

期待現代包青天——法務部

Grasping the Tiger by the Tail: Anti-Corruption

看過港星劉德華主演的《五億探長雷諾案》的人，可以深刻感受到1960年代香港警察風紀敗壞的嚴重程度，當時這名華人探長遊走於黑白兩道，巧取豪奪、仗義疏財，他既向上司行賄，也向部屬收賄，利用職權向轄區內的店家、賭場、舞廳收保護費，充當他們的保護傘。

傳說他有五億港幣的財富，收入明顯與官職不符。

1974年香港廉政公署成立，大刀闊斧清理門戶，不但先辦警察，而且是先辦英國警察，博得人民信任後，才為香港帶來徹底的改變，由一個飽受貪污肆虐的地區，變成一個受國際認可的廉潔城市。

為了澄清吏治，經過二十多年的呼籲提案，今年4月立法院三讀通過「法務部廉政署組織條例」，將原法務部政風司擴大為

廉政署，編制員額上限240人，具司法調查權，7月將掛牌運作。有了廉政署，台灣是否就能除弊於一役？

「台灣是個貪污嚴重的國家嗎？」看看最近幾起公務機關爆發的貪污弊案：

去年7月，有3名台灣高等法院法官和1名板橋地檢署檢察官涉嫌向前立委何智輝索賄800萬元，幫助其在苗栗銅鑼科學園區開發案中由一審重判19年，逆轉為更一審改判無罪，創下歷來偵辦司法官風紀案一次羈押最多人的紀錄。

今年3月，衛生署多家署立醫院爆發主管和醫師涉嫌收取藥商、醫療器材公司數十萬到數百萬元的佣金，透過圍標、綁規格，協助與院方關係良好的廠商標走數千萬元的醫療器材採購案，白色

巨塔裡的黑錢糾葛程度，震驚了社會。

貪污有損國際形象

「國際透明組織」每年都會調查公布世界各國「貪腐印象指數」的排名和分數，2010年台灣排名第33，較2009年的37名進步，評比分數為5.8分（0~10分，分數越高代表越清廉）。

除了整體的印象分數，該組織也會調查民衆對各國內部門的貪腐程度感受，以1~5分計分的「貪腐趨勢指數」（1分最清廉，5分最貪腐）。2010年的調查顯示，台灣民衆普遍認為「警察」（3.9分）貪腐最嚴重，其次為國會、公務人員、政黨等；超過2004~2006年最為人詬病的「政黨」與「國會」（2007~2009年未調查）。

法務部的資料顯示，自政府於

表一：2000-2010年國際透明組織「貪腐印象指數」亞太地區主要國家比較

Table 1: Transparency International Corruption Perception Index for major Asian countries, 2000-2010

國家Country	年度Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
新加坡 Singapore	排名Rank	6	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	3	1
	分數Score	9.1	9.2	9.3	9.4	9.3	9.4	9.4	9.3	9.2	9.2	9.3
紐西蘭 New Zealand	排名Rank	3	3	2	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
	分數Score	9.4	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.4	9.3	9.4	9.3
澳大利亞 Australia	排名Rank	13	11	11	8	9	9	9	11	9	8	8
	分數Score	8.3	8.5	8.6	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.7	8.6	8.7	8.7	8.7
香港 Hong Kong	排名Rank	15	14	14	14	16	15	15	14	12	12	13
	分數Score	7.7	7.9	8.2	8	8	8.3	8.3	8.1	8.2	8.2	8.4
日本 Japan	排名Rank	23	21	20	21	24	21	17	17	18	17	17
	分數Score	6.4	7.1	7.1	7	6.9	7.3	7.6	7.5	7.3	7.7	7.8
中華民國 ROC (Taiwan)	排名Rank	28	27	29	30	35	32	34	34	39	37	33
	分數Score	5.5	5.9	5.6	5.7	5.6	5.9	5.9	5.7	5.7	5.6	5.8
南韓 South Korea	排名Rank	48	42	40	50	47	40	42	43	40	39	39
	分數Score	4	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.5	5	5.1	5.1	5.6	5.5	5.4
中國大陸 Mainland China	排名Rank	63	57	59	66	71	78	70	72	72	79	78
	分數Score	3.1	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.5

資料來源：法務部 / source: MOJ

廉政署7月掛牌

文·滕淑芬 新聞眼 Eye on the News

Agency to Begin Operations in July

Hong Kong superstar Andy Lau's film *Lee Rock* delivers a strong sense of the depth of corruption in the Hong Kong police force in the 1960s. In the film, the protagonist wavers between the dark and the light, earning dirty money while also helping those in need. He takes bribes from subordinates and passes them up the chain of command, while also extorting protection money from the shops, casinos, and dance halls in his jurisdiction.

