force behind the British mercantile community's political activism was self-interest.

As a new colony, Hong Kong needed to raise an income locally to support government services and development, and to build a basic infrastructure. Although it already received a subvention from the British Treasury and would continue to do so for almost two decades, its nature as an imperial outpost rather than a settlement colony gave the colonists justifiable grounds to argue that it should receive a significant subsidy from the imperial government. The case of the expatriate mercantile community was that since Hong Kong was founded primarily as a military and naval station to support imperial interests connected with the whole of the China trade rather than to serve their local interests, the British government should pay a significant proportion of the cost of maintaining this imperial outpost.⁶ Armed with such an argument they petitioned the home government in 1845 to call for some form of municipal self-government so that they could better resist Governor Davis's attempt to raise local revenue by introducing rates.⁷

The British government rejected the mercantile community's requests. Secretary of State for the Colonies William Gladstone ruled that since Hong Kong was occupied 'solely and exclusively with a view to commercial interests' the introduction of rates and other

measures to enable the colonial government to raise revenue locally to finance the administration was justified.⁸ This put an end to the colonists' immediate demand for municipal self-government. It did not, however, change the political reality. It was the British colonists not the Chinese community that could secure the attention of metropolitan Britain and thus the focus of the colonial administration.

To put in perspective the nature of governance in early colonial Hong Kong it is important to recognize that both the colonial society and the government were very small. The expatriate community numbered in the hundreds and the administration consisted of about 50 officials in its first decade.⁹ Thus, despite the grand title of certain offices and references to colony-wide interests, governance and administration of justice among the expatriates closely resembled that of a very small township. Thinking of Hong Kong as a crown colony being run by His Excellency the Governor, supported by his Executive and Legislative Councils and a civil service in the capital city of Victoria, gave a distorted picture of what colonial life and politics were like in the mid-nineteenth century. The colonial community of expatriates in the infancy of Hong Kong was in fact so small that everyone could have known everybody else had they not been divided by strict class barriers. Colonial society in the early decades of British Hong Kong was characterized by the politics of a small community, with all the pettiness, interlocked interests, personal feuds, jealousy and rivalries this entailed. These were exaggerated by the claustrophobic environment of this small island outpost, the inflated egos of officials intoxicated by their grandiose titles, and by the colonists whose sense of superiority *vis-à-vis* the local Chinese cultivated arrogance and pomposity.

The contempt in which a learned man like Governor Davis held the merchants, who were almost all birds of passage associated with the opium trade, was unsurprisingly reciprocated. They detested him and when he left office in 1848 members of the mercantile community ignored him.¹⁰ The animosity that existed between some senior officials and merchants was relatively mild compared with the intensity of hatred and feud that existed among some top officials. Governor Davis forced his colonial treasurer Robert Montgomery Martin to leave office and Hong Kong because the latter not only took a despondent view of the future of the colony but also sought to appeal over the governor's head to London to advocate abandoning

Hong Kong in favour of the more northern island of Zhoushan.¹¹ A quarrel between Davis and the first Chief Justice J. W. Hulme, which originated over the duration of leave that Hulme had allocated himself, eventually turned into a long-running feud and contest of will. The result was Davis resigning from his office after unsuccessfully seeking Hulme's removal by accusing the latter of habitual drunkenness though he could not prove it.¹²

The intense politics of personal rivalries was not the preserve of Governor Davis's tenure. Almost two decades from its founding, similar discord in high office continued to cause havoc within the administration. Hong Kong again lost two top level officials in quick succession after they locked horns. They were Attorney General T. Chisholm Anstey and Registrar General Daniel Caldwell.¹³ They served under Governor Sir John Bowring, another learned man who made himself so unpopular among the colonists that his departure in 1859 was greeted with silence and disregarded by the colonists. Early colonial Hong Kong did not produce an environment conducive to efficient administration or team work within the government.

The smallness of the expatriate population and lack of fully qualified professionals meant that the line between public service and private practice was often blurred. What today would be deemed basic requirements for good practices were simply unaffordable in early colonial Hong Kong. The lack of officers with adequate command of the Chinese language meant that for years the assistant superintendent of police had to act as the interpreter in court for 'cases that he and his network of informants had played a leading role in bringing to court'.¹⁴ The inherent conflict of interest in such a practice made a mockery of any modern principle of good governance or administration of justice.

Even at the highest level in the administration of justice, a shortage of qualified barristers meant that a leading barrister with a private practice, W. T. Bridges, was at different times in the 1850s appointed to serve as both attorney general and colonial secretary.¹⁵ While allowing the attorney general to run a private practice was also allowed in England at the time, in a small community like Hong Kong it allowed questions to be raised about the loyalty and integrity of the barristers concerned. This and other efforts to maximize the value of the limited supply of qualified human resources affected the quality of both governance and the independence of the judicial officers.

Indeed, the personal integrity of senior officials in early colonial Hong Kong was not beyond reproach. Some were known to have speculated in land, taken bribes, colluded with opium farmers or been involved with criminals guilty of extortion and piracy. They included individuals who reached the higher echelons of government like Administrator of the Colony A. R. Johnston, Lieutenant Governor William Caine, Colonial Secretary W. T. Bridges, Registrar General Daniel Caldwell, and Police Superintendent Charles May.¹⁶ Such personal failings of senior officials neither contributed to good governance nor enhanced the prestige and credibility of the colonial administration.

Given its small expatriate population, what made early Hong Kong more than a village or little township was its rapidly expanding Chinese population. Although the original Chinese inhabitants at the time of the British occupation in 1841 numbered roughly 7500 they were quickly outnumbered by a steady influx of immigrants or temporary workers.¹⁷ By 1847, the Chinese population had reached 20,000; it had grown to almost 90,000 by 1860, but then, with the acquisition of Kowloon peninsula, shot up dramatically to almost 120,000 within a year.¹⁸ This expanding Chinese population not only provided the manpower to build a new city-state but also generated many of the economic activities and much of the revenue to sustain the colonial government. In 1855, for example, among 1999 residents who paid rates at or above £10, 1637 were Chinese, while 410 out of 772 who paid rates at or above £40 were Chinese.¹⁹ Although the rapid expansion of the Chinese community was what really enabled Hong Kong to become financially independent and therefore a sustainable colony, it was the expatriate community that continued to receive the overwhelming attention of the administration.

Governing the local Chinese

Despite Hong Kong having been founded as a free port to which people of all nationalities were welcomed, there was little mixing between the expatriate and Chinese communities. By and large, Chinese and non-Chinese chose to live among their own people as the language and cultural gaps between them were substantial. While the parallel existence of the two communities was generally peaceful, the modality of contact between them did pose challenges to good governance and to the administration of justice.

In the mid-nineteenth century, the relationship between an expatriate colonist and a Chinese person was an unequal one. The fact that the vast majority of Chinese who lived in British Hong Kong had little direct dealings with the expatriates did not change this reality. The overwhelming majority of those who had regular contact with members of the expatriate community did so as the latter's servants or employees for menial jobs. A tiny minority of the successful Chinese served as compradors in expatriate owned firms and were charged with dealing with their employers' Chinese trading partners, subcontractors and menial employees. Even though some compradors became highly successful and a few built fortunes that rivalled those of their expatriate employers within a generation, their relationship with their employers was still not that among peers. In its early years as a colony, Hong Kong did not have laws that discriminated against the Chinese, but there was never any doubt that the British colonists saw themselves as superior to the Chinese.²⁰ Discrimination against the local Chinese by the expatriates was so much taken for granted in this early stage of British Hong Kong that no thought was given to providing a legal basis.

For the expatriate community and colonial government, those Chinese who were not in their employ but occasionally came into contact with them were generally treated as actual or at least potential troublemakers. The main causes for contact beyond the provision of service were related to crimes or a breach of the law. Although it was extremely rare for a Chinese person to commit a crime against a European, the Chinese were widely seen as primarily responsible for crimes against expatriate-owned property.²¹ The Chinese also fell foul of the law as some of the activities they practised regularly were proscribed by law under the British. What a Chinese person saw as an enterprising way of making a living, for example as a street trader, became unlawful obstruction of a public highway and unlicensed hawking. In other words, many Chinese were treated as criminals because some of their normal pursuits had been criminalized.²² As far as government officials were concerned, the most likely reason why they would need to contact a Chinese person was when the latter had violated the law or some government regulations and had to be arrested and brought to the magistrate's court. In other words, governance of the Chinese community was seen largely in terms of maintaining stability and good order among an

alien population that did not fully understand or routinely respect the law of the land.

Given that the *raison d'être* behind the founding of Hong Kong was commercial gain, the British were at first happy to leave local Chinese to their own devices so long as they did not break the law or otherwise disturb the peace. Instability or disorder was bad for business or would at least increase the cost of administration. It was with this in mind that the colonial government imported the Chinese social control arrangement known as the *baojia* system. Chinese constables appointed for this purpose were made peace officers with 'the same authorities, privileges and immunities as any constable'²³ and subjected to the general oversight of the police magistrate. They were introduced because the mainly non-Chinese police during Hong Kong's formative years were unable to dampen criminal activities among the Chinese population. However, since they had been abolished by 1861, one must question their effectiveness, especially since there is little record of their achievements.²⁴

As Chinese peace officers failed to establish themselves as an effective auxiliary to the colonial government, the expanding Chinese community gradually produced notables to whom other Chinese increasingly would turn for mediation and arbitration of disputes among themselves. This was tacitly encouraged by the colonial administration as it had no interest in taking on settling disputes among the local Chinese.

Important local leaders in the early days like Loo Achi and Tam Achi had generally profited from working for the British in founding Hong Kong, or made fortunes as compradors or in the entrepôt trade.²⁵ They were not just British collaborators, but differed from traditional Chinese leaders because of their humble and non-gentrified backgrounds.²⁶ Loo, for example, was a Tanka, a kind of outcast boat people, which would normally have stopped him becoming established as a leader of the local Cantonese. Since Hong Kong did not have an established scholar-gentry class, the wealth Loo amassed from provisioning the British put him in a position to try to rise above his lowly origins.²⁷

People like Loo and Tam came to be accepted as community leaders after they used their personal wealth to support local good causes. The landmark development in this connection was the building of the Man Mo Temple on Hollywood Road in the heart of

the Chinese community in 1847. As a temple it was dedicated to the deities for the fortunes of men seeking advancement through the Chinese imperial examinations, and for loyalty and righteousness particularly among warriors. But it was much more than just a temple for the local Chinese. It quickly 'became the main social centre for Hong Kong's Chinese population, regardless of their regional or occupational affiliation'.²⁸

By the start of the 1850s the temple administrators had evolved into a *de facto* local governing board among the Chinese. They 'secretly controlled native affairs, acted as commercial arbitrators, arranged for the due reception of mandarins passing through the Colony, negotiated the sale of [Chinese] official titles, and formed an unofficial link between the Chinese residents of Hong Kong and the Canton Authorities'.²⁹ With neither the wish nor resources to get deeply involved in governing the local Chinese, the colonial government gave benign blessings to this state of affair.

While the local leadership that sprang up around the temple enabled Chinese locals to enjoy *de facto* self government in most everyday affairs, it did not absolve the colonial government of normal policing and public order functions. This was because law and order were matters of serious concern to the expatriate community on which the colonial government focused its attention. When local Chinese broke colonial laws or regulations, they were put before the police magistrate or, in more serious cases, the Supreme Court. Lack of resources, particularly honest officials with sufficient command of the Chinese language to communicate with local Chinese brought in front of the executive or judicial authority, posed a major problem. The relationship between the British governors and the Chinese residents could not be put on a satisfactory footing as neither could communicate effectively with the other.

Institutional inadequacies

The quality of governance the Hong Kong government could offer its residents towards the end of its first two decades of rule was thus very low by the standards of the late-twentieth century, when the Union flag was finally lowered for the last time. The meaning of good governance had also changed over this century and a half. While the government saw meeting the needs of the local Chinese, who always constituted the overwhelming majority of the popu-

lation in Hong Kong, as its primary task towards the end of the twentieth century, its predecessor did not do so.

In the nineteenth century the colonial government looked at the Chinese community largely in terms of maintaining law and order and of securing an important source of public revenue through the imposition of rates and other licence fees. Likewise, to the local Chinese, who were used to the traditional Chinese political practice and unfamiliar with modern British concepts, good governance under alien rule meant good order, non-intrusive administration or enforcement of government regulations, low taxation and scope for them to do whatever they could to earn a living.³⁰ Indeed, even in the United Kingdom, which took a leading part in introducing a professional modern civil service, the mid-nineteenth century was a turning point. In the first part of this century, government offices were still as a general practice, 'shared out [to] the correctly named "offices of profit under the Crown"'.³¹ This was hardly surprising since it was normal in preindustrial states for individuals to go 'into government service in order to make money out of it'.³² The idea of a selfless and devoted modern civil service was only germinating in the early part of the nineteenth century in Britain. It was therefore unexceptional that in Hong Kong, neither the colonial government nor the local Chinese saw their relationship as one between government and citizens.

The inadequacies in governance that existed in mid-nineteenth century Hong Kong were of not much concern to local Chinese primarily interested in being left alone to make a living. They did not think that airing their grievances would reduce abuse by government officials or members of the expatriate community. The colonial government and its magistrates were in any event inherently discriminatory in their dealings with the Chinese. The saving grace for the local Chinese was that the smallness of the administration and the lack of will to interfere in the daily affairs of the local Chinese meant that the government was not generally oppressive. This applied particularly when the failings of the colonial administration were compared with those that prevailed across the border in Guangdong province.³³ Given that stability and good order prevailed and most Chinese were allowed to go about their own affairs as best as they could, they were not dissatisfied with the standard of governance, such as it was.

