

Over this period we have disclosed a wide range of evidence. For clarity, we provide here a summary of what we have shown to date:

1. Lee Hsien Loong has made many contradictory statements in public and private, including under oath -- some must be lies. He seeks to play the filial son in public while acting to thwart our parents' wishes in private through improper means.
2. Using his position as PM, LHL misled his father into believing LKY's house was either already gazetted or would 'inevitably' be gazetted on his passing.
3. LKY's final will is a reversion to his 2011 will on his explicit instructions. Stamford Law attended to the attestation of the Will at LKY's request.
4. Ho Ching improperly took LKY's personal items from his house without permission, somehow "representing" PMO to loan these items to the NHB.
5. Unhappy that the Estate's gift of LKY's furniture and personal items to the NHB required the display of LKY's demolition wish from his Will, LHL acquired a copy of this deed of gift in his official capacity as PM, then improperly handed the deed to his then-personal lawyer for his personal legal fights against LKY's Estate to frustrate the gift.
6. LHL signed a settlement agreement with LKY's Estate, in which he agreed to recuse himself from governmental decisions involving the house and reaffirmed his father's Final Will. Despite this, LHL made extensive submissions to a secret ministerial committee to challenge LKY's Final Will. Only after being forced under public scrutiny did this secret committee reveal its members and deliverables.
7. Through extensive exchanges between the committee and LKY's executors, it is clear that the committee had little interest in examining options about 38 Oxley, instead parroting LHL's attacks on LKY's Final Will to the executors. These attacks were completely spurious and without merit, seeking to challenge or pervert LKY's last wishes.
8. When we were forced by LHL's relentless attacks through the committee to take this issue public, LHL used a parliamentary session to whitewash himself, setting himself once more before his subordinates in parliament, another improper forum. He has refused to subject himself to any independent inquiry on the matters.

What Has Happened to the Values of Lee Kuan Yew: <https://goo.gl/G71SrX>

1. Lee Hsien Loong has made many contradictory statements in public and private, including under oath -- some must be lies. He seeks to play the filial son in public while acting to thwart our parents' wishes in private through improper means.

Lee Hsien Loong in his own words.	
IN PUBLIC	IN PRIVATE
LHL states in Parliament: "there is no immediate issue of demolition of the house, and no need for the Government to make any decision now."	A secret committee of ministers is set up to investigate and make recommendations about the house. Official media now says LHL is "not involved".
Probate for Lee Kuan Yew's will is granted on 6 Oct 2015. The will is recognised as final and legally binding. LHL raises no legal challenge.	LHL writes to the secret committee claiming, "there is no evidence that Mr Lee even knew that the demolition clause had been re-inserted into the last will". LHL swears this under oath (a statutory declaration).
LHL quotes the demolition clause to Parliament, and then says "Mr Lee's position on 38 Oxley Road was unwavering over the years, and fully consistent with his lifelong values." (April 2015)	LHL tells his committee: "Mr Lee then took a number of steps which put beyond any doubt that he came to accept Cabinet's position."
LHL writes on Facebook, I "hope the government will allow the late Mr Lee Kuan Yew's wish for the demolition of the house to be honoured "	LHL tells his committee: "He [Lee Kuan Yew] would accept any decision to preserve it."

When was he lying?

Lee Hsien Loong's speech to Parliament, 13 April 2015

"Most importantly, how we honour Mr Lee must be faithful to the ideals he lived by and fought for. Mr Lee made it very clear throughout his life that **he did not need and did not want any monument**. [...] Mr Lee was very careful never to allow a personality cult to grow around him, much less to encourage one himself."

Lee Hsien Loong, through his personal lawyer Lucien Wong, 18 Sep 2015 letter addressed to lawyers of Lee Hsien Yang and Lee Wei Ling

Mr Lee **never said that he was in principle opposed to any monuments to himself after his death**. On the contrary, Mr Lee felt that it was necessary for Singapore to have appropriate monuments / memorials which would commemorate Singapore's founding fathers, **including himself**, and had given careful thought to how this could be done. As he told our client: "This place needs heroes".

LHL again misrepresents his father's wishes.

2. Using his position as PM, LHL misled his father into believing LKY's house was either already gazetted or would 'inevitably' be gazetted on his passing.

From 2010, LHL improperly misrepresented to our father LKY that gazetting of 38 Oxley Road was either "inevitable" or that the house was already gazetted. We now know that no decision had been made. In doing so, LHL improperly represented the government's position, and acted under a clear conflict of interest.

