

SIXTH PARLIAMENT OF SINGAPORE

Second Session

FOURTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

**Complaint of Non-disclosure of Direct
Personal Pecuniary Interest**

Parl. 7 of 1987

**Presented to Parliament:
16th March, 1987**

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Mr Speaker (Dr Yeoh Ghim Seng, B.B.M., J.P.) (*Chairman*).

Mr E.W. Barker, Minister for Law.

Mr Chiam See Tong, M.P.

Mr S. Dhanabalan, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Minister for National Development; Leader of the House until 24th February, 1987.

Encik Othman bin Haron Eusofe, M.P.

Dr Tony Tan Keng Yam, Minister for Education.

Mr Eugene Yap Giau Cheng, Senior Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Trade and Industry and Minister for the Environment.

Mr Yeo Cheow Tong, Acting Minister for Health and Minister of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

CONTENTS

Report	<i>Pages</i> 1-4
--------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---------------------

Appendices

A Memorandum dated 17th June, 1986, from Prof S. Jayakumar, Minister for Home Affairs	A 1-5
B Reply from Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam dated 11th August, 1986				...	B 1-3
C Minutes of Evidence	C 1-2
D Minutes of Proceedings	D 1-5

FOURTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

The Committee of Privileges to whom was referred the complaint made by Prof. S. Jayakumar, Minister for Home Affairs and Second Minister for Law, against Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam, the then Member for Anson, for non-disclosure of a direct personal pecuniary interest which he had in a matter he raised in Parliament, have agreed to the following Report:-

Introduction

1. At the sitting of Parliament on 26th March, 1986^(a), Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam raised for oral answer the question whether constables from the Commercial and Industrial Corporation (CISCO) could be compelled to work on their weekly rest days. Prof. Jayakumar answered that CISCO constables would only be required to work on their rest days if the exigencies of the service demand. Mr Jeyaretnam went on to pose the problem which could arise if a constable was called to work on his rest day after he had made other arrangements. The circumstance, described by Mr Jeyaretnam, was similar to the case of a CISCO woman constable who was dismissed by CISCO for disobeying orders on four occasions to work on her rest days and for whom Mr Jeyaretnam acted, in his capacity as advocate and solicitor, in her appeal against dismissal to the Commissioner of Police. As Mr Jeyaretnam would appear to have breached section 31 of the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act, Prof. Jayakumar rose in his place to make a complaint against Mr Jeyaretnam.

2. Section 31 of the Act states:-

"A Member shall not in or before Parliament or any committee take part in the discussion of any matter in which he has a direct personal pecuniary interest without disclosing the extent of that interest and shall not in any circumstances vote upon any such matter."

3. Mr Speaker being satisfied that the matter complained of *prima facie* affects the privileges of Parliament and that it had been raised at the earliest opportunity ruled that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

The Complaint

4. At the request of the Committee, Prof. Jayakumar submitted a memorandum dated 17th June, 1986, setting out his complaint. A copy of this letter is at Appendix A (pages A1-5). In his letter Prof. Jayakumar revealed that neither on 17th March, 1986, when Mr Jeyaretnam filed notice of his intention to ask him (Prof. Jayakumar) the question whether CISCO constables would be compelled to work on their weekly rest days nor on 26th March, 1986, when the question was answered by Prof. Jayakumar did Mr Jeyaretnam disclose that the issue raised in his question was the same issue which he raised in a case which he had taken up in

(a) Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 47, No. 15, cols 1227 to 1231.

early 1985 in his capacity as an advocate and solicitor and that he had a direct personal pecuniary interest in the matter, a disclosure as required by section 31 of the aforementioned Act.

5. The case which Mr Jeyaretnam took up in his professional capacity concerned the dismissal by the CISCO of Cik Norlizah bte Long. Cik Norlizah had been found guilty at the conclusion of a disciplinary inquiry of 4 counts of an offence of disobedience of orders and was dismissed from the service. She appealed against the dismissal to the Commissioner of Police as provided for under Regulation 7 of the Auxiliary Police Regulations 1961. The petition of appeal, signed by Mr Jeyaretnam on behalf of the law firm of J.B. Jeyaretnam & Co., raised the issue whether Cik Norlizah could or could not be asked to work on her rest days. A copy of this petition is at Appendix A. The appeal was rejected by the Commissioner on 9th March, 1985. Copy of the Commissioner's letter is also at Appendix A.