The institutional inadequacies that existed were largely a matter that interested the colonial administration but not the colonists, for most members of the expatriate community were part of the colonial establishment and thus enjoyed ready access to the government. What was inherently unsatisfactory to the government was the inability of its higher echelons to communicate directly with the overwhelming majority of the population – the Chinese. The problem was summed up in the remarks of Governor Bowring: ‘We rule in ignorance, they obey in blindness.’³⁴

As revealed in the case laid against Daniel Caldwell, the Chinese speaking registrar general who had previously played crucial roles as a police officer and the chief interpreter for the police and the courts, the administration’s heavy reliance on a handful of individuals who happened to know the Chinese language provided wide scope for the abuse of power.³⁵ Caldwell was appointed the first protector of the Chinese in conjunction with his office as registrar general because Governor Bowring was keen to reduce the abuses the expatriate community perpetuated against the local Chinese. With so much power being concentrated in his hands by virtue of his monopolistic command of the Chinese language at a high level of government, Caldwell could not resist the temptation. He used his office to give patronage to one of the most notorious local pirates Wong Machow and otherwise used his position to further his personal gains. In the Wong case, Caldwell’s patronage ‘invested him with immense power’ so much so that Wong became ‘a terror to the bulk of the community, and tyrannized over the lower orders of Chinese, without their daring to complain’ as Caldwell was the only channel by which they could do so.³⁶ With the government’s relations with the majority of the people at the mercy of a man whose personal integrity was not beyond doubt, good governance for Hong Kong as a colony was more an aspiration than a reality.

By the end of the 1850s, when social tension was at times raised as a result of the second Anglo–Chinese War (1856–60), as during the trial of the leading Chinese baker who was alleged to have attempted to poison the entire expatriate community, Hong Kong had recognized the need to ameliorate this institutional inadequacy. Governor Bowring considered a positive development would be the recruitment into the colonial government of able, well-educated young officers who could be groomed to become competent administrators

able to communicate with the local Chinese community. But he was unable to push for such a reform, for he was not an effective governor and the Treasury control over Hong Kong's finance meant he did not have a lot of scope for increasing public expenditure.³⁷

The Hong Kong government had muddled through its first two decades without an adequate means of communicating with the bulk of the local population. This was an undesirable state of affairs that needed to be rectified, particularly once the local economy was doing sufficiently well to allow the government to seek a remedy. As British Hong Kong entered its third decade, the colonial government started to search for a new modality of government. This started in response to the needs of the time but ended up being the beginning of a long search for good governance.

Chapter 8

MEETING THE CHALLENGES OF MODERNITY

Despite the colonial administration believing in the idea of a small government its span of control and general scope of responsibilities in fact expanded steadily in the postwar era. Part of this expansion was the result of the rapid growth of population. From 1950 to 1990, the local population increased by roughly a million every decade. The more dramatic increase happened in the earlier part of this period when the population doubled from two million in 1950 to four million in 1970. It meant the government had to increase in size just to keep up with discharging its established duties. Advancing modernity also required the Hong Kong government to take on new responsibilities and roles whatever its avowed policy. As Hong Kong evolved into a modern community its government had to assume more and more regulatory roles, be they over the banking and finance sectors or over conditions for workers in factories, or school curricula. Indeed, despite the government's policy of not taking responsibility for social welfare, by 1970 it had already unwittingly become not only the largest local employer but also the largest provider of subsidized health services and the biggest landlord of low cost housing.

By then the old structure of government was clearly under strain. When the government was much smaller the heavy concentration of power at the top worked well and efficiently. Top officials could keep track of most matters, both important policy issues and petty administrative ones; they made decisions quickly and acted decisively. With the huge expansion of the government machinery in the

quarter century after the Second World War, including the proliferation of departments, the old system suffered severe strain as top administrators saw their responsibilities expanding exponentially. The axiom in administration that urgent matters always get attention before important ones proved only too real in Hong Kong.¹ It stretched the capacity of the old system to its limits.

By 1970 or so, it was reaching a stage when top level officials were mainly preoccupied with immediate issues and could not find time to think strategically about important policy matters or plan for a longer-term timeframe. One of the problems inherent in the system was that the principal assistant colonial secretaries at the Colonial Secretariat who on a day-to-day basis coordinated policy and administrative matters with government departments were junior in rank to heads of departments. It meant that 'when disagreements arose, Heads of departments would insist that issues be passed upwards for decision by the Colonial Secretary or the Financial Secretary or their deputies, who consequently became overloaded, often with relatively unimportant matters.'² Indeed, the government's capacity to pre-empt problems was shown to be woefully inadequate by the riots of a few years earlier. As a result, some kind of reform or reorganization of the administration was widely seen as desirable. The introduction of the CDO scheme, examined in Chapter 6, reflected the government's recognition and acceptance of a need for change.

The McKinsey reforms

A fresh approach to reforming the colonial administration to improve governance was taken after Murray MacLehose became governor in late 1971.³ Although the idea of reform was not new, and MacLehose's predecessor, David Trench, was willing to introduce changes, it was MacLehose who brought in a new approach. Instead of appointing a high level commission of senior or recently retired civil servants and distinguished citizens in Hong Kong, or requesting London to appoint a royal commission to review governance, as would have been the more usual practice in the colonial context, MacLehose chose to engage a modern firm of management consultants, McKinsey & Company, for this purpose.

MacLehose decided to take this novel approach partly because he felt a fresh look at the administration would be good for Hong Kong, and partly because he shared the Foreign Office's basic mistrust of

the colonial government, which had been nicknamed 'the republic of Hong Kong' during Trench's governorship. A successful diplomat who had already served as ambassador to two countries of medium importance, MacLehose did not expect to be offered the governorship.⁴ When he accepted the appointment at the age of 52 it was not unreasonable for him to expect a senior ambassadorial appointment to crown his career after a five-year tour in Hong Kong. He was therefore keen not to be seen to have 'gone native' by his colleagues in the Foreign Office. This underlined his decision to engage a neutral and forward-looking firm of management consultants to review and improve the government machinery rather than rely on old established practices in crown colonies.

MacLehose thought it necessary to reform the government machinery not because he deemed the administrative officers or senior colonial civil servants incompetent but because he found the colonial bureaucracy an obstacle to the major changes he had in mind.⁵ When he returned as governor a decade after he served there on secondment as political adviser he could not but have noticed that the structure of the administration had remained largely intact. It was a structure inherited from the Victorian era. It was not an administration 'attuned to the formulation and implementation of development policies' nor one that had 'special capability for sophisticated forward planning or for anticipating future problems'.⁶ Seeing himself as a career diplomat, MacLehose had no sentimental attachment to the colonial establishment or to administrative officers. Being a forward-looking man interested in pushing through some social policies, he concluded it was time the colonial administration were modernized to improve governance and its capacity to support his vision of social development.⁷ As he put it, 'some of the procedures and arrangements of work, which are the legacy of history, do seem to me ... to merit re-examination in the light of the greatly changed conditions of modern Hong Kong including, in particular, the great expansion in the role and scope of Government.'⁸

The engagement of McKinsey in 1972 at considerable public expense caused some unease among administrative officers.⁹ While few failed to see the advantage inherent in having the government machinery and its procedures reviewed from a fresh perspective, most were sceptical of the employment of a firm of management consultants for this purpose. It was a break with long-established

practices. The engagement of a firm of management consultants also in an important sense hurt the pride of the administrative officers. Their 'cardinal importance' and status as 'a central lynch-pin in the exercise and operation of Government' had long been accepted in Hong Kong, but this was implicitly questioned by the engagement of outsiders not renowned for their ability as government administrators even less so in a colonial context.¹⁰ It was fundamentally different from the appointment of a high-level commission of experienced administrative officers from the UK or another commonwealth country, who would be respected for what they were and their appointment seen as intending to provide a professional review by a detached parallel service with no entrenched interest in Hong Kong. The governor's decision to engage McKinsey cast a shadow over whether the elite position of administrative officers would be sufficiently understood, respected and protected.

Whatever individual senior administrative officers might have thought of the engagement of McKinsey, they worked with the consultants to devise reforms that would improve governance without changing the nature of the political establishment. They cooperated with McKinsey not only because they were required to do so but also because they shared the desire to improve governance and wanted to have their own input,¹¹ which was essential also for ensuring that their elite position within the government would not be eroded.

McKinsey & Company produced recommendations focused essentially on two different dimensions of the administration. The first was on making improvements to the existing machinery to make it operate more efficiently and rationally. They included standardizing procedures and formats for various government departments to request resources from the central administration, delegating authority downward in the Colonial Secretariat and outward to departments, and extending the use of computers.¹² They did not affect the position and work of the administrative officers directly. The other dimension was about reorganizing the top echelon of the administration to ensure better use of human resources and to strengthen the capacity of the government to plan for the future. Since administrative officers formed the core of the government, particularly its higher echelons, these changes affected them directly.

The main McKinsey recommendations in this respect were directed towards reorganizing the Colonial Secretariat, creating a new

structure for the secretariat to coordinate, supervising departments without overloading the few top officials, and building into the new structure the capacity for longer-term planning in both policy matters and in the allocation of resources. More specifically, the secretariat was reorganized into six policy branches and two resource branches, each headed by a secretary equal in rank to that of a head of a major government department.¹³ They took over from the more junior principal assistant colonial secretaries of the old structure. In setting up the new branches the old schedules of responsibilities that former principal assistant colonial secretaries had were rationalized and redistributed to the appropriate new branches. The new policy branches were economic services, environment, home affairs, housing, security and social services, whereas the two resource branches were finance and establishment. In McKinsey's conception, the 'policy branches should delegate much of their current day-to-day administrative load to the departments, and should take on a new role of ensuring that plans are developed for the major programmes' so that they would 'take on a greater responsibility, in conjunction with departments, for policy formulation'.¹⁴ The introduction of major policy programmes required 'the setting of overall policy objectives in major fields for 5-10 years ahead' and was meant to remove the scope for department heads in the old system to give low priority to longer term planning.¹⁵ The introduction of annual operating plans was to improve cost effectiveness.¹⁶ With regard to resources, formal plans were meant systematically to 'identify the requirements for key resources across the whole of Government, the means of obtaining them, and their optimum distribution'.¹⁷

In devising a new machinery of government, McKinsey worked closely with senior officials, mostly administrative officers. While it recommended that 'senior jobs' become open to 'all grades', including not only the promotion of specialists to head professional departments but also ending the preservation of certain top positions for administrative officers, it did not make any recommendation that challenged the administrative officers' elite position.¹⁸ Instead, it recognized the value of administrative officers and highlighted that their shortage was an important impediment to improving the effectiveness of the government.¹⁹ The resulting opening of the administrative grade at the middle levels to experienced officials of non-administrative officer background was done selectively and on

the basis of merit. It enabled the ranks of administrative officers to be strengthened.²⁰ It did not reduce promotion prospects for administrative officers. On the contrary, the McKinsey reforms created more senior positions that administrative officers were best placed to fill, not least at the secretary level.²¹ More generally, promotion prospects improved as the number of staff grade posts increased faster than the growth rate of administrative officers as a whole, which averaged 5 per cent per annum in the decade leading to the McKinsey reforms.²²

The McKinsey proposals were in fact neither original nor as carefully conceived as their drafters presented them.²³ The upgrading of branches at the secretariat to oversee government departments created confusion and tension in its early days. The creation of a home affairs branch at the Colonial Secretariat while the old home affairs secretariat was reorganized into the home affairs department created 'a muddle' in the words of the first new home affairs secretary Denis Bray. He admitted that this caused problems as the new director of home affairs Eric Ho 'naturally wanted to behave like a head of department and saw no need for the Secretary to peer over his shoulder all the time'.²⁴ In Bray's own recollection, 'fortunately he was a man I liked, and thought highly of, so we managed affairs without rancour or poaching on each other's territory'.²⁵

The 'most contentious' McKinsey proposal involving 'the reorganization of the Secretariat' was developed into its final form after Governor MacLehose expressed 'a positive and dynamic interest' and 'asked the Consultants to develop' it further than their original suggestions.²⁶ The creation of the new secretary positions amounted to little more than upgrading the former principal assistant colonial secretary posts to near the top rank in the civil service and giving them more resources with which to discharge their responsibilities, which former principal assistant colonial secretaries had not had the rank or resources to accomplish hitherto.²⁷

By giving the new secretaries a 'policy formulation' role, McKinsey reflected a failure to understand the proper constitutional position of senior secretariat offices. Strictly speaking, in the crown colony system that existed in Hong Kong, policy making was the prerogative of the governor in council, and the secretariat staffs were there only to assist and advise the governor in council, and to see that its policies were implemented appropriately.²⁸ They were staff rather than line officers, though they were regularly involved in deliberations leading

to the writing of policy papers that would be submitted to the governor in council for policy decisions. In other words, senior administrative officers had long been part of the policy-making process but they were not strictly speaking policy makers. To accomplish what McKinsey proposed to do in giving the new secretaries the power to make policy, they would have to be made members of the Executive Council and, as such, be given departmental portfolios to superintend in a manner similar to that in a cabinet system. In reality, only a selected few of the new secretaries were appointed to the Executive Council and they merely took over those seats previously allocated to heads of major government departments. Neither the Executive Council nor the secretaries collectively functioned like a cabinet in the normal sense of the word. Some of the McKinsey reforms thus resulted in staff officers being given line responsibilities on dubious constitutional grounds.

Another notable problem created by the McKinsey proposals regards the legal authority of newly created policy secretaries. Until various laws were changed, heads of major government departments, not the new secretaries, were the statutory authorities that represented the government in specific matters. This legal position was not changed by the government's adoption of the McKinsey recommendations and the transformation of them into government policy. David Jordan, the director for commerce and industry, was for example mindful that it was his office that was the statutory authority under the imports and exports ordinance. This meant it was he who would be held accountable for what his department did, not the secretary for economic services, who was given the responsibility over the department.²⁹ Likewise, as head of department he was the budget holder for his department and it was strictly speaking he, not the 'superintending' secretary, who was accountable to the Treasury and the Legislative Council for the use of public funds in his department.³⁰ Since he was equal in rank to the new secretaries and he believed some of the changes McKinsey proposed were problematic on constitutional grounds, he refused to accept any direction from the secretary for economic services though he continued to accept it from the financial secretary, an ex-officio member of the Executive Council.³¹ Since commerce and industry was one of the key departments in the government this did not make for an easy and straightforward implementation of the McKinsey reforms.³²

The personal disapproval of individual senior administrative officers like Jordan and financial secretary Philip Haddon-Cave did not, however, lead to a failure of the McKinsey reforms. Most other administrative officers and heads of department were either unaware of the constitutional issues involved or willing to proceed on the basis that implementing the McKinsey reforms was government policy and *ipso facto* appropriate. After the teething problems such as those outlined above were resolved or fudged and secretaries elevated to a rank senior to heads of major departments, the McKinsey reforms were made to work.

