

FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT OF SINGAPORE

First Session

FOURTH SPECIAL REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Parl. 9 of 2021

Presented to Parliament on

14 December 2021

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Members

Mr Speaker (Mr Tan Chuan-Jin)

Chairman

Ms Grace Fu Hai Yien

Minister for Sustainability and the Environment

Mr Desmond Lee

Minister for National Development and Minister-in-charge of Social Services Integration

Ms Rahayu Mahzam

Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Communications and Information and Ministry of Health

Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai

Minister for Culture, Community and Youth and Second Minister for Law

Mr Don Wee

Mr Zaqy Mohamad

Senior Minister of State, Ministry of Defence and Ministry of Manpower and Deputy Leader of the House

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
FOURTH SPECIAL REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES	1
Annex A - Summary of Key Points from Evidence	A1 – A9
(A1) – Summary of Key Points from Evidence given by Ms Sylvia Lim on 13 Dec 2021	A1 – A7
(I) – Ms Raeesah Khan’s Meeting with Party Leaders on 8 Aug 2021	A1 – A2
(II) – Events after 8 Aug, until 3 Oct	A2 – A3
(III) – 4 Oct Parliament sitting	A4 – A5
(IV) – 12 Oct meeting between Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Ms Khan	A5
(V) – Ms Khan’s statement in Parliament on 1 Nov	A5 – A6
(VI) – The Worker’s Party Disciplinary Panel (“DP”)	A6 – A7
(A2) – Summary of Key Points from Evidence given by Associate Professor Jamus Lim on 13 Dec 2021	A8 – A9
(VII) – 29 Oct meeting with the Central Executive Committee (“CEC”)	A8
(VIII) – 30 Nov CEC meeting	A8 – A9
Annex B – Minutes of Proceedings	B1 – B3

FOURTH SPECIAL REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

The Committee of Privileges (the “**Committee**”) constituted under Standing Order 100(7)(a) has agreed to this Fourth Special Report under Standing Order 105(2):

1. The Committee met on 11 December 2021 and resolved to call Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim, Member of Parliament for Sengkang GRC, as witness.
2. On 13 December 2021, the Committee heard oral evidence from:
 - (a) Ms Sylvia Lim; and
 - (b) Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim.
3. The summary of oral evidence given on 13 December 2021 is set out at **Annex A**.
4. After hearing the above witnesses, the Committee resolved to make the entire video recording of the oral evidence, with sensitive information redacted, available to Parliament and thereby to the public through the Parliament website.

Next Steps

5. The Committee will hear further evidence if it sees fit, and will present its findings and recommendations to Parliament in due course.

Annex A

(A1) Summary of Key Points from Evidence given by Ms Sylvia Lim on 13 Dec 2021

1. Ms Sylvia Lim (“Ms Lim”) gave evidence to the Committee of Privileges (“COP”) on 13 Dec.
2. The key points from Ms Lim’s evidence are summarised below.

I. Ms Raeesah Khan’s Meeting with Party Leaders on 8 Aug 2021

3. On 8 Aug, Ms Lim met with Mr Pritam Singh (“Mr Singh”), Mr Faisal Manap (“Mr Faisal”) and Ms Raeesah Khan (“Ms Khan”) at Mr Singh’s house (the “8 Aug meeting”). The meeting lasted about an hour.
4. During this meeting, Ms Lim learnt for the first time that Ms Khan had lied in her statement to Parliament on 3 Aug (“the 3 Aug Parliament statement”). The lie concerned Ms Khan’s anecdote about accompanying a sexual assault survivor to a police station.
 - a. The 8 Aug meeting was arranged by Mr Singh, who contacted Ms Lim about this meeting on 7 Aug
 - b. On 8 Aug, Ms Lim was the first amongst the group to arrive at Mr Singh’s house. Before Mr Faisal and Ms Khan arrived, Mr Singh told Ms Lim that he had spoken to Ms Khan the night before, and that Ms Khan had told him that the anecdote in her 3 Aug Parliament statement was untrue.
5. During the 8 Aug meeting, Ms Khan shared that the anecdote in her 3 Aug Parliament statement was untrue. She had heard the anecdote during a victim support group that she attended, because she herself was also a victim of sexual assault.
 - a. Ms Khan was emotional as she shared this. Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal were therefore concerned about Ms Khan’s emotional state.
 - b. Mr Singh asked Ms Khan who else knew about the sexual assault. Ms Khan mentioned that Ms Loh Pei Ying (“Ms Loh”), Mr Yudhishtira Nathan (“Mr Nathan”), her therapist and her husband knew.