In Parliament, LHL claimed that, because LKY "considered" alternatives to demolition, citing the renovation plans by Ho Ching as proof that LKY wavered in his demolition wish. The contradictions are many.

As the email below reveals, LKY and we were in fact very skeptical about the renovation plans, as these were inconsistent with LHL's insistence that the house would be gazetted. The evidence also shows that LKY considered alternatives only because of LHL's misrepresentations to his own family. Finally, it contradicts a claim made by Lee Hsien Loong through his lawyer that no decision had in fact been made on the house and that he never informed LKY that 38 Oxley road was to be gazetted as a national monument.

Ultimately, is it even proper for Hsien Loong to be making decisions on a matter where he has a direct personal interest?

Lee Hsien Loong misled even his own father.

Lee Hsien Loong told Lee Kuan Yew that, **LHL in his capacity as PM** had decided to declare the house at 38 Oxley Road a heritage site.

Lee Kuan Yew stated this in an e-mail on 3 Oct 2011. LHL was copied on this e-mail, and did not reply. LHL could have objected to the statement, but did not.

From: Kuan Yew LEE (PMO) [mailto:Kuanylee@pmo.gov.sg]
Sent: Monday, October 03, 2011 07:28 PM
To: HO Ching
Cc: Hsien Loong LEE (PMO)
; Lee Hsien Yang
; Lee Wei Ling
Subject: RE: Architect

Message Classification: Unclassified

Yes.
But **Loong as PM** has indicated that he will declare it a heritage site.
That will put an end to any rebuilding.

On 23 July 2015, LHL's personal lawyer, Lucien Wong wrote to us, claiming,

"It is not correct that our client ever informed Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, or anyone else, that the House at 38 Oxley Road ("the House") was to be gazetted by the Government as a national monument". He added, "the Government had (and has) not made any decision on what (if anything) should be done with the house."

Further details:

Evidence of LHL's misrepresentations to LKY: <https://goo.gl/VRhwiC>

3. LKY's final will is a reversion to his 2011 will on his explicit instructions. Stamford Law attended to the attestation of the Will at LKY's request.

LKY's Final Will of December 2013 was a reversion to his 2011 will on his express instructions.

On 16 Dec, 2013, Lee Wei Ling wrote to Lee Hsien Yang:

Subject: Re: **Papa says to go back to 2011 will**

To get a notary public not from Lee n Lee to witness his signature n that settles it

Stamford Law, was called upon to witness the execution of this will simply because LKY's lawyer, Kwa Kim Li was not contactable at the time. This was also at the express instruction and insistence of our father, who did not wish to wait. Lee Kuan Yew in an email on 16 December 2013 (the day before the signing of the final will):

"OK. Do not wait for Kim Li.

Engross and I will sign it before a solicitor in Fern's office, or from any other office."

LHL stated in a letter dated 15 September 2016 to the Cabinet committee and in a statutory declaration dated 24 February 2017 that this will of 2011 had been drafted by Kwa Kim Li, with clause 7 drafted by Lee Suet Fern. LHL: "Whilst the First Will was drafted by Kwa Kim Li of Lee & Lee, the Demolition Clause was drafted by my sister-in-law, Lee Suet Fern." The 2013 will was essentially a reversion to the 2011 will.

Lee Kuan Yew was a lawyer and well knew the sanctity and finality of a will. He gave clear instructions for the execution of the will. He carefully read his final will before signing it, and he continued to review and reflect after signing to put his affairs in order. Two weeks after signing his will, Lee Kuan Yew personally drafted a codicil to his will and executed it.

All three children were kept fully apprised of the signing of the final will and the codicil. No objection was raised at that time and indeed Hsien Loong has affirmed the will in public and in private. At the end of the day, only a court-proven final will is the legally binding will. Lee Kuan Yew's final will was confirmed by court on 6 October 2015.

Hsien Loong and Ho Ching were unhappy with Wei Ling's right to live at 38 Oxley Road and sought to push back on this in LKY's wills 2 to 6.

Further details:

Drafting and Witnessing of the Will: <https://goo.gl/TqiMqu>, <https://goo.gl/q9CUZo>

Wei Ling's Right to Live at 38 Oxley: <https://goo.gl/CkFc2d>, <https://goo.gl/gFApyD>

See also Section 7.






