

FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT OF SINGAPORE

First Session

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Complaint against Ms Raeesah Khan for Untruth Spoken in Parliament

Parl. 13 of 2022

Presented to Parliament on

10 February 2022

PART B

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

Vol 2 of 2

MASTER CONTENTS OF PARTS A AND B

	<i>Pages</i>
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES	
PART A	
Main Report	1 – 76
Schedule.....	77 – 125
Annex A: Memorandum of Complaint by Leader of the House, Ms Indranee Rajah Against Ms Raeesah Khan	AA1 – AA6
Annex B: Extracts from Official Reports of Parliamentary Debates	BB1 – BB19
Annex C: Documents referred to in the Report	CC1 – CC77
 Appendix I: Minutes of Proceedings	 A1 – A33
 Appendix II: Summaries of Oral Evidence	 BA1 – BA52
Summary of Oral Evidence of Ms Raeesah Khan, Ms Loh Pei Ying, Mr Lim Hang Ling and Mr Yudhishthra Nathan given on 2 and 3 Dec 2021	BA1 – BA14
Summary of Oral Evidence of Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap given on 9 Dec 2021	BA15 – BA22
Summary of Oral Evidence of Mr Pritam Singh given on 10 Dec 2021	BA23 – BA33
Summary of Oral Evidence of Ms Sylvia Lim and Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim given on 13 Dec 2021	BA34 – BA42
Summary of Oral Evidence of Mr Pritam Singh given on 15 Dec 2021	BA43 – BA44
Summary of Oral Evidence of Dr Christopher Cheok and Ms Raeesah Khan given on 22 Dec 2021	BA45 – BA52
 PART B	
Appendix III: Minutes of Evidence	B1 – B869
Volume 1:	
2 Dec 2021	B1 – B143
3 Dec 2021	B144 – B212
9 Dec 2021	B213 – B411
Volume 2:	
10 Dec 2021	B412 – B700
13 Dec 2021	B701 – B793
15 Dec 2021	B794 – B813
20 Dec 2021	B814 – B819
22 Dec 2021	B820 – B869

CONTENTS OF PART B, APPENDIX III, VOLUME 2

	<i>Pages</i>
PART B	
Appendix III: Minutes of Evidence	B1 – B869
Volume 2:	
10 Dec 2021	B412 – B700
– Mr Pritam Singh	B412 – B700
13 Dec 2021	B701 – B793
– Ms Sylvia Lim	B701 – B770
– Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim	B770 – B793
15 Dec 2021	B794 – B813
– Mr Pritam Singh	B794 – B813
20 Dec 2021	B814 – B819
– Mr Pritam Singh	B814 – B817
– Ms Sylvia Lim	B817 – B818
– Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap	B818 – B819
22 Dec 2021	B820 – B869
– Dr Christopher Cheok	B820 – B843
– Ms Raeesah Khan	B843 – B869

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

FRIDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2021

9.00 am

PRESENT:

Mr Tan Chuan-Jin, Speaker (*Chairman*)

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

[Mr Speaker in the Chair]

[6949] **The Chairman:** I call the meeting to order. Serjeant-at-arms, please invite the first witness, Mr Pritam Singh, to the witness table. Thank you.

Mr Pritam Singh was examined on affirmation.

[6950] **The Chairman:** Good morning, Mr Pritam Singh. Please take a seat. For the record, please state your name, occupation and the positions you hold. You can remove your mask.

[6951] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, good morning.

[6952] **The Chairman:** For the record, please state your name, occupation and the positions you hold.

[6953] **Mr Pritam Singh:** My name is Pritam Singh and I am the Secretary-General of the Workers' Party. I am also Leader of the Opposition.

[6954] **The Chairman:** The evidence you will be giving today before the Committee will be taken on oath. If you so desire, you can also take an affirmation. Clerk, please administer the oath.

[6955] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I will take an affirmation.

(The witness made an affirmation.)

[6956] **The Chairman:** Thank you. Please be seated. The Committee of Privileges is looking into the complaint made by the Leader of the House, Ms Indranee Rajah, against former

Member of Sengkang GRC, Ms Raeesah Khan, for breach of privilege. Thank you very much again for attending today's hearing —

[6957] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You're welcome.

[6958] **The Chairman:** — to give evidence before the Committee and to answer the questions which Members of the Committee would like to put to you. You've taken a solemn obligation to answer our questions truthfully. If you refuse to answer our questions directly or attempt to mislead the Committee, such behaviour will be an offence and in contempt of this Committee. I will now call on Mr Edwin Tong to proceed with his questions.

[6959] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you, Mr Chairman. Good morning, Mr Singh.

[6960] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Good morning, Mr Tong.

[6961] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you very much for being here. You've heard Mr Chairman explain the ambit of the inquiry we're conducting. And we'll be taking evidence, including from you, and what we'll be doing is, I'll be asking some questions and, where appropriate, I'll also ask you to elaborate on them. And to the extent that you're aware, if you think there is anyone else who's able to shed light on the issues that I raise with you, please also let us know.

[6962] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I will.

[6963] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** From time to time, there might also be documents which we might ask you to produce, depending on the nature of the discussion that we have and what circumstantial or corroborative evidence there might be. So, I would be grateful if you could please keep a note of the various requests as we go along and feel free to clarify with me if you're not sure.

[6964] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I will do so.

[6965] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Mr Singh, the issue that we are looking into today, this Committee of Privileges, pertains to a lie being told in Parliament. That's a very serious matter, correct?

[6966] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[6967] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's serious in this case as well because the lie also impacts the work of the Police, correct?

[6968] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would disagree with that.

[6969] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The nature of this lie is that the Police had reacted badly to a report made by a sexual assault victim, correct?

[6970] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I would disagree. I believe, I will explain when you give me the opportunity to, but I would disagree that the Police —

[6971] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So,, let me put it to you this way: the false anecdote is the substance of the lie, right?

[6972] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[6973] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the false anecdote relates to an occasion when a Member of Parliament, Ms Khan, says that she had accompanied a sexual assault victim to the Police station, correct?

[6974] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[6975] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And she also described the reaction or the response of the Police in the context of that anecdote, correct?

[6976] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct and she also clarified that she could not substantiate that anecdote —

[6977] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Hang on, Mr Singh —

[6978] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — on the day she gave the speech.

[6979] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Don't jump ahead of me or try to anticipate. Let's take it step by step. On the anecdote, itself, on 3 August, when it was said in Parliament, without or before the clarification, that's where I'm at.

[6980] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[6981] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That anecdote, which is false, and I think we agreed on that, would have an impact, adverse impact on the work of the Police, right?

[6982] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would say it would not.

[6983] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It would not?

[6984] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[6985] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, it's okay to have a lie in Parliament where the lie relates to the reaction of the Police, bad reaction I might add, to a complaint by a sexual assault victim?

[6986] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The Police are not some broken-back organisation. They are fully aware that, in the course of investigations, I solemnly and sincerely believe, if you speak to any senior Police officer worth his salt, he or she will tell you that in the course of investigations, there can be a number of situations where certain questions —

[6987] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh —

[6988] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — are put to a witness —

[6989] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh —

[6990] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — which are uncomfortable for that person. I will not interrupt you. Please proceed.

[6991] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, please don't. Listen to the question.

[6992] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm listening carefully.

[6993] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm talking about the anecdote, and I'm not talking about general Police investigations. We all know how well our Police Force is regarded.

[6994] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Precisely.

[6995] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm talking about the anecdote and I think you know that I'm focused on the anecdote. So, please focus on the anecdote. That anecdote is false. It paints a picture of the Police. That anecdote, if true, if left uncorrected, would have an adverse impact on the work of the Police, correct?

[6996] **Mr Pritam Singh:** In the context in which it was said in Parliament, my answer remains no. That was the earlier answer I gave you. And I say no because Ms Khan could not substantiate that allegation. I do not believe the Police is a broken-back organisation.

[6997] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh, please.

[6998] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's my answer, Sir.

[6999] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. You apologised to the Police, correct?

[7000] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I apologised at my press conference because I don't think anyone deserves that.

[7001] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[7002] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And I work with the Police.

[7003] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You apologised because you felt that wrong was done to the Police, correct?

[7004] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I think time was wasted.

[7005] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Exactly. That's wrong done to the Police. Time was wasted, chasing their tails, for three months —

[7006] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But we're talking about something different here.

[7007] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Correct, Mr Singh?

[7008] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree, because I'm not sure what work the Police actually did. I remember, on 3 August, when Minister of State (MOS) Desmond Tan stood up. He said the Police have no case of this nature. So, what —

[7009] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh —

[7010] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What work was actually done? I'm not aware. I'm not saying no work was done. Obviously, work must have been done to check.

[7011] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Come on, Mr Singh. You are a lawyer. You're a senior member of the Opposition, senior Member of Parliament. You know that if you make an allegation in Parliament, especially one in the nature of what was done in a false anecdote, the Police will have to check, and for them —

[7012] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I don't disagree.

[7013] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** —for them to come and say that there's not one case, it means that they've gone through all the cases.

[7014] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I did not believe I heard that from the Police. I did not hear anywhere that they've gone through all the cases.

[7015] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You apologised on 2 December, at your press conference, correct?

[7016] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I apologised because a reporter put the question to me. And I think the Police deserve it. Anyone deserves it.

[7017] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You apologised before the reporter put a question to you, correct?

[7018] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I believe it was after the reporter put the question about the Police and the work that they had to do, but I have to check this.

[7019] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We'll get there.

[7020] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Please. Please do so.

[7021] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you also cleared Ms Khan's statement on 1 November, correct?

[7022] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I knew what she was going to say. She —

[7023] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh —

[7024] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I will answer the question.

[7025] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You cleared it, correct?

[7026] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I saw the statement and I said, "Yes, this is what you have to say."

[7027] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you approved it?

- [7028] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I wouldn't say I approved it. Those were her words.
- [7029] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You were happy with it?
- [7030] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think I was satisfied, yes.
- [7031] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you cleared it.
- [7032] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I was satisfied.
- [7033] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Come on, don't play with words, okay?
- [7034] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm saying I was satisfied.
- [7035] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.
- [7036] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You're not going to put words in my mouth. I am going to say it as it is.
- [7037] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm not; I can't, I can't. Because the truth has to come from you.
- [7038] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.
- [7039] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the version that you cleared includes an apology to the Police, correct?
- [7040] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would have to look at that. Can I refer to that?
- [7041] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Sure. Please help Mr Singh with the Hansard, 1 November. [*Singapore Parl Debates; Vol 95, Issue No 41, Sitting of 1 November 2021, Clarification section.*]
- [7042] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you.
- [7043] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you have it, Mr Singh?
- [7044] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I do. Yes, there is a line where Ms Khan says: "I wish to correct the record by retracting the anecdote that I shared on 3 August and I wish to apologise to the Singapore Police Force." Yes, indeed. I saw this before Ms Khan made this statement, that's right.
- [7045] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you were happy with this, right?
- [7046] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This was the least she could do.
- [7047] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. You cleared this, right?
- [7048] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I saw it, yes, I did.

[7049] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you felt it was appropriate for her to deliver this statement, correct?

[7050] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.

[7051] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Including an apology to the Police, correct?

[7052] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.

[7053] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, thank you. Wasn't so difficult.

[7054] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it was—I don't think I was—I didn't think I said I didn't want an apology to be made to the Police.

[7055] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think what you have said is on the record.

[7056] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It is on the record. You don't need to think that it is on the record.

[7057] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, I think we can move on. If lying in Parliament is a grave matter, which you accepted, you would accept that allowing a lie to remain on record, if you know it's a lie, is also a grave problem, correct?

[7058] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[7059] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Possibly a criminal offence as well, correct?

[7060] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree, because it is for Parliament to address its matters. If something has been said in Parliament, the Parliament Act, section 5, I believe, covers freedom of speech. Whatever a Member of Parliament says in Parliament is for Parliament to take action. It cannot be questioned in a committee of inquiry, commission of inquiry or any other place outside of Parliament. So, I disagree with that point.

[7061] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. You appear to know your positions very well.

[7062] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, I am Leader of the Opposition.

[7063] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, thank you for that. I will suggest to you that if a Member of Parliament is aware of a lie being said in Parliament and it is not corrected, that's also a very serious problem, correct?

[7064] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[7065] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And it is the obligation and duty of a Member of Parliament, whether it is that Member of Parliament who spoke the lie in the first place or not, if he's aware of a falsehood or a deception in Parliament, there's an obligation, there's an obligation to correct it, correct?

[7066] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Can you repeat the question?

[7067] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you're a Member of Parliament and you're aware that there is a deception on Parliament, a falsehood has been said in Parliament, you have an obligation to correct it, correct?

[7068] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[7069] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Regardless of whether the lie was said by you or that Member of Parliament in the first place or not, correct?

[7070] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Your first question was with regard to a Member of Parliament who has told a lie. It is an obligation on that Member of Parliament to correct the lie. I agree with that.

[7071] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And my second question is: if you are a Member of Parliament and you are aware that there is a lie or a deception on Parliament, regardless of whether the lie came from that Member of Parliament or not, you also have an obligation to correct it, right?

[7072] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7073] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you. In this case, Ms Khan had given a false anecdote in Parliament on 3 August, right?

[7074] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[7075] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And by around 7 or 8 August, you were aware of it, correct?

[7076] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct. I was aware on 7 August when she gave me a call. She wanted to keep to her position of not telling me the truth. And then, I put it to her. I said, "I'm only going to ask you once. Did this happen or not?" And then, she finally confessed. She said, "No, it did not happen." And then, it was left at that.

[7077] We met on 8 August with the Party leadership in my home. And there, I got to know more details about why that lie was told and the circumstances the Member was labouring under before she told the lie.

[7078] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. So, the answer to my question is yes?

[7079] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[7080] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You were aware by 7 or 8 August, correct?

[7081] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.

[7082] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And would you say you were fully aware by that time, of the circumstances and details of the lie, as you had put it, to use your words.

[7083] **Mr Pritam Singh:** To the extent that Ms Khan said so, what she told me, the answer would be yes.

[7084] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You would have, if you are not sure, clarified, correct?

[7085] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not sure about what?

[7086] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If there were any details about the lie, any matters concerning the anecdote, the circumstances which gave rise to the lie, if you are not sure about any of these, you would have clarified with her, right?

[7087] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not necessarily. It would depend on the circumstances of what Ms Khan was labouring under. And the circumstances, I would say, were highly unique.

[7088] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, when she left your home on 8 August, did you have any doubts as to the circumstances which gave rise to the lie or why she told the lie?

[7089] **Mr Pritam Singh:** When she left my house, I told her that she had to speak to her parents.

[7090] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, please, Mr Singh, answer the question.

[7091] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I'm answering the question.

[7092] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you have any doubts?

[7093] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Any doubts about?

[7094] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, if you would listen to my question, you will be able to answer it, and then you can clarify.

[7095] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You can ask the question again.

[7096] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, I will. I will just repeat what I said.

[7097] When she left your home on 8 August, did you have any doubts as to the circumstances which gave rise to the lie or why she told the lie?

[7098] **Mr Pritam Singh:** To the extent that what she had said, I took it on board. To the extent of what she told me, I had no doubt that that was the situation as she described.

[7099] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Did you have any doubt that it was a lie in Parliament?

[7100] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I had no doubt. It was a lie.

[7101] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. Thank you.

[7102] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7103] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** A week ago, you gave a press conference, correct, on 2 December?

[7104] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Are we done with the circumstances leading up from 3 August to 7 August and what happened on 8 August?

[7105] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Not necessarily.

[7106] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, we're going to jump back to it?

[7107] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We may come back to it.

[7108] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. Will we come back to it?

[7109] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We may come back.

[7110] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because there are important details I wish to share, important evidence I wish to give.

[7111] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. I'll make a note of it and I'll come back to it.

[7112] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you.

[7113] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you said 3 to 7 August, right?

[7114] **Mr Pritam Singh:** From 3 to 7 August and 8 August.

[7115] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. I'm happy to let you elaborate but we will have to be the judge of what's relevant and I hope you understand that.

[7116] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely. Absolutely.

[7117] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, last week, 2 December, you gave a press conference, correct?

[7118] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[7119] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I've taken the liberty of transcribing that press conference and I would like to ask you some questions also.

[7120] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Please do.

[7121] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, I will hand out a copy of the transcribed press conference to you. If I may ask the Clerk to please assist me. [*A transcript was referred to.*]

[7122] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you. Thank you so much.

[7123] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, Mr Singh, what you have before you is a transcription of the Workers' Party press conference on 2 December. It happened last Thursday, at around 12.00 noon. Can you quickly cast your eye over it? And let me also tell you that if you like, I can play the video of this press conference, of any portion, if you would like.

[7124] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, sure, no problem, but I would take it that this is an accurate transcription.

[7125] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. But if you find that there is anything inaccurate or not transcribed properly, please do draw it to our attention.

[7126] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, I will do so.

[7127] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You will see that this press conference – at the bottom right-hand corner, you will see the page number.

[7128] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I do.

[7129] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** From page 1, all the way until halfway down page 2 was your prepared text, right?

[7130] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[7131] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I take it this would have been something you prepared carefully.

[7132] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I prepared it, yes.

[7133] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Carefully?

[7134] **Mr Pritam Singh:** To the extent that it was accurate, yes.

[7135] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You prepared it carefully, right?

[7136] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I prepared it. I think we prepare everything carefully when we go to a press conference. It should be a given.

[7137] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, okay, thank you. So, just focus on my question

[7138] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, go ahead.

[7139] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — and just answer it. Okay?

[7140] You would have been very careful to prepare this because you appreciated the gravity of the situation and the gravity of the matters you were going to be disclosing to the press, correct?

[7141] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7142] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Amongst other things, this is the first time the public gets to know that, actually, the Workers' Party was privy to the lie from a few days after it was said in Parliament, correct?

[7143] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[7144] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that would be a very serious matter, correct?

[7145] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It would be serious because there have already been questions in the online space about what the Workers' Party had known previously and that was my focus, to, at least, get that addressed, because it was out there.

[7146] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. In fact, I would say to you that this is something that ought to be addressed, regardless of what's on the online media.

[7147] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I disagree. I disagree vehemently because if somebody tells you, if your MP comes up to you and tells you that she's been [sexually assaulted], which is what Ms Khan told us on 8 August, I think your calculations would not be so straightforward. That's my view.

[7148] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I figured you would say that.

[7149] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Of course. It's quite obvious, I would say.

[7150] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But we'll get into those details.

[7151] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely. I'm sure we will.

[7152] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But let's come back to this press statement.

[7153] You would be very careful to explain the circumstances in which you became aware and the steps to be taken by Ms Khan as a result of you being aware, correct?

[7154] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Repeat the question.

[7155] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You would be very careful to explain to the public the circumstances in which you became aware and the steps that you took to ensure that this lie is clarified, correct?

[7156] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7157] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the steps that you've described in here would be very carefully worded, correct?

[7158] **Mr Pritam Singh:** To the extent for the purposes of a press conference, the key facts, the key details, yes.

[7159] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Whether it's a press conference, a statement in Parliament, a statement before the Committee of Privileges, the accuracy of what you say is very important, correct?

[7160] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7161] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, thank you.

[7162] Now, look at the press statement. I think you'll remember it very well. So, I will just quickly ask you to cast your eye over the first half of it. You set out some background circumstances. Three paragraphs from the bottom of page 1, you said: "Initially, Raeesah stuck to the untruth in her communication with me." That was what you had briefly alluded to earlier, correct?

[7163] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What do you mean I briefly alluded to earlier?

[7164] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** When you said that you initially spoke with her and she maintained the lie. This paragraph refers to that, correct?

[7165] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Is this in the press conference? Are you referring to the press conference?

[7166] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I just gave you a document that transcribes your press conference. I think the answer is yes.

[7167] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, that particular comment that you made —

[7168] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, you made it here.

[7169] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. Here, I said, initially, Raeesah stuck to the untruth in her communication with me. It's on the record.

[7170] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's on the record.

[7171] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7172] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you also said this earlier when you described to me that when you initially called her —

[7173] **Mr Pritam Singh:** By "earlier", it is referring to this Committee?

[7174] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This is not the press conference?

[7175] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I said this Committee. So, are you referring to this Committee, what I said "earlier"?

[7176] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The evidence here, yes.

[7177] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7178] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you.

[7179] **Mr Pritam Singh:** If the question was clear, I would answer it.

[7180] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think there's no need for this kind of retort, Mr Singh.

[7181] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There's no retort. I'm just putting my point of view across.

[7182] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think let's put across some rules, okay? First, we don't speak over each other. Don't interrupt me, okay?

[7183] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I hope it works both ways, Sir.

[7184] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Second, I will give you an opportunity but I will interrupt you if it's not relevant. I hope you understand and I have made that clear to you earlier.

[7185] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And you would accept that I have to put evidence forward as well and you also would give me an opportunity to do so.

[7186] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You will have an opportunity. Mr Chairman will give you an opportunity. But whilst I'm doing the questioning, you will be guided by what I regard as relevant.

[7187] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. I hope you will accept that, sometimes, I may ask you to repeat your question.

[7188] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Of course. That's fine. To clarify and rephrase, please do. Also, please answer the question directly and then, if you wish to elaborate, please say so. If I think it is germane to the issue, I will allow you to. If not, I will make a note of it or Mr Chairman will make a note of it and we'll come back to it. Okay?

[7189] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[7190] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Now, let me show you page 3. You were asked a question by CNA and your answer below, at the bottom of page 3, is: "Certainly, an MP cannot be expected to leave an untruth on the record. She would have had to clarify it at some point."

[7191] That means that the moment an untruth is on the record, it has to be clarified. There's no two ways about it, right?

[7192] **Mr Pritam Singh:** "At some point" doesn't necessarily mean that, right, because you just said "immediately" in your question. But here, I'm saying on record that she would have to clarify it at some point. This is what I mean.

[7193] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I know.

[7194] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7195] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, these are your words?

[7196] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[7197] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I will explore what "at some point" means.

[7198] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[7199] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Actually, why don't you explain to us. "at some point"? What does it mean?

[7200] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, you would have to go back, which is why I initially wanted to put in evidence as to what happened from 3 to 7 August and, thereafter, on 8 August. May I be allowed to do so, so I can explain?

[7201] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Let's put it this way. As far as 3 to 7 August is concerned, you can summarise the evidence because the key point that is germane to this inquiry is the date on which you became fully aware of the lie, and that's on 7 August, which we heard from you earlier.

[7202] So, bear this in mind. I will allow you to elaborate on this, but bear this in mind: what is germane to us is when you knew.

[7203] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It may be germane to you, Sir, but if I have to elaborate on this statement, she would have had to clarify it at some point, then what would be relevant also is my frame of mind, my attitude towards Ms Khan after she claimed in Parliament that she had attempted to follow this particular —

[7204] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, please explain what you mean by “at some point”.

[7205] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure. So, if we go back to 3 August, Ms Khan makes this speech in Parliament, she is questioned by Minister of State (MOS) Desmond Tan. She then goes to the LO office. I get a message that she is crying in the LO office. I don't understand what is going on. I go to the LO office. I said, “Look, the truth matters. You have to tell the truth.” And I asked her, “Look, just substantiate this. When did you go? What happened?”

[7206] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What time was this meeting at the LO office?

[7207] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I will have to check, Mr Tong, but I would say it was shortly after MOS Desmond Tan intervenes to say that the Police have checked their records and there's no such case, I believe, that they can find. Shortly after that.

[7208] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, what did you tell her then?

[7209] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, I was very clear to her. I think my legislative assistants were in the office, and I told her the truth matters.

[7210] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Were they part of this conversation?

[7211] **Mr Pritam Singh:** They weren't part of the conversation but they were sitting at the side. She was sitting on the settee.

[7212] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so, in other words, they were part of the meeting?

[7213] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I beg your pardon?

[7214] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Your LAs were part of the meeting?

[7215] **Mr Pritam Singh:** They were doing other things, watching the speeches as they went along.

- [7216] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.
- [7217] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, she was crying and she kept telling me that she can't contact this person, she's unable to contact this person. And so, I said, "Look, you have to clarify it on the record that you can't contact this person, if that, indeed, is the position." So, I —
- [7218] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You told her that?
- [7219] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I told her that, absolutely.
- [7220] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That she has to clarify it on the record since she can't contact this person?
- [7221] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right, because that's was her representation to me.
- [7222] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you tell her in clear terms?
- [7223] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Very clear terms. I think I have it on the WhatsApp chat and I would like to present that as evidence to the Committee.
- [7224] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Please carry on.
- [7225] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I beg your pardon?
- [7226] Okay. And thereafter, she seems to be confused as to how to clarify it, and she says, "Do I clarify this by email?" I said, "No, you have to clarify it in Chamber." Based on what she has told me and because she was completely in a bad state, I drafted a short note based on what she has told me about the episode, that she's not been able to contact this person.
- [7227] I drafted the short note and I said, "Have a look at it. Do you agree we it?" And she says, "Yes, I do." Then she adds another line in that statement. Doesn't check with me and then makes that statement in the House. It's on the record in the House.
- [7228] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the statement that was made by Ms Khan subsequent to the clarification by Minister of State Tan was something that you had drafted?
- [7229] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that is correct.
- [7230] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Which she revised or did not revise?
- [7231] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She revised one sentence in it.
- [7232] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.
- [7233] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I drafted that and I said, "Look, is this something that you agree with, because only you know the truth?" And she agreed with it. I believe I have this on the WhatsApp chat. And then, she proceeds to make the statement on the day. Thereafter, I believe Leader of the House rises and she reminds Members to substantiate when they make an allegation against a Government body. I'm not sure whether she used these exact words but I think that was the thrust of her intervention.

