

LegCo Panel on Public Service
Meeting on Monday, 16 January 2006 at 10:45 am
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building

Comments of the Police Force Council Staff Side
(SPA, HKPIA, OIA & JPOA)
On LC Paper No. CB(1)675/05-06(03)
Provided by the Administration

- In the papers supplied by the Secretary for the Civil Service (the Secretary) it is stated that “apart from some individual submissions, civil servants in general consider the latest package of change proposals mild and acceptable”. This is wholly and unacceptably wrong. The four Police Staff Associations, i.e. the Superintendents’ Association (SPA), the Hong Kong Police Inspectors’ Association (HKPIA), the Overseas Inspectors’ Association (OIA) and the Junior Police Officers Association (JPOA), and the Police Force Management do not find the proposals acceptable. This is the largest single grouping within the Civil Service which the Secretary has attempted to ignore in his submissions to the Legislative Council.
- Along with our colleagues in the Disciplined Services the Police Force Council Staff Side does not believe these proposals to be neither fair nor legal. This grouping represents around one third of the civil service workforce. The Police Force Council Staff Side believes the proposals are unlawful, unfair and unacceptable. This stance is echoed by Police Force Management. These change proposals are an assault on the Conditions of Service offered to officers on first appointment. These are NOT fringe benefits. The Secretary stated in a meeting with Legislative Council Members in November 2005 that – ‘Civil Service medical benefits are considered contractual agreements between the Government (the employer) and civil servants (the employees) and constitute a part of the employment conditions. These are stipulated in the Civil Service Regulations’. These allowances under review also fall under this definition as kindly supplied by the Secretary.

- It is also important to mention that the Police Force Management does not agree to these change proposals and submitted a lengthy paper to the Secretary in this regard, however, the Secretary has failed to make mention of this 'important' submission in the papers supplied to LegCo. Indeed, the submission by Force Management merits only an annotation in the statistical breakdown of submissions made. If the Secretary was interested in numerical submissions as opposed to consultations with the staff associations then the Police Force can supply a submission from each and every member of the police force.
- As stated in the various written responses to the Secretary all Police Force Staff Associations take the view that if individual officers are given options as regards their Conditions of Service then most will happily take up any reasonable offer of revised Conditions as opposed to the present 'take it and lump it' proposals. Police Staff Associations cannot enter into negotiations with the Administration as they are not unions; instead, open and honest dialogue needs to be made with all individuals concerned. This has been the protocol successfully used in the past and should be used in these circumstances. It is our belief that police officers will in general accept any reasonable, logical and legal offer placed before them.
- The papers supplied by the Secretary talk of major savings. In truth the fiscal savings made from these proposals are miserable. When one compares the depth of bad feeling and damage done to police staff relations with the Administration in order to claw back a few dollars from a shrinking pool of eligible and long serving police officers – then the harm done far outweighs any savings made.
- Hong Kong has a 'can do', loyal and dedicated Police Force – do the members of this dedicated group really need to be further tormented to appease long dead phantoms of deficit and stringency measures?

__ End __