4. Ho Ching improperly took LKY's personal items from his house without permission, somehow "representing" PMO to loan these items to the NHB.

These items were part of Lee Kuan Yew's estate, and not owned by the Prime Minister's Office (PMO). Under Lee Kuan Yew's will, the executors (not the beneficiaries) have absolute discretion over these items. To take them without prior permission constitutes both theft and intermeddling.

Ho Ching took the items on behalf of PMO, despite having no official position in PMO. Neither PMO, nor LHL had the proper standing to authorize the removal of these items or loan them.

Ho Ching, unofficially "PMO", takes LKY's things whilst he is dying

Loan items for ME *List 3*

S/N	Description	Image	Lender/Source	Dimensions	Receipt No.	Date Received	Current Location	Remarks
1	Red Ministerial Box and key with key pouch		Prime Minister Office (PMO) Istana, Singapore. Point of Contact: Ms Ho Ching	45 x 30 x 18 cm	NMS-R116	27/03/2015	Red box- Glass Atrium level 2 (Memorial Exhibition) Key Pouch -NMS/Transit Room 2	Collected by D/NC Loh Hong Noi
2	Cambridge University Reporter, 18 June 1949		Prime Minister Office (PMO) Istana, Singapore. Point of Contact: Ms Ho Ching	Open: 29.1 x 45 cm Closed: 29.1 x 22.9 cm	NMS_R0117	06/02/2015	Glass Atrium level 2 (Memorial Exhibition)	Collected by SC/NMS Chung May Khuen
3	Memo from Director of Posts, Singapore, 11 Feb 1952		Prime Minister Office (PMO) Istana, Singapore. Point of Contact: Ms Ho Ching	16.9 x 21 cm	NMS_R0117	06/02/2015	Glass Atrium level 2	Collected by SC/NMS Chung May Khuen
4	Letter to Mr Lee Kuan Yew from J. Laycock and Laycock & Ong, 13 April 1953 Envelop.		Prime Minister Office (PMO) Istana, Singapore. Point of Contact: Ms Ho Ching	Envelope: 15.2 x 9.4 cm Letter: 25.5 x 20.4 cm	NMS_R0117	06/02/2015	Glass Atrium level 2	Collected by SC/NMS Chung May Khuen
5	Telegram from Lee Kuan Yew, 26 Sept 1958		Prime Minister Office (PMO) Istana, Singapore. Point of Contact: Ms Ho Ching	15.7 x 21.6 cm	NMS_R0117	06/02/2015	Glass Atrium level 2	Collected by SC/NMS Chung May Khuen

Further details:

NHB Receipt of Items taken by Ho Ching: <https://goo.gl/TXQKxX>

The NHB discovers a "clerical error": <https://goo.gl/gkbrWS>

5. **Unhappy that the Estate's gift of LKY's furniture and personal items to the NHB required the display of LKY's demolition wish from his Will, LHL acquired a copy of this deed of gift in his official capacity as PM, then improperly handed the deed to his then-personal lawyer for his personal legal fights against LKY's Estate to frustrate the gift.**

Lee Hsien Loong received confidential documents in his public capacity as PM, and used these in his personal legal disputes with the estate of Lee Kuan Yew.

Documents were passed to Lucien Wong, Lee Hsien Loong's then personal lawyer and now Attorney General.

3 days ago, we asked: Did PM Lee Hsien Loong acquire the Deed of Gift in his public capacity, or in his private capacity?

We already knew the answer.

When we asked the government how LHL acquired the Deed, the Attorney-General's Chambers explained that **LHL acquired the Deed in his public capacity as PM.**

Queries relating to the Deed of Gift

2. Your assertion that the Deed of Gift had been improperly given to others is not correct. Any major public exhibition concerning Singapore's founding leaders or founding Prime Minister, the late Mr Lee Kuan Yew, is a matter for deliberation by the Government. The Ministry of Culture, Community and Youth has oversight over NHB and in turn is accountable to the Prime Minister's Office for such matters. Hence it is neither surprising nor improper that the latter would subsequently receive a copy of the signed Deed of Gift.

Letter from AGC,
25 June 2015

When other ministers receive confidential documents in their official capacities, are they also allowed to use these documents to fight personal legal battles with family?