[7234] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The next few days – and I have this again on WhatsApp chat – I continued to press Raeesah to give me details about this episode, what happened. Raeesah, in the course of this, tells me – I’ll have to check the dates, but it’s on record, I can present those records. Whether it’s on 3 August or 5 August, I don’t remember exactly, or 6 August maybe. On my WhatsApp chat, she says the person’s nickname is [redacted] and she met her outside Bedok Police station. So, that’s what she sent me. So, my perception, of course, is that that episode is true but she’s not been successful in contacting the person.

[7235] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me just pause you for a moment. All of what you’re telling us now, you subsequently discovered was false?

[7236] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I subsequently discovered it was false, but I think it goes to the point of your earlier line of questioning, which was, “If you know a lie has been told, how do you react and behave towards it?”

[7237] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I asked you a question about “at some point”, what that means. Please focus on that.

[7238] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that’s correct. Look, but implicit in what you’re saying and you can disagree, of course, is that there’s some cover-up that’s going on here.

[7239] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh.

[7240] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because that was your line of questions to the witnesses. I beg your pardon, I don’t mean to be argumentative.

[7241] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, please don’t. I’ll be very upfront with you and tell you that I have got no agenda except to ask questions and work out what the facts are, and there’s nothing implicit in my questions; it’s direct. And I hope you appreciate that it’s direct. If I’m going to make a suggestion to you, I will do so and tell you. So, please don’t read into my questions. I’m not making anything that’s implicit or otherwise.

[7242] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I’m just reflecting on the questions that were put to the first two witnesses, which is now in the public domain. That’s where I was coming from, but, please.

[7243] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So —

[7244] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But can I just quickly finish —

[7245] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, back to your explanation of “at some point”, yes.

[7246] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, proceed. Sorry, I didn’t mean to interrupt you.

[7247] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, go ahead and finish your explanation. I want to hear what you mean by “at some point”.

[7248] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay. So, thereafter, I continued asking her and she messaged me at some point and she said, “Can I give you a call?”

[7249] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, can you give me a rough date reference?

[7250] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This would have been 7 August.

[7251] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On 7 August itself?

[7252] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This definitely was 7 August. It was the day before she comes to my house. And she asks whether she can call me, I said, “Yes, sure.” She calls me, and I tell her over the phone, I said, “Look, you’ve told me all this, but if you can’t tell, if you’re not in contact with this person anymore, can you tell me who put you in touch with this person, because it’s not as if you know this victim out of the blue. There must be some NGO, some organisation that would have called you. So, who are these people?”

[7253] And then she said something to the effect of, “No, is there really such a thing as confidentiality?” I said, “Look, I’m SG of this Party and I’m asking you a question and I want to know.” And then I tell her, “I’m only going to ask this once now. Did it happen or not?” And then she said, “No, it didn’t happen.” And, of course, when I hear that, I’m really angry and upset, and I cut the call. I may have said something after that like, “We’ll talk about this” but I’m not sure, really. But I know I was really angry, I cut the call. And that was when I first knew at the end of that call that that episode was actually untrue.

[7254] Thereafter, on 8 August, Raeesah comes to my house. We have other matters that we want to discuss as well between the Party leadership, myself and Raeesah, and she then tells us that she told the lie because she was labouring under this traumatic episode.

[7255] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, I’m sorry to cut you off.

[7256] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, please.

[7257] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But I just wanted to tell you that we will get in detail to this meeting.

[7258] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s fine. I can always give my evidence then.

[7259] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, don’t worry, you will have an opportunity. But I want a quick answer from you as to what you mean by “at some point”.

[7260] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because, you see —

[7261] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, that I can contextualise this.

[7262] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I understand. So, when I got to know when she said she had been [sexually assaulted] when she was 18, I was prepared to give her the time, speak to her parents, settle herself, speak to her therapist whom she admitted at the meeting of 8 August she was seeing and who was aware of her condition, “Settle yourself and once you’ve done that, we’ll have to go to Parliament and you’ll have to make a personal statement.” That was at least my frame of mind. So, that’s what I mean by “at some point”.

[7263] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if I refer you to page 1 of your press statement, and here is part of your prepared speech. At the bottom paragraph, you said “Of immediate concern to me was the fact that Raeesah had not previously informed her family members of her sexual assault, which traumatised her greatly.”

[7264] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7265] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** “In my judgement, it was important that she did so before she could fully address the reasons behind her untruthful conduct in Parliament and to correct the record.”

[7266] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7267] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You then go on to say that “I was prepared to give her the space necessary to address the matter with her loved ones.”

[7268] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7269] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, would that give context to what you mean by “at some point”? Is this what you mean?

[7270] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, it would. It would certainly put that in perspective.

[7271] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the key criteria would be whether she has informed her members and your assessment of her state of mind?

[7272] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It would be —

[7273] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Of immediate concern to you?

[7274] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It would be whether she had told her parents, yes.

[7275] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. I would prefer not to go into specific details which are not necessary concerning the sexual assault in this inquiry, where possible. So, unless you think it is highly germane, because these proceedings will eventually be made public —

[7276] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I understand.

[7277] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — I would ask that we try and respect, as far as we can, the experience that Ms Khan had.

[7278] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I agree, and I hope you also understand that those were the reasons which I was also thinking of very carefully before determining at what point will she come out and tell the truth.

[7279] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, Mr Singh, I think the circumstances are very different.

[7280] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would agree they are different.

[7281] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** They are very different.

[7282] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would agree.

[7283] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You are talking about clarifying a lie in Parliament, as the leader of the Workers' Party, where one of your members had told a lie, and these proceedings here, I think the circumstances are different.

[7284] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't disagree.

[7285] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Go back to your press statement. We were at page 3 earlier. So, if you go and finish up the rest of your answer to CNA, you go on to say "I beg your pardon. She repeated what was the untruth that she originally communicated, but certainly if you want to continue as an MP, if you want to continue as a respectable political party, you know of this fact, I think there's only one outcome. It would have to be clarified." You stand by this?

[7286] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I do.

[7287] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think that is the least that can be done, right?

[7288] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is the minimum we expect of MPs, I would say.

[7289] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[7290] **Mr Pritam Singh:** If you tell a lie, you have to correct it.

[7291] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you. And subject to your views as to what "at some point" means, it must be on your mind that this clarification must happen as soon as possible, correct?

[7292] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Ideally, yes, of course.

[7293] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Not ideally. Absolutely? Right?

[7294] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This is where I think the circumstances, in my judgement, were of such a nature that I was prepared to give the Member time, in view of her – again, I respect what you said earlier, I used the word "[sexual assault]" earlier because this was the word Ms Raeesah Khan used when she described herself, but if Chair and the Committee would want me to use "sexual assault", I'm happy to use that word. I just used that word because that was the word Raeesah Khan used.

[7295] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, and I would prefer not; that we don't go into any other details unless they are strictly necessary.

[7296] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't really know the details.

[7297] **The Chairman:** I am quite happy if you can just use "sexual assault".

[7298] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay, I will use "sexual assault". Just to remember that, on record, that's what Ms Khan told us, that she was [sexually assaulted] when she was 18.

[7299] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** All I'm saying is, subject to what you have said, and the evidence is on the record about what "at some point" means —

[7300] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7301] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — and clarified by the bottom paragraph of the first page of this press statement, which starts with “Of immediate concern”, subject to that.

[7302] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I do apologise, Mr Tong. I don’t mean to make it difficult for you. Could you just repeat that, please?

[7303] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Earlier on, I put to you that once your statement, let me just read back, “There’s only one outcome. It would have to be clarified”, right?

[7304] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right.

[7305] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I said this is the least that can be done, and you said you agree, minimum?

[7306] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right. Absolutely.

[7307] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I put to you that, in normal circumstances, this has to be done as soon as possible.

[7308] **Mr Pritam Singh:** In normal circumstances, yes. I didn’t see this —

[7309] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Very urgently, in normal circumstances, right?

[7310] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, of course. Normal circumstances – we’re not going to quibble about the words – I suppose my judgement, in this case of what was normal, this was, to me, highly abnormal.

[7311] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, we’ll debate that. But the circumstance that in your mind deviates from a usual situation in this case was what you’ve explained earlier when I asked you about “at some point”, and which we looked at in the first page of the press statement, correct? That is, basically, what makes this case, in your mind, unusual?

[7312] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, what makes this case unusual in my mind was the fact that I was dealing with an MP who had shared something highly personal and private to me, and I had to deal with it, in my view, as sensitively as I could.

[7313] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, the circumstances which you say were of immediate concern to you, whether her family members were informed, whether or not you had made an assessment of her state of mind, these were the circumstances, right?

[7314] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that’s correct.

[7315] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You then go on to say, if I may refer you back to page 2 of your press statement, second line from the top, “It was nonetheless made known to her before the Parliamentary Sitting in October that any parliamentary clarification on this matter was hers to make in her capacity as an elected Member of Parliament.” Again, you carefully drafted this statement, right?

[7316] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[7317] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The word "nonetheless" means even taking into account the abnormal circumstances in this case?

[7318] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I wouldn't go so far.

[7319] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. The word "nonetheless" is used in this statement to say that taking into account the circumstances, you had made known to her before the October Sitting —

[7320] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would go to the sentence —

[7321] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish.

[7322] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, go ahead.

[7323] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — that the clarification was hers to make. Agree?

[7324] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, disagree, because "nonetheless", in my mind, related to the earlier sentence, "Raeesah came down with an episode of shingles in September and did not attend Parliament that month, but the anticipation is there's a Sitting coming along in October, hence —

[7325] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I see. Okay. I understand. Please put it on record what you mean.

[7326] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I just did.

[7327] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, you were halfway through. You said there was a Sitting coming along in October. So, please finish it.

[7328] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, there was a Sitting coming along in October and, vis-à-vis that October Sitting, I made it clear to her that she had to take ownership and responsibility for what had happened.

[7329] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. So, let's unpack this.

[7330] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7331] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That statement would have had to be made to her before October? It follows, right?

[7332] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Before the October Sitting.

[7333] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. Correct?

[7334] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7335] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Secondly, when you say “any parliamentary clarification on this matter”, do you see the words?

[7336] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7337] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The phrase “parliamentary clarification” must mean “come clean and tell the truth”, correct?

[7338] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The phrase means you have to set the record right in Parliament.

[7339] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That means explain that it was a lie?

[7340] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right.

[7341] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And tell the truth now?

[7342] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Exactly.

[7343] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, therefore, it was known to her before October that she was to tell the truth?

[7344] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not before October.

[7345] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Before the October Sitting?

[7346] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Before the October Sitting, that’s right. Can you repeat that question again, just specifically?

[7347] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The last question was “Therefore, it was known to her, before the October Sitting, that she was to tell the truth.”

[7348] **Mr Pritam Singh:** My words to her were to take ownership and responsibility of the matter, which extends to telling the truth, yes.

[7349] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Which, in fact, must fundamentally include telling the truth. That’s the whole *raison d’être* behind the clarification, correct?

[7350] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s to remind her that “Indeed, you have to take ownership and responsibility of the matter. You are an elected MP. You’ve made an oath in Parliament. You should do what the right thing is.”

[7351] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, and I hope Mr Chairman can make a direction. Please don’t rephrase my question.

[7352] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn’t mean to. I apologise if you think I did.

[7353] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** My questions are designed with a “yes” or “no”, and you can always clarify later on and elaborate.

[7354] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.

[7355] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, let me try again. Just to give you the context. You had said “My words to her were to take ownership and responsibility of the matter, which extends to telling the truth.” And I said, “In fact, it must fundamentally include telling the truth. That’s the whole *raison d’être* behind making a clarification, correct?” Your answer?

[7356] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. But can I clarify?

[7357] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[7358] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That assumes that she would have closed the issue off with her parents, because, to me, that was important. It was going to be made public in the event she told the truth, that details of her sexual assault, to the extent that she made it her eventual statement, would come out and, in my view, I thought it would be very improper if her loved ones didn’t know about it and she told this to the whole of Singapore before that.

[7359] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Which is the point you articulated in the bottom of the first page of this statement.

[7360] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Page 1?

[7361] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Page 1.

[7362] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that is correct.

[7363] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. Thank you. The paragraph that starts with “Of immediate concern”, correct?

[7364] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct, the last paragraph on page 1.

[7365] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Now, go back to page 2, we were there.

[7366] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7367] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You then have two more paragraphs which explain this, briefly, questioned by MHA on 3 October, I mean, 4 October.

[7368] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I beg your pardon. Which paragraph are you at?

[7369] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Sorry, I stopped at the top paragraph. I’m now going to the second paragraph.

[7370] **Mr Pritam Singh:** From the top.

[7371] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you related what happened on 4 October —

[7372] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7373] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — and then what happened after 4 October in the next two paragraphs?

[7374] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7375] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In your mind – and again, I know the caveat you made about “at some point”, bearing this in mind – it was highly imperative for such a clarification of the truth to be made?

[7376] **Mr Pritam Singh:** At some point, yes.

[7377] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It was, in fact, very important to ensure that the deception that Parliament was under would be clarified?

[7378] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. I may disagree with the choice of the word “deception” but, certainly, what Ms Khan did was not the truth, and this is not what we expect from Workers’ Party MPs in Parliament.

[7379] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But “not the truth” is a deception, Mr Singh.

[7380] **Mr Pritam Singh:** They are different words for a reason.

[7381] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In your mind, this conversation or this clarification with her before the October Sitting, was she under any doubt that that was what you had in mind, in your mind?

[7382] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I do not believe she would have been under any doubt because she would have – can I explain?

[7383] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, just answer the question.

[7384] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I do not believe she would have been under any doubt, and I wish to explain why I think that way.

[7385] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[7386] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Can I do so?

[7387] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please do.

[7388] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, vis-à-vis my conduct towards her from 3 to 7 August, pressing her for the truth, given that she is in receipt of rules of prudence which I signed off and gave to her before and to all the WP MPs after the first Sitting of Parliament and, given that I had told her to tell her parents, all these would have informed her that she would have had to come out with the truth. And given what I told her on 3 August, when I visited her, my wife had to drop off some things to —

[7389] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You meant 3 October?

[7390] **The Chairman:** You meant 3 October?

[7391] **Mr Pritam Singh:** On 3 October, I beg your pardon, 3 October. My wife —

- [7392] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We'll come to that.
- [7393] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.
- [7394] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But I wanted to —
- [7395] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Can I just finish answering the question? And, so, with all this information — I mean, she would know what sort of person I am, I would think, like all my MPs do — she would know that she would have had to tell the truth.
- [7396] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the answer to my question as to whether you thought she was under any doubt or misapprehension as to your clear direction, the answer would be no, right?
- [7397] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She would have been clear. Yes, the answer would be no. That's my view.
- [7398] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Mr Singh, the timeline was this: 7 August, you were aware, and the next Parliamentary Sitting would have been September. You said she had shingles just before the Sitting, I believe.
- [7399] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She uploaded a Facebook post about it and she told me as well. I've got it on a WhatsApp message when she —
- [7400] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. But the point you're making is that she was not present in Parliament and, therefore, could not clarify. Is that what you're saying?
- [7401] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She was not present in Parliament, but I did not speak to her before the September Sitting. I have to put that on record.
- [7402] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But in October, you were aware that she would be in Parliament and there was a Sitting, right?
- [7403] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [7404] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you went to her home on 3 October.
- [7405] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.
- [7406] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Correct?
- [7407] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.
- [7408] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you brought up the issue with her, of the clarification?
- [7409] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right, I did.
- [7410] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think you were trying to make that point earlier in your narrative.

[7411] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I did. I did.

[7412] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because you said your wife had a present?

[7413] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it wasn't a present. I mean, she's got a young daughter, I've got young daughters, and I think that had something to do with it, yes.

[7414] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, it would be fair to say that you anticipated that the issue might arise the next day on 4 October, right?

[7415] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It would certainly have been possible.

[7416] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. In fact, you anticipated it, right?

[7417] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I wouldn't go so far. I'm not a clairvoyant, but it would certainly be possible for it to have come up, yes.

[7418] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I think, well, put it this way. You said you didn't speak to her before the September Sitting?

[7419] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is right.

[7420] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And in your account earlier as to why you believed it was clear to her, you described to me 3 August to 7 August and then you described to me 3 October, with nothing in between, right? That was what I took away from what you said.

[7421] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, the issue – can I explain?

[7422] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes or no? Was there anything in between that you want to talk about?

[7423] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There was.

[7424] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, tell me.

[7425] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It wasn't directly to her. As, Mr Tong, you would know, we were preparing for the Foreign Interference and Countermeasures Act (FICA) debate in October. In the course of my preparations for the FICA debate, I was reading up old Hansard records of the Hendrickson affair, and there was a particular episode where Mr Chiam See Tong made an allegation that NTUC members were paid \$3 to \$5 to manufacture a protest against the Americans.

[7426] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I don't think we need to go into that —

[7427] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'll tell you why this is relevant. Then, of course, the PAP Members in Parliament stood up and said, "Substantiate this. You should withdraw it." So, there was a pretty long exchange. A few PAP members stood up and challenged Mr Chiam, and Mr Chiam said, "The person who told me about this is actually sitting in the Visitors' Gallery —"

[7428] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh —

[7429] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'll tell you why this is important. So, that episode then – something clicked in my mind. I said, “Look”, and I sent an email on 1 October to all the WP MPs, as I was preparing for the FICA debate, to say that, “If you do something like this and you cannot substantiate what you say, be prepared to appear before the Committee of Privileges.” So, the issue was at the back of my mind, the seriousness of it, the importance of it to – the bare standards that, really, Workers’ Party MPs should uphold, and this is unacceptable. I would like to present this, I’m sure I can pull that email out. I would like to present this as evidence to the Committee.

[7430] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Of course, please do. Anything else? We were in the period in between. You remember? From 3 August to 7 August?

[7431] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I do.

[7432] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And then 3 October, and now, you said 1 October, there’s an email.

[7433] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right.

[7434] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Anything else?

[7435] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I don’t believe so. I don’t believe so.

[7436] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And all of these occasions formed the reasons for your belief that Ms Khan was very clear that she would have to clarify the truth in Parliament?

[7437] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right, that’s right.

[7438] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can I invite you to look at Ms Khan’s evidence of this meeting?

[7439] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I’m happy to look at it.

[7440] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can the Clerk please assist Mr Singh, and pick up 2 December?

[7441] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Submission to the Committee of Privileges by Ms Raeesah Khan on 2 December, yes.

[7442] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, sorry. Clerk, it’s the evidence given by Ms Khan on 2 December.

[7443] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think it’s documents or evidence that she gave to the Committee of Privileges.

[7444] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, it’s the transcript.

[7445] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Committee of Privileges' Minutes of Evidence, Thursday, 2 December 2021, 11.00 am.

[7446] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. Please turn to page 83.

[7447] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7448] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Just to give you a timeframe: your press conference, the transcribed notes of which you have in front of you took place last Thursday.

[7449] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7450] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It was almost at the same time, if not at the same time, as when this Committee of Privileges was sitting and taking evidence.

[7451] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I came to know later, yes.

[7452] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And both Ms Loh, who gave evidence, as well as Ms Khan, were not aware of the press conference before they gave evidence.

[7453] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I wouldn't know.

[7454] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm telling you that, because they were here and they were sequestered, and they were not aware of what was said at the press conference at the time they gave this evidence.

[7455] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It wouldn't surprise me.

[7456] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, I'm telling you.

[7457] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7458] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, look at the evidence in that light. They had no idea of what was being said at the press conference.

[7459] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, sure.

[7460] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Have the document in front of you, but let me just set the context. You said that you went to Ms Khan's home on 3 October?

[7461] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, with my wife.

[7462] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** With your wife. Can you tell me what happened at this occasion?

[7463] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure. So, we visit her home on 3 October. As I alluded to earlier, my wife had something to pass over – I think they were baby clothes but I can't be absolutely sure. And this was in the evening. I reckon it was about six plus, but I have to double-check my messages what time it was. She was at home. I knocked the door. Her father and mother were there. We had a short conversation. They are nice people, they are pleasant people; we

had a quick chat. Her husband was there, we said hello. And her son was there. I didn't see the daughter but her son was definitely there.

[7464] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'd like you to focus on what you told Ms Khan —

[7465] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, sure.

[7466] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — concerning the clarification.

[7467] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But there was something interesting that happened. Out of the blue, I didn't expect it because I don't talk to her mother very much, and Ms Khan's mother told me, "Parliament can be not so serious or not?" It was a fragment. I didn't know what to make of it, but I told her, I said, "Aunty, Parliament is very, very serious." And then her mother goes away.

[7468] Then I sit with Ms Khan and I tell her, "Look, I am not sure what is going to happen with this anecdote that you've told, but it is entirely possible that there could be a clarification made. Somebody may ask you something about it and it is important that you take responsibility and take ownership of the issue." And I did say – and she started getting a bit uncomfortable when I said that, and then I told her, "I will not judge you", and "I will not judge you" meant I will not judge you if you take responsibility and ownership. That was the gist of the conversation. I didn't get the sense that she was going to be uncomfortable with telling the truth. She never communicated anything of that sort to me. And at no point did she say, "Pritam, I don't know what to do. Please help me. I need guidance, I need advice," nothing of that sort. I'm just trying to put the context of the 3 October meeting.

[7469] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So —

[7470] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And then – sorry, I'm interrupting you.

[7471] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, are you finished?

[7472] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Oh, okay, not yet. And in gist, that was what I recall from the 3 October conversation, and then, of course, I took my leave and we left. We may have stayed a little while longer because my wife was playing with her son, so —

[7473] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, I don't need to know that.

[7474] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — I can't remember exactly whether we left immediately or not, but that was what happened.

[7475] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, just focus on what's germane, okay?

[7476] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[7477] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I would like to show you Ms Khan's recollection of what happened.

[7478] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7479] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please turn to page 83.

[7480] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7481] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you go somewhere just after halfway down the page, where you see Ms Raeesah Khan says “Before the October Sitting”?

[7482] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7483] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, this is her account of the same conversation.

[7484] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7485] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me read it to you.

[7486] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[7487] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 1435.*]

Ms Raeesah Khan: Before the October Sitting, I had a conversation with Leader of the Opposition, Pritam Singh, and the conversation was that if I were to retain the narrative or if I were to continue the narrative, there would be no judgement.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Can you tell us which date this took place?

Ms Raeesah Khan: 3 October.

[7488] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It would have to be 3 October.

[7489] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 1438.*]

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Where did this take place?

Ms Raeesah Khan: In my house.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Was there anyone else present besides the two of you?

Ms Raeesah Khan: No, there was not.

[7490] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay, that’s untrue.

[7491] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** “Are there —

[7492] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think she has told a lie. That’s not true.

[7493] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can I finish? I mean —

[7494] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, my apologies, but you must understand my shock when she says no one was at home, because her whole family was at home.

[7495] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, this can't be the first time you're hearing this. You would have seen the transcripts.

[7496] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I saw the transcripts. I was shocked about it and I want to relay to you that this is not true.

[7497] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Go over the page. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 1444.*]

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: The discussion for you to retain the narrative and there would be no judgement, can you give me your interpretation of that? What do you make of that statement?

Ms Raeesah Khan: My interpretation was that there would be no consequences for me to continue the narrative that I had begun in August.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: In other words, there would be no consequences on you if you continued the lie and keep up the contention that there was this occasion, this anecdote that you had described on 3 August, despite it being a lie?

Ms Raeesah Khan: Yes. That was my interpretation. Yes.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: And there was, therefore, no attempt by Mr Singh to ask you to clarify the matter in favour of putting out the truth?

Ms Raeesah Khan: Not at that point in time, no.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Not on 3 October?

Ms Raeesah Khan: No.

[7498] So, you disagree with this?

[7499] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.

[7500] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if this is what Ms Khan said, you would say she's lying?

[7501] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.

[7502] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, let's see what the common areas are, first of all. You went to her home on 3 October, right?

[7503] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7504] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You expected the issue to arise in Parliament the next day, on 4 October, right?