This happened partly because senior administrative officers just got on with filling the gaps the McKinsey consultants left behind. A prime example was the lack of any provision in the McKinsey scheme to include 'a more rational system for determining spending priorities'.³³ What eventually made the reforms work was the powerful finance branch 'buying into the reform agenda itself', which made 'medium-term planning both possible and necessary, and thereby making the very necessary medium-term management of the budget possible'.³⁴ This started with the introduction by the deputy financial secretary, Henry Ching, 'of a resource allocation system which dovetailed well with the policy Secretaries' medium term programme plans'.³⁵ Indeed, despite his personal feelings about the McKinsey reforms, Haddon-Cave gave his blessings to Ching's initiative. With the chief secretary presiding over debates on the relative priorities of different programme areas and the finance branch 'keeping a tight rein over total forecast public sector expenditure' they modernized and rationalized the administrative structure of the government.³⁶ This also coincided with a period of rapid growth in government revenue, as Hong Kong's economy truly took off. It meant putting at the disposal of the administration significantly more new resources for meeting the new demands the old structure simply found itself too strained to meet. It ought to be recognized that the McKinsey review did not really change the way the government operated. In an effort to accommodate 'the conservatism of the civil service and the negative tenor of most public comments' the McKinsey recommendations were in fact diluted as they were implemented.³⁷ The dilution and adaptations were essential to the successful modernization of the government apparatus.

The most important achievement of McKinsey's review was to start modernizing and upgrading the government machinery to enable it to take on new social and developmental dimensions of government, for which planning ahead and additional resources were essential. Opening up top positions in the administration to officials of the right calibre rather than the desired career background did not harm administrative officers' careers, for they formed a meritocracy and the changes coincided with a dramatic increase in senior posts. Promotion prospects for the most able administrative officers were in fact improved rather than harmed by the McKinsey reforms. They remained 'the dominant force in [assisting] policy-making'.³⁸

Accountability without democracy

An unintended but nevertheless no less important consequence of the McKinsey reforms was the creation of an additional layer of senior positions mostly occupied by top administrative officers. This is often seen as having facilitated 'the evolution of a cabinet of some kind - made up of "political" administrative officers', who were 'increasingly expected to act and operate as ministers and ministerial staff and to be politically more sensitive and responsive to external political challenges and turbulences'.³⁹ While such an observation rightly highlights the rising need for top civil servants holding the office of secretary to play increasingly important political roles, it is also misleading. It reflects a misunderstanding of what the office of secretary created by the McKinsey reforms was meant to be. It was not intended to be the equivalent of a cabinet minister in the Westminster model, who is expected and required to take political responsibilities. Instead, the secretaries established after the McKinsey review were experienced administrators (though not necessarily administrative officers) who were expected to relieve the colonial secretary, the financial secretary and their deputies from coordinating and supervising the work of departments so that they could engage in strategic planning. McKinsey and the colonial government never intended the newly created office of secretary to be held politically accountable. This issue simply did not come up in the review. Secretaries created as a result of the McKinsey reforms remained civil servants and were treated by the government as such.

'Adding' political roles to secretaries came a decade after the McKinsey reforms when the community of Hong Kong had changed

so much that the issue of government accountability had become a real one. However, it should be recognized that administrative officers performing line duties had always functioned as political officers. It is therefore incorrect to describe secretary-level administrative officers as having acquired new political roles in the 1980s. What was new was that the general public expected to see the government being held accountable, and it saw secretaries as the top officials responsible for the policy programmes associated with their branches.⁴⁰

The anomaly that senior civil servants, usually holding office as secretaries, were deemed accountable for government policies by the general public did not in fact mean they were actually held responsible for policy failures by the colonial government. What was being developed in Hong Kong was fundamentally different from what happened in other British dependent territories when they transformed their crown colony system into a progressively more representative form of government. When the general public agitated for government accountability in British colonies in the latter part of the twentieth century, the British usually responded by granting self-government steadily with a view to eventual independence. The key initial change in this process generally involved the adoption of a 'member system'. This meant selected members of the Legislative Council would be asked to look after departmental portfolios and represent them in the legislature and become quasi-ministers. This marked the introduction of political responsibility to the crown colony system, and would be followed by further moves towards developing a full ministerial government – a development normally paralleled by the advent of political parties and competitive elections. Full self-government and eventual independence would come in due course. This direction of development was not attempted in Hong Kong.⁴¹ Its secretaries were not government ministers and were not required to take ministerial responsibilities.

What was being developed in Hong Kong under MacLehose and his immediate successor Sir Edward Youde (who was governor from 1982 to 1987) was a system that gave the general public a sense that the government was accountable and responsive to its views without making any individual who served in the colonial government personally responsible. In this system there was no question that a secretary, a mere civil servant, should be asked or expected to resign

even if a policy integral to the portfolio under his or her remit should turn out to be a major mistake and need to be retracted.⁴²

The most spectacular example happened in 1984 when the government's decision to introduce new licensing requirements for taxis caused civil disobedience by taxi drivers and a major riot, which forced the government to retract the new policy. The transport secretary Alan Scott did attract 'the brunt of a loud and specific criticism' and was deemed responsible for this policy by the general public.⁴³ However, the government did not hold him politically responsible for the policy backfiring, for the governor in council made the policy and Scott was merely the most senior civil servant tasked to advise the governor in council, prepare the paperwork, advocate it on behalf of the government in public and see to its implementation. The retraction from this initiative was also not based on a decision by Scott but on a decision by the government. While it has been suggested that Scott was forced out of office because of the public outcry he was not in fact punished for the blunder over the taxi licensing requirements and the subsequent disturbances.⁴⁴ What did happen was that Scott's colleagues came to see him as either 'damaged goods' or 'accident prone',⁴⁵ which no doubt contributed to his decision to move on as governor of the Cayman Islands in 1987. Whatever his colleagues thought of him, Scott remained secretary for transport in Hong Kong until the following year and was made deputy chief secretary in June 1985 after an interval of a month as secretary (special duties) - hardly evidence of a demotion or punishment.⁴⁶

The issue here is not one of Scott getting away with it because of patronage by the governor or British government in London. It is that in the system that prevailed he, a civil servant, was not politically responsible for the policy blunder and it would have been unfair for him to have had to pay the price for the failure of the policy. The colonial government's steadfast protection of its top civil servants might have displeased the general public, but not requiring top civil servants to take political responsibility or be used as political scapegoats was vital in maintaining their morale and loyalty. It reassured them, mostly but not exclusively administrative officers, that as long as they performed their duties to the utmost of their abilities and in good conscience the government would not allow their professional careers and reputations to be destroyed for short-term political

considerations, though demonstrated incompetence or failings could and did damage the personal reputation of those concerned.

The confusing roles and positions of secretaries arose because the people and society of Hong Kong came of age and demanded government accountability but the British government decided that the usual response in other British colonies – democratization leading to eventual independence – was not an option in Hong Kong. Unlike previous generations of Chinese residents of Hong Kong, who were sojourners in an outpost of an alien empire, an increasing percentage of Hong Kong's residents in the 1970s were born and brought up in Hong Kong. By the 1980s they had formed a majority of the local population. Unlike their immigrant parents, they developed a sense of identity, received a modern education that exposed them to modern Western concepts, and developed stable and relatively prosperous careers that allowed them the material comfort, leisure and intellectual capacity to assert their rights as modern citizens.⁴⁷ They formed an ever expanding modern middle class that was gaining in civic consciousness. They might remain hesitant about 'rocking the boat' because they could see that the existence of a communist regime in China could result in the extinction of their cherished way of life, but since the 1970s they increasingly wanted their voices to be heard and to hold the government accountable for its policies and their consequences.⁴⁸ To accommodate their legitimate desires, which were expressed in civil actions that were spreading, particularly among the younger and better educated, the colonial government tried to be as responsive to public views and criticisms as possible. The adaptation of the secretary system so that top-level officials would be seen as responding to public opinion and looking after public interests, among other institutional changes, was therefore put into effect.

The role secretaries were thus required to take on *vis-à-vis* the general public was that of a political officer in the traditional sense in a colonial context, not of a minister in a democratic system. A sponsor of new social and development policies Governor MacLehose was conscious of the need to respond adroitly to public opinion and to appear to take into account views of the lower social strata, for the success of such policies needed the general public to embrace them. He 'changed the nature of the Legislative Council' when he increased the number of its unofficial members and in 1976



HM Queen Elizabeth II on tour with Secretary of Housing Ian Lightbody during her first visit to Hong Kong (1975). Behind the Queen is Governor MacLehose.

appointed individuals 'from areas in society that had never been considered before'.⁴⁹ With individuals like Wong Lam, a highly public-spirited citizen and former bus driver, serving as unofficial members at the Legislative Council, it had the effect that they, in the view of a former administrative officer, would 'bring us down to earth when discussions were straying too far into imagination'.⁵⁰ The introduction of lower-middle-class nominees to the Legislative Council might not have changed the fundamentals in the working of the Legislative Council,⁵¹ but it started a process that required secretary level officials to pay heed to the views of the community at large.

In the late 1970s MacLehose even briefly considered introducing a 'member system', but dropped it in favour of asking secretaries and, where appropriate, other senior officials to discharge their role as political officers more sensitively and effectively. The result was the hybrid that took shape in Hong Kong at the beginning of the 1980s.

The increasing importance of the traditional political officer element of the work of secretaries meant that most secretary positions ended up being filled by administrative officers. This was because, with most administrative officers having served as political

officers sometime in their careers – as district officers, city district officers, or assistant secretaries in the Secretariat for Home (previously Chinese) Affairs – they had an advantage over their colleagues from a professional or specialist background. Also, being generalists rather than specialists, they were more comfortable taking on the political role expected of secretaries than their colleagues from a professional or specialist background. Furthermore, it has long been part of the administrative officers' ethos to take on whatever new responsibility may be required of them in good spirit. They also welcomed knowing that, while accountable for their personal failings, their senior colleagues in the administration, mostly fellow administrative officers, would never make a scapegoat of them should a government policy fail or backfire.

Preparing for the end of empire

The need for secretaries to perform their political roles well became more acute as the future of Hong Kong was settled and political reforms introduced in the middle of the 1980s. The addition of indirectly elected members to the Legislative Council came about in 1985.⁵² This had 'become desirable and politically necessary' to ensure the British House of Commons would support 'overwhelmingly the 1984 Sino-British agreement' on the future of Hong Kong.⁵³ Indeed, this agreement 'required the Hong Kong legislature to be constituted by election by 1997 at the latest, which could not be achieved without reform since all members of the then existing [Legislative] Council were appointed, not elected'.⁵⁴ Following the reform of 1985, the new Legislative Council consisted of 57 members, of whom 12 unofficial members were elected by an electoral college, another 12 by functional constituencies, and 22 appointed by the governor. There were also ten official members while the governor presided.⁵⁵ Even though the elective elements introduced were not returned through direct elections on the basis of universal franchise, they nevertheless behaved differently from 'the great and the good' that used to be appointed as unofficial members, who were deemed 'docile and subservient to the British colonial authority'.⁵⁶ This changed the dynamics in the Legislative Council and the 'once staid assembly did get a lot livelier'.⁵⁷

With indirectly elected unofficial members having a need to answer to their constituencies they demanded greater accountability from

their official colleagues in the Legislative Council. With both the unofficial and official members working together, they also started to hold the meetings of the finance committee and the public accounts committee in public. As a result, secretaries who were also members of the Legislative Council found they had almost completely lost the 'protection of anonymity, as they are pushed into a limelight they never sought and were not trained to cope with' in their civil service careers.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, secretaries, particularly those who were administrative officers, were determined to rise to this new challenge. By and large they felt that this was just another new demand put on them and faced it confidently, for they believed they had in any event always been accountable – in the sense that they had habitually borne in mind and acted in the best interest of the community.⁵⁹

The changes unleashed by the reform of the Legislative Council in 1985 were, however, only the beginning. Further developments in increasing the democratic elements in the old colonial system of government progressively demanded the executive branch to be answerable to them over government policy. For the rest of the 1980s administrative officers continued to work on preparing for the progressive expansion of democratic self-government, which culminated in the publication of a government consultation paper on the further development in representative government in May 1987.⁶⁰ However, their efforts did not produce much result because the Chinese government's resistance to democratization in Hong Kong forced the Hong Kong government to slow down for the rest of the decade.⁶¹

The next and more significant change happened in 1991, when the number of elected members in the Legislative Council was raised to 39 (including 19 directly elected members) out of a council of 60. This followed heightened public demand for a faster pace of democratization in response to the Tiananmen Square massacre of 1989.⁶² The Legislative Council became a body that increasingly sought to hold the government to account in public.

This development was given a further and major impetus after former British cabinet minister Chris Patten became governor in 1992. Even though most of his reform package, outlined in his policy address of October that year, was not implemented until 1995, he ended dual membership of non-officials in the Executive and Legislative Councils, and introduced governor's question time to the Legislative Council without delay.⁶³ They marked a basic change in



Just retired Hong Kong Commissioner greeting Prime Minister Thatcher at the Hong Kong Society dinner on 8 June 1989. Others in the picture are Woodrow Wyatt (far left) and Henry Keswick (middle).

the relations between its executive and legislative branches. This was that while the government should remain an executive led one, the executive branch should be seen to be held accountable to the legislative branch in public on a routine basis.⁶⁴

What this career politician governor introduced was not designed to impose political responsibility on top civil servants. It was meant above all to enable the colonial government to find an elegant way out of the political predicament inherent in Hong Kong's transition from a British crown colony to a Chinese Special Administrative Region. By then the people of Hong Kong clearly wanted a faster pace of democratization, but any such development was fundamentally constrained by the policy of the Chinese government to contain democratization as codified in the basic law for the post-1997 Hong Kong SAR. With his hands thus tied, Patten had to introduce some changes quickly, as distinct from his main reform package, which was open to discussions with the Chinese.