Mr Singh also asked Ms Khan if her parents knew about this. Ms Khan told him that her parents were not aware. Ms Lim recalled Mr Singh saying that Ms Khan had to speak to her parents.
 - c. Mr Faisal also asked Ms Khan whether she had sought professional help to assist her in overcoming the trauma of what had happened.
 - d. Apart from this, there was no further discussion about Ms Khan’s untruth during the meeting. According to Ms Lim, Mr Singh, Mr Faisal and she herself were focused on Ms Khan’s emotional wellbeing at that point.
6. After Ms Khan calmed down, they discussed with Ms Khan what Ms Khan had said about female genital cutting and polygamy, in her 3 Aug Parliament statement. It was agreed that Ms Khan

would draft and circulate to them a further explanation of her position on female genital cutting and polygamy, to be posted on her Facebook page.

7. Ms Lim agreed that as an experienced politician, she immediately appreciated that Ms Khan's lie in Parliament was a serious and grave matter that had to be addressed. The lie would have to be clarified, though she (Ms Lim) did not apply her mind to the question of how and when it should be corrected, at that time.
8. Ms Lim did not say anything to Ms Khan about the next steps that would have to be taken, to correct the Parliamentary record. To Ms Lim's mind, Ms Khan had to speak with her parents first, before anything else could be done.
9. Ms Lim did not recall any conversation between Mr Singh, Mr Faisal and herself on 8 Aug (without Ms Khan present) concerning Ms Khan's lie in Parliament, or the next steps that needed to be taken.
10. Ms Lim was also asked about the WhatsApp message that Ms Khan had sent to Ms Loh and Mr Nathan, her closest assistants, soon after the 8 Aug meeting concluded. The message read:

"Hey guys. I just met with pritam, Sylvia and Faisal. And we spoke about the Muslim issues and the police accusation. I told them what I told you guys, and they've agreed that the best thing to do is to take the information to the grave. They also suggested that I write a statement to send out this evening."

- a. Ms Lim disagreed with Ms Khan's evidence. (In her evidence to the COP, Ms Khan had said that "take it to the grave" reflected the consensus reached between Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal at the 8 Aug meeting, that if the matter concerning Ms Khan's anecdote did not arise again, she should continue maintaining the lie.)
- b. Ms Lim was asked if she could rule out that any of Ms Khan's mental conditions (including dissociation) may have caused Ms Khan to make this statement ("take the information to the grave"). Ms Lim said that she could not rule anything out.
- c. When asked, Ms Lim confirmed that she did not serve long in the Police Force (for three years). In that light, in her view, as an ex-police officer, it is unlikely for such information to be hidden for long.

II. Events after 8 Aug. until 3 Oct

11. Ms Lim confirmed that in the period after the 8 Aug meeting, and until the Oct sitting of Parliament starting on 4 Oct:-
 - a. To her knowledge, no steps were taken towards having Ms Khan come to Parliament to clarify the lie. Ms Lim said that she did not think that anything concrete was done, during this period.
 - b. Ms Lim did not speak to Ms Khan, or otherwise communicate with Ms Khan whatsoever about the lie in her 3 Aug Parliament statement.
 - c. Ms Lim did not check whether Ms Khan's family had been told about her sexual assault.