[7505] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I did not expect it to.

[7506] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You anticipated it might?

[7507] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It would be possible.

- [7508] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you anticipated that it might arise?
- [7509] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It might.
- [7510] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you went to her. You raised the topic with her?
- [7511] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.
- [7512] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you did say, “I will not judge you”?
- [7513] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I did, but that was a fragment of a larger conversation.
- [7514] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** These are the points that we agree on so far. What else, from this evidence that I’ve just read to you, do you agree with?
- [7515] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You are talking about Ms Khan’s evidence?
- [7516] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, what I just read to you.
- [7517] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don’t understand this —
- [7518] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, no. What else do you agree with?
- [7519] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I just said it’s not true. How can I agree with something I’ve said is not true?
- [7520] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, we’ve agreed on a few points about the incident.
- [7521] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But that wasn’t specifically relating to this.
- [7522] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Is there anything else here you agree with?
- [7523] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.
- [7524] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, okay. So, your position is that, as far as this evidence is concerned, Ms Khan would be lying?
- [7525] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. Look, if I can be even the slightest bit charitable, she read —
- [7526] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No.
- [7527] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — she completely read the wrong thing that I had put to her. When I tell you to “take responsibility”, it means precisely that. If you look at my conduct towards you in the run-up to what you had said in Parliament, if I really wanted to let this narrative lie – I don’t know where this word comes from, but if I really wanted to do that, I would have just left it where the Leader of the House left it, “Please substantiate in future.”
- [7528] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On 4 October, this issue that you had thought might arise, did arise, right?

[7529] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7530] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And it arose immediately after Parliamentary Questions (PQs). Do you remember?

[7531] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'll have to check, but, yes, it did arise, yeah.

[7532] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me give you some dates —

[7533] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, please do.

[7534] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — and you can take it from me. Parliament sat at 11.00 am on 4 October; and the usual PQs are an hour and a half, 12.30 pm it ended. At 12.30 pm, Minister Shanmugam stood up to seek the Speaker's permission to make a Ministerial Statement, a short Ministerial Statement.

[7535] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think Mr Leong Mun Wai wanted to say something. I remember this.

[7536] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, I think we all remember that, but just to give you —

[7537] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, actually, Mr Tong, I will accept your recollection of what transpired that day.

[7538] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, can I please invite you to look at the Hansard for 4 October. Could staff please assist Mr Singh. [*Singapore Parl Debates; Vol 95, Issue No 39, 4 October 2021, Ministerial Statement section.*]

[7539] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'll just leave this open here.

[7540] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please do. I may come back to it.

[7541] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure. Ah, yes. Mr Leong Mun Wai. It starts with Mr Leong Mun Wai.

[7542] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm not surprised.

[7543] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, he wanted to, I think, put in this petition.

[7544] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** He was by the way a bit out of turn and I think Mr Shanmugam then —

[7545] **The Chairman:** He was totally out of turn.

[7546] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it wasn't so bad, Mr Chairman. I mean, he is entitled to try and put in his view.

[7547] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Anyway, what's important for me is this: that Mr Shanmugam starts at 12.30 pm, or shortly thereafter, after Mr Leong Mun Wai's intervention.

[7548] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7549] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You were in the Chamber at that point in time?

[7550] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I was.

[7551] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, was Ms Khan, right?

[7552] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7553] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And about three or four minutes after Minister Shanmugam started on his Ministerial Statement, and before he finished – and you can take it from me that he finished after six minutes – so, if you go to page 3 of this Hansard transcript, where he concludes by saying: “So, Sir, through you, may I ask Ms Khan for those details?” That would be around 12.36 pm, 12.37 pm?

[7554] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I take it from you.

[7555] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you leave that transcript open and please pick up the bundle of documents provided by Ms Loh on, I think it is 2 or 3 December. The fairly substantial bundle. Yes.

[7556] No, sorry, I beg your pardon, it’s not Ms Loh, I’m sorry. It’s Ms Khan. My apologies. The bundle should be the Ms Khan bundle on 2 December. Go ahead. Do you need anything, Mr Singh?

[7557] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The submission to Committee of Privileges by Ms Raeesah Khan, 2 December, yes.

[7558] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, to give you an orientation of the documents we have, Mr Singh —

[7559] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7560] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — I mentioned to you at the start that, from time to time, we may ask you for documents, emails, messages, WhatsApp, Telegram and so on, and in the course of the earlier witnesses’ testimony, they also give us some of their message records, email records and so on.

[7561] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[7562] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And this came from Ms Khan on 2 December. So, if you can just have a quick flip over it, you will see that there were some WhatsApp messages in text form. And then, near the end, there are some screenshots. Do you see that? At the bottom of the page, you will see a page numbering.

[7563] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don’t see that. The only screenshot I see is Raeesah claiming on 8 August, that “I had met up with Pritam, Sylvia and Faisal and we spoke about the Muslim — ”

[7564] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I will show the clerk which I have in mind and then you can assist me. Sorry, Mr Singh, I think she will assist.

[7565] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Oh, it's the wrong document.

[7566] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She sent it at 8.18 pm. Just give her a moment, Mr Singh.

[7567] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, sure, no problem. Thank you. [*A copy of the document was referred to.*]

[7568] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, she shared some screenshots of her messages with you, Mr Singh.

[7569] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[7570] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if I could ask you to look at the bundle that has the page numbering below, "out of 17". You see that?

[7571] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7572] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Turn to page 4 of 17.

[7573] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7574] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This is a screenshot of her messages with you on 4 October.

[7575] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7576] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you will see, at 12.34 pm, she says: "What should I do, Pritam?" [*A message was referred to.*]

[7577] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I see that.

[7578] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, she has sent you this message whilst Minister Shanmugam was making his Ministerial statement, right?

[7579] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7580] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You were present in the Chamber —

[7581] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I was.

[7582] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — and, obviously, Ms Khan was present in the Chamber. Why do you think she would send you this message?

[7583] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn't see the message —

[7584] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I know that. You may say that, but my question is a different one.

[7585] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[7586] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Why do you think she was sending you this message?

[7587] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can't read into her mind, but it may well be that she is fearful of coming out with the truth.

[7588] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At that point in time, according to your evidence, there was no doubt in your mind that she knew that should the matter come up for clarification, she would have to clarify the truth, right?

[7589] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yeah, because I had told her to take ownership and responsibility. So, in my mind, it would have been clear what the right thing to do was.

[7590] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. So, this message, four minutes into Minister Shanmugam's speech would come out like a bolt out of the blue, right? Completely at odds with your understanding of what she was to do, correct?

[7591] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I will tell you exactly when I saw the message.

[7592] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, that's not my question.

[7593] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, I didn't – please ask your question again, Mr Tong. I apologise.

[7594] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, please do focus.

[7595] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7596] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm not asking you when you saw it.

[7597] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[7598] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I said that receiving a message four minutes into Minister Shanmugam's speech concerning an issue which you had contemplated might arise just the day before and went to her home to speak about it, to receive a message at 12.34 pm, asking you, "What should I do, Pritam", would be completely at odds with your understanding of what she has to do?

[7599] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[7600] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so, I go back to my earlier question. Why do you think she would send such a text —

[7601] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can't answer that, Minister Tong.

[7602] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — if it had already been made known to her, as you told the press?

[7603] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, this may seem like a deviation, but we can come back to it and cut me off if you feel it's inappropriate. She revealed some things about her condition — a condition she's labouring under on 29 November to the WP Disciplinary Panel.

[7604] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I don't want to go into that now.

[7605] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yeah, but you're asking me about what she thinks. Now, if —

[7606] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm asking you contemporaneously, because you, obviously, would not have been aware of —

[7607] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, absolutely not.

[7608] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — what she may have revealed subsequently, okay?

[7609] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right, that's right.

[7610] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, let me just sketch it out for you again.

[7611] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[7612] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You went to see her on 3 October.

[7613] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7614] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Contemplating that the issue might arise, which means that you felt, if it arose, you would speak, tell the truth, right?

[7615] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely, yes.

[7616] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Which means she's ready to do so, in your mind?

[7617] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She would have to do so.

[7618] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And she was ready to do so, correct?

[7619] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7620] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** By 4 October, correct?

[7621] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Whether she was ready was something for her to take responsibility for as an MP of the Workers' Party. I can't assuredly say that she was ready, but I had communicated to her, "You have to take ownership and responsibility" on 3 October.

[7622] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you thought it may happen on 4 October, right?

[7623] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It could have happened. I wasn't sure.

- [7624] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** “Could have” in what way?
- [7625] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Like I said, I can’t foresee that the matter could have come up.
- [7626] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. But if the matter did come up, which you had contemplated, it would be for her to clarify?
- [7627] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [7628] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And she would have to clarify —
- [7629] **Mr Pritam Singh:** For her not just to clarify —
- [7630] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Hang on. It would be to clarify and tell the truth, right?
- [7631] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely, absolutely.
- [7632] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you felt that, by seeing her on 3 October, you felt that this might come up and she would have to come to Parliament and speak the truth?
- [7633] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can’t disagree. Yes.
- [7634] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, in that context, receiving such a message, in the context of everything you told us, 3 to 7 August, 1 October, 3 October, would be at odds — completely at odds with your own understanding of what she is to do?
- [7635] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [7636] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You didn’t reply till later, so, we will come to that. You replied to this message, but later.
- [7637] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [7638] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But I’d like to show you —
- [7639] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Can we just — I said, “Will speak after sitting. Keep chair and I posted.”
- [7640] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I know you said that later. But I wanted to give you a sense of the timeline and, to do that, I think the best thing to do is to look at the video.
- [7641] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.
- [7642] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if I may ask the Clerk to please assist me, and look at the video. [*A video clip was played.*] Can we have the volume, please? Just pause for a moment. If you like, Mr Singh, you can have the Hansard transcripts open so that you know which segment it is, if you like. So, this segment here picks up from after Minister Shanmugam has finished.
- [7643] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right, page 3 of 4.

[7644] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[7645] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[7646] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And as I explained to you earlier, this is around the 12.36 pm, 12.37 pm time period. So, two to three minutes after she sent you the text, she gets up to make her first response to Minister Shanmugam and this is what it is.

[7647] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7648] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please play it. *[A video clip of the 4 October 2021 Parliament Sitting was shown. The text can be found in Singapore Parl Debates; Vol 95, Issue No 39, Sitting of 4 October 2021, Ministerial Statement section.]*

Ms Raeesah Khan: Like I said, it did happen three years ago, and I have not been successful getting in touch with the person that I accompanied and with regards to confidentiality, I would prefer for it to remain that way.

Mr K Shanmugam: Sir, I asked which Police station, which month and the identities of the officers, to the extent Ms Khan knows them.

Mr Speaker: Ms Khan, to facilitate the investigation by the Police, to check.

Ms Raeesah Khan: Thank you. I do not know the identity of the Police officers.

[7649] Ok, please pause. Mr Singh, you will see that between her first response and the second response, this time round, she brings her phone to the podium?

[7650] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn't notice that, but I notice it now.

[7651] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, I obviously didn't notice it then as well, but I would like to draw that to your attention.

[7652] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[7653] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And later on, you will see that she does look at her phone, and I will make some suggestions to you later on.

[7654] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[7655] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, please play the video. *[A video clip of the 4 October 2021 Parliament Sitting was shown. The text can be found in Singapore Parl Debates; Vol 95, Issue No 39, Sitting of 4 October 2021, Ministerial Statement section.]*

Mr Speaker: And the questions on Police station, date and so on.

Ms Raeesah Khan: With regards to confidentiality, with the survivor, I will not like to reveal any of this information. Thank you.

Mr K Shanmugam: Sir, we are talking about the Police station. That has got nothing to do the confidentiality.

Mr Speaker: Understand. Ms Raeesah Khan. The Minister is not asking about the identity of the individual.

Ms Raeesah Khan: I understand but, with regards to confidentiality, I will not be revealing any other information. Thank you.

Mr Speaker: Minister.

Mr K Shanmugam: Sir, I have to say that, perhaps, Mr Speaker has the power to direct answers since the matter has been raised and through you, Sir, I ask for the direction to be given that we be told which Police station and the month; if not the date, at least the month and which Police station.

Mr Speaker: Ms Khan, I think that is a fair question. Would you like to respond or are you holding to the same position? The reason is that certain allegations have been made which I think are fair and serious. The Police, I understand, would like to follow up to check to make sure that they can rectify the situation. So, any leads would be useful without divulging the name of the lady concerned.

Ms Raeesah Khan: Thank you. I would still like for it to remain confidential. Thank you.

Mr Speaker: Minister.

Mr K Shanmugam: Sir, I do not understand this point about confidentiality.

[7656] Okay, pause the video. So, throughout this question, besides the first occasion when she stood up to answer Minister Shanmugam, I would suggest to you that she brought her phone because she was waiting for an answer from you.

[7657] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Oh, Minister, that's a tall ask for me. I would not know why she brought her phone.

[7658] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But it would be a reasonable assumption, right?

[7659] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Why? Can I make an equally reasonable assumption?

[7660] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. Let me suggest this to you: Minister Shanmugam stands up to speak. The issue about, by now, we know it's a lie, has come up —

[7661] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7662] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — so, she's obviously concerned.

[7663] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7664] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She sent the leader of her Party a question as to what she should do, a very direct question.

[7665] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7666] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And she's being pressed to answer several questions?

[7667] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, she has, as I have pressed her before, yes.

[7668] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Both by Minister Shanmugam and by the Speaker?

[7669] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7670] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I suggest to you that she's looking at her phone to see if you would reply and what your direction would be.

[7671] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Why can't she be looking at her phone to look at the statement she has made and to see whether she has already answered the question the Minister has asked her on the phone? We wouldn't know.

[7672] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I can't rule it out.

[7673] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Your guess is as good as mine.

[7674] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But my suggestion would not be an unreasonable one, right?

[7675] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would reject it because we are trying to project our view onto what Raeesah Khan's intentions are.

[7676] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Of course, but I just —

[7677] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't know, I can't —

[7678] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm just asking you to assist this Committee, if you might, to say that taking the phone to the podium in this way, having just sent you a direct question on what to do about the topic that she's currently addressing, would be not an unreasonable view be that she was waiting for an answer from you?

[7679] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think it would be very unreasonable because she knows full well how her Party leader has dealt with her, by pressing her, after she made the initial lie in Parliament, on what to do. I pressed her and pressed her and pressed her until I got the truth out of her.

[7680] And now, you're telling me I'm turning around to say, "Raeesah Khan, you don't know what to do"? She jolly well should know what to do. She has to tell the truth; end of story.

[7681] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, but, nonetheless, she asked you a question?

[7682] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Which I did not see at that time. I actually – do you want to know when I saw it?

[7683] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Obviously, the time of your response would give me an indication.

[7684] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I beg your pardon?

[7685] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The time of your response would give me an indication.

[7686] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you.

[7687] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that was after the entire exchange, right? If you like, I can play out the exchange on video, but I think you —

[7688] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I mean, I think the Hansard is sufficient —

[7689] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — you know how it played out.

[7690] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7691] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, she completed it. At the end of the exchange, she repeated her lies?

[7692] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7693] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Several times?

[7694] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7695] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you will remember that after pressing for details several times, Minister Shanmugam asked for Ms Khan to confirm that everything that she has told us in this House is accurate and that she did accompany such a person and such an incident did happen, and she said, “Yes.”

[7696] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7697] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That would be a bare-faced lie?

[7698] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.

[7699] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you would know that, right?

[7700] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would know that. I had known that by then.

[7701] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And it would be completely at odds with what you had understood she would do if this matter came up in Parliament, right?

[7702] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[7703] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. So, go back to Ms Khan’s bundle.

[7704] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Her WhatsApp messages or the —

[7705] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, the WhatsApp messages. [*A message was referred to.*]

[7706] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[7707] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You wanted to look at your response, right?

[7708] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

- [7709] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, at 12.45 pm, you responded —
- [7710] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [7711] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — “Will speak after Sitting. Keep Chair and I posted”. That was your response?
- [7712] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right.
- [7713] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** By that time, I think you said earlier, you knew that what she had said in August was false?
- [7714] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right.
- [7715] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you also knew that what she had just repeated in Parliament was a reiteration of the falsehoods?
- [7716] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.
- [7717] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What’s worse than lying in Parliament, is repeating the same lie in Parliament two months apart, correct?
- [7718] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Whether it’s two months or one hour, the gravity is the same.
- [7719] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.
- [7720] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You have lied. That should not happen, that should never happen.
- [7721] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, so, it’s worse to have repeated it one hour or two months later, right?
- [7722] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, absolutely.
- [7723] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you must have appreciated that, by that time, this was a far more serious and grave issue, right?
- [7724] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The fact is she had not told the truth.
- [7725] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And continued the lie and repeated it several times —
- [7726] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [7727] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — on 4 October, right?
- [7728] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.
- [7729] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you would have appreciated that there was a far greater, more grave situation?

[7730] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7731] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right?

[7732] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It made it very clear that the decision now was out of her hands, whether she wanted to —

[7733] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We'll come to that.

[7734] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — whether she wanted to —

[7735] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We'll come to that, we'll come to that.

[7736] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Can I finish?

[7737] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I'm asking you for your state of mind then. Once you heard her, she finished around 12.42 pm, take it from me, you would've appreciated that the situation by now at 12.42 pm had become far more grave and serious, correct?

[7738] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The situation was uncorrected and —

[7739] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Answer my question. As I said, please don't paraphrase —

[7740] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Of course. Of course. I mean absolutely, it was terrible.

[7741] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, thank you. So, just answer my question. Don't paraphrase my question. And by that time, you, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap were aware of the falsehoods and, by that time, would have appreciated that what she said in Parliament on 4 October was a repeat of the falsehoods, correct?

[7742] **Mr Pritam Singh:** My answer to both questions is "yes".

[7743] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so, the matter became more grave not only for Ms Khan, but also for the Workers' Party, and, I would say, in particular for you, as the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Workers' Party. Agree?

[7744] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Disagree. The matter became grave to the extent that we have an elected Member of the Parliament of the Workers' Party who is not telling the truth. What are we going to do about it? That's a fair question. I think this is what you're getting at.

[7745] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I'm simply putting to you a simple proposition. A member of the Workers' Party, an elected Member of Parliament, one of the current serving Members of Parliament at that time of Sengkang GRC, one of your colleagues, of which you are the leader of the Party, had repeated the lie?

[7746] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that's factual.

[7747] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And so, it's made it a lot more of a grave situation. We agreed to that earlier.

- [7748] **Mr Pritam Singh:** For herself, yes.
- [7749] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And for the Party?
- [7750] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, I have a view on that. I have a view on that, because —
- [7751] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You agree or disagree? Tell me.
- [7752] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree because —
- [7753] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You disagree? Hang on.
- [7754] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me explain —
- [7755] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No.
- [7756] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You told me just now, if I disagree, I can explain.
- [7757] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, but let me finish my train of thought so that we don't cut across each other.
- [7758] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Go ahead.
- [7759] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, what I understand from you is, on 4 October, you didn't think that the situation for the Workers' Party was grave?
- [7760] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn't say that.
- [7761] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Was the situation for the Workers' Party grave by 4 October?
- [7762] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The situation —
- [7763] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Answer my question. Don't paraphrase it.
- [7764] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.
- [7765] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. So, you see, Mr Singh, don't play with words, okay?
- [7766] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You're asking about the Workers' Party. You switched from Raeesah Khan to Workers' Party. So, you're going to get a different answer from me, whether you like it or not.
- [7767] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, let me read back to you, then.
- [7768] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Go ahead.

[7769] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** “And so, it’s made it a lot more grave situation. We agreed to that earlier.”, “For herself, yes”, “For the party?”, “We have a view on that.”, “You agree or disagree?”, “I disagree.”

[7770] “Let me finish my train of thought. Don’t cut across each other. So, what I understand from you is that on 4 October, you did not think the situation for the Workers’ Party was grave.” And you said: “I didn’t say that.”

[7771] But your earlier answer was: “It’s made it a lot more grave for the Party?” And you said you disagree?

[7772] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7773] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, which is the truth?

[7774] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What are the two propositions again? Put them up again, please.

[7775] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, let’s try again. I think we have your answer on record, but —

[7776] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I think so, too.

[7777] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let’s try again. By 4 October, the situation for the Workers’ Party, having just seen this exchange where Ms Khan repeated her lie, that scenario made the situation a lot more grave for the Workers’ Party. Agree?

[7778] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Disagree.

[7779] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And it would also make the situation a lot more grave for you, as the Leader of the Opposition. Agree?

[7780] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Disagree.

[7781] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And it would make it a lot more grave for you and Ms Lim and Mr Faisal Manap, in particular, because by 4 October, the three of you and no one else, were the only people in Chamber, in Parliament, who were aware that Ms Khan, on 4 October, was repeating her lies and deceiving Parliament?

[7782] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Disagree.

[7783] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Was there anyone else who was aware on 4 October?

[7784] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.

[7785] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In Parliament?

[7786] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.

[7787] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you agree that only the three of you were aware of information that would tell us that what you have just seen – that was repeated by Ms Khan – was a deception on Parliament, right?

[7788] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, only the three of us. Chair, can I please explain my state of mind at this time?

[7789] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish my questions. So, you want to explain why you say that the situation is not more grave for you. Please explain.

[7790] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you. So, as I have alluded to earlier, I believe, the Leader of the Opposition, anyone in Parliament, doesn't take an oath – a Party leader doesn't take an oath on behalf of all his Members of Parliament (MPs). Each MP takes an oath on their own standing, on their own merit.

[7791] In my mind, you are a leader of the Workers' Party. It's not just in your capacity as a member of a GRC. Every Workers' Party MP is a leader. They have to take responsibility and I would like to – I've already mentioned it – I will advance my rules of prudence to the Committee. It's very clear the sort of responsibility that is expected of you. If you honour the oath that you have taken, it is your prerogative to set the record right.

[7792] More specifically, I do not know, at that point, whether Ms Khan told her parents what has happened. Only she knows the truth to that.

[7793] And if I stand up and say, "Ms Khan, you told me that you were suffering from a traumatic episode, you were a victim of sexual assault", without knowing that this information has been communicated to the parents, what have I just done? That's something for Ms Khan to own up to and take responsibility for. That was my thinking.

[7794] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Are you done?

[7795] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm done.

[7796] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** A falsehood has just been repeated in Parliament by one of your members.

[7797] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7798] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Leave aside her responsibility, which I think there can be no doubt and I don't disagree with you on this. As the Leader of the Opposition, you have no duty to correct the falsehood on record?

[7799] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I have a duty to correct the falsehood on record. The question is at what time do I do it, given the unique situation that concerns this falsehood. It's not a falsehood —

[7800] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, Mr Singh, just the day before, you had anticipated, contemplated that this issue would come up.

[7801] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7802] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you were, in your mind, prepared for it to be clarified if it came up, right? We agreed on this.

[7803] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It could have come up, yes.

[7804] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And if it came up, she would clarify and tell the truth, come clean.

[7805] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. That's what I told her to do. I told her to take ownership and responsibility, yes.

[7806] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the very reason why you spoke to her on 3 October is because you contemplated that it would come up on 4 October and she would be prepared to speak on 4 October?

[7807] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7808] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so, all of these about whether she was ready, whether she has told her parents, could not have been on your mind.

[7809] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, absolutely not. It had to be on my mind because that was

[7810] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It could not have been on your mind at that time because by 3 October, you had contemplated it would come up and you were prepared for her to go to Parliament and you said you won't judge her?

[7811] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's your case theory, Mr Tong.

[7812] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I'm putting it to you.

[7813] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree with it.

[7814] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It must have been the case, Mr Singh.

[7815] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It's not.

[7816] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Look, it's logical.

[7817] **Mr Pritam Singh:** To you, it is.

[7818] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You told the press that you had made known to her before the parliamentary Sitting.

[7819] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. How does that contradict anything I have said? I expected her to take ownership and tell the truth. She didn't.

[7820] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And she did not and when she did not, it is not for you now, with respect, to say, "But I thought it's because you did not tell your father yet."

[7821] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Oh, I completely disagree. I don't know how many victims of sexual assaults or sexual crimes you have dealt with, Mr Tong. But I certainly haven't dealt with any.

[7822] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please don't make reference to me in this personal manner.

[7823] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me reply. Because it is your recollection, it is your view.

[7824] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, please don't make a reference to me in a personal manner.

[7825] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I think you're being hyper-sensitive. I am not making any personal reference against you.

[7826] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please do not. Please keep it at a level where we deal with the evidence. Alright?

[7827] **Mr Pritam Singh:** We have been dealing with the evidence.

[7828] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Now, let me suggest to you again. On 3 October, you go and see Ms Khan at her home?

[7829] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7830] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You expect the issue to arise the very next day?

[7831] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It is possible that it would arise.