In Patten's conception, the separation of membership between the Executive and Legislative Councils was meant to give him justifiable grounds to claim that he had made a significant step forward in democratization, and to remove the public expectation that leading

Democratic Party legislative councillors be appointed to the Executive Council.⁶⁵ He thus promptly introduced a change that would enable him to assert that he had turned the Executive Council into something akin to the US cabinet and made it accountable to the legislature.⁶⁶ The introduction of the governor's question time, modelled after the prime minister's question time in the House of Commons, was intended to showcase a flagship democratic institution of the British parliamentary system. With both in place Patten could justifiably claim to have advanced democracy in colonial Hong Kong. Although Patten handled governor's question time himself, the general atmosphere in the Legislative Council changed. For the remaining five years of British rule, legislative councillors demanded and expected secretaries to be held publicly accountable in the legislative chamber. Furthermore, as the administration could no longer take it for granted that bills endorsed by the Executive Council would normally be passed in the Legislative Council, policy secretaries 'had to lobby Legco members to get' government policies under their bailiwick approved.⁶⁷ While there had previously been occasions when the colonial administration had to lobby a sceptical Legislative Council to pass a bill about which it was doubtful, lobbying had by the 1990s become almost a regular practice.

This development reached a high point after the implementation in 1995 of Patten's 1992 package for reforming the Legislative Council, which finally eliminated all appointed members. Although the council no longer had official or ex-officio members, secretaries were invited to appear in council to introduce, explain and defend government policies. When they thus appeared they were questioned and deliberately embarrassed in ways that were unthinkable a decade earlier.⁶⁸ The proceedings of a council meeting on a randomly selected day in the middle of 1996 when there was no major political controversy raging produced, for example, the following exchange, as the secretary for security Carrie Yau tried to answer a question from Councillor Howard Young, on the visa requirements for Chinese citizens visiting Hong Kong.

SECRETARY FOR SECURITY (in Cantonese): Mr President, with effect from 1 August 1993, PRC nationals transiting through Hong Kong to or from overseas countries are allowed a visa-free stay of up to seven days as visitors provided that they

have valid passports, confirmed airline bookings and valid visas for their overseas destinations. The purpose of this arrangement is to facilitate their overseas travel by connecting flights in Hong Kong or stopping over here before returning to China. This transit facility is however not allowed for journeys from China to Macau since PRC nationals in China can go to Macau direct. ...

At present, we have no plan to relax the visa-free arrangement to allow PRC nationals to transit through Hong Kong to Macau. Such a relaxation will invite abuses to bypass the existing schemes controlling PRC nationals visiting Hong Kong.⁶⁹

MR JAMES TO (in Cantonese): Mr President, the first paragraph of the Secretary's main reply is in fact logically refutable because if we say they can go to Macau from China directly, they can also go to Thailand or any other places in the world from China directly, and do not have to go through the Hong Kong Airport. Therefore, there is a logical contradiction in this concept. Nevertheless, my question is on the point in the last paragraph of the main reply where the Secretary said that in so doing, the system would be abused. However, if they only go to Macau for one or two days during that period and then come back to Hong Kong and they can produce proof that they will go back to China, I wonder what security significance is there that the authorities have to refuse their entry to Hong Kong or put them under close scrutiny. Mr President, my question is on security significance.⁷⁰

With the political system changed into one in which the political future of members of the Legislative Council may be affected by their apparent success or failure to hold the administration or its top officials to account, the balance of responsibilities for secretary level officials shifted.

Despite these changes one thing remained fundamentally the same. Secretaries and top administrative officers continued as politically neutral civil servants though they now had to be publicly answerable to directly or indirectly elected legislative councillors. The increased demand on them to perform their political duties did not in fact

make them politically responsible in the sense that ministers are in a parliamentary system. The increasing requirement to discharge their political duties effectively might have meant administrative ability alone would no longer suffice for able administrative officers to discharge their responsibilities at the top. However, the political element of their duties remained fundamentally that of a political officer role in the colonial context.

The political neutrality of the civil service and its senior administrative officers was maintained partly because of bureaucratic inertia and entrenched practices. But it was above all because it was essential to ensure a smooth transition of Hong Kong from a crown colony to a Chinese SAR. It was intended to enable the civil service as a whole to continue to serve Hong Kong to its best ability regardless of the impending change of sovereignty.

To enable a seamless transfer of power to happen in 1997, the colonial government swiftly moved to reassure the civil service and prepare it for the eventual handover of sovereignty, after Britain reached an agreement with the Chinese over the future of Hong Kong in 1984. Since the Sino-British agreement in fact committed Hong Kong to accept fundamental changes in 13 years' time, a basic consideration for the colonial administration was to ensure stability, order, prosperity and predictability in the transitional period. For the British government there was an 'over-riding fear ... that the [colonial] administration might collapse before 1997', which made it very keen to keep the expatriate officers on board while it prepared for localization.⁷¹ Indeed, as 'in other British colonies in the days before independence', the civil service was deemed 'the bulwark of stability in uncertain times, the repository of fairness, justice, and the continued observance of long-established rules.'⁷² The colonial government therefore promptly set out to assure members of the civil service that their future would be secure. On the day after the Sino-British agreement was initialled, chief secretary and head of the civil service Philip Haddon-Cave wrote to all members of the civil service in the following terms: 'Appointments and promotions will be based on qualifications, experience and ability as at present. Matters such as recruitment, discipline, training and management of the public service will continue to be dealt with in accordance with existing principles and practices. The present practice of restricting certain posts to British nationals will be discontinued.'⁷³ Apart from

reassuring the civil servants and maintaining their morale, the government decided to accelerate the process of localization so that the civil service would be in a form suitable to continue to serve Hong Kong after the transfer of sovereignty in 1997.⁷⁴

The government's overt commitment notwithstanding, localization of the administrative officers continued to proceed at a deliberate pace at first, even though the government ended the recruitment of expatriate administrative officers after the Sino-British agreement was signed in December 1984.⁷⁵ The longstanding commitment to a meritocracy meant that while more and more top posts were increasingly made available to local officers they were still promoted on the same basis as before without accelerated promotion. Two years after the agreement was reached, of 197 directorate level administrative officers (or those of Staff Grade C and above), fewer than half or merely 93 were local officers.⁷⁶ At the very top, only three of the 14 secretaries and four of the 11 Staff Grade A officers were local. In the light of the age profile of the senior administrative officers in the mid-1980s, when the handover was scheduled to take place in 1997, top positions in the government, which had to be held by local officers, would be filled mainly by the approximately 40 local administrative officers holding the rank of Staff Grades B and C in the mid-1980s.⁷⁷ This meant in general terms that more than half of them could expect to rise to the top. It provided a powerful incentive to the senior local administrative officers to stay and do their best.

As the colonial administration started to plan and prepare for the eventual transfer of sovereignty it needed to think not only about having suitably qualified and experienced local officers to take the helm in due course, but to consider the welfare and future of expatriate officers whose promotion to the top would be blocked in the run up to 1997. It was a delicate balance because maintaining the effectiveness and efficiency of the government required sustaining the morale and team spirit of all administrative officers, be they expatriate or local. When a policy for localization in the light of the handover was being worked out in the latter half of the 1980s, expatriate administrative officers still dominated the top echelon of the administration. The balance they struck was to provide scope for accelerated promotion for the most able local officers closer to the handover date and to provide a generous package to compensate those expatriate officers whose career prospects suffered as a result.⁷⁸

In addition, they also introduced changes to ensure that the provision of a pension to retired local and expatriate officers would be protected despite a change of sovereignty in 1997.

The decision to promote local officers in preference to expatriate officers started in 1987 and, as a result, ten senior expatriate civil servants lost their jobs to local officers in the first three years of this arrangement, with the expatriate officers concerned being paid HK\$ 10 million in compensation.⁷⁹ Also in 1987, for the first time the number of local officers exceeded that of expatriates at the directorate level, with the percentage shifting in favour of local officers at a faster rate in the early 1990s.

Localization entered its final stage in 1993 as Governor Patten appointed Anson Chan the first local and female chief secretary, and Donald Tsang the first local financial secretary. From this point on, in the retrospective assessment of Patten, they 'led a mainly Chinese civil service, which withstood the political buffetings of the following years with character and confidence.'⁸⁰ Although Patten was right to pay tribute to the local administrative officers and other members of the civil service as they loyally served Hong Kong and the British crown right until the handover, this should not be taken to mean that racial prejudice had completely disappeared from the colonial establishment. Leo Goodstadt, who served as the head of the government think tank, the Central Policy Unit, in this period recalls that after Chan's appointment as chief secretary 'it was suggested that her access to official documents should be limited on the grounds that she did not have formal Positive Vetting clearance.'⁸¹ This was despite one of her recent predecessors, Philip Haddon-Cave, having refused to be positively vetted yet nonetheless been 'given unrestricted access to official files'.⁸²

In the final years of British rule, top Hong Kong officials, by now dominated by locally recruited administrative officers adhered to the ethos of the service to provide an administrative framework to ensure stability and good order so that the private sector could continue to generate prosperity. With the support of British diplomats and the confidence given to them by Governor Patten, they resolved numerous issues with their Chinese colleagues that could have hindered a smooth transfer of sovereignty. Compared with the period when Sir David Wilson was governor (1987-92), when an annual average of almost 40 working agreements were reached

between Hong Kong and the Chinese authorities, nearly 100 was reached every year under Patten until the last.⁸³ Goodstadt attributed this success to the fact that the local 'Hong Kong officials faced no language or cultural barriers in addressing either the community or their Chinese counterparts, which made it increasingly difficult to challenge their right to argue Hong Kong's case,' and because they proceeded on the basis of 'clear policies that reflected the community's own preference and priorities'.⁸⁴

As a result, when the end finally came the Hong Kong government and its administrative officers were as well prepared as they could have been for the transfer of sovereignty. Admittedly, they did not pass on a form of government most suited to the people of Hong Kong at the end of the twentieth century. However, they did bequeath a well structured and administered civil service headed by a professional cadre of administrators committed to performing their duties to the best of their ability as politically neutral civil servants in order to further the interests of Hong Kong. It should be recognized that the colonial government had no master plan for the transfer of power, though more planning was put into preparing for it than for almost any other policy in a century and a half of colonial rule. Despite having put extra resources into preparing for the transfer of sovereignty, the colonial government handled the matter largely as it had always done, namely to adapt to changing situations and perceived needs and do what its top administrators saw as essential and appropriate. It worked because the long-established structure and procedures in the administration ensured that senior officials were given the scope to discharge their responsibility as best they could. For better or for worse, administrative officers formed the core of the colonial administration and should take the lion's share of the responsibility for its success or failure.

NOTES

Chapter 1. Governance in a colonial society

1. *Hong Kong Register* (Hong Kong), 11 August 1846, p. 127.
2. *The Times* (London), 15 March 1859.
3. Carroll 1999, pp. 16–20.
4. Carroll 2005, p. 18.
5. Sayer 1980, p. 154.
6. Endacott 1964a, p. 43.
7. Public Record Office (Kew), Colonial Office archives, CO129/13, Enclosure to Davis to Stanley dispatch 114, 20 August 1845.
8. CO129/13, Gladstone to Davis, dispatch 32, 7 March 1846.
9. *China Mail* (Hong Kong) 23 June 1859.
10. Endacott 1964b, p. 63.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 61.
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 61–4.
13. For a detailed analysis of the Caldwell affair and the events leading to both him and Anstey leaving office, see Munn 2001a, pp. 307–21. See also Chapter 2.
14. Munn 2001b, p. 23.
15. Christopher Munn 2001a, p. 212.
16. Endacott 1964b, p. 122.
17. Sayer 1980, appendix II.
18. *Ibid.*, appendix X.
19. Endacott 1964b, p. 125.
20. For the class and racial divide in early Hong Kong, see Tsang 2003a, pp. 62–6.
21. Munn 2001a, p. 113.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 147–50.
23. CO129/6, enclosure to Davis to Stanley 21, 18 June 1844 (Ordinance 13).
24. Ting 1990 pp. 154–5; Endacott 1964a, pp. 37–8.
25. Carroll 2005, pp. 28–32.
26. The classic on this subject is Ping-te Ho 1962.
27. This was also helped by Loo acquiring an official rank from the Chinese government in the course of the second Anglo–Chinese War in the late 1850s (Smith 1985, p. 109).
28. Carroll 1999, p. 23.
29. Eitel 1983, p. 282.
30. Tsang 1995, p. 5.

31. Hobsbawn 2000, p. 96.
32. Finer 1999, p. 1616.
33. Tsang 2003a, p. 54.
34. Quoted in Endacott 1964b, p. 95.
35. CO129/82, minutes by CZg commenting on Robinson to Newcastle, dispatch 160 of 25 September 1861.
36. *British Parliamentary Papers: China 25 (Hong Kong, 1862–1881)* (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1971), p. 5 (Robinson to Newcastle, dispatch 220, 16 December 1861).
37. Endacott 1964b, p. 95.