- d. Ms Lim did not discuss the matter with Mr Singh, Mr Faisal, or with anyone else. In particular, Ms Lim confirmed that she did not discuss with either Mr Singh or Mr Faisal whether Ms Khan's lie would be clarified in Parliament during the Sep sitting.
12. Ms Lim explained that because Mr Singh knew Ms Khan best, and was guiding her, she left it to Mr Singh to follow up on this matter with Ms Khan.
13. Ms Lim believed that Mr Singh would have known that she was leaving him to handle the matter. She did not discuss any specific timeframe with Mr Singh, as to when Ms Khan's lie should be clarified.
14. On 1 Oct, prior to the Oct sitting of Parliament, Mr Singh had sent an email to all the Workers' Party ("WP") MPs. The email reminded them that if anything was said in Parliament that could not be substantiated, the MP would face being hauled up before the COP. Ms Lim said that she read this as meaning that Mr Singh had his eye on the matter involving Ms Khan.
15. On 3 Oct, Mr Singh had gone to Ms Khan's house to discuss the Parliament sitting the next day with her (the "3 Oct meeting"). Ms Lim said that she was not aware of this meeting at the time, and only learnt of it the following day (see below).
16. Ms Lim also provided the COP with a copy of the notes she had taken, during the WP's Disciplinary Panel ("DP") interviews with Ms Khan (see further below). Ms Lim said that these notes were as close to verbatim as possible, and had been taken contemporaneously. Ms Lim highlighted to COP the following exchange between Mr Singh and Ms Khan, concerning the 3 Oct meeting:

[Taken from Ms Lim's handwritten notes of the DP interview on 29 Nov]

PS: *Before Oct session, I met you + I told you it was your call.*

Did need to tell the truth in Parl occur to you?

RK: *Yes but consumed with guilt + own experience.*

Thought it wouldn't come up.

PS: *Can't lie right?*

RK: *Yes.*

17. Ms Lim was asked for her views on what Mr Singh had said to Ms Khan, on 29 Nov, at the DP interview ("I told you it was your call"). Ms Lim said that Mr Singh seems to have told Ms Khan, that it was for Ms Khan to decide what to do on 4 Oct, if the issue arose in Parliament. In a different part of her evidence, Ms Lim said as follows (when describing what she believed/thought, prior to the DP meeting on 29 Nov): she would not have believed that Mr Singh would have given Ms Khan a choice to lie, if the matter arose again, and that she could not "fathom" the possibility that Mr Singh would have given Ms Khan the choice between telling the truth and lying again (see below).

III. 4 Oct Parliament sitting

18. On 4 Oct, Ms Khan repeated her lie in Parliament during an exchange with Minister Shanmugam concerning the anecdote in her 3 Aug Parliament statement. Ms Lim was present during Ms Khan's exchange with Minister Shanmugam, and heard what Ms Khan said.
19. Ms Lim said that she was very frustrated by what had happened. She was frustrated because it did not appear that there had been any progress made, to move Ms Khan towards correcting the Parliamentary record. Instead, through Ms Khan's exchange with Minister Shanmugam, there had been a "doubling down" on the untruth, making the situation even worse.
20. Ms Lim said that she did not know, at that time, what Mr Singh had discussed or agreed with Ms Khan, in terms of what to do if this matter were to arise in Parliament. But Ms Lim said that she would not have believed that Mr Singh would have given Ms Khan a choice to lie, if the matter arose again.

Ms Lim's discussion with Ms Khan in the afternoon

21. After Ms Khan's exchange with Minister Shanmugam, Ms Lim arranged to meet Ms Khan later that afternoon, in the Leader of Opposition's ("LO") office. Ms Lim said that she arranged this meeting for two reasons: first, to ascertain Ms Khan's emotional state after the exchange in Parliament, and second, for Ms Khan to respond in Parliament as Parliament is the proper body to handle it and to suggest that Ms Khan get legal advice on any potential request by the police for assistance.
22. Ms Lim confirmed that this was the first time, since the 8 Aug meeting, that she spoke with anyone concerning the lie that Ms Khan had told to Parliament.
23. Ms Lim said that during that discussion, Ms Khan was stressed. Ms Lim did not ask Ms Khan what she (Ms Khan) had discussed with Mr Singh, or why she ended up repeating the lie. At this point as well, Ms Lim did not think that Mr Singh would have told Ms Khan to "double down" on the lie, and thus did not ask about the discussion.
24. Ms Lim agreed that it was urgent for the steps to be taken to correct the Parliamentary record, and understood the need to move quickly. She said it was a matter of judgment as to when the best and earliest possible time was.
25. Ms Lim did not think that it was an option to have Ms Khan clarify the lie at the Parliament sitting the next day (5 Oct).
 - a. Time was needed to carefully structure Ms Khan's clarification, and make sure that she was comfortable with it.
 - b. Ms Lim also cited what happened on 3 Aug, when Ms Khan first told the lie in Parliament. At the time, Mr Singh had drafted a clarification for Ms Khan (which she delivered later that same day). The clarification turned out to "double down" on the lie, because the information from Ms Khan was untrue. Ms Lim said this was a reminder of how things had to be done with due deliberation