The NHB had chosen the items it wanted. Lorries came to collect the furniture from the house. The agreement specified that Lee Kuan Yew's demolition wish had to be displayed as part of the exhibition. Nonetheless, because of LHL's unhappiness over the display of the demolition wish, NHB tried to backtrack on the agreement. This was a major gift by the Estate of Lee Kuan Yew to the people of Singapore. LHL should not have involved NHB or AGC in his personal disagreements with the Estate of LKY. He should have raised his issues directly with the Estate. (DPM Teo in Parliament on 4 July 2017: "If the NHB is to be faulted for anything, it is that they were drawn, through this Deed of Gift, into this private disagreement.")

Further details:

Letter from Lucien Wong/LHL challenging gift: <https://goo.gl/yeMzBr>

Explanation from PMO on using information for personal use: <https://goo.gl/ELaoc6>

LHL acquires Deed of Gift in Public Capacity as PM: <https://goo.gl/KPpXsJ>

NHB attempts to backtrack on gift after collecting items: <https://goo.gl/UhqsRW>

6. LHL signed a settlement agreement with LKY's Estate, in which he agreed to recuse himself from governmental decisions involving the house and reaffirmed his father's Final Will. Despite this, LHL made extensive submissions to a secret ministerial committee to challenge LKY's Final Will. Only after being forced under public scrutiny did this secret committee reveal its members and deliverables.

A committee of the highest-paid ministers in the world has been set up in secret "to get a clearer sense of Mr. Lee's thinking on the house." (DPM Teo Chee Hean)

Since they seem to have forgotten, we would like to remind them.

Lee Kuan Yew: The house "**should not be kept as a kind of relic.**"

Lee Kuan Yew: "**I've told the Cabinet, when I'm dead, demolish it.**"

Lee Kuan Yew: "it is my wish, and the wish of my late wife Kwa Geok Choo, that [our house] **be demolished** immediately after my death, or if my daughter, Wei Ling, would prefer to continue living in the original house, immediately after she moves out of the house."

Lee Kuan Yew's Last Will and Testament

Hsien Loong: "Mr Lee's position on 38 Oxley Road was **unwavering** over the years, and fully consistent with his lifelong values."

Speech to Parliament, 13 April 2015

Do they remember now?

Five facts DPM Teo hasn't told you about the secret committee.

- It refused to reveal the identity of its members, and its terms of reference.
- It refused to list the options under consideration.
- It focused primarily on LHL's attacks on Lee Kuan Yew's demolition wish.

(In five letters dated 9 Dec 16, 16 Dec 16, 13 Jan 17, 27 Feb 17, and 25 Apr 17.)

- These were repetitions of earlier attacks made by LHL's then-personal lawyer, Lucien Wong.
- It involved the Attorney-General's Chambers over LHL's "private family matter."

7. The Committee has been consulting AGC and will consider the various points and responses, both of which will be treated as having been made in official confidence, subject to the Committee and AGC's right to use them in their discretion.
Letter from committee, 9/12/16

A committee of LHL's subordinates should not judge a private dispute between the PM and his siblings.

A secret committee is not the right forum to 're-examine' a will that the courts have declared final.

The secret committee refused to disclose details about itself, despite many requests from the Estate of Lee Kuan Yew.

Amongst others we had also raised specific concerns on the possible membership of Shanmugam and his conflicts of interests and ethics, having advised LKY and us on options to achieve LKY's wishes, and in the drafting of the demolition wish. This was brushed off by Lawrence Wong: "Nothing you have stated precludes any member of the Cabinet from taking part in the Committee's work or its deliberations, with the exception of the PM." Only now do we find out he is a member of this Committee.

From: Lee Wei Ling
Date: 29 July 2011 at 18:55:57 GMT+10
To: Shanmugam, Lee Hsien Yang

MM thinks Loong asked him to speak to the cabinet because Loong wanted cabinet to tell father they want it preserved.
He is agreeable w your suggestion. I told him after u meet w Yang n me, then we decide how to draft his will w regards to this house.

As part of LHL's settlement agreement with the Estate of Lee Kuan Yew (December 2015), he affirmed Lee Kuan Yew's will, and promised to recuse himself from all matters concerning the house. LHL also made clear the reason he did so was to leave the Executors free to deal with the house: "One reason for transferring the house to you is so that you are free to do what you want, and I need not get involved."