Chapter 2. The cadet scheme

1. Tsang 2003a, p. 35.
2. Tsang 1995, p. 144.
3. Feuchtwanger 1975, p. 91.
4. Chapman 2004, p. 11.
5. Clarke 1962, p. 220.
6. Chapman 2004, p. 16.
7. Beales 1969, pp. 186–7.
8. Chapman 2004, p. 12.
9. Compton 1968, p. 265.
10. Feuchtwanger 1975, 92.
11. CO129/80, Robinson to Newcastle, dispatch 39, 23 March 1861.
12. Sayer 1980, p. 221.
13. Cameron 1991, p. 85.
14. Collins 1952, p. 96.
15. *British Parliamentary Papers: China 25, 20* (Robinson to Newcastle, dispatch 220, 16 December 1861).
16. CO129/80, Robinson to Newcastle, dispatch 39, 23 March 1861.
17. Eitel 1983, p. 364.
18. CO129/80, Robinson to Newcastle, dispatch 39, 23 March 1861.
19. Compton 1968, p. 266.
20. CO129/80, 'Sketch of a scheme for the establishment of Hong Kong cadetships', undated, c.March 1861.
21. CO129/80, Rogers to Hamilton, letter of 7 July 1861.
22. CO129/80, 'Interpreter pupils – Hong Kong', undated, c.June 1861.
23. Lethbridge 1978, p. 36.
24. For a critical analysis of the Chinese system, see Ichisada Miyazaki 1976, pp. 111–29.
25. CO129/80, 'Subjects for nomination for Hong Kong cadetships', 29 June 1861.
26. Dewey 1973, p. 274.
27. CO129/312, 'Hong Kong, Straits Settlements, and Federated Malay States cadetships', December 1902.
28. Dewey 1973, p. 267.
29. Jeffries 1938, p. 7.
30. Collins 1952, p. 107.
31. CO129/80, 'Sketch of a scheme for the establishment of Hong Kong cadetships', undated, c.March 1861. This proposal was accepted almost *in toto* apart from the

age of recruitment, which was raised slightly. For an approved version of this scheme, see Tsang 1995, pp. 149–50.

32. Cameron 1991, p. 92.
33. Collins 1952, p. 104.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 110.
35. Hamilton 1969 p. 18.
36. Lethbridge 1978, p. 3.
37. Collins 1952, p. 110.
38. Ireland 1905, p. 34.
39. Hong Kong Government, Sessional Papers 1893: Commission Report on Working of Treasury Department, p. 3.
40. Lethbridge 1978, pp. 41–2.
41. Lethbridge 1978, p. 40.
42. Perham 1960, p. 302.
43. CO129/120, MacDonnell to Carnarvon, dispatch 183, 7 January 1867.
44. CO129/126, MacDonnell to Buckingham, dispatch 416, 14 December 1867.
45. The only exception happened between late 1891 and early 1893, when Major General A. H. A. Gordon served as captain superintendent.
46. Tsang 1995, p. 167.
47. Observation of E. J. Eitel, cited in Lethbridge 1978, p. 40.
48. Eitel 1983, pp. 526–7.

Chapter 3. Benevolent paternalism

1. Woodhouse 1997, p. 27.
2. Qian Mu 2002, pp. 174–5.
3. Chu 1962, pp. 22–31.
4. Ping-ti Ho 1962, pp. 48–9.
5. Grantham 1965, p. 6.
6. Airlie 1989, pp. 11–4.
7. Part of Cadet F. H. May's experience as recorded in his diary was published in the Sunday edition of the *South China Morning Post*, 10 October 1980.
8. Lethbridge 1978, p. 37.
9. Wilson 2000, p. 6.
10. Grantham 1965, p. 7.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
12. Airlie 1989, p. 18.
13. Lu Xun n.d., p. 6.
14. Endacott 1964b, p. 276.
15. Hong Kong Sessional Papers 1912, 'Report on New Territories, 1899–1912' by G. N. Orme, 9 June 1912. District Officer South was previously known as Assistant District Officer South and before that, Assistant Land Officer (South).
16. Tsang 1995, p. 39.
17. Collins 1952, p. 137.
18. Chu 1962, p. 2.
19. Smith 1983, p. 45.
20. Chu 1962, p. 16.
21. One of the more serious incidents of resistance, which involved the burning down of a police mat-shed in the market town of Taipo on 3 April 1899 and called for

- the immediate dispatch of the Royal Welsh Fusiliers to relieve Captain Superintendent of Police Francis May (a cadet), whose party came under attack from a hail of broken bricks, had more to do with *feng-shui* than governance. For May's account of the event, see CO882/5, May to Colonial Secretary, 4 April 1899. This incident was a prelude to the most serious resistance to the British takeover, when the hoisting of the British flag was challenged, eventually by a force of 2600 later in the month. The Chinese challenge was overcome by two companies of the Hong Kong Regiment with ease in the vicinity of Kam Tin. A summary report on Chinese resistance efforts can be found in *ibid.*, Blake to Chamberlain, dispatch 107, 28 April 1899.
22. CO882/5, Stewart Lockhart to Colonial Office, dispatch 38, 8 October 1898.
 23. Hong Kong Sessional Papers 1912, 'Report on the New Territories 1899–1912'.
 24. The papers left by Stewart Lockhart are available at George Watson's College, the National Library of Scotland and the Stewart Society, all in Edinburgh.
 25. Cadets were strictly speaking not available for deployment in Hong Kong when they were under language training or on leave or on secondment to the Colonial Office or elsewhere. When there was a serious shortage, it was not unknown for cadets receiving language training to be deployed.
 26. Cadet positions were not open to women before the Second World War.
 27. He was born James Haldane Lockhart but incorporated into his own surname the name of his mother's family, Stewart of Lorne, when he married in 1889. For consistency, he is referred to by his preferred name of James Stewart Lockhart in this volume.
 28. Airlie 1989, pp. 3–11.
 29. CO129/80, 'Hong Kong cadetship', paper submitted to Sir T. Roger, 2 July 1861.
 30. CO129/220, Bowen to Derby 89, 23 February 1885.
 31. Tsai 1993, pp. 127–44.
 32. Airlie 1989, p. 37.
 33. CO129/220, Bowen to Derby 89, 23 February 1885. For an assessment of why Bowen might have misunderstood the nature of this incident, see Tsang 2003a, pp. 90–1.
 34. CO129/232, Bowen to Herbert, 3 May 1887.
 35. Airlie 1989, p. 40.
 36. *Ibid.*, p. 51.
 37. *Ibid.*, p. 57.
 38. *Ibid.*, p. 54.
 39. Sinn 1989, p. 156.
 40. *Ibid.* Sinn's book provides a detailed account of how the Tung Wah Hospital played a key role in the local Chinese community in the nineteenth century.
 41. Tsang 2003a, p. 69.
 42. Sinn 1989, p. 156.
 43. *Ibid.*, pp. 156–83.
 44. *Hong Kong Sessional Papers 1894*, 'Governor's dispatch to the secretary of state with reference to the plague', 20 June 1894.
 45. On Whitehead's attack, see *Sessional Papers 1896*, 'Report on Tung Wah Hospital by the Honourable T. H. Whitehead', 17 October 1896, pp. 1–15.
 46. Lethbridge 1978, pp. 106–7.
 47. Chan 1991, p. 82.

Governing Hong Kong

48. Tsang 2003a, p. 70.
49. On the leasing of the New Territories, see Tsang 1997a, pp. 1–12; and Wesley-Smith 1983.
50. CO882/5, Report by Stewart Lockhart on the extension of the Colony of Hong Kong, 8 October 1898, ff13.
51. CO882/5, Chamberlain to Blake, confidential dispatch, 6 January 1899.
52. CO882/5, Report by Stewart Lockhart on the extension of the Colony of Hong Kong, 8 October 1898, pp. 13–15.
53. Airlie 1989, p. 102.
54. CO882/5, Report by Stewart Lockhart on the extension of the Colony of Hong Kong, 8 October 1898, pp. 15–16.
55. Airlie 1989, p. 108.
56. Atwell 1985, pp. 6–11.
57. Cadets were encouraged to gain a legal qualification, which would then make them eligible for appointment as police magistrates or deputy registrars of the Supreme Court. The registrar of the Supreme Court was a position that could only be filled by a qualified barrister. New offices were periodically added to this list subsequently.
58. CO129/209, Bowen to Derby 84, 23 May 1883.
59. *Ibid.*
60. Grantham 1965, p. 14.
61. CO129/312, Hong Kong, Straits Settlements and Federated Malay States cadetships, December 1902.
62. See below for the unification of the colonial administrative service.
63. CO129/376, Lugard to Harcourt, dispatch 145, 20 April 1911.
64. CO129/313, Enclosure 1 to Blake to Chamberlain, dispatch 534, 10 December 1902 (letter from nine cadets to Chamberlain, 21 November 1902).
65. CO129/376, Harcourt to Lugard, dispatch 193, 15 June 1911; and CO129/313, Chamberlain to Blake, dispatch of 13 February 1903.
66. CO129/376, Stubbs's minutes to Collins, 1 June 1911.
67. CO129/313, Chamberlain to Blake, dispatch of 13 February 1903.
68. *Ibid.* The basis of this calculation is not clear and may be dubious, as the first cadet to make colonial secretary, Stewart Lockhart, took 16 years from the date he joined to the date he was promoted colonial secretary. It would be 13 years from when he became a passed cadet.
69. CO129/313, May to Blake, minutes of 3 December 1902.
70. CO129/376, Stubbs's minutes for Collins, 1 June 1911. Clementi's recommendations can be found in *ibid.*, Colonial Secretary to Governor, 30 March 1911.
71. Jeffries 1938, pp. 8–9
72. They exclude members of the Indian Civil Service.
73. Jeffries 1938, p. 10. For the purpose of making a general comparison, among the 30 dependencies whose governorship was open to members of the colonial administrative service in the 1930s, only six (Nigeria, Kenya, Trinidad and Tobago, Jamaica, Ceylon, and the Straits Settlements) offered a higher salary to its governor than Hong Kong. This provides an indication of the rough disparity in remuneration for administrative officers. Two of these six were in fact Eastern colonies with their own cadets.

74. Jeffries 1938, p. 62.
75. Warren report, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 59.
76. Jeffries 1938, p. 74.
77. CO129/525/6, Memorandum from Swire and Sons Ltd to the Colonial Office, 20 February 1930.
78. Miners 1987, pp. 88–9.
79. MacDougall to his wife, letter of 27 February 1941, *MacDougall Papers*, Rhodes House Library, Oxford University. MacDougall's role after 1941 is examined in Chapter 4.
80. CO825/35/55104, Extract from minutes of 35th meeting of the Colonial Office Committee on postwar problems, 2 April 1942.
81. Whitfield 2001, pp. 8–10.
82. Bertram, p. 120. For the view of a Western educated Hong Kong Chinese person, see CO129/590/25, letter to Churchill from a Hong Kong born Chinese sent from Kweilin, 28 September 1942.

Chapter 4. Effects of the Pacific War

1. For the Japanese occupation, see Endacott and Birch 1978; and Snow 2003.
2. Jeffery 1999, p. 319.
3. Elsbree 1953, p. 163.
4. Quoted in Thorne 1978, p. 157.
5. Waijiaobu, *Zhanshi Waijiao*, vol. 3, agreement between Chiang Kai-shek and Mountbatten, October 1943.
6. *Ibid.*, Roosevelt to Chiang, telegram of 31 December 1941.
7. Academia Historica (Taipei), *Papers of Chiang Kai-shek: Dejiao Dangan*, 080103–058, 08A–01322, Chiang's draft message to Churchill, 1943.
8. Tsang 2003a, p. 124.
9. For Chiang's thinking, see Tsang 1997a, pp. 28–9.
10. Gu Weijun (1987) *Gu Weijun Huiyilu*, vol. 5, Beijing: Zhonghua Shudian, pp. 14–15.
11. CO825/42/55104/2, Gent's minutes, 14 February 1942.
12. MacDougall had made a vivid account of his escape in a letter to his wife dated 17 January 1942, which is being added to the *MacDougall Papers*, at the Rhodes House Library, Oxford University.
13. CO825/35/55104, Secret note by MacDougall, March 1942.
14. CO825/35/55104, Minutes of 35th meeting of the committee on postwar problems, 2 April 1942.
15. Tsang 2003a, pp. 133–8.
16. Zhou Hongtao 2003, p. 33.
17. Academia Historica, *Chiang Kai-shek Papers: Shiluegaoben*, 060100–204, 06–00930, entry of 2 September 1945.
18. Snow 2003, pp. 277–8.
19. Franklin Gimson (n.d.) 'Internment in Hong Kong March 1942 to August 1945', typescript in possession of the author, p. 1.
20. The order for Gimson is in CO129/591/16, Foreign Office to Chungking telegram, 11 August 1945.
21. *British military administration Hong Kong*, p. 1.

Governing Hong Kong

22. CO129/591/12, Admiralty to Commander in Chief, Hong Kong telegram of 3 September 1945.
23. MacDougall to his wife, letter of 27 February 1941, *MacDougall Papers*, Rhodes House Library, Oxford University.
24. CO129/594/6, MacDougall to Garter, letter of 5 December 1945.
25. Author's interview with MacDougall at 'Mercers' Finchingfield, Essex on 17 February 1983.
26. CO537/1650, G. E. J. Gent's minute, 21 September 1945.
27. Tsang 2003a, p. 66.
28. Tsang 1988, p. 26.
29. FO371/53632, Minute from Foreign Secretary to Prime Minister dated 8 March 1946.
30. FO371/53632, Prime Minister's minute to the Foreign Secretary dated 9 March 1946; Luff 1968, p. 77.
31. CO129/595/4, Governor's speech, 1 May 1946.
32. South China Morning Post, *Hong Kong Hansard: Reports of the Meetings of the Legislative Council of Hong Kong, Session 1946* (Hong Kong: South China Morning Post, 1946), 63 (Minutes of 5th meeting).
33. Tsang 1988, pp. 186–8.
34. CO129/312, 'Hong Kong, Straits Settlements, and Federated Malay States cadetships', December 1902.
35. Miners 1987, p. 85.
36. Mills 1942, p. 420.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 421.
38. Tsui's personal account of his time as a member of the BAAG can be found on the Internet, at <http://www.galaxylink.com.hk/~john/paul/paul.html>.
39. Ride 1981.
40. Tsang 2003a, p. 129.
41. Colonial Secretariat 1966, p. 96.
42. Clinton was appointed a cadet in December 1951.
43. Personal communication received from Mrs Ellie Alleyne, dated 19 March 2004.
44. Tsang 1988, p. 27.
45. FO371/46259, 'Notes on Future of Hong Kong' by Keswick, 3 November 1945.
46. FO371/46259, 'Secretary for Chinese Affairs' by Keswick, 24 September 1945.
47. Tsang 1988, p. 188.
48. Snow 2003, p. 289.
49. For the civil war, see Westad 2003.
50. CO882/31, Governor Young to Secretary of State, confidential dispatch, 22 October 1946.
51. Tsang 1988, p. 60.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
53. CO537/5400, minutes of the Smaller Colonial Territories Committee on 20 July 1950.
54. Author's interview with MacDougall at 'Mercers' Finchingfield, Essex on 17 February 1983.
55. For the reversal of the Young reforms, see Tsang 1988.
56. CO537/5400, minutes of the Smaller Colonial Territories Committee on 20 July 1950.

