

# Advisers question Han affair

By CONNIE LAW  
and LINDA CHOY

HONG Kong affairs advisers yesterday questioned Beijing's decision to invalidate Chinese dissident Han Dongfang's passport and called for an explanation.

But they believe that such a case would not happen in the territory after 1997.

Liu Yiu-chu said Mr Han should have been tried by court before the Chinese Government revoked his travel document.

"If Mr Han has really acted against the interests of the country, or if he has broken the Chinese law, I think he should be prosecuted according to the official procedure before the verdict is laid."

Miss Liu suggested that Mr Han could appeal for assistance to members of the National People's Congress Standing Committee.

He could also bring the case to the Supreme People's Court in China if he had found the administration at fault in handling his case, Miss Liu said.

Allen Lee Peng-fei said he thought the Chinese Government should give a clear rationale for the cancellation of the passport.

"If China feels Mr Han has broken the law, it should bring him back to the mainland and put him on a trial."

He noted Hong Kong people were worried and that the incident was becoming increasingly political.

Victor Sit Fung-suen said it was far from satisfactory that the Chinese admin-

istration had revoked a citizen's passport through administrative measures.

"I think it would be better if the proper legal procedure could be followed and Mr Han was given a chance to defend his case. Obviously, the Chinese Government should have a solid reason to support its own claims against him," he said.

Asked if the incident would undermine Hong Kong people's confidence in the Chinese Government, Mr Sit said he believed similar cases would not happen in Hong Kong under the concept of "one country, two systems".

He urged the Hong Kong Government not to meddle too much in Chinese politics because Mr Han was a permanent resident of China and his case had nothing to do with Hong Kong politics.

His view was shared by Tsang Tak-sing and Ng Hong-mun, who said the Basic Law provided enough protection for the rights of Hong Kong people to enter the territory.

Mr Cheng Kai-nam said he felt China's treatment of Mr Han was inappropriate and it was normal for Hong Kong people to have worries.

But he said China must have realised the ramifications beforehand and have its reasons for cancelling Mr Han's passport.

If it was found to be a unique case, then there was no cause for concern, he said.

Albert Tong Yat-chu said he hoped China would give a more detailed explanation on the cancellation of Mr Han's passport.

Mr Tong said the incident should not have any implications for Hong Kong people's freedom to travel as the systems practised by China and the territory were totally different.

Raymond Wu Wai-yung said he hoped China would explain clearly under which law it had cancelled Mr Han's passport and whether such provision would be applicable to Hong Kong after 1997.

Until these doubts were cleared, it was difficult to say whether China was right or wrong; or whether Hong Kong people would face the same danger after 1997.

A member of the Preliminary Working Group for the Preparatory Committee for the Special Administrative Region, Rita Fan Hsu Lai-tai, said that Hong Kong people's freedom to travel after 1997 had already been guaranteed by the Basic Law, which allowed them the freedom to enter or leave the territory.

Ma Lik said the cancellation of Mr Han's passport had been a political event and it was unfair to give an early judgment before China had given an explanation.

He said Chinese immigration laws stated that its citizens could not do anything to undermine national interests during their stay overseas and the Ministry of Security was empowered to revoke people's passports.

It was misleading to relate Mr Han's case to the issue of Hong Kong people's freedom to travel after 1997 because Chinese immigration laws would not be applied to the territory, he said.