[7832] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. You expected it. I think of that, there can be no doubt.

[7833] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's your evidence.

[7834] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think we have what you said on record – Mr Lee reminds me. You tell her, "I will not judge you." That statement can only mean, "Whatever you say in Parliament, I will not judge you." You agree?

[7835] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Disagree.

[7836] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You disagree?

[7837] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It was a fragment of a larger statement which you are ignoring, which has to do with taking ownership and responsibility and, in that context, "I will not judge you."

[7838] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, we heard your evidence. So, let's try not to obfuscate, okay?

[7839] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Nobody is obfuscating.

- [7840] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, focus on the evidence and be direct.
- [7841] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I've been focused. I've been direct.
- [7842] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. On 3 October, you contemplated the issue might arise. Fair?
- [7843] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Fair.
- [7844] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And you told her, "I will not judge you". Right?
- [7845] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Fragment of a statement? Yes, I did.
- [7846] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you had expected that, if the issue came up, she would clarify it and tell the truth. Correct?
- [7847] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [7848] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In that context, knowing what we know, can I invite you to look at your answer again?
- [7849] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Where?
- [7850] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The WhatsApp messages. You have it?
- [7851] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I do.
- [7852] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. 12.45 pm.
- [7853] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [7854] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** "Will speak after Sitting. Keep Chair and I posted."
- [7855] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [7856] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In the context of everything that I've told you, Mr Singh, this is a thoroughly underwhelming response by you. Don't you agree?
- [7857] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What am I supposed to say? You seem to know what I would say on WhatsApp.
- [7858] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, I'm looking at it from logic and human behaviour.
- [7859] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [7860] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You are the Leader of the Opposition.
- [7861] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, looking at it from human behaviour, you say?

- [7862] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And logic.
- [7863] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Your logic?
- [7864] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's a matter of logic.
- [7865] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [7866] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You are the Leader of the Opposition.
- [7867] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [7868] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** One of the MPs have come to Parliament to lie. We agreed it's very serious. She lied again, which is even more serious. You have told her, made clear to her that she was going to clarify in Parliament when it comes up. It has come up. She's repeated the lie.
- [7869] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.
- [7870] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And your response is, "Will speak after Sitting. See you later"?
- [7871] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I fully expect her to be in tatters and crying again, like how she was when she told the lie in the first place.
- [7872] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, that's also a speculation on your part.
- [7873] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, the same way you are speculating about human behaviour and logic.
- [7874] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, but the difference between what you are saying and what I'm saying is that at 12.45 pm, you could have asked to see her and decided for yourself whether she was, indeed, in tatters, as you put it.
- [7875] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think I know this lady a little bit better than you, Mr Tong. I know how she reacted after she told the initial lie and so that is my state of mind.
- [7876] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, just answer my question. So, could you, at 12.45 pm, have asked to see her immediately. Yes or no?
- [7877] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think there's a Parliament Sitting.
- [7878] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes or no?
- [7879] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I could have, of course, but I'm Leader of the Opposition. There is a parliamentary session in progress. There are things that are coming up. My mind is on that, too, isn't it?

[7880] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, the reason I put this to you, and I'm not trying to put words in your mouth. Okay? But you must also appreciate that there is a flow and there is a sequence of events.

[7881] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Based on the evidence you have and you are relying on.

[7882] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Which you have told me. I remind you. You told me that you were very clear in your mind that she was to come clean.

[7883] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that was in answer to your questions.

[7884] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. Are you saying it's untrue?

[7885] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What is untrue?

[7886] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Your evidence.

[7887] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Of course not.

[7888] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. Thank you. So, she was to come clean the next time it came up in Parliament, right?

[7889] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She was to take ownership and responsibility for what she had done, yes.

[7890] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, I told you don't paraphrase my —

[7891] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But you said "come clean", and I'm just giving you my answer. If you don't like my answer, I can't help it.

[7892] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Then you say no. Okay?

[7893] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right. I will answer no.

[7894] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, please focus on my questions. Your understanding on 3 October was that if the matter came up, she would stand up in Parliament and clarify the lie. Correct?

[7895] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7896] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you said that, in your mind, there was no doubt that she understood you, right?

[7897] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[7898] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And, so, at 12.30 pm, when Minister Shanmugam stood up to make his Ministerial Statement and seek the clarification, in your mind, there was only one outcome.

[7899] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.

- [7900] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that she would stand up and tell the truth?
- [7901] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.
- [7902] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you saw the exchange.
- [7903] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [7904] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She stood up and she repeated the lie several times.
- [7905] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [7906] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you didn't flinch. You sent a response like this, which is why I put to you it's a thoroughly underwhelming response.
- [7907] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree. I completely disagree.
- [7908] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you had an understanding with Ms Khan that she would have to clarify, speak the truth and not exacerbate the problem, in your words to the press, "not leave", "correct the parliamentary record", "have to be clarified", "cannot leave an untruth on the record".
- [7909] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm, mm-hmm.
- [7910] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If all that is true, Mr Singh, your first response to Ms Khan will not be, "I see you later. Keep Chair and I posted."
- [7911] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong —
- [7912] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes or no?
- [7913] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. This line of questioning, you're fully entitled to make it, of course.
- [7914] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Of course, I am and I will. Stop. At 12.45 pm, could you have asked to see her?
- [7915] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I could have asked to see her at any time.
- [7916] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, thank you. So, the answer is yes, right?
- [7917] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Of course.
- [7918] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** As I've said, please don't answer my question with paraphrasing.
- [7919] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm answering your questions.
- [7920] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It doesn't really help. We've been here for a while.

[7921] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think it helps in putting my perspective across.

[7922] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. You're here to assist us.

[7923] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But I'm not suggesting in any way that I'm not assisting you. I'm giving you my evidence because that's why I'm here.

[7924] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, thank you, thank you.

[7925] So, I'm suggesting to you that there could have been any number of responses by someone in your position on 4 October, having just seen what I played on the video. And those responses would include asking to see Ms Khan immediately to ask her why didn't she comply with your instruction.

[7926] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can't disagree with your hypothesis. There could be a number of responses that could have been forthcoming. But if you remember, you talked about timing of this particular intervention by the Minister for Home Affairs. What was happening after this? We had a major debate to get into the FICA debate. I was speaking on that Bill. Where my mind was? I know that this has to be clarified in Parliament. The lie cannot stand.

[7927] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, let me —

[7928] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And so, there is time for us to resolve that problem. I'll have to speak with her, confirm with her, "Have you actually told your parents? What's the issue?" So, there were a lot of things to do because she did not tell the truth.

[7929] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, let's not quibble with this. We've all been in Parliament, we know.

[7930] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not quibbling.

[7931] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It'll take you all of five minutes to step out, she steps out and asks her directly.

[7932] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Ask her what?

[7933] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** "Why didn't you do what we said we would agree to do?"

[7934] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There's no time to do that.

[7935] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, if your understanding was that she will go and speak the truth and clarify the lie and we had agreed earlier that it has to be done as quickly as possible. Then, surely, you will want to know very quickly why that was not done.

[7936] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, like I mentioned earlier —

[7937] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Say whether you agree or disagree.

[7938] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree and I think I also have already put it on evidence earlier. Maybe you've forgotten.

[7939] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I don't forget.

[7940] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay. I'm sure you don't, which then begs the question: I did say I was not sure whether she had told her parents yet.

[7941] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So —

[7942] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And my suspicion was she hadn't.

[7943] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Stop. So, why didn't you say as well, which you can do by message, "Have you told your parents"?

[7944] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, there are —

[7945] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, answer my question.

[7946] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's not my first question to her, mind you. When I eventually saw her that day —

[7947] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me repeat to you what you said to the press. "Of immediate concern to me was that Ms Raeesah had not previously informed her family members of her sexual assault. It was important that she did so before she could fully address the reasons."

[7948] So, if that was on your mind, and you seemed to tell the press that it was, then I would suggest to you that even if you felt it was so important for you to be in Parliament, sitting in Chamber, which I appreciate, you could, at the very least, have asked her on message, "Have you told your parents? Why didn't you come clean? What are the reasons for you to repeat the lie?"

[7949] **Mr Pritam Singh:** All these questions eventually did come up, but not after this message.

[7950] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I would suggest to you that, on a matter like this, and let's not dice around with words because we all know that —

[7951] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Nobody is dicing with words. I think we are both —

[7952] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Don't interrupt me, don't interrupt me. On a matter like this, and I said "don't dice around with words", we all know how serious it is. Your response is just underwhelming and suggests a very different set of circumstances.

[7953] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I completely disagree.

[7954] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It would make no sense if there was an understanding that Ms Khan would have stood up the moment there was a clarification to tell the truth, agree?

[7955] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Could you repeat that question? You're reading from something. Is this one of the documents?

[7956] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. I'm looking at your message.

[7957] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay. Go ahead. What is the question?

[7958] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Your message would make no sense if there had been an understanding between you and Ms Khan that she would clarify the truth the next time it came up in Parliament.

[7959] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Disagree.

[7960] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you had just spoken with her the day before to contemplate that this will come up?

[7961] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Uh-huh.

[7962] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you tell me this —

[7963] **Mr Pritam Singh:** How is that connected with this WhatsApp message?

[7964] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm looking at your response, because your response surprises me, Mr Singh.

[7965] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, can I be permitted to respond to that? It should not surprise you, because we communicate in many different ways. I know what I told the member Ms Khan on 3 October. She's fully aware of my state of mind insofar as how I expect MPs to deal with the truth. And I am, of course, concerned why she did not tell the truth. And all I'm telling her is, "We will speak after the Sitting."

[7966] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Immediately.

[7967] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay, go ahead. Don't accuse me of interrupting you.

[7968] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Exactly. You said you were very clear; 3 to 7 August, very clear.

[7969] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[7970] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** First October email, very clear.

[7971] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[7972] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Third October, very clear. I asked you whether anything else, you said no – these three occasions. So, very clear in your mind, this was going to happen.

[7973] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[7974] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so, I put it to you that normal human behaviour, if I expect something to happen on a serious matter and it doesn't happen, I would react. I would jump.

[7975] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me suggest to you, if I had put that question you suggested I should put, "Have you told your parents?" would I prefer to have this long story after that on WhatsApp why she didn't tell her parents? Or would I want to tell her, "Meet me in the office, tell me what's going on"? I think the answer is obvious.

[7976] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You're capable of a long story. Look at the bundles next to you. They are all your WhatsApp messages, and of several other people as well.

[7977] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[7978] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, it's not beyond you, Mr Singh, to put in a long story. And I'll show you some long messages that you sent to Ms Khan later on as well.

[7979] **Mr Pritam Singh:** When I was in Parliament, in the context of a Parliamentary Sitting, where I am going to make a speech on a major Bill? I think we know the truth, Mr Tong.

[7980] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I will let the Committee judge.

[7981] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And I hope the Committee takes notes that these points. Were those messages made in the context of a Parliamentary debate that was going to take place?

[7982] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, you can say that, but against this, you must also appreciate that there is a serious matter. There is an expectation on your part, in your view, very clear that she was to come clean, if asked. And that didn't happen. Instead, she repeated it several times, made the lie worse, if anything else. So, I think we will judge, we will judge.

[7983] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I know that even before this sitting took place.

[7984] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** When did you meet with her, then?

[7985] **Mr Pritam Singh:** We met in the LO office that day itself. I'll have to check my messages when we met. I think it was the afternoon, if I remember correctly, but I don't remember what time. I think —

[7986] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** How many times did you meet with her?

[7987] **Mr Pritam Singh:** On 4 October? On the day itself?

[7988] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** After this exchange of messages here, how many times did you meet her?

[7989] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I reckon, I can't remember exactly, but I would believe I definitely spoke to her at least once in the LO office on this matter, in particular.

[7990] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Look at your messages, the same bundle.

- [7991] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [7992] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At 11.14 pm, you said, “Hi, Rae, meet in LO office.”
- [7993] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, where? What page am I looking at?
- [7994] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The same page we were on. I’m still at the same message.
- [7995] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, 11.14. That’s right.
- [7996] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 11.14 pm.
- [7997] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right. That would have been at night after the debate. But I believe we met earlier. It may not have been captured in this message, because I think Ms Lim brought it to my attention. Ms Sylvia Lim.
- [7998] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, did you meet earlier? Yes.
- [7999] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I’ll have to check the facts because I do believe that we met before Parliament adjourned. But it’s not captured in this WhatsApp chat.
- [8000] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.
- [8001] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It was in the afternoon, and I really, I don’t know what other evidence I can bring to bear, but Ms Lim may have a message, asking to meet. I’m not sure.
- [8002] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you can’t tell me now whether you met her once, twice or three times on that day?
- [8003] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Definitely, I met her that day to discuss this matter, but whether it was once or twice, I’m not so sure now.
- [8004] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** When you met with her, did you tell her, “We had an understanding. Why didn’t you come clean?”
- [8005] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.
- [8006] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You didn’t tell her that?
- [8007] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. There was no understanding to – I beg your pardon. There was no understanding in that sense that was an answer – There was an expectation that she should take ownership and responsibility of the issue; that was an understanding, that was the understanding.
- [8008] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, again, don’t dice with words. “Take ownership and responsibility of the issue” can only mean tell the truth.
- [8009] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I’m not denying that.

- [8010] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right.
- [8011] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, yes. Absolutely.
- [8012] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, let's just keep to telling the truth.
- [8013] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely, yes.
- [8014] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, there was an understanding that she would come and tell the truth.
- [8015] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [8016] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, when you met with her, at whatever time it was, and it appears it was at 11.15 pm, at least, on that occasion.
- [8017] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't believe so, Mr Tong. I'm trying to recall, because I'm quite sure we also met earlier.
- [8018] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, you can't recall, but I do have at least all these.
- [8019] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But, definitely, on the face of the messages, yes, after Parliament adjourned.
- [8020] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This, by the way, was not when Parliament adjourned.
- [8021] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What time did it adjourn that day?
- [8022] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We're past this.
- [8023] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.
- [8024] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you like, I can show you the record.
- [8025] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There could have been a break, I don't know, I don't know.
- [8026] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'll show you the video if you'd like, but let me put to you that at 11.15 pm, you did leave Parliament Chamber, I have it on video and Parliament was still going on.
- [8027] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure. But I believe I met up with her earlier, also.
- [8028] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The point is, so much for not stepping out when Parliament is in session, Mr Singh.
- [8029] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I beg your pardon. What's the relevance of this?
- [8030] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So much for not wanting to step out whilst Parliament is in session. Because you left at 11.15 pm, whilst Parliament was in session.

[8031] Mr Pritam Singh: What is, where are you leading with this?

[8032] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: I am putting to you that at 12.45 pm, in answer to my question earlier as to why you couldn't have asked to see her straightaway, you said Parliament was sitting.

[8033] Mr Pritam Singh: Mr Tong, but you conveniently forget that my FICA speech is over. I've already made my speech; my focus is now different.

[8034] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Mr Singh, at 12.45 pm, as we saw earlier, Mr Leong Mun Wai had stood up to make an intervention.

[8035] Mr Pritam Singh: Mm-hm.

[8036] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: It was not the FICA debate.

[8037] Mr Pritam Singh: No, thereafter. I haven't made my speech yet, Mr Tong. I think you are now dicing around the issue.

[8038] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: No, I am not.

[8039] Mr Pritam Singh: You know exactly what is happening and what your state of mind would be when, for example, you have to present a Bill. Of course, your mind is on your Bill. You're moving a Bill in Parliament. You want to focus on that because you know Members are going to ask you questions about it.

[8040] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: So, let me come back to what is germane, okay?

[8041] Mr Pritam Singh: Please do.

[8042] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Did you tell Ms Khan, when you met her that, "We just met yesterday. We spoke. This is what I thought you would do. Why didn't you do it?"

[8043] Mr Pritam Singh: No. Would you like me to tell you what I told her?

[8044] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: No. I would suggest to you that you didn't do that because telling the truth was not your understanding, correct?

[8045] Mr Pritam Singh: Say that again.

[8046] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: For Ms Khan to come to Parliament to tell the truth was not your understanding?

[8047] Mr Pritam Singh: Absolutely disagree.

[8048] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: I thought you would.

[8049] Mr Pritam Singh: Absolutely.

[8050] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, tell me one good reason why, after she stood up and repeated her lies, contrary to what you expected her to do, you did not tell her, when you met her, or ask her why didn't she clarify and tell the truth? Give me one good reason.

[8051] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I will tell you what happened. I will not give you a good reason, I'll tell you exactly what happened, because it's important —

[8052] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh, please answer my question.

[8053] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — what the evidence was.

[8054] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Give me the reason and then you can elaborate.

[8055] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She came to the LO office. She, again, was in a distraught state, and I said, "What have you done?" And then, she looks up at me with this dazed look in her eyes and says, "Perhaps there's another way. That is, to tell the truth." And I looked at her and I said, "But look at the choice you've made. You've made your choice." And then, from that moment — and then, of course, she completely starts to break down. And I said, "Anyway, good. We're going to talk about this", which is, this point she's making about honesty. That was it.

[8056] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, on your own account, she came to you and said, your own words, "And then she looked up at me with this dazed look in her eyes and says, 'Perhaps there's another way. That is, to tell the truth'."

[8057] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8058] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Your evidence, Mr Singh.

[8059] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.

[8060] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You stand by this?

[8061] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I stand by this.

[8062] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** "Perhaps there is another way. That is, to tell the truth".

[8063] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8064] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That means, the other way is to lie?

[8065] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That must have been her thinking of the matter. But I would not come up to this Committee, I have taken an oath to tell the truth. This is what she said.

[8066] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please do, please do.

[8067] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She said that. And that's exactly what she said because I remember it.

[8068] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: So, at the very least, your takeaway from this discussion must be that she's now prepared to tell the truth, even if she wasn't before, right?

[8069] Mr Pritam Singh: She should have been very clear what the truth was, she would have —

[8070] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: No, no. Please answer my question.

[8071] Mr Pritam Singh: I beg your pardon. I apologise. Please repeat the question.

[8072] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: I said, at the very least, based on your account of the conversation, your takeaway must be that, at that stage, she was prepared to tell the truth, even if she wasn't previously, correct?

[8073] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes.

[8074] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Yes. So, did you tell her then, "Let's prepare to tell the truth, the next day, on 5 October, when Parliament was still sitting".

[8075] Mr Pritam Singh: No, I did not.

[8076] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Why not?

[8077] Mr Pritam Singh: My thinking at that time was, she had not cleared this with her parents yet.

[8078] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Did you ask her?

[8079] Mr Pritam Singh: No, I did not ask her. But I was quite sure because, if she had told her parents, she would have just told the truth right there and then.

[8080] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: So, you see, you tell the press that it was of immediate concern to you —

[8081] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes.

[8082] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: — that her father was aware, first?

[8083] Mr Pritam Singh: Sorry, did I tell the press that? That her father —

[8084] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Yes, that "had not previously informed her family members", which includes her father, right?

[8085] Mr Pritam Singh: Of course. And it was clear that she hadn't told.

[8086] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: And she does not come and tell the truth. And she tells you now, on your case, that on that day, "I'm prepared to tell the truth." Why didn't you say, "Come and do it the next day"?

[8087] Mr Pritam Singh: She didn't say, "I'm prepared to tell the truth."

[8088] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: She said, “Perhaps there’s another way. That is, to tell the truth”.

[8089] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes.

[8090] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Yes.

[8091] Mr Pritam Singh: And so, I told her, I said, “Good, let’s talk about this.”

[8092] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: No, you see, again, Mr Singh, you must appreciate what you’ve been saying. Put it together.

[8093] Mr Pritam Singh: I have.

[8094] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: You’ve been concerned that she must tell her family members first before she comes clean in Parliament?

[8095] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes.

[8096] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Right?

[8097] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes.

[8098] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: She doesn’t come clean in Parliament on 4 October.

[8099] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes.

[8100] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: But there’s a Sitting the next day; in fact, just a few hours after you meet with her —

[8101] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes.

[8102] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: — if I believe, the 11.00 pm discussion.

[8103] Mr Pritam Singh: Right.

[8104] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: At that stage, wouldn’t it have been the normal, reasonable and, I would say, proper thing to do, to take steps to have her tell the truth the very next day? Yes or no?

[8105] Mr Pritam Singh: My answer is no, no. And I will explain why, if I may be permitted to.

[8106] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: You can explain but let me finish this line.

[8107] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes.

[8108] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: And if you felt that there was any impediment, such as, in your words, something of immediate concern to you, whether her family members were

aware, the natural thing for you to do on 4 October, when you met her, would be to ask, “Are your family members now aware?” But you didn’t ask.

[8109] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I did not ask, that’s right. And there’s a reason for that. She had two whole months to speak to her family members prior to the Sitting on 4 October. And, in my mind, the only reason why she did not come out with the truth was that she hadn’t closed the loop with them. If she has trouble closing the loop after two whole months, I have no confidence she can settle this issue in one day.

[8110] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** How —

[8111] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me finish. And this session finishes very late at night. We’ve got only the morning the next day to settle the issue with her parents, who, I’m sure, would want to speak to me about it, as they did, and I said, “No, this is something for Raeesah to do.” That happens later. But it’s very clear in my mind because I know that, by then, I would have understood that she actually didn’t tell her parents. She had not confronted her parents with this.

[8112] Let me finish. She had not confronted her parents with the issue and because of that, she does not want to tell the truth. That was the only reason in my mind.

[8113] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, with respect, you see, you were confronting Ms Khan on 4 October. The most important issue for you, a precondition even, for you, for her to come to Parliament to tell the truth, was whether her family members were aware or not.

[8114] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Uh-huh.

[8115] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you had her in front of you and you don’t ask her that question. And yet you come to these proceedings now and you say, “Well, it must have been that her family members were not aware.”

[8116] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s my evidence.

[8117] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But I would suggest to you that that’s quite incredible.

[8118] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is incredible to you, but I, like I said, this is how it happened and I am telling you exactly how it happened.

[8119] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I’m telling you that how this happened is incredible because the only barrier, as you say, to her coming clean in Parliament to tell the truth was whether her family members were aware. You met with her on 4 October. You just heard her —

[8120] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, 3 October.

[8121] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Fourth October.

[8122] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn’t — You are talking about the meeting at the LO office, yes.

- [8123] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. On 4 October, after she had repeated her lies.
- [8124] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Uh-huh.
- [8125] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you don't ask her whether her family is aware?
- [8126] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think I know her family members are not aware.
- [8127] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No.
- [8128] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And events proved me right.
- [8129] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh.
- [8130] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Events proved me right, on 12 October, when I see her for the first time to tell her, after this —
- [8131] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, we will get there. Please, don't interrupt —
- [8132] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, it's important because you're making a case without knowing what had actually happened.
- [8133] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh.
- [8134] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And you can't do that. You can't make a case to me without knowing the whole of what had happened.
- [8135] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, stop. The reason why 12 October is irrelevant for my line of enquiry, let me explain to you —
- [8136] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Please, go ahead.
- [8137] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — is because that was not operative on your state of mind at that occasion on 4 October, okay?
- [8138] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What was not operative?
- [8139] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What you learnt on 12 October cannot be imputed to your state of mind on 4 October.
- [8140] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, that's obvious.
- [8141] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You understand?
- [8142] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [8143] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, on 4 October, let's keep to that, you had not had any other conversation on 12 October yet? Are we clear on that?
- [8144] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's logical.

[8145] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, thank you. On 4 October, you have no direct basis for knowing if your most immediate concern, that is, whether her family was aware, was met or not. Whether they were —

[8146] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think it's a very reasonable inference for me to make.

[8147] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, listen to me.

[8148] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Go ahead.

[8149] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You have no direct evidence of that, agree?

[8150] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Direct evidence? No, absolutely not. Of course not.

[8151] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you.

[8152] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8153] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you had the opportunity to meet with her, maybe once, probably once, twice maybe, to ask her that question and you failed to ask her that question, right?

[8154] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I did not ask her that question, correct. Because I knew what the answer was.

[8155] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me put to you that I think that is just incredible, that the very —

[8156] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me — go ahead.

[8157] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The very reason which you believe stopped her from telling the truth in Parliament, you had her in front of you, you could have easily verified with her if her family was aware. She was telling you now, on your case, "Maybe I should tell the truth." She could have done it "tomorrow", the very next day, on 5 October. And if you had verified that the family was aware, that was certainly possible. And, so, in that context, Mr Singh, I put it to you again, and help me, please, to understand why this played out in the way it did. Why didn't you just ask her a direct question, "Is your family aware?"

[8158] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because — sorry.

[8159] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And if they are, then it clears the hurdles, as far as you say, for her to come clean in Parliament?

[8160] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I had only one reason in my mind why I did not stand up on 4 October beyond —

[8161] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh.

[8162] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, yes, yes, but I'm coming to your point.