6. The ground for Prof. Jayakumar's complaint therefore was that Mr Jeyaretnam in raising the question in Parliament should have declared his direct personal pecuniary interest in the matter as required of him by section 31 of the Act. As he (Mr Jeyaretnam) did not so declare, he (Prof. Jayakumar) was moved to make the complaint.

The Reply

7. Mr Jeyaretnam replied to the complaint on 11th August, 1986. A copy of his reply is at Appendix B (pages B1-3). In his reply Mr Jeyaretnam argued that Prof. Jayakumar had misconceived the matter and miscomprehended section 31 of the Act. Mr Jeyaretnam did not deny having taken up the appeal against dismissal on behalf of Cik Norlizah, but he pointed out that the matter was concluded in March, 1985. Since the question, which he raised and which was the subject of Prof. Jayakumar's complaint, was raised in March 1986, the question of his not declaring his pecuniary interest in the matter did not arise, as there was no pecuniary interest to declare. He maintained that section 31 did not require a Member to inform the House that he had at some time prior to his raising an issue in the House acted professionally on behalf of someone on that issue.

8. Mr Jeyaretnam also pointed out that Prof. Jayakumar did not show in his complaint that he (Mr Jeyaretnam) had "a direct personal pecuniary interest" at the time of asking the question. On the other hand, the interpretation of this term was already given by him (Mr Jeyaretnam) in another representation to the Committee on 25th June, 1982.

9. Mr Jeyaretnam also drew the Committee's attention to the UK House of Commons' Resolution of 12th June, 1975, on the term "proceedings" for the purpose of declaring personal pecuniary interest. He said that in the House of Commons a matter raised in a notice or a supplementary question did not require a Member raising it to declare his personal pecuniary interest in it. Hence, he concluded that Prof. Jayakumar's complaint was based on a miscomprehension of section 31.

Finding and Recommendation

10. The Committee after due consideration are unable to accept Mr Jeyaretnam's arguments. The Committee are of the view that there was no prohibition on him raising the question in Parliament even though he had represented Cik Norlizah previously in his professional capacity.

11. What was wrong, however, was his failure to declare his interest. There is no doubt that he had an interest. As a lawyer, he had taken up her case with the authorities. He had been paid his professional fees and this was confirmed by Mr Jeyaretnam.

12. There are very good reasons why a Member should, as a minimum, declare his interest in such cases. The House must know whether a Member, in taking up a matter, has any connection with the case in his personal or professional capacity which involves a pecuniary interest. The House will then be in a position to assess the intentions of the Member and to decide the extent to which the Member might have had his position influenced by his involvement in the case.

13. If a Member did not declare his interest, this could result in abuses of the proceedings of the House. The House will then be used for ventilation of dissatisfaction over failure to obtain redress in the Courts or other forums. Such failure to disclose interest can also lay open abuse of a Member's position for profit and mischief.

14. The Committee noted that Mr Jeyaretnam had gone to some length to explain the term "direct personal pecuniary interest" in an earlier proceeding for non-disclosure of pecuniary interest (vide Paper Parl. 3 of 1982). But the Committee reject his attempt to relate that explanation in order to absolve himself from liability in the current proceeding. The Committee noted that in spite of his explanations, the earlier proceedings had concluded with the recommendation that he be reprimanded and warned by Mr Speaker.

15. The Committee are also unable to accept his argument that a Member need not disclose his pecuniary interest in questions raised in Parliament because this is the practice in the UK House of Commons. The requirement for disclosure in the Singapore Parliament is expressly provided for by statute in section 31 of the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act. This provision requires a Member to disclose his pecuniary interest when participating in a "discussion". Raising questions and supplementary question would certainly take the form of discussion. It would be an absurd interpretation of the law to hold that a Member must declare his interest in debates but not in a questions and answers exchange which results from raising a question or supplementary question.

16. The Committee, therefore, find Mr Jeyaretnam's conduct dishonourable and a breach of privilege. We have taken into account that this is not the first time that he has breached the rule on disclosure of pecuniary interest.