57. *Transcript of interview between Heathcote-Smith and Steve Tsang*, typescript at Rhodes House Library, Oxford University, 7.
58. Grantham 1965, p. 19.
59. Tsang 2003a, 92–101.
60. Grantham 1965, p. 105.
61. Grantham was tremendously successful in this respect. See Tsang 1997b.
62. Grantham 1965, p. 105.
63. Ibid.
64. CO129/611/2, Ruston's minute, 10 April 1946.
65. Ibid.
66. FO371/53634, Secretary of State to Commander in Chief, Hong Kong, dispatch 8, 6 May 1946.
67. CO129/611/2, Ruston's minutes of 31 December 1946.
68. *Transcript of interview between Heathcote-Smith and Steve Tsang*, Rhodes House Library, Oxford University, 6.
69. CO537/5628, Governor to Secretary of State, 230, 5 March 1950.
70. Grantham 1965, p. 112.
71. See Tsang 1997b.
72. Tsang 1988, pp. 168–9.
73. Grantham 1965, p. 104.
74. Ho n.d., p. 5; and Tsang 1995, p. 156 (Report of Public Service Commission Chairman for 1956 and 1957).
75. C. B. Burgess, 'Great Britain and constitutional development in Hong Kong 1945–1952', unpublished paper in author's possession.
76. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with David Jordan conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 11–12.

Chapter 5. Expansion

1. Tsang 2003a, p. 148.
2. CO129/597/2, Creech-Jones to Grantham 302, 24 September 1948.
3. CO129/597/3, Bourdillon's minute of 5 July 1949.
4. CO1030/392, Ashton's minute of 10 July 1956.
5. Bray 2001, pp. 51–2.
6. Communication received from P. W. Williams, 16 August 2000, ff.4.
7. Morrison 1962, p. 133.
8. Hong Kong Salaries Commission 1959, para. 167.
9. Paper attached to Michael Wright to Ian Lightbody, personal communication dated 4 March 2001.
10. Hong Kong Salaries Commission 1959, para. 68.
11. Bray 2001, p. 35.
12. Tsang 1995, pp. 157–8.
13. For a short overview of the case in western Europe, see Goldsmith 1998, pp. 25–54.
14. Bartholomew 2004, p. 309.
15. Faure 2003, p. 125 (Governor to Secretary of State, 14 November 1950).
16. Ibid.; and Hamilton 1969, p. 63.
17. Bray 2001, p. 52.
18. Sweeting 1993, pp. 52–4.

Governing Hong Kong

19. Donohue 1962, pp. 11–12.
20. Sweeting 1993, p. 238.
21. Interview with Burgess in London on 15 June 1983.
22. Ibid.
23. Rhodes House Library MSS Ind.Ocn.s.222, Papers of Sir Franklin Gimson, 'Diary 1 June 1943 to 17 August 1945', pp. 174–5.
24. Ibid., pp. 177–8.
25. Interview with Burgess in London on 15 June 1983.
26. Personal communication from Kenneth Topley, 17 March 2005.
27. CO1030/1386, Burgess (Officer Administering the Government) to I. McLeod (Secretary of State) confidential tel. 354, 18 April 1960.
28. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with David Jordan conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 339.
29. Personal comment received from K. Y. Yeung, dated 23 June 2005.
30. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir David Trench, conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 97–8.
31. Tsang 2003a, p. 190.
32. Scott 1989, pp. 105–7.
33. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with David Jordan conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 339.
34. Personal communication from Bernard Williams dated 23 March 2005, and conversations with Bernard Williams in Oxford on 17 March 2005.
35. For Holmes's exploits during the war, see Ride 1981.
36. Bray 2001, pp. 79, 93; and personal communication from Kenneth Topley dated 23 March 2005.
37. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir David Trench, conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 97.
38. Ibid., p. 266.
39. Holmes 1969, pp. 2–3.
40. Scott 1989, p. 125.
41. Bray 2001, p. 139.
42. Interview with Cowperthwaite in St Andrews on 4 April 1983.
43. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir David Trench, conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 202–3.
44. Bartholomew 2004, p. 312.
45. Comments received from K. Y. Yeung dated 23 June 2005.
46. Bartholomew 2004, p. 313.
47. Personal communication received from Eric Ho, dated 2 June 2005.
48. Personal communication received from Kenneth Topley dated 22 March 2005.
49. Bartholomew 2004, pp. 311–12.
50. Personal communication received from Kenneth Topley, 6 June 2005.
51. Bray 2001, p. 118.
52. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir David Trench, conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 200–1.
53. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir Philip Haddon-Cave conducted by Steve Tsang*, 30.
54. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir David Trench, conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 203–4.

55. Ibid., p. 204.
56. Ibid., p. 205.
57. Ibid., pp. 276–9.
58. Personal communication received from Eric Peter Ho, dated 24 May 2005.
59. Interview with Cowperthwaite in St Andrews on 4 April 1983.
60. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir David Trench, conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 278–80.
61. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir Philip Haddon-Cave by Steve Tsang*, 22–3.
62. Tsang 2003a, p. 190.
63. Tsang 2003b, pp. 225–6.

Chapter 6. Meeting the challenges of a Chinese community

1. Coates 1975, p. 17.
2. Personal communication from Brian Wilson, 13 January 2006.
3. Ibid.
4. Wilson 2000, p. 23.
5. Hayes 1996, p. 16.
6. Wilson 2000, p. 22.
7. Coates 1975, pp. 92–3.
8. Ibid., p. 95.
9. For an authoritative account of Tsuen Wan's history and genealogies, see Hayes 1983, pp. 115–26, which is written by a former administrative officer.
10. Coates 1975, p. 95.
11. Hayes forthcoming, Chapter 7, section entitled 'Shek Pik 1959–60'.
12. Coates 1975, pp. 95–8.
13. Akers-Jones 2004, pp. 21–2.
14. Hayes 1996, p. 31.
15. Ibid., p. 37.
16. Ibid., pp. 41–2.
17. Wilson 2000, p. 34.
18. MacPherson 2001, p. 117.
19. Communication made orally by Robert Upton on 17 January 2006.
20. Hayes 2001, p. 73.
21. Communication from Patrick Williamson to the author (via Christopher Hui), 23 August 2000.
22. Akers-Jones 2004, p. 46.
23. Response to questionnaire received from Jeremy Marriott, p. 3.
24. Hase 2001, p. 134.
25. Personal communication received from James Hayes, dated 24 May 2004.
26. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir David Trench, conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 97.
27. Clark 2004, pp. 171–2.
28. Tsang 2003a, p. 190.
29. Bray 2001, pp. 133–4.
30. Personal communication received from Robert Upton, 17 February 2006.
31. Ibid.
32. Bray 2001, p. 134.

33. Secretary for Chinese Affairs 1969, p. 3.
34. Bray 2001, p. 135.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 137.
36. Mulloy n.d., pp. 9–10.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 16. See below for a discussion of police corruption in Wanchai.
38. *Ibid.*, pp. 16–17.
39. Bray 2001, pp. 137–8.
40. Mulloy n.d., pp. 11–12.
41. Ho 2005, p. 98.
42. Hase 2001, p. 135.
43. *Ibid.*
44. *Ibid.*, p. 136.
45. *Ibid.*, pp. 134–5.
46. Mulloy n.d., p. 13.
47. *Ibid.*, pp. 13–15.
48. Ronald Holmes, 'Informal remarks made by Sir Ronald Holmes at a farewell reception held by the Administrative Officers' Association' (private paper in possession of the author: 24 March 1977), p. 3.
49. Rhodes House Library *Transcript of interviews with B. V. Williams conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 10–11.
50. Wilson 2000, p. 65.
51. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with David Jordan conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 97–8.
52. Ho 2005, pp. 15–16.
53. Oral communication received from Robert Upton on 17 January 2006.
54. Clark 2004, p. 162.
55. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with David Jordan conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 80–1.
56. *Ibid.*, pp. 81–2.
57. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with G. C. Hamilton conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 72–3.
58. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with G. T. Rowe conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 114.
59. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir David Trench, conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 81–5.
60. Ian Lightbody, 'Farewell speech at administrative service dinner on 17 July 1980', p. 5.
61. See Chapter 2.
62. Tsang 1995, p. 167.
63. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Henry Heath conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 187.
64. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir Donald Luddington conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 32.
65. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Henry Heath conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 186.
66. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir Donald Luddington conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 30–1.
67. Personal communication received from Eric Peter Ho, 13 January 2006.

68. Strictly speaking, Baron was not the first director of Social Welfare. Fellow cadet Kenneth Keen was the first director but he served in this capacity for less than three months before handing over to Baron.
69. Personal communication received from Eric Peter Ho, 13 January 2006.
70. Ibid.
71. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with David Jordan conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 13–4. Jordan did learn to speak Cantonese while in service in Hong Kong and retained a good knowledge of written Chinese.
72. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with David Jordan conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 446.
73. Ibid., p. 451.
74. Ibid., p. 455.
75. Ibid., pp. 482–4.
76. Ibid., pp. 499–507.
77. Ibid., pp. 506–7.
78. See Ho 2005, pp. 55–8.
79. Personal communication from Eric Peter Ho, 13 January 2006.
80. Ibid.
81. Tsang 2003a, p. 201.
82. Lethbridge 1978, p. 38.
83. MacPherson 2001, p. 108.
84. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with G. C. Hamilton conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 149–53.
85. CO1030/1386, Officer Administering the Government (Burgess) to Colonial Office, telegram 354, 18 April 1960.
86. Mulloy n.d., p. 17.
87. Ibid., pp. 17–19.
88. Ibid., pp. 19–20.
89. For the legal complexity, see Solicitor General Arthur Hooton's explanations, in Tsang 1995, pp. 181–2.
90. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with G. T. Rowe conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 158–9.
91. Prendergast joined as deputy commissioner and director of operations and he was knighted for his service at the ICAC. Harknett joined as Prendergast's deputy and succeeded Prendergast when he retired. Within the colonial government, in contrast to the image outside it, it was Prendergast not Cater who personified the ICAC in its first years.

Chapter 7. Localization

1. Mills 1942, p. 421.
2. Tsui was later reappointed as a cadet in 1948. See Chapter 4.
3. For an assessment of Young as governor and his views on political changes in Hong Kong, see Tsang 1988.
4. Personal communication received from Robert Upton, 16 May 2006.
5. Kirk-Greene 2000, p. 264. The Colonial Administrative Service was superseded by Her Majesty's Overseas Civil Service in 1956, but to avoid confusion, colonial administrative officers instead of Her Majesty's overseas civil servants are used

throughout this book to refer to those who were administrative officers in other British colonies and dependencies.

6. Personal communication from Kenneth Topley, 12 January 2006.
7. Personal communication from Robert Upton, 16 May 2006.
8. Those who were appointed to Hong Kong directly as colonial/chief secretaries are excluded, such as Sir Robert Black or Sir Denys Roberts who is a professional lawyer and not a colonial administrative officer prior to his appointment as chief secretary.
9. Topley 2001.
10. Akers-Jones 2004, pp. 6–7.
11. Personal communication from Roderick MacLean dated 27 February 2001.
12. MacLean n.d., p. 3.
13. Clark 2004, pp. 162–4.
14. MacLean n.d., p. 3.
15. Clark 2004, p. 161.
16. MacLean n.d., p. 5.
17. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with G. C. Hamilton conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 86–7.
18. Ho 2005, p. 21.
19. MacLean n.d., pp. 7–8.
20. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with G. C. Hamilton conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 81.
21. Miners 1991, p. 93.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 100.
23. This officer, Selwyn Alleyne, had his terms of appointment converted to that of an expatriate officer in March 1961 only after he made a successful appeal to the governor in council. Personal communication from Alleyne, 29 September 2005.
24. Colonial Secretariat 1970, Gen. Est. pp. 2–3.
25. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with G. T. Rowe conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 119.
26. Teesdale transcript, p. 82.
27. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with G. T. Rowe conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 117.
28. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with G. C. Hamilton conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 84.
29. Names and personal details of unsuccessful candidates are not available.
30. Cell 1999, p. 235.
31. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with G. T. Rowe conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 120.
32. Mrs Rachel Cartland's response to a questionnaire on the administrative service, dated 8 August 2000. She is referring to her own selection interview conducted in 1972.
33. Furse 1962, pp. 219–25.
34. MacPherson 2001, p. 108.
35. Jeffries 1956, pp. 138–9.
36. Ho 2005, p. 88.
37. 'Vision, high ideals of service, fearless devotion to duty born of a sense of responsibility, tolerance and, above all, team spirit' are qualities specified in the

