

Ir Prof Dr Wanbil Lee

FHKCS, FHKIE, FBCS, FIMA

私人用箋

李雲彪博士 教授工程師

[wanbil@acm.org](mailto:wanbil@acm.org); (852) 9190 8993

16 June 2011

Ms Yue Ting-po, Chief Council Secretary  
Clerk of Information Technology & Broadcasting Panel

Follow-up of my note on the Godfrey Saga (31 May 2011)

Please convey to the Panel my message below for consideration.

1. If Mr Jeremy Godfrey is proved lying, then the administration has the case to defend it is right to appoint someone like Mr Godfrey because the selection procedure of senior officers, particular at departmental head level, is known or believed to be known as strict, demanding and thorough. In this case, technical competence aside, Mr Godfrey's personal moral standard is questionable. The administration is blameworthy, more severe considering senior level appointments. In the end, this will throw open the question of competence of other top-level officers thus appointed.
2. If Mr Godfrey's allegation is shown justified and indeed he has proved himself a competent officer and a specialist of high technical and ethical standards, then the administration will suffer an overcast of autocracy.
3. Under these premises, while I reiterate that the appearance of this episode inevitably tarnishes Hong Kong's image and hurts its reputation in governance terms, notwithstanding whose faults (my note, 31 May 2011), I **conclude** that it is only fair and right for a platform to be provided in legislative arena not only to erase that tarnish and sooth that hurt, to rebuild that image and reputation, but also to enable Mr Godfrey, Secretary John Tsang and Permanent Secretary Elizabeth Tse and others involved to clear their names, respectively. Referring to my 4-point proposal in my note and its supplement, the first step has been done of summoning the three key persons. Since the motion to call in the Powers & Privileges Ordinance in the meeting today (16 June 2011) was surprisingly turned down, I urge the Panel either to carry out the other three steps (re-assessing all five proposals by an independent, politics-free specialists including not only feasibility and risk analyses but also an ethics or refer to other, higher panels/subcommittees to do so. This is my conclusion drawn on the two premises above – the only way out of this dilemma.