17. The penalties for dishonourable conduct and breach of privilege are provided for under section 20 (1) of the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act. The section, before its amendment on 6th September, 1986, provides as follows:

"For any dishonourable conduct, abuse of privilege or contempt, on the part of a Member, Parliament may -

- (a) impose upon him a fine not exceeding the sum of one thousand dollars;
- (b) suspend him from the service of Parliament for the remainder of the current session of Parliament or for any part thereof; and
- (c) direct that he be reprimanded or admonished in his place by the Speaker."

18. The Committee therefore recommend:

- (a) that Parliament find Mr Jeyaretnam guilty of the offence of breach of privilege;
- (b) that Parliament impose upon him a fine of \$1,000 which was the maximum fine under the Act prior to its amendment.

**MINISTER FOR HOME
AFFAIRS**

17th June, 1986

COMPLAINT AGAINST J.B. JEYARETNAM

As requested by the Committee of Privileges, I attach a Memorandum in connection with the complaint I made in Parliament on 26th March, 1986, that J.B. Jeyaretnam did not disclose his pecuniary interest.

S. JAYAKUMAR

MEMORANDUM

**COMPLAINT AGAINST THE MEMBER FOR ANSON
(MR J.B. JEYARETNAM)**

On 17th March, 1986, the Member for Anson filed notice with the Clerk of Parliament of his intention to ask the Minister for Home Affairs the following question for oral answer:

To ask the Minister for Home Affairs whether constables from the Commercial and Industrial Security Corporation are compelled to work on their weekly rest days.

2. On 26th March, 1986, when the House met, this question appeared in the Order Paper as Question No. 10 for oral answer. As Minister for Home Affairs, I answered the question as well as his supplementary questions.

3. On neither occasion, that is, when he filed notice of his intention to ask the question and when the question was actually asked in Parliament, did the Member for Anson inform the House that the issue raised in the question was also precisely the same issue which he raised in a case he had taken up in 1985 in his capacity as an Advocate and Solicitor.

4. The case referred to concerned the dismissal by the Commercial and Industrial Security Corporation ("CISCO") of one Mdm Norlizah bte Long. The said Mdm Norlizah, who was at the material time an auxiliary police officer employed by CISCO, had been found guilty at the conclusion of a disciplinary inquiry of 4 counts of an offence of disobedience of orders. She was accordingly dismissed by CISCO on 29th June, 1984. She then appealed to the Commissioner of Police as provided for under Regulation 7 of the Auxiliary Police Regulations, 1961. With respect to this appeal, she was represented by the law firm of

J.B. Jeyaretnam & Co. On 17th January, 1985, the petition of appeal signed by Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam on behalf of the said law firm was submitted to the Commissioner of Police. A copy of this petition of appeal is attached at *Annex A^(a)*. The main issue raised in the petition of appeal was whether the said Mdm Norliza bte Long could or could not be asked to work on her rest day. (The relevant parts of the petition of appeal related to this argument are sidelined.) The Commissioner of Police, on 9th March, 1985, replied to Mr Jeyaretnam's law firm that his appeal on behalf of his client was rejected (letter of Commissioner of Police is at *Annex B^(b)*).

5. My complaint, therefore, is that the Member for Anson in raising this question in Parliament should have declared his direct personal pecuniary interest in the matter as is required of him under section 31 of the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act and which provides as follows:

"A member shall not in or before Parliament or any Committee take part in the discussion of any matter in which he has a direct personal pecuniary interest without disclosing the extent of that interest and shall not in any circumstances vote upon any such matter."

6. The Member for Anson must have known full well that the issue raised by him in the question was similar to the issue raised by him in his unsuccessful appeal in his capacity as an Advocate and Solicitor.

7. In the circumstances, I am moved to make this complaint before the Committee of Privileges for whatever action it deems fit and proper to take in the matter.

S. JAYAKUMAR
MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS

(a) See pages A 3 - 4 .

(b) See page A 5 .

**PETITION OF APPEAL
of
WCC NORLIZAH BTE LONG**

The Appellant was charged on four counts of disobeying orders, an offence under section 6 (e) of the Auxiliary Police Regulations, 1961.

First Charge

This relates to her failure to attend in-service training at CISCO Headquarters on the 3rd of April, 1984. This was a Tuesday.