- [8163] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That's not my question.
- [8164] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I know.
- [8165] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm focused on your meeting with Ms Khan.
- [8166] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm entitled to put those circumstances. Because you're asking me why I didn't do something. I can't answer a counterfactual. So, you have to understand the circumstances which led me to that point. May I be permitted to proceed, Chairman?
- [8167] **The Chairman:** Yes.
- [8168] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright, please do.
- [8169] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, you are asking me a counterfactual why didn't I do something. And I am suggesting to you that I would have expected her – there was no inhibition for her to just tell the truth if she had already cleared that with her family. The only reason, in my mind, she did not tell the truth on 4 October was because she had not told her family the truth.
- [8170] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But that would have been a supposition on your part on 4 October, right?
- [8171] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It would have been a very reasonable supposition.
- [8172] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But a supposition, right?
- [8173] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, let me suggest something else.
- [8174] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, answer my question, please.
- [8175] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I beg your pardon. Ask your question again.
- [8176] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** A supposition, right?
- [8177] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What was the supposition? I am sorry, I broke your chain of thought, but if you want to look at the record, please put the question to me again.
- [8178] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please don't paraphrase; maybe Mr Chairman can give a direction. Please don't paraphrase my question when you answer it. Because it makes it very difficult for the transcribers and it makes it very difficult to follow the evidence.
- [8179] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I just think it may be difficult for you but I don't think so. But anyway, please ask the question. I have committed to being as cooperative as I can be.
- [8180] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you, and I will try to help you along. You said
—
- [8181] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It's the supposition that you put to me.

[8182] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, you said “that would be a supposition on your part” because you said there would have been no inhibition on her part. “I would have expected her. There was no inhibition for her to tell the truth.” And I said, “But that would be a supposition on your part?” You said, “But a reasonable supposition.” But I said, “A supposition, right?” Your answer?

[8183] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I’ve made it clear. The answer is on record already. It would be a reasonable supposition.

[8184] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The answer is, it is a supposition, right?

[8185] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, yes, based on facts, of what I’ve – what she would be aware of.

[8186] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you would have been very easily able to confirm that supposition one way or another, right? Directly with Ms Khan?

[8187] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Again, it’s a counterfactual, but yes.

[8188] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[8189] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I mean, there could have been a number of things I could have said and done. I mean, we can write a whole list of them out. But my state of mind at that point, as I have already put on evidence, was that she had not told her parents yet, because that would have been the only thing which prevented her from telling the truth in the first place.

[8190] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me go back to her words to you: “Perhaps there is another way. That is, to tell the truth.” Mr Singh, that is very telling as to her state of mind.

[8191] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8192] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right? It’s very telling because if these were her words, and that’s your evidence, she was under an impression, and you might say misapprehension, but she was certainly under an impression that she was not to tell the truth, and that’s why some other way is to tell the truth, right?

[8193] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You can —

[8194] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That’s a reasonable way of interpreting what she said to you, right?

[8195] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, I have another way of interpreting it.

[8196] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh —

[8197] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it’s not. Then, my answer is no.

[8198] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** When she comes to you, she’s just repeated her lie in Parliament, made it worse for herself. She comes to the Leader of the Opposition, the leader of her Party, and says, “Perhaps there is another way. That is, to tell the truth.”

- [8199] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She was — sorry.
- [8200] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish. In that context, Mr Singh, I think one understands now that she was thinking that she was to lie, and perhaps now she's telling you, perhaps one other way, Mr Singh, is to come clean, tell the truth.
- [8201] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me suggest a different —
- [8202] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Correct?
- [8203] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Wrong, no, I say no. Let me suggest another —
- [8204] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But before you do that, and I will let you do that, you stand by this, she said this to you?
- [8205] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, absolutely she did. Because I remember this. She was in a dazed state, she said that, and I think it impressed on her finally, "You are an MP who's taken an oath. You know what's the right thing to do. You've got rules of prudence that have been signed by your Secretary-General on how an MP behaves. You know what your Secretary-General, how your Secretary-General got the truth out of you. You should take ownership and responsibility." And I think she was verbalising what she should have done in the first place.
- [8206] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I know, but you may say that, and we know all these rules of prudence, and I understand what they say. But here we have an episode where, again, in context, okay?
- [8207] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.
- [8208] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Which is important for this tribunal, to look at things in context and to appreciate conduct in the context of when it occurs —
- [8209] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [8210] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — and also to draw inferences from what is done subsequently —
- [8211] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I understand.
- [8212] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. I think, as a lawyer, you understand.
- [8213] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I absolutely understand.
- [8214] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, here is an MP who has told an untruth.
- [8215] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.
- [8216] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You came down hard on her, right? You probed her on 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 August, she confessed to you; 8 August, she told two other senior Party leaders.
- [8217] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8218] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And, in your words, several other occasions – 1 October, 3 October – you made it clear to her.

[8219] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I beg your pardon. First October, it was to all the MPs. It was a general email, yes.

[8220] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, this was, at least, your evidence of her state of mind that she was going to come and tell the truth?

[8221] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would — yes, yes.

[8222] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She goes to Parliament and she's questioned by Minister Shanmugam.

[8223] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8224] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think we all know what that means.

[8225] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. No, what does that mean? It means what it means, that she's being questioned.

[8226] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, that means that MHA is very concerned, it takes it very seriously, wants to get to the bottom of this.

[8227] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Correct.

[8228] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, she then says, "I repeat my lies in Parliament."

[8229] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She doesn't say that.

[8230] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She repeats the lies in Parliament —

[8231] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[8232] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — in front of you?

[8233] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, in front of the whole House.

[8234] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, you and two others in the whole House were the only ones who knew they were lies.

[8235] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right, right.

[8236] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, let's be clear about that.

[8237] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think we know. We have established that already.

[8238] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She then comes to you, you say, in tatters, crying.

[8239] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

- [8240] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And she says —
- [8241] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She was, she was in a daze when she made that remark, “Perhaps there’s another way”.
- [8242] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. But she comes to you. You summoned her, at least based on what we see in this —
- [8243] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.
- [8244] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You summoned her and she says to you, “Perhaps there is another way. That is, to tell the truth.”
- [8245] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She said, “Perhaps there’s another way. That’s honesty.”
- [8246] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, your words. “Perhaps there is another way. That is, to tell the truth.”
- [8247] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think you should look at the first time I delivered my evidence.
- [8248] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This is the first time.
- [8249] **Mr Pritam Singh:** If I’m not wrong and “That is, to tell the truth”. She uses the word “honesty”.
- [8250] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, I asked you several times whether you stand by this; you confirmed. So, I’m reading from your own words, okay?
- [8251] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s fine.
- [8252] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** “Perhaps there is another way. That is, to tell the truth”.
- [8253] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.
- [8254] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, someone coming to you like this in her state of mind, it would be reasonable to suppose that she was not required to tell the truth by you. And now, coming to you and saying, this not working, perhaps there’s another way and let’s now tell the truth, right?
- [8255] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree.
- [8256] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that, in fact, would be entirely consistent with the evidence that Ms Khan gave.
- [8257] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I’m not surprised that she gave that evidence.
- [8258] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, Ms Khan gave evidence that you met her in August, the instruction was to not raise it if not pressed, you met her again —

[8259] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So —

[8260] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish.

[8261] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Please finish.

[8262] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We can get to —

[8263] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Please finish. I stopped myself because I knew I was interrupting you.

[8264] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I will hear you. I will definitely give you an opportunity. But again on 3 December, we heard her evidence. I know you disagree, but her evidence was you told her, “Stick to the narrative” – and I’m paraphrasing – “Stick to the narrative. I won’t judge you.” And her interpretation of that was keep to the lie, you won’t judge her. She goes to Parliament, keeps to the lie, gets questioned repeatedly by Minister Shanmugam, is obviously worried as a result of that, then comes to you and says, “Mr Singh, perhaps there is another way. That is, to tell the truth.”

[8265] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[8266] This is completely consistent with her state of mind as being one where she was not required to tell the truth. But she’s now coming to you on 4 October, in the aftermath of that exchange, and telling you, perhaps this way is not working, let’s find another way, which is to tell the truth. Do you agree?

[8267] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree.

[8268] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You disagree?

[8269] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree. The evidence that I gave of what she told me was what it was. That’s what she said, “Perhaps there’s another way, and that is honesty, to tell the truth.” And you have completely missed out my reaction to that. I was very upset with that, and I said, “But look at the choice you’ve made.”

[8270] And in my point of view, the only reason why she had not told the truth was because she had not squared away the fact that her parents did not know what had happened and, in my point of view, I was actually quite relieved to hear that, to be honest. Because that means she would have had to come out and take that path.

[8271] How she would do it is a different question, but she would have had to make a statement in Parliament. In my assessment?

[8272] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[8273] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think you went down this line to say “Why not the next day?” In my point of view, why not on 5 October? In my view, there was no way, from midnight or thereabouts until the next morning, she would have been able to come up with a statement, closed the issue with her parents and make that personal explanation in Parliament. That’s my

assessment. You can criticise that assessment, you can say it's not logical and so forth, whatever theory you want to advance, but that's my evidence.

[8274] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I'm open to the facts. I want to understand what it is. And I'm putting to you as openly as I can.

[8275] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I understand.

[8276] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I'm surprised when you say, "I was relieved to hear that, because that means she would now have to come out and take that path". "That path" means the path of honesty.

[8277] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because she's already chosen a path that a WP MP should never go on.

[8278] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But why would you be relieved if your understanding just the day before, in fact just minutes before she stood up to speak, was that she would tell the truth anyway? What's there to be relieved about?

[8279] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I am relieved because she's decided not to continue lying and this is the first time I'm hearing from her that, "I'm going down a truthful path."

[8280] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, no. You see, when she comes to you and says to you, "Mr Singh, perhaps there's another way. That is to tell the truth", if that had been, if your understanding was that she was supposed to have done that anyway, a reaction of relief is far from a natural reaction.

[8281] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, you —

[8282] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish, let me finish.

[8283] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You've missed out the earlier thing I said. Okay, but go ahead.

[8284] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If I had understood her to be going to Parliament to clarify it and speak the truth and she doesn't do that, and she comes to you now and says, "Perhaps there's another way", another way, "that is, to tell the truth", my first reaction would not be one of relief, Mr Singh.

[8285] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because you didn't know how —

[8286] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** My first reaction would be one of, "But we had an understanding and I thought we had an understanding. You're going to do that."

[8287] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What I said was, "But you made your choice by what you have said" and that's on the evidence.

[8288] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh. You see —

[8289] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And then later on, I said, “Actually, I’m relieved to hear that because this is the first time I know that you want to own what you’ve done in Parliament, something that you have not done.”

[8290] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** See, if she comes – let’s take your case at face value, what you just said. If she says this to you, there’s another way, tell the truth, you’re relieved, now you —

[8291] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I’m not relieved. You’re putting words – you missed out an important intervention I made.

[8292] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You said “the only reason she had not told the truth was because she hadn’t squared away the fact that her parents didn’t know. I was quite relieved to hear that.”

[8293] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, before that. The first time I raised this anecdote to the Committee as to what happened in my office on 4 October.

[8294] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That’s not — that’s not germane —

[8295] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s too far back. Too difficult to scroll back. No, it’s very germane to it because your line of questioning is in that direction.

[8296] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, focus on my question, okay? You had an understanding with her, at least your understanding, okay?

[8297] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm, thank you.

[8298] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That she would tell the truth, and I asked you earlier, about an hour and a half earlier, whether you were clear, you said “Yes”. “Any doubts?” No doubts, very clear that’s what she was supposed to do. She comes to Parliament and does the complete opposite, which is to lie.

[8299] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[8300] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Later that evening, she comes to you and tells you, “Mr Singh, perhaps there is another way. That is, to tell the truth.”

[8301] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She doesn’t tell that to me directly. She’s in a daze. I don’t know what she’s thinking, but she’s saying that.

[8302] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, please don’t try to qualify the evidence.

[8303] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I did put it on the evidence. No, I’m not qualifying. I beg your pardon. I am not qualifying.

[8304] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You stand by it?

[8305] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I stand by it. She was in a daze, she said that. She did say that. And I’m not withdrawing any bit of the evidence I’ve given.

- [8306] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, let's focus on the words.
- [8307] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Go ahead.
- [8308] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** "Perhaps there's another way. That is, to tell the truth."
- [8309] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, right.
- [8310] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Surely, if you heard that, your immediate reaction would be, "But that's what you were supposed to do, Ms Khan."
- [8311] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And I believe it is on the evidence I said that thereafter, "But look at the choice you've made. You've made your choice", and that was —
- [8312] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you didn't say, no, you didn't say, "You were supposed to do that, Ms Khan."
- [8313] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Look, I can only —
- [8314] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You can look at the evidence.
- [8315] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can only narrate what I remember clearly I said. I mean, if you think I carry a recorder with me, exactly word for word, I don't, but I can only communicate on oath what I shared with her. And —
- [8316] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You can remember what's important and what's material and —
- [8317] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think this is what is material.
- [8318] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — in the context of this episode, what is important and material is that if you genuinely had an understanding with her that she would go and tell the truth, and she didn't tell the truth, and she came to you with a statement like this, "Perhaps there is another way. That is, to tell the truth", it would have been top of your mind to tell her, "But you were supposed to tell the truth.
- [8319] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Again, that —
- [8320] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** "We have discussed that yesterday and I gave you the assurance that I would not judge you." That would have been a natural reaction for someone in your position, agree?
- [8321] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think it's easy to stitch this narrative, given these pieces of evidence. But at that point in time, I have given you the evidence of what happened. And I'm telling you that in my state, in my mind, this lady, Ms Khan, had not squared this issue away with her parents and she would have to —
- [8322] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you didn't ask her that.

[8323] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I knew! Because if she had, there would be no reason why she would continue to lie. That's my evidence.

[8324] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But at the same time, she's also coming to you to say that, on your case, she is now prepared to tell the truth.

[8325] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She's saying – and, yes, I'm relieved about that because this is the first time I hear it from her.

[8326] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, from this statement, there are a couple of options for someone in your position. Let me suggest them to you.

[8327] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Go ahead.

[8328] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Number one would be to say, "Since you're now prepared to tell the truth, the natural supposition is 'I've told my parents'." That's one, which means, your precondition to coming clean is satisfied.

[8329] Number two, "Have you told your parents? If not, tell them now, because what you've just done on 4 October to perpetuate the lie, to repeat it, has made it worse. So, now, time is of the essence." In your words earlier, that decision has been taken out of her hands. Option two.

[8330] Option three is to say, "Your parents may not have been told yet, and you will find that out, but, given what you have done, it is now important to at least clarify the record and go and tell Mr Speaker or, perhaps, in Parliament, that that anecdote was false, and you can leave the explanation concerning the sexual assault aside."

[8331] There could have been any of these options, agree?

[8332] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Disagree.

[8333] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** These options are possible, right?

[8334] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Anything is possible.

[8335] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, please don't be —

[8336] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm answering the question. Tell me where I don't answer you.

[8337] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Answer my question. These three options, at least, would have been possible options, right?

[8338] **Mr Pritam Singh:** To the extent that anything would have been possible, yes.

[8339] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, these are all reasonably possible options.

[8340] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not in this particular context, not in this episode. That's my evidence. I mean you may not accept it, but that's my evidence.

[8341] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If your interest is to be open, transparent, come clean, honest, then these would have been options you would reasonably consider?

[8342] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, and the very fact that I was relieved to some extent—

[8343] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, wait, yes or no, answer my question.

[8344] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, what is your question? Is it about the three options?

[8345] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. I said if your intention is to be open, transparent, come clean, honest, then these would have been options that you would reasonably consider, correct? You said “yes” —

[8346] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, no.

[8347] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — on the record.

[8348] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Put the question to me again, I will correct the record.

[8349] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, you said “Yes, and the very fact that I was relieved” —

[8350] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Put it again, I will correct the record.

[8351] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I said if your intention is to be open, transparent, come clean, honest, then these would have been options that you would reasonably consider.

[8352] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And I said to the extent that anything is possible, those would be reasonable. I mean, you can —

[8353] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Those are reasonable options to consider, right, Mr Singh?

[8354] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, if you divorce my position, if you ask me on hindsight would that have been possible, I would say anything would have been possible, but I can only come back to the point —

[8355] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, it’s not helpful to say anything is possible, and I think you know that.

[8356] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I’m giving you the evidence, Mr Tong, and I’m going to give the evidence which I believe is the evidence that is accurate.

[8357] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, answer my questions, okay? Don’t give the evidence that anything is possible, because I think you’d appreciate that’s just being unhelpful.

[8358] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I believe I’ve given the context as to why I believed she had not told her parents yet. That was my conclusion. I made that conclusion. If you are quibbling with the fact that I should not have made that conclusion —

- [8359] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, no, Mr Singh —
- [8360] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — that is entirely your evidence, not mine.
- [8361] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — you heard my options.
- [8362] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [8363] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** My options include the possibility that she has not yet told her parents.
- [8364] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sir, those are your options, not mine.
- [8365] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, but they include the possibility that she has not told her parents, right?
- [8366] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely, yes.
- [8367] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, they take into account the concerns that you have, and I'm saying that even with those concerns that you have, it would have been possible to take one of those options, and the truth would have come out earlier in Parliament. Agree?
- [8368] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Disagree. The option, as far as I was concerned, by the evidence that she gave, what she said at the LO's office, was there's another path, perhaps there's another path to tell the truth – honesty. And the way I read it was, "Okay, you're going to have to prepare a personal statement. You're going to have to put the record right in Parliament." That's all I took from it.
- [8369] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, we know what happened later, but —
- [8370] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And, of course, my view was "I cannot understand why you've let this drag. I've given you fair warning that something may come out. I've told you also to take ownership and responsibility."
- [8371] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, stop, because this was not what you said you said to her that night.
- [8372] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What do you mean?
- [8373] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Fair warning.
- [8374] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I'm not saying I said that to her on 3 October.
- [8375] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let's be clear.
- [8376] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let's make that evidence clear. I did not say that.
- [8377] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The last part of what you said, you didn't say it to her on that night.

[8378] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely, not on that night. Absolutely. I think we can have that on record. I'm talking about 3 October, when I see her at her house, I tell her "You have to take ownership and responsibility for what you've done."

[8379] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And "ownership and responsibility" means tell the truth?

[8380] **Mr Pritam Singh:** To tell the truth. Absolutely. Exactly. And, thereafter, then, on 4 October, she says in a dazed sort of state, perhaps there's another way, and that is honesty.

[8381] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, but you see —

[8382] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And I agree with that because that's the only way, it's not another way. If you take into account my behaviour towards her, if you take into account how WP MPs are expected to tell the truth in Parliament, there was only one way.

[8383] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you said she came to you — I'm reading from your evidence, page 124, line 7 —

[8384] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't have that in front of me.

[8385] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That's why I'm reading it to you. "As far as I was concerned, by the evidence that she gave, what she said at the LO's office was there's another path, perhaps there's another path to tell the truth — honesty."

[8386] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8387] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, why would she think that telling the truth was another path?

[8388] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You have to ask her. I actually —

[8389] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm asking you because you have developed a very clear understanding with her.

[8390] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8391] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But she's coming to you, after she has told a lie, to come and tell you that another path is to tell the truth —

[8392] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Perhaps, it is because —

[8393] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — which means that the path she was on was not to tell the truth, right? Yes or no?

[8394] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, because it all starts from the very first SMS she sends and what her state of mind is, but the SMS I did not see until the interim report came out, that there is this narrative to take a lie to the grave, something which was never brought to my attention by Loh Pei Ying and Mr Yudhishtira Nathan, something that, if was sent to Sylvia or Faisal, was also never brought to my attention, and I think she is labouring under that state of mind.

- [8395] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, I think now you are speculating.
- [8396] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I'm telling you what I am saying. I mean, you've asked me speculative questions, what could have happened, what was suggested, so, I think I'm entitled to tell you what I think is the state of affairs here.
- [8397] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, let me take you on your last evidence.
- [8398] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [8399] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You think that this was a very elaborate plan, beginning from 8 August, when Ms Khan sent that message to Mr Nathan and Ms Loh in contemplation of the day when she would have been expelled or sacked from the party —
- [8400] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's not my evidence.
- [8401] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — facing proceedings, and then be able to use that evidence that she so carefully put in place in August to come and say, that was her state of mind. Is that your evidence?
- [8402] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, that's not my evidence.
- [8403] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because it can't be, right?
- [8404] **Mr Pritam Singh:** My evidence very simply is, if we're talking about country over party, I would have fully expected that SMS to be given to me, or, if for some reason you are uncomfortable with me, go to the CEC with it, you are two senior cadre members, tell the CEC "We've got a rogue secretary-general who is telling us, lie, who's telling our MP to lie."
- [8405] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Oh, okay.
- [8406] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's what I believe they should have done, but that did not come to me at all. I did not even know of it.
- [8407] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, we will get there, and I will —
- [8408] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And this is important because of the point you are making of her state of mind — "perhaps there's another way, the truth". We have to interrogate what was her takeaway from the meeting of the 8th.
- [8409] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We did, and I put it to you.
- [8410] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, put it to me.
- [8411] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you see, Mr Singh, what the senior cadre members, as you call them, thought and said to you, both when you were a member of the DP and —
- [8412] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Member of what, sorry?

[8413] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Of the Disciplinary Panel.

[8414] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[8415] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — and privately in messages to you, we will get to, we will see what they said.

[8416] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, absolutely.

[8417] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But I'm back to where we are on 4 October or the meeting you had at the LO's office.

[8418] One reason why she said the words “perhaps there's another way, that is, to tell the truth”, would be she was on a different path, a path of continuing with the falsehood or, in her words, continuing with her narrative. But now that she's been questioned quite robustly by the Minister, she is now coming to you and saying that path isn't working, perhaps there's another way. It's a fair supposition?

[8419] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It's a fair supposition, but it has to presuppose —

[8420] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On her part.

[8421] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — on her part, who put her on that path.

[8422] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Fair supposition on her part?

[8423] **Mr Pritam Singh:** On her part, given what she has said – what she has said, not what I have said.

[8424] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, what she has said.

[8425] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I cannot speak for her, but if she says “No, I was told to continue a narrative to lie”, “No”, on 3 October, “I will not judge you”, that the party had given her some direction to take this lie to the grave, I mean, that's her supposition.

[8426] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, but you see —

[8427] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Whether it's fair, oh, good god!

[8428] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, we'll make a judgement on that, and I'm asking you to help us make a judgement on that, alright? And I can tell you there's an open mind on this. What troubles me, and to be very open with —

[8429] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Go ahead.

[8430] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — what's on my mind is that everything that we have seen, if you believe Ms Khan's account from August through to 3 October, and now, this evening, in your office, at the LO's office, where she says “perhaps there's another way”, if you believe Ms Khan's account and take Ms Khan's account at face value, everything that has happened is consistent with that account. Would you not agree?

- [8431] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree.
- [8432] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Why would you disagree? Because if she's been told to take it to the grave, not say anything, don't raise it if not asked, isn't that what happened?
- [8433] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What about what I told her on 3 October, to take ownership and responsibility?
- [8434] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, and you also said you will not judge her.
- [8435] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, "If you take ownership and responsibility, you won't be judged if you take responsibility and ownership".
- [8436] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, I showed you her account and her takeaway of that meeting. So, I'm saying to you, take it on her account.
- [8437] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can't take it on her account because her account is not truthful.
- [8438] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I'm asking you to help us, because we have to make —
- [8439] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can't help you there. I'm so sorry, Mr Tong, I cannot help you explain what Ms Khan's state of mind was.
- [8440] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, it's a reasonable —
- [8441] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Please put it to me. I'll try and answer it if I can.
- [8442] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, we take Ms Khan's account as the parameters. I know you don't agree with it, on that caveat, okay?
- [8443] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [8444] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You disagree with it?
- [8445] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [8446] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I think you will say you disagree with it vehemently. Fine.
- [8447] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [8448] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But on that caveat, on her account, now, you look at the events that took place over the last three months, beginning from August all the way through to 1 November.
- [8449] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [8450] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Just take that period.