Lau's character is reputed to have assets worth HK\$500 million, and an income well above his official salary.

The Hong Kong Independent Commission Against Corruption was established in 1974 and set out to clean up the city, taking on both the local and the British police forces. ICAC earned the public's trust and brought about comprehensive reforms, turning a city once devastated by corruption into one internationally renowned for its integrity.

In April, Taiwan's Legislative Yuan finally passed the third reading of a law establishing Taiwan's own anti-corruption agency under the Ministry of Justice that will replace the Department of Government Ethics (DGE). The new agency, originally proposed more than 20 years ago, will begin operations in July of this year with a staff of up to 240 and the investigatory powers of a law enforcement agency. Will it be able to weed out corruption in Taiwan?

Does Taiwan suffer from high levels of corruption? Numerous reports on



法務部長曾勇夫說，成立廉政署是建立清廉政府，誠信社會的新契機，廉政署有信心與決心打擊公部門的貪瀆不法。（莊坤儒攝）

Minister of Justice Tseng Yung-fu says that the Anti-Corruption Agency has the confidence and the resolve to attack corruption in government. In his view, its formation is a step towards building a cleaner government. (photo by Chuang Kung-ju)

corruption within government agencies have appeared over the last year or two.

Last July, three High Court judges and a Banqiao District Court prosecutor solicited an NT\$8 million bribe from former legislator Ho Chih-hui. The four overturned Ho's 19-year sentence for his involvement in the Tong-luo Science Park development scandal, declaring him not guilty of receiving kickbacks. The charges against the judges and prosecutor resulted in jail time for more individuals than in any previous ethics case.

In March of this year, news broke that administrators and doctors at sev-

eral Department of Health hospitals were suspected of taking kickbacks ranging from hundreds of thousands to millions of NT dollars from pharmaceuticals and medical device manufacturers. Collusion and bid rigging helped firms with good relationships to the hospitals win medical device contracts worth tens of millions of NT dollars. The amount of "black gold" discovered to be pouring through the white corridors of our hospitals was simply staggering.

Detrimental to our national image

Transparency International publishes a Corruption Perceptions Index, rating and ranking the nations of the world every year. Taiwan's 2010 score of 5.8 on the 10-point scale (higher numbers represent greater integrity) ranked it 33rd in the world, versus 37th in 2009.

In addition to providing an overall score, the organization asks the public of each nation to rate institutional corruption in their own countries on a scale of 1 (the cleanest) to 5 (the most corrupt). Taiwan public scored the police at 3.9, indicating a perception of severe corruption. The police were the most egregious offenders, followed by the legislature, civil servants, and the political parties. That compares to the 2004–2006 survey, where our political parties and legislators took "top honors." (No survey was conducted in 2007–2009.)

According to the Ministry of Justice, it investigated and prosecuted 5,645 corruption cases between the government's July 2000 rollout of its campaign against "black gold" and March 2011. Those cases involved NT\$34.17 billion in illicit payments and brought

2000年7月執行「掃除黑金行動方案」至今年3月以來，偵辦貪瀆起訴的案件計有5,645件，起訴1萬5,976人次，查獲貪瀆金額高達341億7,649萬元；其中起訴的高層公務人員有961人（6%），民意代表782人（4.89%），中層公務人員2,775人（17.3%），基層公務人員4,331人（27.1%），也就是說，政府每年查獲貪瀆金額超過五成都是被各級公務人員（含民意代表）污走。