The Appellant's defence before the Authorised Officer was that although she was aware that she was required to attend the in-service training, it was her day off and she had no one at home to mind her baby and therefore failed to attend the in-service training. This was not accepted by the Authorised Officer.

It is submitted that it is unreasonable on the part of the Authorised Officer to have rejected her evidence on this. If the Authorised Officer had felt that her word alone was not good enough, the Authorised Officer should have asked the Appellant to adduce further evidence by calling her baby sitter to give evidence. The Appellant has stated that the baby sitter had taken the day off because it was her (the Appellant's) day off.

The Appellant had a reasonable excuse for not attending the in-service training.

An offence under Regulation 6 (e) of the Auxiliary Police Regulations is only committed if the subordinate officer disobeys any order without reasonable or lawful excuse. Here the Appellant had a reasonable and lawful excuse and the Authorised Officer was wrong in rejecting her evidence outright.

Apart from the reasonable excuse of not having anyone at home to look after her baby, it is submitted that the Corporation was wrong in requiring the Appellant to attend the in-service training on her rest day.

Under her contract of employment, the Appellant was entitled to one rest day a week and her hours of work were limited to 44 hours per week. The Appellant, however, was given two rest days a week on Mondays and Tuesdays and was made to work ten (10) hours a day for the other five (5) days of the week. These conditions follow exactly those provided in the Employment Act. The Employment Act also provides that no employee shall be compelled to work on a rest day except in special defined circumstances set out in the Act.

It is submitted that the in-service training does not fall within the special defined circumstances entitling the Corporation to compel an employee to work on his or her rest day.

The Appellant was therefore within her rights in not turning up for the in-service training.

It is submitted that paragraph 1 (m) of her letter of appointment and rule (2) of the Rules and Regulations of the Corporation do not empower the Corporation to require an employee to work on his or her rest days.

The Authorised Officer does not appear to have given this aspect of her evidence any or proper consideration at all.

If the Appellant could not be legally compelled to attend the in-service training on her rest day under her contract of employment, then her failure to attend cannot be made an offence and she cannot be dismissed for that failure. The conviction, it is respectfully submitted, cannot stand.

Second and Third Charges

It is submitted that for the reasons submitted heretofore the Authorised Officer was wrong in convicting the Appellant as the 10th and 24th of April, 1984, were also her rest days.

In addition, it is further submitted that the only evidence before the Authorised Officer that the Appellant was informed that she was required to attend the in-service training on the 10th and 24th of April, 1984, was the evidence of PWS - Sgt.5087 Savariappan. His evidence is far from satisfactory.

The Appellant's evidence before the Authorised Officer was that it was not brought specifically to her notice that she had to attend training on the 10th.

The Authorised Officer himself would appear to have had some doubt whether the instructions had been brought to the Appellant's notice because of his question to the Sgt. whether he had any witness to his having informed the Appellant. The Sgt.'s reply was that he had no witness but he had made a note of the Appellant's refusal to sign the instructions. The note is a self serving notice and does not corroborate his oral evidence.

Fourth Charge

The Appellant's evidence was that she had told the Operations Manager that she was unable to attend the in-service training and she was asked to write in. She said that she did not write in as her child was ill and she could not find the time.

The Authorised Officer does not seem to have directed his mind to this question about whether her child was ill. If he was not satisfied with her evidence, he could have asked her to produce some further evidence.

In addition, it is further submitted that for the reasons already set out, the Appellant was not obliged to attend the in-service training on the 8th of May as it was her rest day. The Corporation was wrong in asking her to attend under the terms of the contract of employment.

Sentence

Finally, it is submitted that the sentence of dismissal is much too harsh in view of everything that has been set out above.

J.B. JEYARETNAM
Solicitors for the Appellant
17th January, 1985

POLICE HEADQUARTERS
PHOENIX PARK
TANGLIN ROAD
SINGAPORE 1024

9th March, 1985

Messrs J.B. Jeyaretnam & Co
Advocates & Solicitors
1 Colombo Court #08-02
Singapore 0617

APPEAL AGAINST DISMISSAL WCC 11172 NORLIZAH BTE LONG

I refer to your letter dated 17th January, 1985 forwarding the grounds of appeal of the abovenamed against the conviction and sentence imposed on her by the Commercial and Industrial Security Corporation.

2. I have carefully considered the grounds of appeal in conjunction with the records of the disciplinary proceedings and I uphold the conviction and sentence.