- [8451] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.
- [8452] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She says she was told to bury it, take the information to the grave. I know you disagree, but she says that. Right?
- [8453] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. And she didn't share this with anyone, at least the leadership.
- [8454] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Fair enough, I have no reason to —
- [8455] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Neither did Yudhish and Pei Ying.
- [8456] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At this point in time, I have no reason to disagree with that. On 3 October, there was another meeting with you. We've also seen her account.
- [8457] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [8458] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Her account was that she was told by you to continue with the narrative in August and you won't judge her.
- [8459] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's her account.
- [8460] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That's her account. So, I'm asking you to take her account at face value. Based on this account, what happened in the last three months leading up to this occasion was consistent, isn't it?
- [8461] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it is inconsistent, and I'll explain why.
- [8462] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It must be consistent because if she was told – if, indeed, she was told on 8 August to take the information to the grave and not clarify it if not pressed, it explains why there's just been no activity about clarifying it all the way through August and September, all the way until 1 October, an email by you to the whole party, and 3 October, this —
- [8463] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not to the whole party.
- [8464] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** To all your MPs.
- [8465] **Mr Pritam Singh:** MPs.
- [8466] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — 3 October to when you met with her at her home.
- [8467] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree.
- [8468] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** All of what she did or didn't do would be consistent with that.
- [8469] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it would not be, because there would have been —
- [8470] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'll let you explain later —

- [8471] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, go ahead.
- [8472] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Follow my train of thought.
- [8473] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I apologise if I cut you off.
- [8474] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And what she said in Parliament would also be consistent with that narrative, with her account?
- [8475] **Mr Pritam Singh:** With when she said when?
- [8476] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In Parliament, on 4 October.
- [8477] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.
- [8478] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She – you saw the exchange earlier – continued with the narrative, that is, kept up with the lie that she told in August that there was such a case, there was such an incident in the Police station. And she continued with that.
- [8479] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.
- [8480] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, I'm saying to you that just taking her account at face value, would you not accept that everything that has happened is completely consistent with her accounts on 8 August and on 3 October as to what you and, in the case of 8 August, together with Ms Lim and Mr Faisal Manap, and on 3 October with you alone, is completely consistent with her account of what happened, right?
- [8481] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'll answer this question. I'm not going to – It's a qualified yes. It's a qualified yes, because that account starts from a reading of and understanding a highly untruthful understanding of the meeting of 8 August, that there's a narrative to be told and that there is a lie that has to be taken to the grave. When you start with that presupposition and you don't clarify it at any point within two months to the leadership, or to me, or to anyone, I mean you've got your own GRC MPs, there are so many people that you can speak to and say, "Look, I'm being told to cover this lie, I can't deal with it. I have to tell someone." Nothing of this sort happens.
- [8482] I would suggest it never happened because that was never, never communicated to her.
- [8483] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.
- [8484] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And so, if you follow a flawed – I'm not saying this is your analysis and that is flawed – but if you follow a flawed reading of her interpretation as to what transpired up to 1 November, then there's nothing for me to clarify or to even suggest. Because, to me, you've been told very clearly something can come up, you are aware of our code, you are aware of our rules of prudence, you know what an MP is supposed to do, you know what behaviour your Secretary-General (SG) displays towards you, at least, when you were pressed for the truth and your conclusion is "I'm supposed to continue a lie"? I think that's highly doubtful and ridiculous.

[8485] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, I understand. You said yes to my question earlier and —

[8486] **Mr Pritam Singh:** A qualified yes.

[8487] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — you said a qualified yes. And you have now explained why you qualified it.

[8488] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8489] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you are saying the qualification rests with her misapprehension of what happened on 8 August?

[8490] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not misapprehension. Her total untruth of what happened on 8 August.

[8491] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if I were to say to you, assume for the moment, that her account is true.

[8492] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can't do it, I can't even do that. I'm so sorry. I can't help you. I can't even do that.

[8493] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You would agree that if we assume her account was true, that would remove the qualification, right, if you assume?

[8494] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I know where you're going with this.

[8495] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Help us with it, because —

[8496] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think you can help yourself with it. Because I think you've already dealt with it in some way.

[8497] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, I —

[8498] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not playing the fool here. Don't get me wrong. But if you're asking me to confirm a supposition, a train of thought that Ms Khan has which I know to be untrue, I can't agree with it.

[8499] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Stop, Mr Singh. I'm not asking you to confirm a supposition. I'm asking you to assume that her account is true.

[8500] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I cannot even do that. I cannot even make that assumption because I know for a fact it's not true.

[8501] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. But if you assume it is true —

[8502] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not going to do that, Mr Tong. I apologise. Mr Chair, in this part of the inquiry —

[8503] **The Chairman:** From my perspective, we are trying to understand a few different narratives, one of which you are sharing from your perspective, your evidence as to what has happened, and that's one account. We have heard from Ms Raeesah Khan and a few of her associates, and some of the messages were shared contemporaneously as things evolved. And that's another possible narrative which you believe is untrue.

[8504] So, we need to look at the whole train of events as it evolved and to ascertain which may make sense, which doesn't make sense. I think that's the premise on which Minister Tong is asking.

[8505] **Mr Pritam Singh:** With respect, Chair, Mr Tong is asking me to assume an assumption or make an assumption, and I can't make an assumption based on facts I know are not true.

[8506] **The Chairman:** But if we assume that that particular recount is true and that whole series of different events or things that didn't take place, took place, would that be a reasonable way to assess that whole chain of events, as an assumption? And I can accept, and you've registered the point, that you do not believe that to be true.

[8507] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I know that to be untrue.

[8508] **The Chairman:** But, if, from our perspective, we are trying to ascertain what exactly happened, we have a few different narratives evolving, we are trying to ascertain which seems to make sense, which seems to be true. And if this holds true and if this account is accurate, then would all this series of events kind of make sense? Is it logical? Then, there will be another version which is, for example, as you shared as what you believe is true. And that would be one train of events.

[8509] So, we are trying to understand, if, indeed, this is so, would all these things be consistent and would it make sense or would it not make sense? Would your version of it, therefore, also make sense or not make sense? And that's where we are. It is to help us understand which line would seem credible. That's where we are trying to understand that.

[8510] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[8511] **The Chairman:** So, that question on the assumption is really on that basis. But we fully accept what you've said, which is, as far as you are concerned, it's untrue. But what Minister Tong is asking is, if, from our perspective, assume that what she said and believed to have interpreted was true, would these train of events seem to make sense, which you said "a qualified yes". So, let's get back to that and pursue that.

[8512] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, please answer the question.

[8513] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, go ahead.

[8514] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On the assumption that Ms Khan's account is true, would you agree that the steps that – and her account on 3 October as well as 8 August are true – would you agree that the events that took place or didn't take place, as the case may be, leading up to 4 October, it would be completely consistent with her account?

[8515] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would say no.

[8516] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It would be completely consistent because the information was not brought up. So, the rest of August we didn't hear anything. In September, we didn't hear anything. There's no discussion. And it might come up again on 4 October. So, you went to see her on 3 October. Remember, Ms Khan's account was, "If not pressed, don't have to clarify." So, now you thought, on 3 October, maybe she might be pressed, so, it's time to revisit the issue.

[8517] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me –

[8518] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Hold on.

[8519] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry.

[8520] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And then she goes to Parliament and she continues the narrative, which is her account on 8 August, and she tells a lie, several lies. And then she comes to your office and says, "Perhaps, there is another way" – "another path", as you put it – "That is, to tell the truth".

[8521] So, explain to me, in the context of this, why you would disagree that on the assumption that Ms Khan's versions are correct, why you would disagree that everything that's happened is completely consistent?

[8522] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would disagree, Mr Tong, because if, indeed, we assume from 8 August that there is a narrative to lie, I wouldn't see her on 3 October, would I? Because it's already been established and that's why I disagree. There would have been no reason to see her on 3 October.

[8523] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I will suggest to you, based on her narrative, that you saw her on 3 October and you wanted to, first of all, share with her your contemplation that the issue might arise, which we've gone through earlier; and, secondly, you chose your words carefully on that occasion, you said, "I won't judge you."

[8524] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Don't forget what I said. That's a fragment of the main thrust of what I was driving at. You have – please go ahead.

[8525] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, we heard your evidence earlier, and I will take it at face value. You said, "I won't judge you" after a series of other messages to her.

[8526] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, no. Not messages. I said something before I said "I won't judge you".

[8527] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, whatever you conveyed to her but we have also heard her version of this.

[8528] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[8529] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'll put to you this. That in concluding with the phrase "I won't judge you", that phrase is an equivocal phrase. Agree?

- [8530] **Mr Pritam Singh:** If seen as a fragment, yes.
- [8531] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And if you had wanted to convey to her that there's no doubt that if it comes up, you will tell the truth, you could have said so in very clear terms?
- [8532] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I believe I was quite clear with her.
- [8533] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You could have said so in clear, direct terms and probably even in writing, to make sure there was absolutely no doubt about it, right?
- [8534] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Like I said, this is similar to your line of questioning in other cases. There are a number of things I could have done but these are all counterfactuals.
- [8535] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I am putting it to you. We have to understand why it was not done because —
- [8536] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It was because the verbal message that was communicated to her, in my mind, was very clear. And let me put into context “I will not judge you”.
- [8537] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, you are capable of being a lot clearer and a lot more forceful in your communication.
- [8538] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, absolutely.
- [8539] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I believe that if you had wanted to leave her in no doubt that she was to tell the truth the very next day, you would have been perfectly able to make that absolutely clear.
- [8540] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would have, I thought that it was very clear what she had to do. You are a Workers' Party MP. We have struggled to get here, where we are, and are we going to throw this all away because of this?
- [8541] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, you could have —
- [8542] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And so — sorry, go ahead.
- [8543] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I wasn't going to cut you off, I'm sorry. Please go ahead.
- [8544] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, in my mind, it was crystal clear, “Take ownership, take responsibility.” What does that mean? Is this another one of those “I don't know what ‘substantiate’ means”?
- [8545] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, no. You see, (a) the words chosen could have been clearer, much clearer; (b) it could have been in writing. And you've had no qualms giving her instructions on how she frames her Parliamentary Questions (PQs) and supplementary questions (SQs) in writing. You sent her messages on that, right?
- [8546] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, her PQs and SQs?

[8547] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Parliamentary questions and supplementary questions.

[8548] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Context?

[8549] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Have you not done so?

[8550] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I mean, I could have, but in what context are you referring to PQs and SQs?

[8551] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I thought this is a point you would easily agree to. You would have written to her.

[8552] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. Certainly, Mr Tong, I would have —

[8553] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish.

[8554] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, go ahead.

[8555] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You had, on previous occasions, given her guidance on how she frames her Parliamentary Questions and her Parliamentary responses, right?

[8556] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would have, I am sure there have been Parliamentary Questions which I thought she had put which were ridiculous and she had to put them, make sure she knows what she was talking about. I'm sure I would have done that. I had done that.

[8557] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you would have had no difficulty writing to her, putting your position down in writing, giving her a clear direction for something like a Parliamentary Question?

[8558] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8559] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, I'm suggesting to you that, in this case, all the more so, when a falsehood has been said, you felt it was going to come up, she would have to deal with it, take ownership, like you said, clarify it, be truthful —

[8560] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Take responsibility.

[8561] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — say something in Parliament that will absolve her of what has happened, take ownership and responsibility, as you say, and it was a very clear and deliberate intention on your part to reinforce that, first, on 1 October in your general email, and again on 3 October, when you made an attempt to go to her home to do it. Surely, putting it down in writing, to leave no room for doubt, would have been quite easy, right?

[8562] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I disagree. So, my answer is no. I'm going to meet her and rather than talk about it on WhatsApp, I find it sufficiently important to go and meet her to tell her to take ownership and responsibility. So, I would disagree.

[8563] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, in the context of the severity of the matter, the importance of the matter, this is not an SQ, this is not a speech you might make at an event,

this is not even a speech that you might make on a Bill or a Motion. And that's important. This is a clarification of a lie that has been said by a seating Member of Parliament in Parliament. And, at that point in time, on the record for something close to two months. It's a serious matter, right, Mr Singh?

[8564] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, absolutely.

[8565] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And if my intention, as a leader of the Party, was to ensure that my MP, in the words that you've chosen, in your press conference, "for her to take responsibility is for her to do so, for her to own up because she has the facts and I don't", as you put it, then, surely, that point must be absolutely clear and reinforced. And one way of doing it, I'm suggesting to you, is make sure it's in writing, right?

[8566] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think a more direct way to do it would be to tell it to her in her face, which is what I did.

[8567] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you chose words which —

[8568] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think were crystal clear. Sorry?

[8569] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — could lead to doubt and interpretation, and, at least in this case, it was read by Ms Khan differently from you?

[8570] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Unfortunately, yes. But I believe if you labour under the presumption that your leadership is telling you to take a lie to the grave, I can see why she read it that way.

[8571] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But I also suggest to you that you know what she told you after she told the lies in Parliament on 4 October, "Perhaps, there is another way", in her words —

[8572] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think that's a mea culpa on her part.

[8573] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — "That is, to tell the truth", I think it's very suggestive of what her frame of mind was when she was in Parliament, when she was on the other path, which is the path of continuing with the narrative to keep up with the lie she told in August, wouldn't you agree?

[8574] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can't do anything about that, Mr Tong, what words she said when she narrated her state of mind to me on 4 October. And I cannot assure you that that means she was definitely on a path to continue a narrative, tell a lie. I can't make a comment on that because this is what she told me. And, as far as I was concerned, "Look, it's quite obvious what you should be doing" and the fact that we are even quibbling about what you should be doing, to me, it's absolutely ridiculous.

[8575] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Going back to my point earlier about how the events which unfolded is consistent, completely consistent with her accounts of what happened —

[8576] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[8577] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — even your reaction, you didn't tell her immediately that it's inconsistent with what she had agreed to; in fact, you did not do that. You didn't check —

[8578] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, agreed to what?

[8579] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On 4 October.

[8580] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[8581] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Your immediate reaction when you respond to her message, "What should I do Pritam?", "Will speak after Sitting. Keep Chair and I posted", yes, I take your point. You have a debate coming up, but you also have a very important issue that has just become worse.

[8582] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I agree.

[8583] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And your response, as I said earlier, was somewhat underwhelming.

[8584] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, when you have —

[8585] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Underwhelming if we believe that there was a pre-existing agreement, intention, for her to tell the truth. It is underwhelming in that context. But completely consistent with an understanding that, in fact, she was to continue with the lie. And now that she has been found out, now that the Police have told her and now you know, in Parliament, that they would continue with the investigations, it is then appropriate to speak about this now and discuss the next steps. Wouldn't you agree?

[8586] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I do apologise. You'll have to put that question to me again. I'm so sorry. It was a long question and I need you to put it again.

[8587] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's a long question because I wanted to explain the context so that you know clearly where I'm coming from, okay?

[8588] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[8589] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I was focused on your response and I said that your response was underwhelming.

[8590] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[8591] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I put it to you earlier. I think you disagreed.

[8592] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[8593] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But I'm now also saying to you that it's underwhelming only if we believe that there was a pre-existing agreement or intention for her to come to Parliament to tell the truth. Do you understand me so far? Because if she wants to tell the truth, such a response, in my view, would be underwhelming. But —

[8594] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She was —

[8595] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish. But if there was no such intention and, in fact, her account is the correct one — that she was required or told by her senior Party leadership to continue the narrative, to continue the lie — then, in Parliament, was further told that the Police would now step up and carry on with an investigation and interview her. Then, in that context, I can understand why you might send a response like this.

[8596] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. Mr Tong, I understand —

[8597] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And my —

[8598] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, go ahead.

[8599] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And my proposition to you is: wouldn't you agree it's completely consistent with that?

[8600] Now that you know that “carry on with the lie” will probably not work because MHA is going to get the Police to interview Ms Khan, now let's discuss, “Will speak after Sitting. Keep Chair and I posted”. And the first words to you were, “Perhaps there's another way. That is, to tell the truth”.

[8601] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree.

[8602] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It coheres together, Mr Singh.

[8603] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it does not and I will explain why. I think I've already put it in evidence. But you say my response is underwhelming. I take a very different view. I think there is a very clear choice that she has made and this is going to lead her down definitely a very negative path, she made that choice. And there's really nothing else for me to say. You have dug your own grave already by not telling the truth. And so, that is the context of “Will speak after Sitting”. I think it's quite clear that you have basically destroyed your own political career. At least if you tell the truth, you can recover. But if you don't tell the truth, what more is there for me to say?

[8604] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Prior to the Sitting on 4 October, let's get this clear, it was in your contemplation, in fact, very clear, no doubt about it, that if the matter came up in Parliament, she would make a statement to clarify the truth, correct?

[8605] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She would take responsibility and ownership, yes. And that means clarifying the truth, yes.

[8606] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Come to Parliament, come clean, make a statement, tell the truth, confess to the lie and explain, right?

[8607] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[8608] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, prior to 4 October, did you keep your CEC informed that this might happen?

- [8609] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I did not.
- [8610] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And get their approval and consensus?
- [8611] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Consensus for?
- [8612] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, consensus for the fact that one of your sitting Members of Parliament would be coming to confess to a grave infraction and to get clearance for what she will be saying.
- [8613] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I do that when she confirms she's going to make that —
- [8614] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh.
- [8615] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I did not.
- [8616] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, yes or no? No, right? Okay.
- [8617] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I did not, I did not ask my CEC, no. I asked later.
- [8618] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you stepped into Parliament on 4 October —
- [8619] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [8620] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — with a very clear contemplation that this might come up, and, if so, she will make a statement, right?
- [8621] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And she would tell the truth.
- [8622] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.
- [8623] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [8624] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you didn't tell the CEC before that?
- [8625] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, because I didn't know what she was going to say.
- [8626] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me ask you whether you even asked her for a draft of what she was going to say.
- [8627] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, because, you see, the —
- [8628] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes or no?
- [8629] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I didn't, because I didn't even know that it was going to come up. It was just my speculation that the issue may come up.
- [8630] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, but it was a very — I mean, you might call it clairvoyant or prescient — but whatever it is, it was in your mind that it was likely to come up?

[8631] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It was possible. Certainly, it was possible.

[8632] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And we were told that the Workers' Party has an established pre-Parliamentary process of looking at speeches, of each other's speeches ahead of time?

[8633] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[8634] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if you have that process and if you have an expectation or at least a sense that this was going to come up on 4 October —

[8635] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8636] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — on a matter as serious as this, surely, you would have asked to see at least an outline speech, if not the full speech, of what she was going to be saying?

[8637] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, this process that we have is for speeches that you make in the course of Bills that are about to be coming up for Second Reading.

[8638] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, and I would say all the more so, a speech that you would make in confession of a falsehood that you spoke in Parliament. If you vet —

[8639] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I understand where you're going.

[8640] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — if you vet speeches to support Bills or oppose Bills, that's important. But what's more important is for you, as the Secretary-General of the Party, to be aware of what your Member of Parliament is going to be saying when she confesses to a very serious infraction, right?

[8641] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree and I will explain. She is not only going to confess to a serious issue she's lied in Parliament; she's also going to confess some very deep, personal details of hers which led her to commit that lie in the first place.

[8642] And so, in my mind, this is something for her to take ownership and responsibility for, and she should state the truth in Parliament.

[8643] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, can we seriously believe that you would have been prepared to let Ms Khan come to Parliament on an occasion when you anticipated that the issue might arise, explain that she told a lie, and clarify this, without you knowing in advance what she was going to say?

[8644] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She already told me what happened. She already told me what the circumstances were which led her to lie in the first place. She was suffering from a traumatic episode that came up, which resulted in her putting that anecdote in her speech. I expected her just to say that. That's the truth. Just come out and tell the truth.

[8645] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, I think your explanation might have been okay on its own if it is just October we are talking about. But we now know what happened in the lead-up to 1 November, when she did, in fact, come and make an explanation.

[8646] In the lead-up to the explanation on 1 November, and you can confirm if I'm right or wrong, the CEC was informed ahead of time, correct?

[8647] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The CEC? I called for a —

[8648] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes or no; just yes or no.

[8649] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, the CEC was informed.

[8650] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you. The CEC heard a draft of what she was going to explain on 1 November, correct?

[8651] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right and they were free to ask her questions about anything.

[8652] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. You had, yourself, given comments and edited the draft, correct?

[8653] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I did not edit the draft. I gave comments to it. It was important for her to take ownership of the draft. She put it together; I believe, Pei Ying and Yudhish may have helped her.

[8654] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Ms Sylvia Lim was also involved in giving comments on the draft, right?

[8655] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right, Ms Lim was also involved.

[8656] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you had several meetings, including at Party HQ on the draft, correct?

[8657] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I have to recall where, but we had several meetings, that is correct.

[8658] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I can show you later, but you had several meetings.

[8659] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, I will not dispute that.

[8660] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Some at your home, some at Party headquarters, right?

[8661] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[8662] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In addition to all of these, you also appreciated the fall-out that could happen if she, Ms Khan, came to Parliament to confess to a lie. And apart from clearing with your CEC, looking at the draft, you also ensured that there were activists and volunteers who would pick up on Ms Khan's social media handles, right?

[8663] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't understand your question.

[8664] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** My question is a simple one. You know that the news would be big news?

- [8665] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Of course.
- [8666] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you expected there to be some adverse fall-out?
- [8667] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There would be a lot of fall-out.
- [8668] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Especially in Sengkang and particularly in Compassvale, right?
- [8669] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [8670] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so, prior to 1 November, you discussed with Mr Nathan and Ms Loh steps to be taken to answer her emails, how to explain to constituents, how to deal with social media?
- [8671] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, I did not do that. Ms Loh – I can't remember which one of them, either Ms Loh or Mr –
- [8672] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me put it this way: you were aware that this was being done, right?
- [8673] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Ms Loh and Yudhish told me that they would control her social media. That's what they told me. It wasn't a direction from me.
- [8674] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In fact, beginning from around 12 October, all the way through to just the weekend before 1 November, a period of about two weeks and a few days, the CEC was told, the CEC was —
- [8675] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The CEC was told on 29 October, if I remember.
- [8676] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — and was aware of a draft?
- [8677] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [8678] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Had several meetings to discuss the draft at Party HQ?
- [8679] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Myself —
- [8680] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Ms Lim?
- [8681] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Ms Lim, yes.
- [8682] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Ms Khan and, in some cases, Mr Nathan and Ms Loh as well, right?
- [8683] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, but not just in Party headquarters. Most of them, I think, were in my house.
- [8684] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, but at these meetings, if not more than one, at Party HQ, right?

- [8685] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I wouldn't dispute this, but I'll have to check the facts.
- [8686] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. In addition, you also were aware that Ms Khan's father had given input to the statement, right?
- [8687] **Mr Pritam Singh:** He messaged me, yes.
- [8688] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, did any of these steps happen prior to 4 October?
- [8689] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, what steps are you referring to?
- [8690] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Any of these steps: CEC looking at the draft —
- [8691] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, they did not.
- [8692] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Reviewing, editing —
- [8693] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, they did not.
- [8694] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the reason I'm suggesting to you that they did not, none of these steps took place was because it was not in your contemplation on 4 October that the truth would be clarified in Parliament.
- [8695] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I disagree. It was not in my contemplation that she would lie on 4 October.
- [8696] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Neither is it in your contemplation that she would lie on 1 November and yet you took all these steps: to clear the draft, review, edit, tell the CEC in advance.
- [8697] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because I —
- [8698] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You knew what she was going to say, so —
- [8699] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because I confirmed from Ms Khan that she —
- [8700] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish.
- [8701] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, go ahead.
- [8702] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish. So, if we take it on your case, Mr Singh, that she was going to come to Parliament on 4 October and tell the truth, just as she did on 1 November, then all of these steps that we see in the run-up to 1 November would have happened in the run-up to 4 October.
- [8703] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I see where you're going. I disagree. Because you have to remember, I didn't know for sure whether the matter would come up in October, in the Sitting of 4 October.

- [8704] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you expected it.
- [8705] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It was a reasonable — it could have happened. So, the state of mind —
- [8706] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Put it this way, Mr Singh.
- [8707] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, go ahead.
- [8708] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You expected it to a degree, sufficient for you to go to Ms Khan's home and talk to her about it?
- [8709] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Agree.
- [8710] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you. Please carry on.
- [8711] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, the situation was as such on 4 October; it was entirely possible the matter could come up. Ms Khan was told to take ownership and responsibility, and one would expect, very reasonably, I would say, a Workers' Party MP would just go there, tell the truth what had happened, if it had come up now.
- [8712] Thereafter, she indicated that there was another path, like I suggested in my evidence, honesty and so forth, and on 12 October, finally, she gets in touch, and she actually doesn't want to — I called for a meeting in my house. She doesn't want to tell the truth. Sylvia gets angry, I know, because I remember quite clearly. And I tell her, "Look, you have to tell the truth. This is not going to go away. So, don't even think that this is going to be just left alone."
- [8713] And the reason why I felt it was important to look at what she was saying was: I'm not sure what she's going to say in her personal explanation on 1 November. So, "You better show me what you're going to say. Don't come up with some cockamamie lie again."
- [8714] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, by the same token —
- [8715] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes?
- [8716] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You had no idea what she was going to say on 4 October, Mr Singh.
- [8717] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, but had I had no idea also that she was actually going to tell a lie in Parliament.
- [8718] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, but I'm putting it to you in this context: you must surely appreciate that this is going to be a grave revelation in Parliament, as it turned out to be, right?
- [8719] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [8720] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think we all know that.

[8721] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. I agree.