Ms Lim and Mr Singh's discussion with Ms Khan that night

26. Later that day, at around 11.15 pm, Mr Singh and Ms Lim met with Ms Khan in the LO's office. Ms Lim said that this meeting did not last very long.
27. According to Ms Lim:
 - a. Mr Singh asked Ms Khan what she planned to do about the matter.
 - b. Ms Khan said that perhaps there was another path – honesty.
 - c. Mr Singh responded by asking Ms Khan if she hadn't (already) chosen her path by what she had said in Parliament that day. (Ms Lim does not recall Ms Khan replying to this.)
 - d. The meeting ended off with Mr Singh saying that they would discuss this further.
28. At this meeting, neither Ms Lim nor Mr Singh asked Ms Khan if she had spoken to her parents. They also did not articulate to Ms Khan the need to take matters forward through a parliamentary clarification, though Ms Lim said that this was what she had in mind.
29. Ms Lim said that she did not have any separate discussions with Mr Singh that day, on this issue (either in person, or via other forms of communication).

IV. 12 Oct meeting between Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Ms Khan

30. On 12 Oct, Ms Khan met with Ms Lim and Mr Singh at Mr Singh's house.
31. At this meeting:
 - a. Initially, Ms Khan indicated some reluctance to correct the record.

Ms Lim was asked whether she had, at that point, clarified with Mr Singh what he had discussed and agreed with Khan. Ms Lim said that she had not done so, as it never crossed her mind that Mr Singh and Ms Khan would have agreed to “double down” on the lie. Ms Lim said that she could also not fathom the possibility of Mr Singh giving Ms Khan the option of choosing between telling the truth, or continuing the lie.
 - b. Ms Lim said that both she and Mr Singh were angry and told her to make the correction and said that Ms Khan had no choice but to come clean at the next available Parliament sitting (in Nov). After discussion, Ms Khan agreed that this would be the best thing to do.
 - c. On the police request (sent on 7 Oct) to interview Ms Khan, Ms Lim told Ms Khan that it was alright not to respond, since she was going to be making a clarification in Parliament.
32. Ms Lim confirmed that this was the first time that an express commitment was made for Ms Khan to clarify the lie in Parliament.

V. Ms Khan's statement in Parliament on 1 Nov 2021

33. On 1 Nov, Ms Khan delivered a statement in Parliament, clarifying the untruths that she had told Parliament on 3 Aug and 4 Oct.

34. Prior to 1 Nov, various steps were taken in preparation for Ms Khan's statement in Parliament:

- a. Between 12 Oct and 29 Oct, various drafts of Ms Khan's statement were prepared, reviewed and amended by Ms Khan, Ms Loh, Mr Nathan, Mr Singh and/or Ms Lim.

There was also a number of meetings, at both Mr Singh's house and the WP headquarters, to discuss these drafts.

- b. On 29 Oct, Ms Khan met the WP Central Executive Committee ("CEC") to discuss her draft statement.

The meeting on 29 Oct was the first time the CEC became aware of Ms Khan's lies in Parliament, and of her intention to clarify the lies on 1 Nov.

The CEC was not told that Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal had been aware of Ms Khan's lie from 8 Aug.

VI. The Workers' Party Disciplinary Panel ("DP")

35. On 2 Nov, the WP CEC set up a DP to inquire into Ms Khan's lies in Parliament.

- a. The DP comprised the Party's three most senior members – Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal.
- b. At that time, the CEC still was not aware that Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal had been aware of Ms Khan's lies from as early as 8 Aug.
- c. The composition of the DP was proposed by Mr Singh, as the Secretary General of the WP.
- d. Ms Lim was asked about Ms Khan's evidence (given to the COP), that Mr Singh, Mr Faisal and Ms Lim had told her (Ms Khan) to continue the lie. Ms Lim was asked whether there was an issue with the DP's composition, if what Ms Khan said was true. Ms Lim said that if this issue had been raised earlier, the composition of the DP could have been different.