3. The appeal on behalf of your client, WCC 11172 Norlizah bte Long is rejected.

GOH YONG HONG
Commissioner of Police
Singapore

1 COLOMBO COURT #08-02

SINGAPORE 0617

11th August, 1986

The Clerk of Parliament
Singapore

I refer to your letter of 10th July, 1986, and now forward herewith my written representation. Please let me know if the Committee would like to hear me orally.

J.B. JEYARETNAM

**WRITTEN REPRESENTATION
on the Complaint by the
Minister for Home Affairs
on 17th June, 1986**

The complaint by the Minister is, in my view, totally misconceived. The misconception is that because, prior to or at the time of my asking the question in the House on the 26th March, 1986, I had not informed the House "that the issue raised in the question was also precisely the same issue which he (I) raised in a case he (1) had taken up in 1985 in his (my) capacity as an Advocate and Solicitor" (para 3 of the Complaint), I am in breach of section 31 of the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act.

With every due respect to the Minister it shows an inability to comprehend section 31 of the Act and what is required by it.

There is no question that my firm was instructed in 1984, by one Cik Norliza Bte Long, an auxiliary police officer after she was dismissed for failing to report for duty when asked to do so on a rest day. The matter was concluded in March 1985. In the House after the Minister had raised the issue I admitted that I had written to the Commissioner of Police on her behalf.

Nowhere in section 31 of the Act is a Member required to inform the House that he had at some time prior to his raising an issue in the House acted professionally on behalf of someone on that issue.

The section is explicit enough. It prohibits any Member from taking any part in any proceeding in the House in any matter in which he "has a direct personal pecuniary interest" unless he had first disclosed his interest.

The Minister's complaint is conspicuous by the absence of any reference to "a direct personal pecuniary interest" I possessed at the time I asked the question.

I would respectfully refer the Committee to the representation I submitted to the then Committee of Privileges on the 25th June, 1982, on a similar complaint. I do not wish to repeat here what I have said therein on what the words "a direct personal pecuniary interest" mean and how they have been interpreted in the UK House of Commons. Suffice to say I did not have any "direct personal pecuniary interest" in the question.

The question of my disclosing my "direct personal pecuniary interest" simply did not arise. You cannot disclose something which you do not have.

The above should be enough to dispose of the complaint by the Minister but for completeness sake I would refer the Committee to the current procedure and practice in the UK House of Commons.

The UK House of Commons resolved on the 22nd May, 1984

"That, in any debate or proceeding of the House or its committees or transactions or communications which a Member may have with other Members or with Ministers or servants of the Crown, he shall disclose any relevant pecuniary interest or benefit of whatever nature, whether direct or indirect, that he may have had, may have or may be expecting to have.

That every Member of the House of Commons shall furnish to a Registrar of Members' Interests such particulars of his registrable interests as shall be required, and shall notify to the Registrar any alterations which may occur therein, and the Registrar shall cause these particulars to be entered in a Register of Members' Interests which shall be available for inspection by the public."

By further resolutions of 12th June, 1975, the UK House resolved

"That, pursuant to the Resolutions of the House of 22nd May, 1974, this House agrees with the recommendations made in the Report of the Select Committee on Members' Interests (Declaration) relative to the arrangements for the registration of Members' Interests, and with the recommendations contained in paragraphs 43 and 47 of that Report in relation to the declaring of such interests; and that a register of such interests be established as soon as possible in accordance with the proposals made in that Report.

That, for the purposes of the Resolution of the House of 22nd May, 1974, in relation to disclosure of interests in any proceeding of the House or its Committees -

- (i) any interest disclosed in a copy of the register of Members' Interests shall be regarded as sufficient disclosure for the purpose of taking part in any Division in the House or in any of its Committees;
- (ii) the term "proceeding" shall be deemed not to include the giving of any written notice, or the asking of a supplementary question."

Members of the Committee will, I am sure, see that the UK Resolution of 22nd May, 1974, goes far wider than section 31 of our Act. But even under their Resolution after the 12th June, 1975, a Member was not required to disclose any interest he had, may have, or may be expecting to have in any question he may ask in the House at Question Time. (Sub paragraph 2 of Second Resolution of 12th June, 1975).