[8722] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so, it's natural. I mean the steps that I have just outlined to you, leading up to 1 November, any political party would do that.

[8723] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[8724] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you expect that a major concession/admission is going to be made in Parliament, you would expect that. But we don't see any of that take place on 4 October, not one step, Mr Singh, not one step.

[8725] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because I think it is understood what an MP has to do. An MP has to tell the truth.

[8726] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, it is also understood —

[8727] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, if it comes up as a question and not your own personal statement, you tell the truth. There's no ambiguity about this.

[8728] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. It is also understood on 1 November that she would tell the truth. And yet, you were very careful.

[8729] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, because she was prevaricating. On 12 October —

[8730] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh —

[8731] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry. Go ahead.

[8732] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You might make that argument about what she will say in her statement. But let me come at this from a different angle. However she puts the statement, if it contains her clarification and her admission, there will be significant media interest, right?

[8733] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I'm sure.

[8734] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And prior to 1 November, in fact, you appreciated that and prepared a media release on the very same day, correct?

[8735] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Which media release are you referring to?

[8736] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I will show you. Can the Clerk please assist Mr Singh?
[A media release was referred to.]

[8737] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thanks, Lin Hwee. Thank you.

[8738] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On 1 November, you issued this statement. In fact, it's called "The Secretary-General's Statement", correct?

[8739] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, it was a Facebook post I made and then the Party put it up as a statement from me.

- [8740] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you prepared this before 1 November?
- [8741] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I did not.
- [8742] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On 1 November?
- [8743] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [8744] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you see, you appreciated that you had to clear with the CEC because it's a big matter.
- [8745] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.
- [8746] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You had to prepare or you, at least, had to know that steps were being done to prepare the ground in Compassvale and in Sengkang for the adverse publicity. You knew that you had to issue a press statement. All of these steps have nothing to do with the words that Ms Khan might choose in her personal statement. So, the excuse that you gave earlier or the reasons that you explained earlier as to why —
- [8747] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The reason, not the excuse.
- [8748] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The reasons that you gave earlier as to why 1 November is different from 4 October doesn't hold insofar as these other statements are concerned. Do you agree?
- [8749] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I see where you're coming from. No. I disagree.
- [8750] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you understand my question, right?
- [8751] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I understand your question and I disagree with it because Ms Khan, on 12 October, did not actually want to come up with a personal explanation. She just wanted to leave the issue as it was. And how do you trust a person like that? "You lied to me even after the speech you made on 3 August? You insist it's a lady. You gave me her name, her nickname, at least. You tell me which Police station you met her." But now —
- [8752] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you see, Mr Singh —
- [8753] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — hold on, let me finish.
- [8754] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, let me tell you where I'm coming from. Maybe you can be clearer in the evidence. You see, all of these that took place about lying to you about a bus stop and the Police station and so on which took place pre-4 October are now no longer relevant?
- [8755] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it is very relevant, because I tell you why it is very relevant.
- [8756] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. It is no longer relevant because we're now at a stage where we're gearing up towards the 1 November explanation.
- [8757] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And I have explained why it is very relevant.

- [8758] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay? So, keep that in mind.
- [8759] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. I'm keeping it absolutely in mind.
- [8760] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because you see, you can't use the fact that she lied to you in August.
- [8761] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She lied to me in August.
- [8762] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish.
- [8763] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Go ahead.
- [8764] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You can't use the fact that she lied to you in August as a reason for requiring her to put a statement in writing to you for 1 November because that same reason would also have been operative on your mind on 4 October, right? So, that's not a good reason. I think you understand where I'm coming from.
- [8765] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I haven't finished that reason —
- [8766] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the reasons which require you to now do something differently on 1 November must be reasons which took place after 4 October. Do you follow?
- [8767] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.
- [8768] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, focus on after 4 October. Don't talk about what happened in August.
- [8769] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'll tell you why everything is relevant and you should see it as a whole. She lies to her Secretary-General even after his queries in August. Secretary-General tells her, "Take ownership, take responsibility." She takes no heed of that. She lies in Parliament again. Then, she tells the Secretary-General on 4 October, "Perhaps, there's another way, the truth." Then, she turns around on 12 October, not wanting to come up with the truth. What am I supposed to assume? And I'll tell you what I assumed. "I want to make sure what you say in your statement is the truth." That's my explanation.
- [8770] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. I understand what you say. We will come back to looking at breaking it down a little.
- [8771] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.
- [8772] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you remember we were on looking at the other steps that were taken, not her statement.
- [8773] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay. Let me just say something.
- [8774] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, why is it that before 4 October, when you expected or contemplated that such news might arise, that you didn't see the need to brief the CEC, tell them, at least, in gist, what she was going to say, prepare your statement, prepare the ground,

ensure that there were steps being taken to deal with the adverse publicity? I mean, you're a very seasoned politician. You would know that this would be the fallout and we wouldn't expect anything less of you to be fully prepared for that. So, the fact that these steps are all missing pre-4 October suggests to me that it was never in your contemplation that the truth would come out.

[8775] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me assure you, Mr Tong, this Secretary-General's statement wasn't pre-planned. It was a Facebook post I made which then was put up on the WP website as it was. There was no planning to prepare the ground in Compassvale and so forth. CEC was just informed that an MP is going to make this statement. Ms Khan was at liberty to share what that statement was, what the circumstances were and people did ask her about what had happened. But I know the point you are making.

[8776] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, don't —

[8777] **Mr Pritam Singh:** On 4 October, there was no assurance that this thing would come up. It may not have come up. You prepare for something which may not have come up before even Ms Khan tells me, "Look, I'm prepared now. I've spoken to my family. I'm going to come up with the truth"?

[8778] Now, if she had said that, "Pritam, I'm prepared now. I'm going to come up with the truth", I would say, "Okay, we've got to prepare and do the same things that we did, the same things that I did in the run-up to the hearing on 1 November, which is to call a CEC meeting and say, "Look, this is what's going to happen because Ms Khan is going to make this statement."

[8779] So, two very different state of affairs and I hope that clarifies matters for you and the Committee.

[8780] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. I will take this up. But let me just pick up on a point that you made earlier, your words. And I will read it to you as it has been transcribed. Page 164, line 23: "On 4 October, there was no assurance that this thing would come up. It may not have come up."

[8781] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[8782] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, if it didn't come up and it's possible, did you make any plans to voluntarily come and clarify the point?

[8783] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Which point?

[8784] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The lie.

[8785] **Mr Pritam Singh:** At that point, no, because this was something for Ms Raeesah Khan to do.

[8786] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But did you ask what steps were being taken to voluntarily clarify it?

[8787] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I did not. Let me answer the question first. No, I did not.

[8788] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish. You see, we have been having this discussion on the basis that it might come up on 4 October and then you must tell the truth. But, actually, a more serious point is being made by you here, which is, even if it does not come up, it should be clarified.

[8789] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8790] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I don't see any suggestion pre-4 October that there was any agreement, any contemplation, any preparation for the Workers' Party, Ms Khan in particular, to clarify this point —

[8791] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[8792] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — on her own volition. Agree?

[8793] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Agree.

[8794] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I'm suggesting to you that that is yet another step that is consistent with Ms Khan's takeaway from the August meeting that if this matter does not come up, if you are not pressed, keep to the August narrative. Agree?

[8795] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree. I disagree.

[8796] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's consistent. I know you —

[8797] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It's not consistent to me.

[8798] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I know you disagree with Ms Khan's interpretation.

[8799] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I mean, you have my answer on record.

[8800] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[8801] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It's not consistent to me because I know Ms Khan has to reveal a very personal and deep episode affecting her to her family, and I was prepared to give her space to do that.

[8802] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. But you see, space, I understand.

[8803] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8804] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you have to react and, on your own volition, clarify the lie, even if it doesn't come up in Parliament, right?

[8805] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, she has to do that. I'm going to make sure she does that.

[8806] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, how did you make sure that she's going to do that?

[8807] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, it's a moot question because by the time the Minister for Home Affairs arises on 4 October, she has to deal with it. Whatever path she chooses, the truth ought to have come out on 4 October from her mouth.

[8808] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, sorry. I disagree with you because —

[8809] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It did not. You can disagree but this is my evidence.

[8810] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I disagree with you because if you are right in what you just said, that the truth has to come out and it's for her to clarify, let me go back to 3 October. You went to her home because you thought that it might arise the next day?

[8811] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[8812] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Actually, and you told her that, "If it comes up, you clarify the truth.", in your words, "take ownership and responsibility". Remember?

[8813] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8814] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. That's what you said to her?

[8815] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8816] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But actually, a deeper point and a more important point exists, which is, actually, you should have gone to her home and told her, "Regardless of whether it comes up tomorrow, you should be in a position to clarify the untruth". Correct?

[8817] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong —

[8818] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Correct or not? Answer my question. That should have been what you would have done if your intention was to, voluntarily and on your own volition, ensure that Ms Khan clarifies the lie?

[8819] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree that I would have had to put it in that way. But in my view, telling her to take ownership and responsibility, in addition to my behaviour, rules of prudence, how you've seen the Workers' Party operate, you should have known what you have to do.

[8820] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. But, clearly, she didn't know.

[8821] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, that's on her.

[8822] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I'm putting it to you that, actually, the conversation on 3 October should have been a very simple one. "Ms Khan, regardless of whether it comes up tomorrow, you are now in Parliament tomorrow, shingles is over in September, you should clarify it. Stand up and clarify it."

[8823] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think I made that clear to her. You can disagree. But that's my evidence.

[8824] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You can check the transcripts but I don't think you gave any evidence in any of your discussions on 3 October that you had told her that, "Even if it didn't come up, you should, on your own accord, go and make a statement".

[8825] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's because I didn't say that but I told her to take ownership and responsibility. And if that isn't clear, I'm not sure what is.

[8826] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the same statement that you made to her to tell her to expect it to come up tomorrow, should also be read by her to mean, "Even if it doesn't come up tomorrow, you should still do the same thing". Is that your evidence?

[8827] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely, because this is very clear. It's very clear to me, unless we have some different understanding of how MPs should behave and what the standard of politics ought to be, I think there's no other interpretation.

[8828] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, therefore, your evidence earlier that, "Hey, I didn't know whether it would come up tomorrow or not, and, therefore, I don't have to take all these steps to prepare the statement, to prepare my CEC", is false, Mr Singh.

[8829] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. It's not.

[8830] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'll tell you why it's false because if you believe your last statement that regardless of whether it comes up tomorrow or not, on 3 October, she was expected to clarify it on her own accord.

[8831] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[8832] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You must know, by 3 October, that come hell or high water, it will come up on 4 October. There are no ifs and there are no buts if you believe your evidence. Correct?

[8833] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Repeat the question?

[8834] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think you know where I'm coming from. You need a bit more time?

[8835] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, please repeat the question nonetheless.

[8836] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm saying to you, Mr Singh, that your evidence earlier, that you were not sure if the matter would come up in Parliament on the next day, on 4 October, is false. And the reason it's false is because if we believe your last statement, the very last statement you made, which is that, your phrase, "take ownership and responsibility" must mean, either it comes up because it's been raised by someone else, or, if not, on your own accord, you should clarify it. If we believe that statement, then the only answer must be that by 3 October, you knew, for sure, that the next day, on 4 October, this issue will arise.

[8837] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I didn't know.

[8838] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please, Mr Singh, I think you know—

[8839] **Mr Pritam Singh:** How would I know? I've already put it on evidence it could have come up.

[8840] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[8841] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn't know for sure it would have come up.

[8842] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It could have come up only if you are resting it on whether someone else raises it. But now you're telling me that, actually, Ms Khan, from your statements, was expected to know that even if it is not raised, she should bring it up on her own accord.

[8843] **Mr Pritam Singh:** At some point, she would have had to. But I didn't tell her on 4 October, she had to do it.

[8844] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, on 3 October.

[8845] **Mr Pritam Singh:** On 3 October, it was predicated on the issue coming up. If the issue came up, you'll have to take ownership and responsibility for it.

[8846] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, you're changing your evidence.

[8847] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I'm not changing my evidence. If you look at my evidence in total, you would realise I'm not changing my evidence at all.

[8848] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I was very precise, I was very precise, I was very precise. I was waiting for the point, for a point where you might say whether it comes up on 3 October or not.

[8849] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not sure whether this is going anywhere, frankly. I think you're putting a lot of weight on it. But if you look at the evidence that I have given, it's very clear the matter may come up. If it comes up, take ownership, take responsibility. That's the evidence that I have given.

[8850] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Page 168, line 11, I said, "The more important point is that you should have gone to her home and told her, regardless if it comes up tomorrow, you should be in a position to clarify the truth. Correct?" I say, "Correct or not, answer my question."

[8851] Then you go on to say, "In my view, telling her to take ownership, in addition to my behaviour", I think it's your conduct, "rules of prudence, you would've seen how the Workers' Party operate, you should have known what you have to do". "But clearly, she didn't know." And then you said, "Well, that's on her."

[8852] I went back to the same point and I said, "And I'm putting it to you that actually the conversation on 3 October should have been a very simple one: Ms Khan, regardless of whether it comes out tomorrow or not, you are now in Parliament tomorrow. Shingles is over in September. You should clarify. Stand up and explain." And your answer, "I think I made that clear to her. You can disagree, but that's my evidence."

[8853] So, you gave evidence that, regardless of whether it comes up tomorrow or not —

[8854] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay, I know where you're going with this.

[8855] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — it will be raised on 4 October —

[8856] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, no.

[8857] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish.

[8858] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, go ahead.

[8859] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Which means, Mr Singh, that by 3 October, you knew, if your evidence is correct, you knew that it will come up on 4 October. And, so, the evidence you gave earlier about not knowing for sure and, therefore, not preparing a statement, not checking with the CEC because it may not arise, all that is not true.

[8860] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, that's not — Mr Tong, this is completely a wrong interpretation of what I have been putting to you right from the get-go. My evidence is on the record. I'm not going to quibble with you on this. I think you know where I am coming from.

[8861] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The evidence is, indeed, on the record.

[8862] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You know what I meant when I spoke to her on 3 October. She had to take ownership and responsibility, and she did not.

[8863] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, on 3 October, on your evidence, the one I just read to you —

[8864] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8865] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — if we believe that, then, in your mind, when you left her home on 3 October, you would have no doubt that through one of the methods, through either way, this issue will come up in Parliament the next day.

[8866] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What methods?

[8867] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The two methods or the two ways are: either someone asked Ms Khan a question, or, if not, then she will stand up on her own to make a clarification.

[8868] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, no, no, not the latter. Not the latter, Ms Tong. It's a clever try. Not the latter. I made it very clear in my evidence right from the beginning, which is why I said look at my evidence in total. And if you look at it in toto, you will realise what I had said earlier. And you're trying to catch me in a "gotcha" moment on one question you put in there? I'm sorry, Mr Tong, you're a good lawyer —

[8869] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you.

[8870] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — but I'm a good listener —

- [8871] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I don't know about the latter but thank you.
- [8872] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay, but let me be very clear about it.
- [8873] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, I think your evidence is there.
- [8874] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think my evidence is all there. I think we can put it there.
- [8875] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, I suggest to you that when you left her home on 3 October, if we believe your evidence, as you're telling us today, on oath, then you could have had no doubt on 3 October that the statement will arise.
- [8876] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It could have arisen.
- [8877] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It will arise because —
- [8878] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.
- [8879] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — either she was to clarify it, if it was raised; or, on your account, she would have had to do it on her own volition.
- [8880] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She would have had to tell the truth. How can —
- [8881] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On her own volition; raise it on her own volition on 4 October.
- [8882] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, that's not my evidence. You can put that down. That's not my evidence.
- [8883] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me say as a matter of record that I think you're changing your evidence.
- [8884] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't think I am.
- [8885] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You're qualifying it.
- [8886] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I'm not.
- [8887] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In fact, you are. I think you realise the —
- [8888] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, nice try. That's all I'm saying. Nice try.
- [8889] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You realise the bind that you find yourself in. And now, you qualify your evidence.
- [8890] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, you can't bind me with a piece of sewing thread, because that's what it is.
- [8891] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And going back to my original point, the reason why none of these preparatory steps were taken in the same way as in the lead-up to 1 November

was done for 4 October, was because there was never any contemplation on your part, and, indeed, on Ms Khan's, that the truth would come out in Parliament on 4 October. Agree?

[8892] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Disagree.

[8893] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And even if you had thought that this issue would only arise if she was asked – that means not on her own volition, but if she was asked – in your mind, there was a reasonable contemplation of that happening, correct?

[8894] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There was a reasonable contemplation of the issue being brought up. It could have come up, yes.

[8895] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And she would have to say that she lied, right, earlier?

[8896] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She would have to tell the truth.

[8897] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, even in that context, assuming you are right in that evidence, you would still have had to prepare. Take some steps to prepare.

[8898] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, what would there be —

[8899] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Know in advance what she was going to say.

[8900] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I disagree.

[8901] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You disagree.

[8902] **Mr Pritam Singh:** First, tell the truth. What's the truth, put it on record. We have it on record, why did you lie. And then the Party will have to determine this is the admission, what are we going to do with this?

[8903] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I find it hard to believe, Mr Singh, that on an issue like this, a Member of Parliament coming to say that, two months ago, I had lied in Parliament, and you contemplated that happening on 4 October, that you would not take steps to try and find out, at least in gist, the substance of the statement. I find it hard to believe, Mr Singh. So, please explain to me why I'm wrong.

[8904] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't find it hard to believe that you find it hard to believe. In my mind, if the issue had come up, it would have to be dealt with by the Party. She had to tell it, if she had told the truth —

[8905] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh, let's not digress.

[8906] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But I think I've put the evidence quite clearly there.

[8907] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let's focus —

[8908] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Please, let's focus on it.

[8909] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — on the occasion. It might come up.

[8910] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[8911] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And if it comes up, it's big news. We've past that Rubicon, right?

[8912] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8913] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, I put to you, and I'm sharing my doubt with you so that you can help me to understand.

[8914] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, go ahead.

[8915] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I find it hard to understand why if you thought such news would come up, where an MP admits to lying, you would not tell your CEC in advance, you would not look at the draft of what she's going to say in advance. At the very minimum, these two steps, if not more.

[8916] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, number one, as I've established, I didn't know whether it was going to come up for a fact, unlike on 1 November, which was your initial presupposition. On 1 November, I know it will come up because I have sight of it. On this particular occasion, I don't know whether it will come up, so there was no other action that was taken. I hope that's clear. I mean, I don't want to repeat myself here.

[8917] **The Chairman:** If I may, just help me understand this part. So, you're suggesting to us that because on 1 November you know for a fact that this will come up —

[8918] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[8919] **The Chairman:** — and, therefore, you went through the process: informing the CEC, working the drafts, discuss and so on.

[8920] **Mr Pritam Singh:** We didn't work any draft of a press statement.

[8921] **The Chairman:** So, as you described. On 4 October, there was a possibility that it might crop up.

[8922] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[8923] **The Chairman:** And the gravity of the explanation would be no less significant.

[8924] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[8925] **The Chairman:** But you were not sure, as you said. But there was that real possibility and the significance is no less important. But no similar effort was done, and you feel that's a reasonable series of steps not to have taken, in preparation for 4 October?

[8926] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I agree.

[8927] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Would Mr Chairman like to take a short break now, given that they have to reboot? I mean, we have been on it for a few hours.

[8928] **The Chairman:** We can take a short break and rest. It is now 12.20 pm. Let's come back about 12.40 pm. Okay, we will adjourn. We will come back at about 12.40 pm? Thank you.

(The hearing adjourned at 12.22 pm and resumed at 12.51 pm.)

[8929] **The Chairman:** Mr Singh, please be seated. Have you had your lunch?

[8930] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, I didn't finish, but it's okay.

[8931] **The Chairman:** Would you like to finish your lunch?

[8932] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm fine.

[8933] **The Chairman:** Okay. We may resume. Mr Edwin Tong.

[8934] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you. Thank you, Mr Singh.

[8935] So, before we had the break, we were at the occasion on 3 and 4 October, that period, just to refresh you, and Mr Chairman and I asked you a series of questions. But prior to that, I had asked you about whether you would have told your CEC in advance and whether they would have seen a draft and so on.

[8936] So, just to round up that portion of the evidence: by 4 October, the CEC had not been told that Ms Khan might make a clarification in Parliament to tell the truth, which means to explain that she had lied in Parliament, correct?

[8937] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[8938] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that there was no draft of her statement prepared prior to that date?

[8939] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.

[8940] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We heard the words that you used on 3 October and I'm not disagreeing with you. I think it's on the record. And I asked you whether you followed up with something clear in writing and you the answer was no, right?

[8941] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[8942] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you answer this question: did you tell Ms Khan directly to tell the truth in Parliament, or words to that effect?

[8943] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Or words to that effect, yes, I did.

[8944] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And tell me what those words to the effect are.

[8945] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The words to that effect were, "If this issue comes up in Parliament, you have to take responsibility and take ownership of this matter."

[8946] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.

- [8947] **Mr Pritam Singh:** “And you have to tell the truth.”
- [8948] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you say that?
- [8949] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don’t believe I said “you have to tell the truth”, but that’s what I meant when I told her you have to take ownership and responsibility.
- [8950] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you did not say to her that, “You have to tell the truth”?
- [8951] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I did not.
- [8952] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can I ask you this, so that I understand the timeline: 3 to 7 August, you were still trying to understand whether or not the allegations could be substantiated. You pressed Ms Khan?
- [8953] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [8954] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. On 7 August, she spoke to you, and you knew that there was a falsehood. She confessed to you?
- [8955] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, she confessed, yes.
- [8956] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On 8 August, there was a meeting, which we will get to, where the three of you, yourself with Ms Lim and Mr Faisal, met with Ms Khan?
- [8957] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right.
- [8958] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that’s at your home?
- [8959] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s at my home.
- [8960] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And between 8 August and 1 October, which was your email to Workers’ Party MPs.
- [8961] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, on 1 October.
- [8962] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** There was no interaction with Ms Khan on this issue?
- [8963] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, there was not.
- [8964] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Was there any interaction with Ms Khan’s family on this issue in this period to ascertain if they had become aware of the issue so that Ms Khan could then proceed to clarify the matter in Parliament?
- [8965] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, there was not.
- [8966] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the first occasion thereafter would have been the 1 October email, that means, the first occasion after 8 August would have been the 1 October email?

[8967] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, the 1 October email was a general email to all the MPs. Yes.

[8968] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I think you said you wanted to produce a copy of that, so could you do that?

[8969] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I will be happy to produce that into evidence.

[8970] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And after 1 October, there was a 3 October meeting at her home which we spent some time on earlier?

[8971] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[8972] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that's when you said you told her to take ownership and responsibility, but did not tell her to speak the truth in those words?

[8973] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[8974] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Would you accept that it is important to how we look at, characterise and assess the facts for there to be complete disclosure so that everyone is on the same page?

[8975] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think it's very hard to disagree with that, yes.

[8976] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. Can I ask you to look at your press conference, the transcripts again?

[8977] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't think I have it in front of me.

[8978] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I handed a copy to you earlier.

[8979] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I may have returned it to Lin Hwee. [*A transcript was referred to.*] Thank you.

[8980] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, so, we agreed earlier that there were two parts to it. The first is your prepared speech, which you then delivered, and then we opened it up to the floor.

[8981] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8982] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Or rather, before that, Ms Lim, I think, spoke in Mandarin, and then you opened it up to the floor?

[8983] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[8984] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** There were several questions. Actually, in both your prepared speech as well as in the questions that you fielded thereafter, you did not say that you had told Ms Khan on 3 October, when you went to her home, to tell her to take responsibility and ownership, correct?

- [8985] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't believe I told them.
- [8986] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You can have a look if you like.
- [8987] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'll take your word for it. I don't recall putting that in, that's right.
- [8988] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And there's also nothing in here which refers to that occasion on 3 October and outlines your expectation on that day that the issue was likely to arise or might arise the next day?
- [8989] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [8990] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right.
- [8991] **Mr Pritam Singh:** If we follow, that's right.
- [8992] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. And there's also no reference here to the message that you conveyed to Ms Khan on that day, culminating in "I won't judge you".
- [8993] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, that's right.
- [8994] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. Can you offer a reason as to why that is so, when that would have been one of the key events between when the lie was first said in Parliament on 3 October, and the 4 October, which was the next occasion in which this issue came up in Parliament and when she repeated the lie? I beg your pardon, let me rephrase that.
- [8995] It would have been the key event between 3 August, when the lie was first said in Parliament —
- [8996] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [8997] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — and 4 October, when the lie was then repeated again —
- [8998] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [8999] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — this time round, several times.
- [9000] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [9001] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And my point to you is that the 3 October event was the one event in this timeline which is the most significant and has the most nexus to the issue that we are talking about that this press conference was to address?
- [9002] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right. The press conference concerned Ms Raeesah Khan's resignation and the circumstances around it, and I didn't feel the need to put that in because it would put Ms Khan in a very negative light.