再細看貪瀆起訴案件在中央各部會的分布情形，可以發現起訴件數1,866件中，以內政部最高（536件），其次為交通部、經濟部、財政部、法務部等。

「貪污的都是管錢的，受賄的都是有權的。掙票子的不如有門子的，有門子的不如有位子的，」中國大陸這句順口溜反應出「權力讓人腐化」的淪喪心態。

絕對權力使人絕對腐化

為什麼有權的、管錢的更容易貪污呢？

輔仁大學管理學院教授許培基在《企業誠信與國家清廉》一文中表示，華人社會受到「民不與官鬥」的觀念影響，為了避免日後再與官方接觸會受到報復，對於知情的賄賂與貪瀆情形，通常採取容忍態度，不願舉發，導致公務人員的貪瀆行徑有恃無恐。

法務部長曾勇夫說，內政部轄下的警察、營建署核發建照，交通部的工程發包等幾個部門的主管業務都與民衆來往密切，讓不肖公務員有上下其手的機會；或者像法務部的檢察體系承辦民衆訴訟案件，也會有「司法黃牛」從中穿針引線，打著檢察官的名義向民衆要錢，「帳都會算在我們頭上，但我們也知道有少數害群之馬。」

更大的案子是，2008年二次政黨輪替後，前總統陳水扁家族

因涉及多起貪瀆弊案遭到起訴，中華民國有史以來有國家領導人帶頭貪汙並被判刑定讞，入監服刑，重創台灣的國際形象。

為整肅貪瀆，馬英九總統上任後即將肅貪列為重大政策。他強調，法官、檢察官與警察是社會正義的最後防線，「這道防線不能被不肖警察、法官、檢察官輕易摧毀，政府一定要提出更有效的防貪、肅貪行動，才能向人民交代。」

但是該從何處著手呢？就從成立一個專責肅貪的廉政署開始。

根據行政院研考會去年7月公布的「民衆對成立廉政專責機關的看法」民調，顯示有近7成受訪者認為，成立廉政機關有助提升政府的清廉程度、台灣國際形象和展現政府的反貪決心。

「我們給你廉政署，請你給我們大力改革！」

其實，提議設立一個獨立超然的廉政機關，非自今日始。

早在1987年，還是國民黨的前立委趙少康就在立法院提案成立「反貪汙局」，當時連署立委高達102位；6年後，已成新黨的趙少康再度提案成立「廉政總署」，連署立委驟降為23位。1996年，第一次總統大選期間，設立廉政公署或提升肅貪機關階，是不分黨派候選人的政見；二千年總統大選亦然。

政黨輪替後，時任法務部長的陳定南，再度大力推動廉政署，從組織草案到說帖，一應俱全，但國民黨和親民黨都反對。反對的理由未必是國、親兩黨不反貪，反而是主管的調查局擔心肅貪大權旁落，例如前某位調查局長就反對組織架構層層疊疊。

就因各方角力，廉政署一拖二十多年，才終於在今年通過《廉政署組織條例》。雖然時機已晚，但社會仍賦予很高期待；

15,976 people to trial. More than half of the dirty money the government investigates every year goes to civil servants (including elected representatives).

Some 1,866 cases involved central-government agencies. The Ministry of the Interior (MOI), which accounted for 536 of those, was the most troubled ministry, followed by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications (MOTC), the Ministry of Economic Affairs, the Ministry of Finance, and the Ministry of Justice (MOJ).

As a mainland Chinese saying puts it: "Bribe takers are always people with power and control over the coffers."

Why is it that those in power and those interested in money are so readily corruptible?

Minister of Justice Tseng Yung-fu notes that the MOI has jurisdiction over the police and the Construction and Planning Agency, which issues construction licenses, while the MOTC oversees bidding on many major projects. In other words, the key operations of these ministries involve a great deal of interaction with society at large, providing unethical public servants with opportunities for graft. The prosecutorial apparatus of the MOJ, meanwhile, is charged with bringing cases involving the public to trial, which provides opportunities for unethical individuals to use their standing as prosecutors to extort money. "We're all stigmatized by the actions of a few bad eggs."

A still larger case came to light in 2008 after the handover of presidential power, when members of the former president's family were charged for their involvement in numerous corruption cases. The case, the first time in the history of the Republic of China in which a national leader was convicted of taking bribes, was enormously detrimental to Taiwan's national image.

President Ma Ying-jeou made cleaning up corruption a major policy focus following his inauguration. He stressed that judges, prosecutors, and police are our last line of defense in the pursuit of social justice. "This line of defense cannot crumble," said the president. "If the

government is to justify its own existence, it must take more effective action against corruption.”