36. On 10 Nov, all members of the Party were invited to share their views with the DP.

- a. As a lawyer, Ms Lim agreed that a usual mitigating circumstance was whether, how early, and the extent to which someone had admitted to his or her wrongdoing.
- b. However, she did not think that Ms Khan's admission to Mr Singh, Mr Faisal and herself on 8 Aug was relevant to the DP's work, or that this fact had to be disclosed to Party members who came forward to offer their views. Ms Lim said that the DP was inquiring only into Ms Khan's untruths on 3 Aug, and her repetition of her false claim, on 4 Oct.
- c. Ms Lim also said that the invitation to Party members was a feedback gathering exercise, and that the DP was not bound by what members told them.

37. The DP held two interviews with Ms Khan, on 8 and 29 Nov. Ms Lim highlighted that these interviews broadly discussed:

- a. the preparation of Ms Khan's 3 Aug Parliament statement, and why the untruth was included in the statement – on this, Ms Khan's explanation was that she was dissociated and did not realise what she was doing;
 - b. the discussion between Mr Singh and Ms Khan on 3 Oct (see above);
 - c. the actions Ms Khan was taking to address her psychological needs – Ms Khan submitted documents from a psychotherapist saying that she was undergoing therapy; and
 - d. whether and, if so, why Ms Khan wanted to remain in the Party, as an MP and a CEC member.
38. The DP also verified that Ms Khan had attended sessions held by a women's survivor group in 2018 and 2019, as she had claimed.

(A2) Summary of Key Points from Evidence given by Associate Professor Jamus Lim on 13 Dec 2021

39. Associate Professor Jamus Lim (“A/P Lim”) gave evidence to the Committee of Privileges (“COP”) on 13 Dec.
40. The key points from A/P Lim’s evidence are summarised below.

VII. 29 Oct meeting with the Central Executive Committee (“CEC”)

41. On 29 Oct, the CEC called for an extraordinary meeting (“the 29 Oct meeting”).
42. During the meeting:
 - a. The CEC was informed that Ms Raeesah Khan (“Ms Khan”) had lied in her statements to Parliament on 3 Aug (“the 3 Aug Parliament statement”) and on 4 Oct.
 - b. The CEC was also informed that Ms Khan would be delivering a personal explanation during the next Parliamentary sitting on 1 Nov, to clarify her untruths.
 - c. Ms Khan’s draft personal explanation was recited to the CEC members, who discussed and gave suggestions on the same.

Some members felt that the reference to Ms Khan being a sexual assault victim could sound like an excuse, but A/P Lim felt that it was important for her to state this.

43. A/P Lim confirmed that prior to 29 Oct, he was not aware that Ms Khan had said untruths in Parliament in August and October 2021.

VIII. 30 Nov CEC meeting

44. On 1 Nov, Ms Khan delivered her personal explanation in Parliament. On 2 Nov, the Workers’ Party CEC set up a DP comprising Mr Pritam Singh (“Mr Singh”), Ms Sylvia Lim (“Ms Lim”) and Mr Faisal Manap (“Mr Faisal”).
45. A/P Lim was a member of the CEC appointing the DP. A/P Lim said that as a “political rookie”, he did not know what a DP was meant to do. But his sense was that the DP would investigate the episode, gather the facts, and make a recommendation to the CEC.
46. The DP presented their recommendations to the CEC on 30 Nov. A/P Lim said that the points made by the DP were secondary to his decision. He had been receiving feedback through other channels, and had also reflected independently on the matter.
47. A/P Lim confirmed that as at 2 Nov (when he approved the formation of the DP, as a CEC member) and on 30 Nov (when he decided on the DP’s recommendations, as a CEC member), he did not know that:
 - a. On 7 Aug, Ms Khan had already confessed to Mr Singh that she had lied in her 3 Aug Parliament statement.