I must, of course, not be taken to be admitting that I had a "direct personal pecuniary interest" in the question and that I am seeking refuge under the UK resolution of 12th June, 1975.

My answer is that the Minister has completely failed to show that I had "a direct personal pecuniary interest" when I asked the question.

I shall be glad to attend before the Committee if the Committee would like further clarification of what I have said or any assistance from me in their deliberation on the complaint.

J.B. JEYARETNAM

11th August, 1986

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

CONTENTS

Witness Examined

Page

Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam

C 1-2

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

19 JANUARY 1987

PRESENT:

Mr Speaker (*in the Chair*)

Mr E.W. Barker	: Dr Tony Tan Keng Yam
Mr Chiam See Tong	: Mr Eugene Yap Giau Cheng
Mr S. Dhanabalan	: Mr Yeo Cheow Tong
Encik Othman bin Haron Eusofe	

Examination of Witness

Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam was examined under oath.

1

19 JANUARY 1987

2

COMPLAINT AGAINST MR J.B. JEYARETNAM FOR NON-DISCLOSURE OF

DIRECT PERSONAL PECUNIARY INTEREST

Chairman

1. Please remember you are still on oath, Mr Jeyaretnam? - Yes.

2. This is arising on this question of pecuniary interest in the matter of the Cisco guard? - Yes.

Chairman] Mr Barker, would you like to start off?

Mr Barker

3. Yes, just one question. You acted as an advocate and solicitor of this person? - For Madam Norlilah, yes, a year before. I think it was 1985.

4. All right? - I think I have said it in all my statements.

5. No, no. I just want to confirm. Did she pay you any fees? - Yes. The matter was concluded. She paid, yes.

6. She paid. That's all? - The bill was drawn on the 15th of March 1985.

7. I am not interested in the amount. I want to find out whether or not you received fees. That's all? - Yes.

Mr Barker] Thank you.

Mr Chiam See Tong

8. This fee was paid in relation to what matter, Mr Jeyaretnam? - Cik Norlilah Bte Long, she was charged with disciplinary proceedings and one of the charges was that she failed to turn up for

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

3

19 JANUARY 1987

4

Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam (cont.)

duty on her rest day when she was ordered to do so and she was found guilty. And then I made an appeal to the Commissioner of Police on her behalf. Of course, the matter was the same. I am not denying that here. Then in 1986, I had a card, it just said "members of Cisco", asking me to raise this matter of being compelled to work on rest days, and so I raised it.

Mr Chiam See Tong (cont.)

9. In fact, your question in Parliament does not relate entirely to the interest of Norlilah Bte Long? - Not at all.

10. In fact, it was of interest to all employees of Cisco? - Of course, of course. I wasn't bringing her case up in Parliament in March 1986.

11. Thank you? - Mr Chairman, Sir, I, in my written representations, referred to the UK practice and may I now hand up what I have received. I suppose I will give you the letter from the Clerk of the House of Commons and the printed copy of the Members' interests referred to in

my written representation. [*Copies of documents handed to the Chairman.* May I also, before I leave, refer the Committee to section 3 of the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act as it was before it was amended.

Mr Barker

12. Our Act? - Our Act, yes. And it is quite clear from there that the immunities, privileges of Members are the same as the privileges, immunities of Members of House of Commons at the relevant point of time. It is exactly on all fours. Sorry, may I have the originals back and I give you copies because I would like to keep the originals if you would like to check them. I am sorry. If you would like to check the originals.

Chairman

13. No, no need, Mr Jeyaretnam. We trust you. It is all about the 1975 Resolution of the House of Commons. All right, I will show this letter to all the Members here? - I see. May I be released then?

14. You are released. Thank you for coming? - Thank you very much.

(The witness withdrew.)

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

1st Meeting

MONDAY, 26TH MAY, 1986

3.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Mr Speaker (*in the Chair*)

Mr E.W. Barker

Mr Chiam See Tong

Mr S. Dhanabalan

Dr Tony Tan Keng Yam

Mr Eugene Yap Giau Cheng

Mr Yeo Cheow Tong.

ABSENT:

Encik Othman bin Haron Eusofe (on leave of absence).