The president decided to start by establishing an agency dedicated to rooting out corruption.

“We gave you an anti-corruption agency. We want big changes in return!”

The establishment of an independent anti-corruption body wasn’t a new idea.

Former KMT legislator Jaw Shau-kong proposed the formation of an anti-corruption bureau to the Legislative Yuan as early as 1987, persuading 102 fellow legislators to cosponsor his bill. Six years later, Jaw made a similar proposal as head of the New Party, but this time attracted only 23 cosponsors. During the presidential elections of 1996 and 2000, the establishment of such a body was a mainstream position.

When the DPP took over the presidency in 2000, Minister of Justice Chen Ding-nan pushed hard for the formation of such an agency, drafting organizational proposals and memoranda, but the KMT and the People First Party opposed his efforts. It wasn’t that the two parties were pro-corruption, but that the MOJ’s Investigation Bureau (IB) was worried about power being placed in hands other than its

own and about institutional overlap.

More than 20 years of wrangling from all sides finally came to an end this year with the passage of a statute establishing the Anti-Corruption Agency (ACA). The ACA may be late to the party, but expectations are nonetheless running high. On the other hand, the public has doubts about the establishment of the ACA within the MOJ, fearing that it won’t have sufficient standing or independence.

Minister Tseng argues that given that prosecutors play a central role in investigations under our nation’s criminal justice system, placing the ACA under the Office of the President, directly under the Executive Yuan, or under the Control Yuan would have reduced their efficiency and created chaos within the system.

“The division of labor between the ACA and the Investigation Bureau will create a sort of ‘crossfire,’ says Tseng. “Their objective is the same: to expose hidden corruption. But, to avoid diluting manpower resources, the ACA will focus primarily on anti-corruption and corruption-prevention communications, and secondarily on eliminating corruption. Moreover, it will be limited to investigating corruption within governmental organs. Eliminating corruption is, along with investigating

national security and economic crimes, just one of the IB’s many responsibilities.” Tseng says that the IB, which employs 3,000 people, is well staffed and well equipped, but that the two agencies will pursue their cases in different fashions. The anti-corruption agency will have prosecutors on staff and be able to direct police and the IB. It will be highly mobile and able to quickly lay hands on evidence. The hope is that the agency will be able to increase the conviction rate in corruption cases to 70% from its current level of 65%.

Learning from Hong Kong

Establishing the anti-corruption agency is only the first step towards cleaning up corruption. The real challenges will be having the courage and determination to prosecute big cases and building public trust in the authorities.

Hong Kong’s economy grew rapidly in the 1960s, driven by manufacturing, but public services such as education, housing, and medical care failed to keep pace with citizens’ needs. In those days, individuals seeking public housing, admission into schools, or to utilize fire and emergency services had no choice but to bribe civil servants. In some instances, firemen went so far as to demand payment before putting out fires.

表二：2010年亞洲各國主要部門之貪腐程度比較

Table 2: Perceived institutional corruption in Asian countries, 2010

右列哪個部門的貪腐情況最為嚴重？ 1. 表示非常不嚴重 5. 表示非常嚴重 To what extent do you perceive the following institutions in this country to be affected by corruption? 1: Not at all corrupt. 5: Extremely corrupt.	政黨 Political parties	國會 Parliament	警察 Police	私部門 Business	媒體 Media	公務人員 Public officials	法院 Judiciary	非政府組織 NGOs	宗教 Religious bodies	軍隊 Military	教育 Education
全球平均 Global average	4.2	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.2	3.7	3.3	2.9	3.3	2.8	3.1
香港 Hong Kong	3.3	3.0	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.4	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.8
新加坡 Singapore	2.9	2.6	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.7
南韓 South Korea	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.6	2.7	3.0	3.3	3.5
中華民國 ROC (Taiwan)	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.2	3.8	3.3	2.8	2.9	3.4	3.2
日本 Japan	4.2	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.9	3.1	3.1	4.0	3.3	3.6
中國大陸 Mainland China	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.7	3.0

資料來源：國際透明組織/source: Transparency International

不過，輿論對於廉政署設在法務部之下，層級不夠高，獨立性不夠，仍有疑慮。尤其，負責調查黑金弊案已有最高法院特偵組（負責偵辦部長級以上的貪瀆案）、調查局，廉政署是否疊床架屋？