Nonetheless, this secret ministerial committee was set up in July 2016 to examine the house, even though the government's position had been that no decision needed to be taken and it was for the government of the day to decide some time in the future. Despite his 'recusal', Lee Hsien Loong made extensive submissions to the ministerial committee. In these submissions, he sought to undermine Lee Kuan Yew's demolition wish and will.

Is it an abuse of power to have PM Lee's subordinates act as secret judges on what he claims is a "private family matter"? How can PM Lee at his whim ignore his legal obligations under our settlement agreement? How can such a committee of subordinates ever be impartial in a dispute where the Prime Minister has clear vested interests? How can a secret ministerial committee be the correct forum for re-examining the validity of a court-declared binding will?

Further details:

Was LHL's Cabinet Committee a secret?: <https://goo.gl/4Qfsb6>

Committee was neither transparent nor proper: <https://goo.gl/7sT17S>

Private family matters and secret committees: <https://goo.gl/ZxZujD>

7. **Through extensive exchanges between the committee and LKY's executors, it is clear that the committee had little interest in examining options about 38 Oxley, instead parroting LHL's attacks on LKY's Final Will to the executors. These attacks were completely spurious and without merit, seeking to challenge or pervert LKY's last wishes.**

The ministerial committee's correspondence to us focused almost entirely on attacking Lee Kuan Yew's Final Will rather than examining options about 38 Oxley.

LHL's statutory declaration to the committee claims that "there is no evidence" that Lee Kuan Yew was aware of the demolition clause. This is false. Lee Kuan Yew initialed directly beneath the demolition clause.

7. I further declare that it is my wish, and the wish of my late wife, KWA GEOK CHOO, that our house at 38 Oxley Road, Singapore 238629 ("the House") be demolished immediately after my death or, if my daughter, Wei Ling, would prefer to continue living in the original house, immediately after she moves out of the House. I would ask each of my children to ensure our wishes with respect to the demolition of the House be carried out. If our children are unable to demolish the House as a result of any changes in the law, rules or regulations binding them, it is my wish that the House never be opened to others except my children, their families and descendants. My view on this has been made public before and remains unchanged. My statement of wishes in this paragraph 7 may be publicly disclosed notwithstanding that the rest of my Will is private.

LKY.

At the time of the signing, Lee Kuan Yew was a sitting MP, alert and of sound mind. As a Cambridge-educated lawyer, he was more than capable of understanding a four-page document.

In January 2014, Lee Kuan Yew personally drafted a codicil (legal addendum) to his will, which was witnessed by his secretary and bodyguard. Again, he kept his children informed. Lee Kuan Yew understood entirely the contents of his will - he was mentally sharp enough not only to read his will, but to draft new parts without assistance. He subsequently also executed an Advance Medical Directive.

It is improper for LHL to use a committee of his subordinates to try to undermine the will. The correct place for such objections was during probate hearings. Probate for Lee Kuan Yew's will was granted in Oct 2015, so the will is full, final, and legally binding. If LHL wanted to object to

our father's will, the correct time and place to do so was during the probate process. He chose not to at the time, and indeed urged the executors to file for probate.

Lee Hsien Loong now claims : "I did not challenge the validity of the Last Will in court because I wished, to the extent possible, to avoid a public fight which would tarnish the name and reputation of Mr Lee and the family." Objections to probate are regularly heard 'in camera', away from the public eye, so a desire for privacy is no excuse. The courts have found that Lee Kuan Yew's will is final and legally binding. By now trying to undermine the court ruling via a committee of his subordinates, Lee Hsien Loong has disregarded the separation of powers. Is everyone allowed to attack their father's will through secret committees, or is this privilege reserved only for the PM?

- 8. When we were forced by LHL's relentless attacks through the committee to take this issue public, LHL used a parliamentary session to whitewash himself, setting himself once more before his subordinates in parliament, another improper forum. He has refused to subject himself to any independent inquiry on the matters.**

Why are we speaking up?: <https://goo.gl/Nah2ra> <https://goo.gl/4zwhbC>

Parliamentary Whitewash: <https://goo.gl/c1a5SG>

Evidence of LHL's misrepresentations to LKY: <https://goo.gl/VRhwiC>

Conclusion

We have disclosed evidence that warrants serious concern. We have done so carefully after considerable thought and review, including consideration of our parents' integrity and values.

This is just a brief summary of evidence to date. There is much evidence we have yet to show. Some of this evidence is too complex to be well-suited to social media. We reserve this to show to a truly open and independent investigation, if there ever is one.