



## The Betty Letters

*My Dear Grandchild,*

*In my book, I maintain that our Chief Executive has lost all credibility. Bo-Bo, my froglike husband, agrees with me – which he has to do anyway if he wants any nooky-nooky from me. What Chief Executive Donald Tsang Yam Kuen ( ) has permitted to happen is to allow Hongkong to be an Administration, governed by complaint. The entire mess was caused by him so he only has he, himself, to blame. The last nail, hammered into his political coffin, was when he stated, during his policy speech of Wednesday, October 15, 2008, that all Hongkong residents, having achieved the age of 70 years, will have to go through a means test in order to qualify for an increase of \$HK295 in their monthly allowance, bringing it to \$HK1,000. It is a disgusting imposition on a person, who has reached the so-called 'Golden Years'. For what reason should a person have to prove to the Hongkong Government that he/she is qualified to receive an increase in his/her monthly allowance? What could possibly be achieved by a means test: That a person needs the money? If a person did not need the money, then, that person would not have applied for such a measly sum of money in the first place. Whether or not a person needs the money, after having worked for the best part of 50 years and having paid taxes to the Hongkong Government, throughout that period of time, is immaterial, in any event. Is it too much to ask for some of that money, paid in taxes, to be rebated to these people in their last years of life? And, even if a person, having achieved the age of 70 years, had never paid a penny in taxes, he or she, certainly, made a contribution to Hongkong, during his/her lifetime. After having spent 50 years in Hongkong, performing tasks, of one shape or another, in order to help to create the miraculous economy for which Hongkong has become famous, is it possible that the Hongkong Government owes to that person a debt of gratitude? The sum of \$HK1,000 per month is not, exactly, a fortune, is it? But it would be a tangible indication to people, having achieved the age of 70 years and older, that the Hongkong Government recognises the debt that it owes to these elderly people. By the way, I am not one of them, and, in any event, I would never admit as to how old I am to anybody.*

*On another subject, during the Policy Speech of the Chief Executive, some Legislative Councillors threw some bananas against a wall, not far from him, in order to show their disgust at what they had heard or did not hear. While I empathise with the plight of the elderly people of Hongkong in that they should be given more money, I do not condone the actions of those Legislative Councillors in throwing bananas. In my book, it is a form of violent civil disobedience. There are much better ways to put across their displeasure without resorting to such tactics. Violence only begets more violence. Violence, on the part of law-makers of Hongkong, could well have a lasting and detrimental effect on the right-minded residents of the territory. Also, it could send a message to some of the ruffians of Hongkong that violence could be a means to an end – which it must never be. The Frog agrees with me, too. He said that Beijing must have taken note of the banana-throwing Legislative Councillors. They have been given a black mark in Beijing's book of people to watch. I imagine that it is ammunition to those in Beijing who maintain that Hongkong is not ready for a full, democratic government. In this case, I tend to agree with The Frog – which is not very often. The banana-throwing could well be just the beginning, Beijing must have reasoned: Will there be rock-throwing next? Then, what will follow? What the banana-throwing incident indicated was, among other things, that these Legislative Councillors are unfit for their high office. They are supposed to be setting an example to*

*the people of Hongkong. They have a duty of fidelity to the people, who voted them into office, and, it follows, to the entire population of Hongkong, the young, the old, the healthy and the infirm. These banana-throwers are supposed to be law-makers not law-breakers. Their actions must have been tantamount to an attempted assault on the Chief Executive. What would have happened if one of the bananas, by accident, had hit Mr Donald Tsang Yam Kuen on the head? Would that not have been assault and battery, an act which is contrary to the laws of Hongkong? If the banana-throwers were not charged for their acts of hitting the Chief Executive with a banana, would it not send a message to others, perhaps, that it is acceptable to assault a civil servant ... or, for that matter, to assault anybody whose views were in variance with theirs? It is rum state of affairs.*

*Talk to you, next week.*

*Chief Lady*

***While TARGET makes every attempt to ensure accuracy of all data published, TARGET cannot be held responsible for any errors and/or omissions.***

*If readers feel that they would like to voice their opinions about that which they have read in **TARGET**, please feel free to e-mail your views to [editor@targetnewspapers.com](mailto:editor@targetnewspapers.com). **TARGET** does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.*