法務部長曾勇夫說，我國刑事訴訟制度是以各地檢察官為偵查主體，如果是在總統府、行政院或監察院之下設置廉政署，將使檢察官指揮監督偵查工作的效率降低，也會打亂制度。為了提升廉政署的效率與獨立性，將由社會公正人士組成「廉政審查委員會」，定期審查民衆檢舉資料與結存案件，防止誤判、拖辦及吃案。

「至於廉政署與調查局的分工是『交叉火網、分進合擊』，目標一致，即挖掘出藏匿在各角落的貪瀆弊案，但為了避免人力分散，廉政署將以反貪、防貪的宣導工作為主、肅貪為輔，並限定在調查公務機關的貪瀆弊案，而肅貪只是調查局查賄、國家安全及經濟犯罪等多項職掌的一部分。」曾勇夫說，調查局編制有3,000人，人力與設備充沛，但兩者辦案模式不同，廉政署有駐署檢察官，可以指揮警察、調查局，行動力高，很快掌握事證，希望未來可以將目前定罪率65%，提高到70%。

以香港「廉政公署」為鏡

設立廉政署只是清廉改革的第一步，有沒有魄力與決心辦大案，樹立權威公信，才是挑戰。

借鏡香港經驗，1960年代的香港由製造業帶動經濟成長，但不少社會資源如教育、住屋、醫療等公共服務都追不上市民需求。當時無論是申請國民住宅、入學，使用緊急消防和救護服務，都需要賄賂公職人員才能獲得服務，甚至發生火警時，消防員還

要市民先付錢才願救火。

市民忍無可忍，凝聚強大的輿論壓力。1974年香港廉政公署成立，直接向港英總督麥理浩爵士負責，被賦予廣大權力。廉政公署雷厲風行，首先向警界開刀，令警隊人心惶惶，極度不滿，1977年香港警察走上街頭示威，爆發嚴重的警廉衝突。最後，港督頒布特赦令，不溯既往，衝突才告平息，可見整飭官箴是多麼困難。

香港民主黨立法會議員劉慧卿為文指出，香港的反貪腐工作能夠成功，有賴廉政公署、獨立的司法機構、市民尊重法治和不斷的公民教育等。七百萬人的香港每年編列給廉署8億港幣（合約32億新台幣）預算，聘請1,300名幹員，賦予他們查閱銀行帳目、扣留及審查商務和私人文件，及要求受疑人提供其資產、收入和支出的詳細資料等權力；以台灣的面積、人口和政治的複雜性，投入的資源實不能少。

廉政公署的內控機制更是嚴密，深恐權力讓人腐化，據統計，在1,300名職員中，每年因貪瀆被調查、起訴的人不超過3人，

自我要求嚴謹。

香港的廉政文化能內化為市民的道德價值，反貪教育及爭取社會支持也是關鍵。包括在媒體播放反貪的教育節目、向公眾交代執法個案、為企業訂下防貪程序的標準、實務指引，與電視台合製「廉政行動」電視劇等，將反貪觀念烙印民衆心中。

尚方寶劍，杜絕源頭

一言以蔽之，肅貪需從源頭杜絕，減少民衆送紅包與官員收賄的機會，而不是天天勞師動衆抓貪污。

為此，近年我國行政與立法部門已陸續制定《遊說法》、《政治獻金法》、《公職人員財產申報法》等，公開規範公職人員行為；但仍有些法令待補足，例如2009年4月通過的《貪污治罪條例》即訂有「財產來源不明罪」，但施行兩年來，檢方沒有起訴任何案件，似乎沒有發揮作用。

曾勇夫說，現行的「財產來源不明罪」構成條件太過嚴苛，條文規定要犯下貪汙罪，進入偵查程序才能定罪，但若是已遭起訴

《全球貪腐報告》指出，過去兩年，各國貪腐事件讓全球企業損失數十億美元，也衍生出員工士氣低落、客戶不信任等危機。圖為去年財政部舉辦的企業誠信發表會。（法務部提供）

According to the *Global Corruption Report*, corruption cost businesses billions of US dollars worldwide over the last two years, while also damaging employee morale and customers' faith in businesses. The photo was taken at a 2010 Ministry of Finance presentation on corporate integrity. (courtesy of the Ministry of Justice)