- b. On 8 Aug, Ms Khan had also met Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal, and confessed again, that she lied in her 3 Aug Parliament statement.
 - c. On 4 Oct, Ms Khan repeated in Parliament the untruth from her 3 Aug Parliament statement. At the time, Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal were aware that what Ms Khan said on 4 Oct was untrue, and knew that Ms Khan had repeated a lie in Parliament.
48. A/P Lim said that apart from what he was told at the 29 Oct meeting (see above), he generally learnt of the facts concerning this matter only when they became public. The people whom he had obtained feedback from would likewise be unaware of the above facts, since those facts were not public knowledge at that time (i.e. as at 30 Nov).
49. A/P Lim was asked whether, as a member of the CEC, he would have expected:
- a. The DP to be disinterested from the episode and the surrounding circumstances, so that they had no personal interest in the matter which they were supposed to investigate.
 - b. The facts concerning Ms Khan's confessions to the Party leadership on 7 and 8 Aug, and the Party leaders' state of knowledge on 4 Oct (see above), to be told to the CEC.
50. To these questions, A/P Lim said that he trusted the Party leadership to inform the CEC of all material facts. Given that the Party leaders had not told the CEC about their involvement in the matter from an early stage (see above), A/P Lim trusted that these facts were not material.
51. A/P Lim agreed that there were circumstances in which these facts would have been material, and should have been shared with the CEC.
- a. According to A/P Lim, the materiality of the facts concerning the senior Party leaders' involvement would depend on what the truth of the matter was.

A/P Lim initially agreed that the truth of the matter would have to be determined by the CEC, taking into account the recommendations of the DP. He subsequently said that he did not know who determined the truth, and that the truth was what everyone was trying to uncover.
 - b. If Ms Khan had planned to subsequently confess, then her prior confessions to the Party leaders would not have been material.
 - c. If, on the other hand, Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal had instructed Ms Khan to "take the information [of the untruth] to the grave" (as Ms Khan had told the COP), then their suppression of these facts and of their own involvement, would have been material information that had to be disclosed.

ANNEX B

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

9th Meeting

Monday, 13 December 2021

12.00 pm

PRESENT

Mr Speaker (Mr Tan Chuan-Jin) (*in the Chair*)
Ms Grace Fu Hai Yien
Mr Desmond Lee
Ms Rahayu Mahzam
Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong
Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Mr Don Wee
Mr Zaqy Mohamad

-
1. The Committee deliberated.
 2. *Agreed*, that the Chairman do present a corrigendum to Parliament to make a factual correction to paragraph 50 in Annex A of the Second Special Report of the Committee.
 3. Ms Sylvia Lim was examined on oath.
 4. Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim was examined on affirmation.
 5. The Committee further deliberated.

Adjourned to Tuesday, 14 December 2021

10th Meeting

Tuesday, 14 December 2021

4.30 pm

PRESENT

Mr Speaker (Mr Tan Chuan-Jin) (*in the Chair*)
Mr Desmond Lee
Ms Rahayu Mahzam
Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong
Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Mr Zaqy Mohamad

ABSENT

Ms Grace Fu Hai Yien (on leave of absence)
Mr Don Wee (on leave of absence)

1. The Committee deliberated.
2. Question put, “That the video recordings of the oral evidence of Ms Sylvia Lim, Member for Aljunied GRC, and Associate Professor Jamus Jerome Lim, Member for Sengkang GRC, be made available to Parliament and published on the Parliament website.”.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 5
Tan Chuan-Jin
Desmond Lee
Rahayu Mahzam
Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Zaqy Mohamad

Noes, 1
Dennis Tan Lip Fong

Resolved, “That the video recordings of the oral evidence of Ms Sylvia Lim, Member for Aljunied GRC, and Associate Professor Jamus Jerome Lim, Member for Sengkang GRC, be made available to Parliament and published on the Parliament website.”.

3. Question put, “That the Chairman’s Fourth Special Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.”.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 5
Tan Chuan-Jin
Desmond Lee
Rahayu Mahzam
Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Zaqy Mohamad

Noes, 1
Dennis Tan Lip Fong

Resolved, "That the Chairman's Fourth Special Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph."

4. Question put, "That paragraphs 1 to 5 inclusive stand part of the Fourth Special Report."

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 5
Tan Chuan-Jin
Desmond Lee
Rahayu Mahzam
Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Zaqy Mohamad

Noes, 1
Dennis Tan Lip Fong

Resolved, "That paragraphs 1 to 5 inclusive stand part of the Fourth Special Report."

5. Question put, "That this report be the Fourth Special Report of the Committee to Parliament."

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 5
Tan Chuan-Jin
Desmond Lee
Rahayu Mahzam
Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Zaqy Mohamad

Noes, 1
Dennis Tan Lip Fong

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

6. *Agreed*, that the Chairman do present the Fourth Special Report to Parliament today.
7. The Committee further deliberated.

Adjourned to Wednesday, 15 December 2021