- report of the Committee on the System of Appointment in the Colonial Service, Cmd. 3554 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1930), p. 23.
38. Goodstadt 2005, p. 39.
 39. Among the first three local female administrative officers, two came from distinguished local families with exposure to British ways and the colonial establishment. Audrey Chau is a niece of Sir S. N. Chau while Anson Fang is a niece of Dr Harry Fang.
 40. Kirk-Greene 2000, p. 242.
 41. *Ibid.*, p. 243.
 42. Tsang 2003, pp. 170–5, 190–6.
 43. G. C. Hamilton, 'Hong Kong Disturbances 1967/8 Twelfth Report', 4 February 1968 (in possession of the author).
 44. Scott 1989, p. 105.
 45. Murray MacLehose in fact started his career as a member of the Malayan civil service, before he transferred to the British diplomatic service. However, he made it a point to avoid reference to his time in the colonial administrative service and saw himself as a professional diplomat sent to govern Hong Kong. As governor he did not identify with the Colonial Administrative Service, which had by then been renamed Her Majesty's Overseas Civil Service.
 46. There were, for example, 2500 members of the CAS (HMOCS) in 1957, but by the mid-1970s, there were only 1500, among whom only 300 were not employed in Hong Kong. Kirk-Greene 2000, pp. 270–1.
 47. Attachment to Acting Colonial Secretary (M. D. A. Clinton) to all administrative officers, 15 May 1974 (ref: EBCR 2/4068/73).
 48. Comment made by Robert Upton on 17 January 2006.
 49. Attachment to Acting Colonial Secretary (M. D. A. Clinton) to all administrative officers, 15 May 1974 (ref: EBCR 2/4068/73).
 50. MacPherson 2001, p. 109.
 51. Rear 1971, p. 61.
 52. Kirk-Greene 2000, p. 243.
 53. Clark 2004, pp. 167–8.
 54. *Ibid.*, 167.
 55. Personal communication received from Eric Peter Ho, 13 January 2006.
 56. Attachment to Acting Colonial Secretary (M. D. A. Clinton) to all administrative officers, 15 May 1974 (ref: EBCR 2/4068/73).
 57. *Ibid.*
 58. They were Cater (1970), Clinton (1968), Heatherington (1963), Lightbody (1969), Sorby (1968), and Todd (1966). See Chapter 4, 'End of Colour Bar'.
 59. The rank of Secretary was introduced after the McKinsey reforms. See the following chapter for the reforms.
 60. Clark 2004, p. 168.
 61. Interview with Dame Anson Chan, 24 October 2003.
 62. The Joint Declaration was agreed and initiated in 1984, and came into effect formally after it was ratified in 1985.
 63. Miners 1991, p. 93.
 64. *Ibid.*, p. 94.
 65. Interview with Dame Anson Chan, 24 October 2003.
 66. Personal communication from Selwyn Alleyne, 29 September 2005.

67. Interview with Dame Anson Chan, 24 October 2003.
68. *Ibid.*
69. Hong Kong Government 1973, p. 210.
70. Kirk-Greene 1999, p. 50.
71. Upon marriage all three officers adopted their married name, viz., Audrey Ho, Anson Chan, and Katherine Fok.
72. Establishment Branch 1967, pp. 16–18.
73. Interview with Dame Anson Chan, 24 October 2003.
74. *Ibid.*
75. Personal communication from Mrs Rachel Cartland, dated 22 September 1999.
76. Interview with Dame Anson Chan, 24 October 2003.
77. Personal communication from Mrs Rachael Cartland, 13 November 1999.
78. *Ibid.*
79. Words of Trevor Clark, summing up what Barnett was known to have said. Clark 2004, p. 167.
80. For an examination of how the Hong Kong government delivered the best possible governance in the Chinese tradition, see Tsang 1997c, pp. 62–83.

Chapter 8. Meeting the challenges of modernity

1. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with David Jordan conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 707.
2. Miners 1991, p. 88.
3. Scott 1989, p. 127.
4. The two countries were South Vietnam and Denmark.
5. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with David Jordan conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 707.
6. Scott 1989, p. 133.
7. Akers-Jones 2004, p. 71.
8. Hong Kong Hansard Session 1973, p. 13.
9. The cost of engaging McKinsey came to HK\$ 4.7 million. Hong Kong Hansard Session 1976, p. 104.
10. The words in quotes are from Hong Kong Salaries Commission 1971, p. 7.
11. Deputy Colonial Secretary (M. D. A. Clinton) to heads of departments, confidential circular letter of 13 March 1973.
12. McKinsey & Company 1973, pp. 4–6.
13. Secretaries were soon elevated in rank to ensure that they were senior to heads of even major departments, with the exception of the director of commerce and industry who was given the rank of secretary.
14. McKinsey & Company 1973, p. 16.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
20. Secretary of the Civil Service (Alan Scott) to all Administrative Officers, circular letter EBCR L/M 310/73, 18 January 1974.
21. Scott 1989, pp. 136–7.

22. Secretary of the Civil Service (Alan Scott) to all Administrative Officers, circular letter EBCR 4/4068/70, 9 October 1973.
23. Scott 1989, p. 136.
24. Bray 2001, p. 179.
25. Ibid.
26. Deputy Colonial Secretary (M. D. A. Clinton) to Heads of Departments, circular letter 13 March 1973, ff.6.
27. Secretary posts were ranked below the chief secretary, which was a rank of its own, and that of the financial secretary, the attorney general and the secretary for home affairs. They were at first Staff Grade A posts but were quickly elevated to a rank above Staff Grade A (equivalent to head of a major department).
28. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with David Jordan conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 713-14.
29. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with David Jordan conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 710.
30. Ibid., p. 711.
31. Ibid., p. 709–10.
32. The director of commerce and industry was given the rank of secretary (supernumerary) until after Jordan's retirement as its director.
33. Personal communication from K. Y. Yeung, 30 January 2006.
34. Personal communication from Robert Upton, 16 May 2006.
35. Personal communication from K. Y. Yeung, 30 January 2006.
36. Ibid.
37. Scott 1989, p. 138.
38. Ibid., p. 140.
39. Cheung 1997, p. 724.
40. The formal name of the colonial secretariat had by then been unceremoniously changed to government secretariat.
41. For an overview of how Hong Kong differed from other colonies in the process of decolonization in the British Empire, see Darwin 1997, pp. 16–32.
42. Interview with Dame Anson Chan, 24 October 2003.
43. Hall 1997, p. 26.
44. Hall is wrong in asserting that the 'Taxi Strike ended abruptly along with Mr Scott's Hong Kong career', implying that Scott was removed from office and from HK as a result of this blunder (Hall 1997, pp. 26–9).
45. Personal communication received from Robert Upton, 16 May 2006.
46. Government Secretariat c.1987, p. 191.
47. Tsang 2003b, pp. 229–31.
48. Wilding 2003, p. 37.
49. Bray 2001, p. 192.
50. Ibid., p. 193.
51. Goodstadt 2005, p. 105.
52. From 1884 to 1973 there was a longstanding practice for the justices of the peace and the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce to nominate one candidate each to the governor for appointment as unofficial members of the Legislative Council. This can be loosely described as indirect election, as the convention was that the governor would not normally refuse the nomination of these bodies. This

practice was ended by Governor MacLehose. The 1985 change was therefore a significant departure from the practice at the time.

53. Tsang 1995, p. 92–3.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 93.
55. Cheek-Milby 1995, p. 76.
56. Goodstadt 2005, p. 109.
57. Chung 2001, p. 225.
58. Cheek-Milby 1989, p. 273.
59. Interview with Dame Anson Chan, 24 October 2003.
60. Hong Kong Government 1987.
61. Personal comment made by Robert Upton, 10 May 2006.
62. Cradock 1994, p. 228.
63. For the Patten reform and controversies surrounding it, see Tsang 2003a, pp. 255–65.
64. Patten 1992, pp. 34–5.
65. Dimpleby 1997, p. 148; and Tsang 1997a, p. 192.
66. Dimpleby 1997, p. 147.
67. So 1999, pp. 198–9.
68. Chung 2001, pp. 225–6.
69. *Hong Kong Hansard*, 10 July 1996, pp. 18–19.
70. *Hong Kong Hansard*, 10 July 1996, p. 20.
71. Personal communication from Robert Upton, 16 May 2006.
72. Scott 1988a, p. 6.
73. Letter from the Chief Secretary to all civil servants, 27 September 1984.
74. Annex I of the Sino–British Joint Declaration stipulated that ‘The government and the legislature of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region shall be composed of local inhabitants.’
75. Burns 1988, p. 101.
76. Scott 1988b, p. 27.
77. Burns 1988, p. 101.
78. Cheek-Milby 1988, p. 116.
79. Miners 1991, p. 94.
80. Patten 1998, p. 46.
81. Goodstadt 2005, p. 41.
82. *Ibid.*
83. *Ibid.*, pp. 87–8.
84. *Ibid.*, p. 88.

Chapter 9. An elite within the government

1. CO129/80, ‘Sketch of a scheme for the establishment of Hong Kong Cadetships’, undated, c.March 1861.
2. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir David Trench, conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 265 (Tape 4).
3. A very small number of administrative officers, including those at the secretary level, were not in fact graduates. They were mostly recruited from within the Hong Kong government.
4. Burns 2004, p. 118.
5. Colonial Secretariat 1966, p. 59.

6. Personal communication received from Ian Lightbody, 15 January 2006.
7. Clark 2004, p. 162.
8. Burns 2004, p. 132.
9. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir David Trench, conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 265 (Tape 4).
10. Wright 2001.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.
14. Scott 1988b, p. 37.
15. Ibid., p. 38.
16. Wright 2001.
17. Ibid.
18. Interview with Dame Anson Chan, 24 October 2003.
19. Personal communication from K. Y. Yeung, 13 April, 2006.
20. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Henry Heath conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 185–6.
21. Personal communication received from Peter B. Williams, 16 August 2000, pp. 8–9.
22. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Henry Heath conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 186.
23. Ibid.
24. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with David Jordan conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 520–1 (Tape 9).
25. The number of aircraft involved was over 80 at first, but 11 left Hong Kong for China with their crews when they defected from the nationalist to the communist government in November 1949, and were therefore not subject to the subsequent litigation. For an analysis of the complex issues involved, see Zeng 1987, pp. 105–24.
26. Steve Tsang 1997b, p. 301.
27. CO537/5628, Governor to Secretary of State, secret and guard telegram 230, 5 March, 1950.
28. Leary 1972, p. 656.
29. CAB129/39, CP(50)61, 3 April 1950 (Cabinet paper ‘Chinese Civil Aircraft at Hong Kong’, submitted by the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs).
30. CAB128/17, CM19(50)2 (Cabinet Minutes), 6 April 1950.
31. Grantham 1965, p. 163.
32. CO537/5628, Governor to Secretary of State, secret and guard telegram 230, 5 March, 1950.
33. CO537/5628, J. J. Paskin minutes of 7 March 1950.
34. CAB128/17, CM19(50)2, 6 April 1950 and CM24(50)6, 24 April 1950.
35. CAB129/39, Annex to CP(50)74 (Opinions of the Attorney-General, 17 April 1950).
36. CAB129/39, CP(50)74, 21 April 1950 (Cabinet paper ‘Chinese Civil Aircraft at Hong Kong’, submitted by the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs).
37. CAB128/17, CM19(50)2 (Cabinet Minutes), 6 April 1950.

38. CAB129/39, Annex B to CP(50)61, 3 April 1950 (Opinions of the Attorney General).
39. CO537/5629, Secretary of State to Governor, secret telegram 481, 4 April 1950.
40. CO537/5630, Governor to Secretary of State, secret and guard telegram 369, 8 April 1950.
41. Personal communication received from Robert Upton, 16 May 2006.
42. Vickers n.d.
43. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir David Trench, conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 229 (Tape 4).
44. Vickers n.d.
45. Goodstadt 2005, p. 215.
46. Miners 1991, p. 219.
47. Vickers n.d.
48. Ibid.
49. Personal communication received from Topley, 27 October 2003 (Ken Topley's 'Memoirs', 2001), p. 34.
50. Personal communication received from Trevor Clark, dated 7 August 2002.
51. Vickers n.d.
52. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Michael Wright*, pp. 253–5 (Tape 5).
53. Bray 2001, p. 200.
54. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with David Jordan conducted by Steve Tsang*, pp. 502–3 (Tape 9).
55. Ibid., p. 503.
56. See Chapter 6, 'Life and work in departments'.
57. First two quotes are from Vickers n.d., and the last is from a personal communication received from Kenneth Topley, 27 October 2003 (Ken Topley's 'Memoirs', 2001), p. 34.
58. Bray 2001, p. 200.
59. Personal communication from Robert Upton, 16 May 2006.
60. Bray 2001, p. 200.

Chapter 10. Inhibited elitism

1. Some of the prewar cadets who distinguished themselves have already been named in Chapter 2 and their names are therefore not repeated here.
2. Personal communication received from Ian Lightbody, 3 April 2006.
3. Ibid.
4. Quote from Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with G. T. Rowe conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 120. See Chapter 7 for recruitment criteria.
5. Personal communication from Selwyn Alleyne, 17 April, 2006.
6. Personal communication from Brian Wilson, 21 April, 2006.
7. David MacDougall was the only one who had the capacity to do so but he was an intake of 1928 and was seconded out of the Hong Kong government to serve in the British government in 1937. He was too junior to have been in a position to have made much of an impact before his secondment.
8. For the pressure that Hong Kong came under during the cold war, see Mark 2004; and Tsang 2006, pp. 165–86.

9. Personal communication from Kenneth Topley to Ian Lightbody, 4 April, 2006, made available to the author on 25 April 2006.
10. For the strike-cum-boycott, see Carroll 2005, pp. 131–58; and Tsang 2003a, pp. 92–101.
11. I examined this issue in detail in Tsang 1997c.
12. Personal communication from Brian Wilson, 21 April, 2006. For an enquiry into the limits to judicial independence in early Hong Kong, see Munn 2001b, pp. 19–47.
13. Steve Tsang 1997d, p. 40.
14. Peter Wesley-Smith 1994.
15. Tsang 1997a, pp. 56–7.
16. Tsang 1999, p. 7. This concept is borrowed from Ramon Myers, who defined it in a slightly different way as ‘the zone that contains power, symbols, and institutions that allocate and project power’ but is ‘constrained by the existence of economic and ideological marketplaces’ (Myers 1994, p. 172).
17. Tsang 1997d, p. 41.
18. Ibid.
19. Personal communication received from Robert Upton, 16 May 2006.
20. Ibid.
21. Rhodes House Library, *Transcript of interviews with Sir David Trench, conducted by Steve Tsang*, p. 204 (tape 3).
22. Tsang 1997c, p. 78.
23. Personal communication received from Robert Upton, 16 May 2006.
24. Tsang 2000, pp. 44–8.
25. Tsang 1997e.