的貪污罪，刑度最少5年以上，檢方若再起訴刑度只有3年的「財產來源不明罪」，顯得多此一舉。

「我們考慮將『帽子』加大，擴大財產來源不明罪的條件，只要公務員的財產在一定時間內暴增，又不能說明時，就能起訴。」

其次，《貪污治罪條例》也將增訂「不違背職務行為行賄罪」，「以前民衆送紅包沒事，以後是自己也會構成犯罪，雙管齊下杜絕紅包文化，」曾勇夫說。

所謂「違背職務行為」是指送紅包讓公務員「違法」通過工程驗收；而「不違背職務行為」是指給了好處，要求公務員在「合法」範圍內，儘快通過工程驗收程序，這時不管公務員有沒有收錢，送錢的都會構成「不違背職務行為」行賄罪。

清廉執政是政府對人民的承諾，民衆不應該送紅包，也不必送紅包。貪污破壞市場秩序、扭曲資源分配，傷害經濟與社會極深，如今在民衆「望廉若渴」的期待下，「我們給了你尚方寶劍，也請你還以一個包青天。」□



Fed up, residents eventually brought the power of public opinion to bear. Hong Kong established the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) in 1974, giving it broad powers and placing it under the direct control of the territory's governor, at that time Baron MacLehose. ICAC acted swiftly, targeting the police force first. Frightened, police officers took to the streets for demonstrations in 1977, triggering a conflict with the commission that was not resolved until the governor offered officers amnesty. In Hong Kong, cleaning up entrenched corruption was no cakewalk.

Hong Kong Democratic Party legislator Emily Lau has written that the foundations of the success of Hong Kong's anti-corruption efforts were ICAC, the independent judiciary, the people's respect for the law, and constant public education. Nowadays, the city's 7 million residents provide ICAC with annual funding of some HK\$800 million (roughly NT\$3.2 billion). The commission employs some 1,300 persons charged with investigating bank statements, and seizing and examining personal and business records. ICAC also has the power to demand detailed accounts of suspects' assets, income, and expenditures. Given Taiwan's larger size and population, and its more complex politics, we shouldn't skimp on our own agency's budget.

ICAC's internal control systems are stringent out of concern that the body's power will corrupt its own employees. As a result, fewer than three of its 1,300 workers are prosecuted each year on corruption charges.

At the source

Corruption has to be eliminated at the source, which means reducing opportunities for people to offer bribes and for officials to accept them.

In recent years, our executive and legislature have created legislation intended to shine a light on the actions of public servants. These laws have included the Lobbying Act, the Political Donations Act, and the Act on Property-Declaration by Public

Servants. But other regulations have yet to be brought fully online. For example, the Anti-Corruption Statute, passed in April 2009, includes a provision on "assets of unclear origin," but officials have yet to prosecute anyone on this charge.

Tseng says that the provisions on "assets of unclear origin" are far too stringent, requiring for a conviction that suspects have already been investigated for taking bribes. But if a suspect has already been charged with corruption, for which the sentence is a minimum of five years, adding on the assets charge, which carries a sentence of just three years, seems superfluous. "We are considering expanding the provisions of the article on assets of unclear origin so that we can utilize it when a civil servant's assets have expanded rapidly in a given period of time, and the civil servant cannot explain why."

A provision is also to be added to the Anti-Corruption Statute to criminalize the giving of bribes that don't induce violations of professional conduct. "Prior to this, giving a red envelope [to an official merely to encourage them to perform their normal duties] wasn't an issue," says Tseng. "But in the future it will constitute a crime. We're attacking 'red envelope' culture from both sides."

"Giving red envelopes without inducing violations of professional conduct" refers to practices such as giving gifts to encourage an official to act within the law to expedite the approval of a project. Even if the official in question doesn't take the money, its offer will constitute a crime.

The government has made a commitment to clean up corruption. For its part, the public has no need to and should not give red envelopes. Corruption disrupts market operations and distorts the distribution of resources, inflicting profound harm on our economy and our society. In recent years, the public has come to expect better. Its attitude today is: "We've given you the power. We expect integrity in return." □

(Teng Sue-feng/tr. by Scott Williams)