

**Select Committee to Inquire into Matters Relating to  
the Post-service Work of Mr LEUNG Chin-man**

**Further written statement of The Hon. Mr Justice Pang Kin-kee**

- (a) *your term of office as the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Post-service Employment of Civil Servants (“ACPE”);*

The following are my terms as Chairman of the Advisory Committee:

- (i) 14 July 2003 – 13 July 2005
- (ii) 14 July 2005 – 13 July 2007
- (iii) 14 July 2007 – present

- (b) *the number of post-service work applications from directorate civil servants which you have considered during your tenure as the Chairman of ACPE;*

Total number of application considered from 14 July 2003 – 9 April 2009 is 395.

- (c) *the number of post-service work applications mentioned in (b) above which were considered by ACPE by way of circulation of papers to members of ACPE;*

Total number of application considered by way of circulation is 390.

- (d) *the number of post-service work applications mentioned in (b) above which were considered by ACPE by way of discussion at meetings of ACPE, the reasons for convening meetings to consider the applications mentioned in (b) above, the dates of these meetings and the number of applications considered at each of these meetings;*

- (i) There were a total of 5 applications considered by way of discussion at meetings.
- (ii) The reasons for convening the meetings to consider the applications mentioned in (b) above:

Case A : There was a divergence of views regarding the length of sanitization period to be imposed on the applicant in the light of the applicant’s proposal to take up his employment on the same month as his commencement of pre-retirement leave.

The meeting to discuss Case A was held on 7 March 2005.

Case B : To discuss the issue of public perception on the proposed appointment of the applicant.

Case C : To request for further information on the scope of work and the composition of the organization to be joined by the applicant.

Case D :

- (i) to discuss whether the applicant's proposed employer would gain an unfair advantage over its competitors;
- (ii) whether the issue of perceived conflict of interest could be adequately addressed by imposing restrictive conditions and if so, the nature and extent of such restrictions.

Case E : To discuss the issue of public perception on the proposed employment.

The meeting to discuss cases B, C, D and E was held on 23 January 2009.

Submitted.



---

The Hon Mr Justice Pang Kin-kee  
Date : 14 April 2009