1. The Committee deliberated on the matter referred to them on 26th March, 1986, namely, the complaint made by the Minister for Home Affairs, Prof S. Jayakumar, of non-disclosure by the Member for Anson, Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam, of a personal pecuniary interest in a matter raised by him in Parliament on 26th March, 1986.

2. Agreed that Prof S. Jayakumar be invited to submit a memorandum of his case to the Committee.

Adjourned until 3.10 p.m.,
Monday, 26th May, 1986.

3rd Meeting

WEDNESDAY, 9TH JULY, 1986
3.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Mr Speaker (*in the Chair*)

Mr E.W. Barker

Mr Chiam See Tong

Mr S. Dhanabalan

Encik Othman bin Haron Eusofe

Dr Tony Tan Keng Yam

Mr Eugene Yap Giau Cheng

Mr Yeo Cheow Tong.

1. The Committee deliberated on the matter referred to them on 26th March, 1986, namely, the complaint made by the Minister for Home Affairs, Prof S. Jayakumar, of non-disclosure by the Member for Anson, Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam, of a personal pecuniary interest in a matter raised by him in Parliament on 26th March, 1986.

2. Memorandum dated 17th June, 1986 submitted by Prof S. Jayakumar setting out the case of his complaint against Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam was considered.

Agreed, -

- (a) that prima facie the matter of the complaint comes within the ambit of section 31 of the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act; and
- (b) that a copy of the memorandum from Prof S. Jayakumar setting out his case be sent to Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam for reply by 11th August, 1986.

Adjourned to a date to be fixed.

4th Meeting

MONDAY, 18TH AUGUST, 1936

3.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Mr Speaker (*in the Chair*)

Mr E.W. Barker

Mr Chiam See Tong

Mr S. Dhanabalan

Encik Othman bin Haron Eusofe

Mr Eugene Yap Giau Cheng

Mr Yeo Cheow Tong.

ABSENT:

Dr Tony Tan Keng Yam (on leave of absence).

1. The Committee deliberated on the matter referred to them on 26th March, 1986, namely, the complaint made by the Minister for Home Affairs, Prof S. Jayakumar, of non-disclosure by the Member for Anson, Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam, of a personal pecuniary interest in a matter raised by him in Parliament on 26th March, 1986.

2. Memorandum dated 11th August, 1986 submitted by Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam in reply to the memorandum dated 17th June 1986 submitted by Prof S. Jayakumar setting out the case of his complaint against Mr Jeyaretnam was considered.

Agreed, that oral evidence be heard from Mr Jeyaretnam.

Adjourned *sine die*.

18th Meeting

MONDAY, 19TH JANUARY, 1987
11.00 a.m.

PRESENT:

Mr Speaker (in *the Chair*)

Mr E.W. Barker

Mr Chiam See Tong

Mr S. Dhanabalan

Encik Othman bin Haron Eusofe

Dr Tony Tan Keng Yam

Mr Eugene Yap Giau Cheng

Mr Yeo Cheow Tong

4. The Committee deliberated on the matter referred to them on 26th March, 1986, namely, the complaint made by the Minister for Home Affairs, Prof S. Jayakumar, of non-disclosure by Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam, the then Member for Anson, of a personal pecuniary interest in a matter raised by him in Parliament on 26th March, 1986.

5. Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam was examined on oath.

6. The Committee adjourned.

20th Meeting

MONDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1987
3.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Mr Speaker (*in the Chair*)

Mr E.W. Barker

Mr S. Dhanabalan

Encik Othman bin Haron Eusofe

Dr Tony Tan Keng Yam

Mr Eugene Yap Giau Cheng

Mr Yeo Cheow Tong

ABSENT:

Mr Chiam See Tong

6. The Committee deliberated on the matter referred to them on 26th March, 1986, namely, the complaint made by the Minister for Home Affairs, Prof S. Jayakumar, of non-disclosure by Mr J.B. Jeyaretnam, the then Member for Anson, of a personal pecuniary interest in a matter raised by him in Parliament on 26th March 1986.

Fourth Report

7. The Chairman's draft report brought up and read the first time.

8. Resolved, "That the Chairman's report be read a second time paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 18 inclusive read and agreed to.

9. Resolved, "That this report be the Fourth Report of the Committee to Parliament.".

10. Agreed that the Chairman do present the Report to Parliament when printed copies of the Report are available for distribution to Members.

Adjourned sine die.