INDEX

- Africa, 76, 117
Akers-Jones, David, 90, 116, 117
Alleyne, Selwyn, 120, 128
American Flying Tigers, 173
American War of Independence, 51
Amery, Leo, 51
Anglo-Chinese War, 2, 11, 13, 16
Anstey, T. Chisholm, 5
Asia, 1, 18, 48, 51
- Bank of England, 83
Barnett, Kenneth, 22, 37, 127, 137
Baron, David, 105
Beijing, 30, 115, 187, 194
Bevin, Ernest, 174
Black, Wilson, 41
Blake, Sir Henry, 41
Bombay, 37
Borneo, 21, 22
Bowen, Sir George, 36
Bowring, Sir John, 5, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17
Bray, Denis, 95, 144, 179, 180
Bridges, W. T., 5, 6
British Army Aid Group (BAAG),
50, 56, 57, 79, 114
Burgess, Claude, 22, 65, 75, 76, 111
- Caine, William, 6
Caldecott, Sir Andrew, 56
Caldwell, Daniel, 5, 6, 11, 15, 16
Cambridge, 18, 19, 61, 122, 123
Canada, 179
Canton, 9, 15, 29–31, 35–6, 38
Cartland, Rachel, 134
- Cater, Sir Jack, 23, 56, 112
Cayman Islands, 149
Central Air Transport (CAT), 173
Central Air Transport Corporation
(CATC), 173
Central Intelligence Agency, 173
Central Policy Unit, 159
Ceylon, 17, 35, 41, 45, 46, 55, 59
Chamberlain, Joseph, 40, 46, 47
Chan, Anson, 23, 130, 134–5, 159, 169
Chau, Audrey, 133
Cheng Hon-kuen, 111
Cheng Tung-choy, 120
Chennault, General Claire, 173
Cheung Chau, 54
Chiang Kai-shek, 52, 172, 173, 189
Chiang Kai-shek, Madam, 54
China, 3, 15–18, 20, 24, 27, 31–3, 37,
40, 42, 48–52, 54, 56, 58–9, 62–4,
67–8, 75, 79, 85, 90–1, 109, 120,
131, 134, 136–7, 150, 156, 173, 176,
177, 180, 189, 191, 193–95;
People's Republic of China (PRC);
Republic of China
China National Aviation
Corporation (CNAC), 173
Chinese Affairs, 58, 62, 63, 73, 77, 78,
95, 101, 103, 164
Chinese Civil War, 60, 187
Ching, Henry, 146
City District Officer (CDO), 78, 79,
80, 85, 87, 94, 96–100, 103, 111,
125, 140, 190
Civil Service Abuses Inquiry, 16

Governing Hong Kong

- Clark, Trevor, 101, 118, 119, 127
Clarke, Arthur, 82
Clinton, Michael, 56
Coates, Austin, 87, 88, 89, 92
cold war, 173
Colonial Air Regulations Order, 175
Colonial Office, 13, 17–19, 35, 45, 46,
47, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 62, 65, 76, 81,
170, 178
Colonial Secretariat, 32, 117, 130,
140, 142, 144, 164
Commerce and Industry
Department, 79, 106, 107
Confucius, 31
Cotton Advisory Board, 106
Cowperthwaite, John, 65, 75, 80, 81,
82, 83, 84, 106, 168, 182
Crimean War, 14
Crown Lands Resumption
Ordinance, 97
Cultural Revolution, 79, 85
- Dalian, 42
Davis, Sir John, 1, 3, 4, 5
Deane, Walter Meredith, 19, 21, 24,
25
Democratic Party, 155
Department of Trade, 108, 178, 179
Department of Trade and Industry,
108
District Watch Committee, 38, 39, 40
Donovan, General William (Wild
Bill), 173
Dunn, Lydia, 135
- East Asia, 52, 187
East India Company (EIC), 14
Edinburgh, 35
Europe, 51, 72, 73
Executive Council, 20, 83, 100, 101,
155, 186
- Fang, Anson, 77, 133
Federated Malay States, 45
Festival of Hong Kong, 165
Fiji, 22
First World War, 47, 61, 137
Fisher, Sir Warren, 47, 48
- Fletcher, Sir George, 22
Foreign and Commonwealth Office,
108, 178, 180
Foreign Office, 17, 54, 62, 63, 108,
122, 140, 178, 179, 180
Furse, Ralph, 123
- General Agreement on Tariffs and
Trade (GATT), 106, 107, 109
Geneva, 106
George Watson's College, 35
Gimson, Franklin, 53, 76
Gladstone, William, 3, 14
Godber, Peter, 110
Goodstadt, Leo, 159, 160
Government of India Act, 14
Grantham, Sir Alexander, 22, 30,
60–6, 73, 85, 173–5
Gu Weijun, 52
Guangdong, 2, 10
- Haddon-Cave, Philip, 82, 116, 146,
157, 159, 178
Haileybury College, 14
Hamilton, Geoffrey, 101, 125
Hancock, Alfred, 38
Harcourt, Cecil, 43, 53, 58, 76
Harknett, G. A., 112
Hase, Patrick, 98
Hawkins, Brian, 105
Hayes, James, 89, 90, 93, 182
Heath, Henry, 105, 170
Heathcote-Smith, C. B. B., 63
Heatherington, Robert, 56
Heung Yee Kuk, 88
Ho, Eric Peter, 119, 120, 127, 128, 144
Holmes, Ronald, 50, 65, 69, 75, 78,
79, 80, 85, 95
Hong Kong Regiment, 49, 50
Honolulu, 51
Hotung, Robert, 38, 54
House of Commons, 152, 155
Hulme, J. W., 5
- Imperial Defence College, 76, 79
Independent Commission Against
Corruption (ICAC), 112
India, 14, 19, 46, 51, 54, 121

- Indian Civil Service (ICS), 14, 18, 35, 46, 182, 191
 Indian Mutiny, 121
 Indo-China, 36, 51
 Ip Chi, 120
 Ireland, 50
 Isle of Man, 35

 Japan, 50, 51, 162; Japanese, 30, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 59, 65, 68, 76, 77, 79, 80, 120, 187, 192
 John Swire & Sons, 135
 Johnston, A. R., 6
 Johnston, Sir Reginald, 22
 Jordan, David, 101, 106–9, 145, 146, 171, 172, 179, 182, 184

kai fong associations, 77
 Kennedy, Sir Arthur, 26
 Kennedy-Skipton, G. S., 50
 Keswick, John, 38, 58, 61, 62
 King William’s College, 35
 King, T. H., 26
 King’s College, 29, 35
 Korean War, 67, 68
 Kowloon, 6, 13, 15, 32, 82, 87, 88, 92, 94, 96; Kowloon City, 97
 Kuomintang, 59, 62, 64, 172, 174
 Kwun Tong, 92

 Labour Party, 178
 Lee, Thomas C. Y., 105
 Legislative Council, 148, 150, 152, 153, 155, 156, 170
 Li Fook-kow, 120, 128
 Lightbody, Ian, 56, 104, 163
 Lister, Alfred, 22, 23
 Lo, Katherine, 133
 Lockhart, Sir James Stewart, 22, 24, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 75
 London, 4, 13, 18, 29, 35, 52, 53, 57, 58, 61, 68, 73, 79, 81, 108, 109, 115, 120, 140, 149, 167, 170, 171, 173, 174, 175, 177, 178, 179, 180, 188, 192, 194
 London School of Economics, 117
 Loo Aqui, 8

 Lu Xun, 31
 Luddington, Sir Donald, 23, 104, 105, 111, 170
 Lushun, 42

 Macau, 156
 MacDonnell, Sir Richard, 25
 McDouall, John, 75, 77, 78, 79, 95, 103
 MacDougall, David, 22, 43, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 81
 McKinsey & Company, 86, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147
 MacLean, Roderick, 117, 118, 119
 MacLehose, Sir Murray, 22, 83, 86, 92, 125, 140, 141, 144, 148, 150, 151, 180, 192
 Macmillan, Harold, 115
 MacPherson, Ian, 126
 Major, John, 176
 Malaya, 17, 30, 46, 55, 115
 Man Mo Temple, 8
 Mao Zedong, 173
 Marshall Plan, 172, 174
 Martin, Robert Montgomery, 4
 Matheson, Jardine, 38, 58
 May, Charles, 6
 May, Francis Henry, 22, 44, 46
 Medical and Health Department, 74
 Mencius, 31
 Mok Man Cheung, 38
 Mulloy, Gareth, 97, 98, 99, 111, 112
 Mutual Aid Committees (MACs), 98

 New Territories (NT), 31–3, 37, 40–3, 56, 79, 87–9, 91–5, 99, 101
 Newcastle, Duke of, 17
 Nigeria, 101, 118
 Northcote, Stafford, 14, 16

 O’Rorke, Bridget, 76, 133
 Office of Strategic Services, 173
 Oxford, 18, 57, 107, 121, 122, 123, 126

 Pacific War, 22, 30, 42, 51, 80, 120, 163, 167, 173
 Pan American Airways, 173

Governing Hong Kong

- Part, Sir Antony, 108, 109, 179
Patten, Chris, 131, 153–5, 159, 192
Peak, 38, 54
Peak District (Residence) Repeal Bill, 55
Pearl Harbour, 51
Pembroke College, 61
People's Republic of China (PRC), 155, 156, 172, 173, 174, 176, 189, 194; *see also* China; Republic of China
Pottinger, Sir Henry, 1
Prendergast, John, 112
Public Service Commission, 124, 165
Public Works Department, 73, 169
- Qing period, 28, 33
- Republic of China, 173
Resettlement Department, 69, 74, 79, 98
Rider, Edith Louise, 38
Roberts, Lord Goronwy, 178
Robinson, Sir Hercules, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 26, 30
Robinson, Sir William, 39, 41
Rowe, George, 122, 123
Rowlands, Martin, 69
Royal Navy, 54
Royle, Anthony, 178
Russell, Lord John, 15
Russell, Sir James, 22, 23
- Sandhurst, 61
Sarawak, 21, 22
Sassoon, Frederick, 37
Sassoon family, 38
Sayer, Geoffrey, 22
Schofield, Walter, 22
Scott, Alan, 149
Second World War, 67, 87, 114, 124, 133, 140, 189
Secretariat for Chinese Affairs, 79, 85, 105
Selborne, Lord, 47
Sham Shui Po, 98
Shamian, 31
Shandong province, 42
Shatin, 92
Shawcross, Sir Hartley, 174
Shek Kip Mei, 69, 70, 73
Shek Pik reservoir, 90
Shiu-ching Lo, 77
Shuet-yeng Chau, 77
Sierra Leone, 80
Simla, 54
Singapore, 51, 115, 117
Sino–French War, 36
Smith, Adam, 81
Smith, Norman, 22
Smith, Sir Cecil Clementi, 19, 21, 22, 26, 31, 37, 46, 75, 186
Social Welfare Department, 73, 95, 98, 105, 169
Solomon Islands, 23
Sorby, Terence, 56
South Africa, 115
Southeast Asia, 117
Southeast Asia Command, 58
Special Administrative Region (SAR), 23, 109, 154, 157, 194
Special Operations Executive, 79
Stanley Fort, 99
Stanley internment camp, 50, 53, 66, 76
Star Ferry riots, 78
Starkey, R. G., 23
Stewart, Frederick, 36
Straits Settlements, 17, 21, 22, 30, 45, 46
Sui dynasty, 18
Swaine, John Joseph, 120
Sweetman, James, 117
- Tai Po, 88
Tai Po Kau, 92
Taipei, 173
Taiwan, 64, 172
Tam Achoy, 8
Tan Boon-cheok, 120
Teesdale, Edmund, 22
Thailand, 51, 156
Tiananmen Square massacre, 153, 176
Todd, Alastair, 56
Tonnochy, Malcolm Struan, 19, 21

- Topley, Kenneth, 117, 178
Transport Department, 82, 165
Trench, Sir David, 23, 78, 79, 81–3,
95, 102, 103, 116, 125, 140, 141,
162, 177, 192
Trevelyan, Charles, 14, 16
Trinidad, 22, 121
Tsang, Donald, 23, 159
Tsuen Wan, 89, 90, 92
Tsui, Paul Ka-cheung, 56, 57, 65, 114,
128, 129
Tun Mun, 92
Tung Wah Hospital, 38, 39, 40

United Kingdom, 10, 16, 105, 108,
109, 124, 171, 172
United Nations, 67
United States (USA), 67, 106, 155,
174
Upton, Robert, 180

Vickers, Simon, 176
Victoria, 4, 21, 31, 32, 40
Victoria Harbour, 76, 82
Victoria, Queen, 1, 2, 121
Vietnamese boat people, 177

Wall Street crash, 55
Wanchai, 97, 98, 99, 111

Wardle, Charles, 176
Wei Yuk, 37
Weihaiwei, 22, 42
Wellington College, 61
Western Pacific, 23, 78, 95
Whitehall, 133, 137, 177, 178
Whitehead, T. H., 39
Williams, Bernard, 100
Williams, Peter, 69, 170
Wilson, Brian, 92
Wilson, Sir David, 159
Wodehouse, H. E., 24
Wong Lam, 151
Wong Machow, 11, 16
Wong, David T. K., 706
World Trade Organization, 109
Wright, Michael, 167, 169, 178, 180

Yau, Carrie, 155
Yeung Kai-yin, 133
Yeung Wing-tai, 120
Youde, Sir Edward, 148, 180
Young, Howard, 155
Young, Sir Mark, 50–1, 54–6, 58–61,
63, 64, 66, 114, 192
Yuen Long, 88

Zhongqing, 58
Zhoushan, 5