[9003] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But here was the press asking, of which at least these two would be most germane: first, what did the Workers' Party senior leadership know and when it knew —

[9004] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Which we answered.

[9005] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — and probably a third, which is, what then did they do, right?

[9006] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[9007] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I think what then did they do, the 3 October meeting would figure very prominently under the heading “what then did they do”, correct?

[9008] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. Umm —

[9009] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — because this would disclose that the Workers' Party had contemplated – or at least you had contemplated – that it might arise, and on 3 October, put in a very strong message to Ms Khan that she was to clarify the lie?

[9010] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right. There was no untoward reason to exclude it. In my judgement, I figured that if that was in, it would unnecessarily put Ms Khan under even more pressure than she was already under. As it is, she had admitted to lying, and then to be told that your S-G also visited you at your house to tell you to take responsibility, I think it would have been very, very negative on her. That was the only reason. There was no other reason to conceal it, if you are suggesting that.

[9011] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can I just put forward this suggestion to you: that you were concerned with putting in this incident because, if you did, you would then have to explain what you told Ms Khan and —

[9012] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.

[9013] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — let me put forward the proposition, then you can agree or disagree.

[9014] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, I apologise.

[9015] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, let me start again. You were concerned with revealing this incident because, if you did, you would have to also address a follow-up question, which would be, “What, then, did you tell Ms Khan?” And your concern was that what you told Ms Khan could come across as being equivocal and not clear enough, that it was made clear to her that she would have to tell the truth the next time she was in Parliament. Would you agree?

[9016] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree.

[9017] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because in the entire timeline of what the Workers' Party did following its knowledge of this lie, the 3 October meeting stands out as being the only occasion when you went to see Ms Khan after you became aware, and you went to see Ms

Khan for at least one of the specific reasons was to contemplate that it might arise the next day, correct?

[9018] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Correct.

[9019] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, wouldn't you agree that that's a relevant point to put out into the public domain?

[9020] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree for the reason I've already put on record. I didn't find it necessary to further expose Ms Raeesah to more attention or attention to the extent that people would be saying, "Your S-G also went so far as to visit you to tell you to take responsibility and ownership." That was the only reason. There was no other reason why it wasn't included in the press conference.

[9021] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Sorry, what did you say? That was the reason? Okay.

[9022] **Mr Pritam Singh:** For which it wasn't included in the press conference.

[9023] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But would you accept the suggestion that if you had put it out, Ms Khan, who we now know has taken a very different view and interpretation of that meeting, might then say this never happened?

[9024] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That did not cross my mind at all. There was no reason for me to consider that even.

[9025] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Earlier on, we talked about Mr Nathan and Ms Loh, and you were asked, well, you know, did they come forward, did they make their view known and so on. I'd like to explore that line.

[9026] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[9027] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But before that, I'd like to show you some messages that went on between them. You were not party to those. So, I'm just sharing with you and you may be seeing this for the first time.

[9028] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Alright.

[9029] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The relevance of this, which I would like to explain to you, is because you, on 12 October, did meet with Ms Loh and Mr Nathan, and you did relate to them what you told Ms Khan on 3 October.

[9030] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9031] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. So, to that extent, the evidence that Ms Loh and Mr Nathan gave about what you told them and how you put it across was relevant to the Committee of Privileges, and we received that evidence, and we asked some questions as well, and I'd like to put it to you, based on the messages and what they have said to this Committee. Okay?

[9032] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, please go ahead.

[9033] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, I'd like to start, Mr Singh, with this large bundle here. This is the bundle from Ms Loh. Could I ask you, please, Mr Singh, to turn to page 163? [A document was referred to.]

[9034] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, 163?

[9035] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 163.

[9036] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9037] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Just to give you an orientation of this bundle, it's a download of the WhatsApp messages that took place in a chat group between Mr Nathan, Ms Loh and Ms Khan.

[9038] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[9039] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the parts that are redacted in black, were redacted by Ms Loh when she furnished it to us.

[9040] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Without your sight of what was redacted?

[9041] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** One or more of the staff from Parliament may have seen what it is and agreed with the redaction, but I am not privy to that. I have not seen it.

[9042] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[9043] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I'm telling you that this is not redacted because we don't want you to see it; but because I have also not myself seen it.

[9044] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not making that suggestion.

[9045] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I wanted to do explain that to you so that you know why there are portions which have been blacked out. I will show you a number of pages from this and I hope you bear with me, because they give you the full context of where I'm coming to. And I'd like to explain to you that I will be asking you some questions on their view of what you told them about what you said to Ms Khan on 3 October.

[9046] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I understand.

[9047] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, can you please start with page 163. Some of this is a bit of banter and I will just skip over, okay? So, beginning at 3 October, you see the timing?

[9048] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I do.

[9049] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 3.34 pm. [A message was referred to.]

[9050] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9051] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** “We’ve got an insight to how they plan this, et cetera, and asking you to resign now is really quite a betrayal and completely reactionary, however important it is to preserve WP’s image. If they really play you out, I will be quite shaken, but hopefully they don’t.” “Sylvia patted me and said all will be well.” That’s from Raeesah. So, this is in the aftermath of the announcement of the Disciplinary Panel on 2 November. So, that was what —

[9052] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right, this is 3 November.

[9053] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And now this is 3 November.

[9054] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9055] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, I wanted to start with that to give you the context of what they were discussing. So, if you can just quickly cast your eye over the next couple of pages. And I will just highlight a few to you.

[9056] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[9057] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you go to page 166 and 167, you’ll see that they’re talking about the Disciplinary Panel, at 167.

[9058] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Where on 167, sorry?

[9059] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 13 November.

[9060] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I see it, yes. A lot of it is redacted, but this part is not redacted.

[9061] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. [*A message was referred to.*] “Hey, guys. During the DP meeting, Pritam mentioned that if I don’t have the support of my immediate teammates, there is no point in me continuing.” Raeesah then goes on to say, “I haven’t spoken to Ru, but we know how she feels about me. And Jamus is not sure if I should continue. I haven’t spoken to Louis about it.”

[9062] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9063] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, again for context, by this time, Ms Khan had met with the DP on 8 November.

[9064] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9065] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And one of the issues raised was whether she would have the support of her Sengkang GRC teammates.

[9066] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I have notes on this. I think, very briefly, it would have come up.

[9067] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes?

[9068] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I will answer as yes.

[9069] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And her understanding, at least, was that she would have to, she was asked to consult with the other teammates to check if they were comfortable with her continuing.

[9070] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This did happen, but I have to double-check on the dates when that representation was made to her. Because it was made more strongly on 29 November, when she requested to see the DP for the second time.

[9071] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But, at least based on this, as on 13 November, in Raeesah's mind, Ms Khan's mind, she was required to do this and she's been speaking to Jamus and she hasn't spoken to Ting Ru or Louis.

[9072] **Mr Pritam Singh:** To enquire whether she has their support.

[9073] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.

[9074] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's what it says.

[9075] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Over the next page at 168, Yudhish, at 10.40 am, says [*A message was referred to.*]: "I'm wondering if the CEC going to expel you. I don't get the sense that they're about to do that, even though I know we're all a bit afraid of that. So, the other three's opinions don't really matter now." And then it goes a few lines down, at 10.44 am: "So, by saying this, what does Pritam want you to do? Resign?" "I think he does," Raeesah says. Yudhish says, "And he gets off scot-free? Because right now, people don't know that he knew it was a lie when he told that to Shanmugam." I think the "he" actually refers to Ms Khan. "And my understanding is that even if you are no longer an MP, you would still have to go through the Committee of Privileges, where if they ask you about what the leaders knew and when, you could damage Pritam's reputation if you reveal the truth." Raeesah says, "I wouldn't do that." Yudhish says, "What I'm saying is, it's not about what you would or wouldn't do at that stage, but Pritam needs to be accountable to public also" —

[9076] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9077] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** "If he throws you under the bus, don't forget, P and S," which I think is Pritam and Sylvia, "literally told you your political career wouldn't end by coming clean." Raeesah then says, "They did tell me that, and that's why I was shocked by P's behaviour at the Panel." I think "P" refers to you at the panel.

[9078] **Mr Pritam Singh:** "P" would refer to me, yes.

[9079] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** "I don't know if I can trust them anymore and remain as an MP if the SK team is against it", which I take as a reference to her being asked to check if she has their support.

[9080] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It possibly could be, yes.

[9081] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Then, you cast your eye over the rest of the page, talking about what the CEC and when they might vote and so on.

[9082] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9083] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At the bottom, Pei Ying then says, “Am I allowed to talk to any of them, including Pritam, because it would mean that I would have to share some degree of info you’ve shared with me.” Raeesah says, “What information though?” Over the page: “Like Pritam saying your team doesn’t support you.” Raeesah says, “That’s a good idea, but I don’t think they’ll agree.” “I can just talk to Pritam,” Pei Ying says. But Raeesah says at 12.09 pm, “But meeting the other three MPs would be a good idea.” So, they were talking about the DP, what is happening from the DP.

[9084] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. This is on 13 November.

[9085] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, 13 November. The rest of the next three or four pages are either redacted or they are referring to a speech made by a previous MP, Mr Siew, so that’s not relevant for my purposes. I’ll ask you to pick it up again from page 179.

[9086] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9087] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, this time round, it’s 18 November. [*A message was referred to.*] It says, “Hey guys,” and then some parts are redacted, “Why would someone do this?” So, I’m not really sure why these are redacted, but if you go over the page; I’m not sure what they’re discussing, but at 3.40 pm, there’s a question by Raeesah: “I wonder if Pritam is entertaining this.”

[9088] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, where are we, I beg your pardon, Mr Tong, where is it?

[9089] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Page 180.

[9090] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Page 180, okay. I’m on it.

[9091] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 3.40 pm.

[9092] **Mr Pritam Singh:** 3.40 pm, okay, I’m there, yes.

[9093] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** “I wonder if Pritam is entertaining this”.

[9094] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, but there’s a whole redaction of —

[9095] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, redacted. So, we don’t know what it is. Then, at 3.47 pm, Yudhish says, “I think Pritam knows he has some guilt in all this too, in terms of his knowledge of the truth by the Shanmugam Sitting and subsequent silence. I know the panel is meeting members as late as 4 December. I’m not sure until when, though.” “I really hope it doesn’t drag,” Raeesah says.

[9096] And then over the page, parts of it are redacted, and we can’t really make sense of 182, but it appears that it’s talking about chats from some other media material.

[9097] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9098] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And then at 183, a screenshot of a discussion is posted by Raeesah.

[9099] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9100] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's a discussion that she had with you on text, and the date at this point in time is 22 November. [*A message was referred to.*]

[9101] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[9102] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The question by you, Mr Singh, "Have you managed to speak to your teammates?" Answer: "Ru will not meet, and I'm speaking to Louis tomorrow." You then asked her, "Do you wish to speak to me about anything?" She then replies to you and says, "I would like to meet the Panel one more time before you come to a decision. I think the last time we met, I was not prepared for the things you had to say, but I've been thinking about it and I would like to be open and honest about the challenges I face and also how I feel I've succeeded. It would be great if I could have the opportunity to do so."

[9103] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This was to me, yes.

[9104] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This was to you.

[9105] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[9106] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And over the page, you see another screenshot. You replied to her and said, "This not prepared for the things you had to say is unfortunately not becoming of an MP, Raeesah. Because you can't make statements and then wish to change your perspective or add something new. The DP session was a very formal meeting. Please email the three of us on the DP and request for a hearing." And then she says she will send an email. So, she sends this exchange to Mr Nathan and Ms Loh.

[9107] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't know about that, but —

[9108] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, you didn't know about this at that time.

[9109] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right, that she sent to it Mr Nathan and Ms Loh.

[9110] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And then they have a discussion on that, and they go on to say this at 7.40 pm, "I'm trying to be honest, but I really feel that everything gets twisted." Yudhish says, "I think your messages were good. Not becoming of an MP? He and ...", and it's blanked out there, I think he means you, Mr Singh, with reference to the earlier messages, "sat there and didn't say anything when you spoke to Minister Shanmugam. How's that for not becoming of an MP, let alone a Party leader."

[9111] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, I see that.

[9112] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Pei Ying then says, "Wow. Pritam is a...", and then it's blanked out, "I felt angry reading that. Don't worry, Yudhish and I are going to give him a piece of our minds on Thursday." I think she has in mind a meeting she's set up with the Disciplinary Panel on Thursday.

[9113] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That would be, I think, we saw them on 25 November; but I can check, I can confirm the dates.

[9114] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Just a few more lines.

[9115] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, go ahead.

[9116] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 8.35 am: “Sorry, guys, I was so angry, I had to switch my phone off. Anyways, this was the rest of the convo.” Then, she sends another screenshot where your reply to her was, “Dear Raeesah, hope we can see that it is precisely your character and behaviour that is under review here. In view of your actions in Parliament and your decision to stick to the untruthful anecdote when asked again in October. Anyway, better to speak in person to the DP.”

[9117] There’s another screenshot over the page at 187, and I’d like you to now focus on the next two pages. Because this is when they speak about what you told them in October, which was the thrust of my question.

[9118] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[9119] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Raeesah says at 8.36 am, “I was shocked by his reply about October.” Then she has an emoji. Pei Ying says, “I am too, but don’t worry, I’m ready to tell him. We know.” “Your decision” – this is Yudhish – “to stick to the untruthful anecdote when asked again in October. What happened to ‘I won’t judge you’?”.

[9120] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I see it.

[9121] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** “And we know, because he literally told us in his house that that’s what he said.” Pei Ying says, “Yeah, I’m ready to say this to him on Thursday”. Yudhish says, “I think Faisal and Sylvia should know this.”

[9122] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[9123] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I know you were not privy to this account.

[9124] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[9125] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But as I’ve explained earlier, the reason I’m using this is a premise. It’s because you did speak to Mr Nathan and Ms Loh, and you did recount what you said to Ms Khan to them.

[9126] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Briefly, yes, I did.

[9127] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Would you accept that, at least based on these messages, their takeaway from your account was that you will not judge Ms Khan whichever way she decides to explain her position?

[9128] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I beg your pardon. I can see why they concluded that way. But again, there was also, I made it quite clear to them, this was when I met them on 12 October, they requested to see me at my house at night. And we had that conversation. And I made it quite clear that she had this choice that she ought to have made, because I had told her to take responsibility and ownership. And I also told them that, I also said, “I also will not judge you”,

and, to me, that was my way of communicating to them that Raeesah would have been quite clear in her mind that she had to tell the truth.

[9129] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. You would have told them, or, at least, you would have recounted the incident to them about your meeting with Raeesah on 3 October, right? And the impression that they are left with was that it was for Raeesah to decide what to do and you won't judge her.

[9130] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It appears from these messages that that would be a reasonable conclusion to make, yes.

[9131] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that's not the same as being very clear, as you said earlier, that on 3 October, you left her under no doubt that she was to tell the truth if asked on 4 October, correct?

[9132] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right, but I did not narrate the entire episode to the way that I had spoken to Ms Raeesah on 3 October, but I did make it clear to them that I had told her to take ownership and responsibility. And for me, saying "I won't judge you" was precisely the opportunity for Raeesah to take responsibility and ownership. Ms Loh and Yudhish, they are not wrong when they say "I won't judge you", because I did say that to them.

[9133] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, you did, but —

[9134] **Mr Pritam Singh:** My reason for saying that was to impress upon them that she's a leader in her own right, she had that choice.

[9135] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, and that choice was an equivocal one, right?

[9136] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What do you mean by "equivocal"?

[9137] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That means "take responsibility, you could decide your fate, decide whether to tell the truth or not"?

[9138] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I wouldn't put it that way. I think it was quite clear from my communication to Ms Khan that she had to take ownership and responsibility.

[9139] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But would you accept that, at least based on this chat, the way in which you had narrated the incident to both Mr Nathan and Ms Loh left them with the impression that there was a choice given to Ms Khan?

[9140] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think they had a skewed impression, but I think it could be because that they are very protective of her. But it's speculative on my part, let me just say that. But I did communicate to them that this was something that she had to take ownership for, that I said that to — so, this, again, is just a fragment, but I can understand it's on the SMS "I won't judge you".

[9141] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I've taken some care to read you the longer extract because it shows you the state of mind that they felt that you were being harsher on Ms Khan than necessary and that you should also speak to your own knowledge of the matter, which is the reference that Mr Nathan and Ms Loh made, correct?

[9142] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, but it has to be said that this was not communicated to me by them at any point, and I would have expected them to communicate with me, and because – let me say something about the both of them. They are very decent people, they are good people, and they work very hard for the Party, but, at the minimum, I would have expected them to at least say, “Pritam, we’ve got a message from Raeesah saying that you wanted her to take a lie — you instructed her to take a lie to the grave.” There were numerous opportunities to raise this with me. But I don’t know why it didn’t come up. I can only speculate.

[9143] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, they did raise with you what is the thrust of these messages, which is, that you knew more than you were letting on, they say, and you sat there while Raeesah was answering Minister Shanmugam, and you must accept responsibility for that as well.

[9144] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s certainly their view, yes.

[9145] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, these points they did make to you, correct, when they met with the DP on 25 November?

[9146] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, they did. Yes, they did.

[9147] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And they made it quite strongly, isn’t it?

[9148] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would suggest that it was as strong as the other points they were making, because I think they were of the view – because, initially, when the DP was formed, I informed them that the DP was going to be set up, and they were not against it. In fact, Yudhish thought it was a good thing to do because Party members and volunteers would be quelled by it. I can forward the relevant evidence in WhatsApp between me and Yudhish. And Pei Ying also, likewise, alluded to it being the right thing to do. So, I can again also forward that communication to you.

[9149] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[9150] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think the issue turns when they realised that the Party are completely dead set for her either resigning or the Party expelling her, and then they understand – wait a minute, I think you’ve got to —

[9151] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Wait, you said —

[9152] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, sorry.

[9153] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You said when they realised that the Party is dead set against her either resigning or expelling her —

[9154] **Mr Pritam Singh:** By “Party”, I beg your pardon, I mean Party members, other Party members, they cannot accept this.

[9155] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand what you’re saying and we’ll get to the point that they made to you on 25 November. But, for the moment, I’m focused on the conversation on 3 October. And what’s interesting to me – and the reason I’m bringing it up to

you – is because now we’re on the 12 October and you’re recounting an incident that happened on the 3 October.

[9156] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[9157] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And we’ve gone through that in some detail before the break —

[9158] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[9159] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — what happened on 3 October, what happened on 4 October, your reaction, what happened on 4 October night and so on. I won’t recount that. But this conversation on 12 October with Ms Loh and Mr Nathan gives us a different dimension, and it gives us a different dimension because although you are now recounting what you told Ms Khan on 3 October, you now know by 12 October what she didn’t do on 4 October.

[9160] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[9161] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if you were giving an account to Ms Loh and Mr Nathan on 12 October, wouldn’t it be natural for you to say, “I said these words. They were actually very clear instructions to her to come clean, tell the truth, take ownership and responsibility, clarify the lie, but she failed to do so”? You didn’t say this to them, right?

[9162] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Look, I don’t remember exactly how I phrased the conversation I had with Raeesah Khan on 3 October with Ms Loh and Yudhish, but it was very clearly communicated to them that if Raeesah Khan was put on notice, the issue may come up, she would have to take responsibility and ownership, and I think I impressed enough to Yudhish and Pei Ying that it was her choice, as a leader, to tell the truth.

[9163] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, my point to you —

[9164] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But I do apologise, I don’t remember exactly how I phrased this to them.

[9165] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I’m suggesting to you that you did not say to them or leave them with an impression that you had been very clear with Ms Khan on 3 October, and that she acted contrary to the understanding on 3 October.

[9166] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is possible.

[9167] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You didn’t say that to them, right?

[9168] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Didn’t say that —

[9169] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You didn’t give this account to Ms Loh and Mr Nathan when you reported this occasion to them on 12 October.

[9170] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think I sufficiently communicated the detail that it was something that Ms Khan had to take ownership and responsibility for.

[9171] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because if that was how they saw it and they heard from you, that's what they would have been discussing amongst themselves, that, actually, on 12 October, "we were told by Mr Singh that he had made it very clear to Ms Khan that she would come clean, but she failed to do so"?

[9172] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can't comment on this three-way chat between Raeesah, Yudhish and Pei Ying as to what they communicate between each other, but I am quite clear when I spoke to Yudhish and Pei Ying to inform them that Raeesah Khan, I met her on 3 October, she had an opportunity to take ownership and responsibility for the lie that she had said.

[9173] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[9174] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And when I said "I won't judge you", I mean "that ought to be an incentive for you just to speak the truth". That's what I'm sharing.

[9175] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. Don't juxtapose what you're interpreting from your own words and what it should convey. Just tell us clearly what it is that you told —

[9176] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's what I would have told them. I think I've already had it on — That's what I told them. I said, "Look, I met her. She was told to take ownership and responsibility, she had a clear choice, and this is what she decided to do." And I did tell them that "I will not judge you", but that is really to make Raeesah understand that she should just come out and tell the truth.

[9177] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you please look at the transcripts again on 2 December?

[9178] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure. Which page are we on?

[9179] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I will get to it in a moment. I need to find it. Please turn to 2 December, page 23.

[9180] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you. Page 23, yes.

[9181] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, Ms Loh is answering some questions from me. If you look at the bottom one-third of the page, it starts with "This is information", do you see that? [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 405.*]

[9182] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I do.

[9183] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** "This is information that I have that was shared with me after 4 October."

[9184] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9185] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** "I believe she met Mr Pritam Singh the day before." "The day before 4 October?" "That's right?" "Alright, can you describe the gist of their discussion?" "Okay. I can't recall if she's the one to tell me this."

- [9186] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She said “she didn’t”, right?
- [9187] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, “I can’t recall —”
- [9188] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Please say that, that’s the whole line, “Okay. She didn’t —”
- [9189] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 409.*]
- Okay. She didn’t – I can’t recall if she’s the one to tell me this, but definitely I know, in a subsequent meeting that I had with Mr Pritam Singh in person, at his place, that he shared with me he had met her the day before and he had told her that he has a feeling this might come up. And I don’t know the full details of what he said to her, but he shared with me that he said, “I will not judge you.”
- [9190] Pause for a moment.
- [9191] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I beg your pardon. Yes.
- [9192] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I know you’re fixated with the words “she didn’t” but actually the entire paragraph —
- [9193] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I’m not fixated on those words. I’m fixated on the other words.
- [9194] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please don’t interrupt me.
- [9195] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, go ahead.
- [9196] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think you know that the premise of my question was that this conversation that you had with Ms Loh and Mr Nathan, they didn’t hear from Ms Khan.
- [9197] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right, yes. That is correct.
- [9198] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that’s important for me because they are now hearing from you.
- [9199] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [9200] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right, thank you. Let me go on. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 410.*]

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: He shared with you and said “I will not judge you” to you?

Ms Loh Pei Ying: To Ms Raeesah Khan.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: To Ms Khan. I’ll come to this in a moment, but let’s just focus on your knowledge that prior to 4 October, there was a meeting between Ms Khan and Mr Singh.

Ms Loh Pei Ying: Yes.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Okay, let's focus on it because you're saying that there's a subsequent occasion where you had direct knowledge because you were at Mr Singh's house discussing the issue.

[9201] I would like you to cast your eye over the next few lines because we are trying to fix what occasion it was. I'll give you some time.

[9202] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, could you say that again? "Okay, let's focus on it because —"

[9203] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Read it yourself the next few lines. Okay? And end off with her answer where it says [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 425.*]:

Ms Loh Pei Ying: I don't know if they discussed what response she should give. As I said, it was relayed to me that they had a conversation, and that conversation was that he had a feeling that she would be pressed about this issue again. And his response to that was that he would not judge Ms Raeesah Khan.

[9204] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9205] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This is her account to us.

[9206] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[9207] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you know that they are —

[9208] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But whether she is referring to a discussion she had with Ms Khan or referring to our meeting on 12 October isn't clear.

[9209] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She's referring to you conveying this to her.

[9210] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9211] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because if you look at the preceding lines, in fact, she says, "She didn't —", meaning Ms Khan didn't, "in a subsequent meeting that I had with Mr Pritam Singh in person", and so, this is the occasion she's referring to, and this is a meeting that took place at your home on 12 October. Mr Singh, my question is this.

[9212] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Please go ahead.

[9213] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If she left with the impression —

[9214] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Who left?

[9215] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If Ms Loh left with the impression after meeting with you on 12 October, that you had, in fact, made it very clear to Ms Khan that she should tell the truth, but that on the very next day, she failed to do so, that would be something she would recollect and take away from the meeting. If you had made that clear to her. Agree?

[9216] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She should have.

[9217] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so, the fact that she did not, suggests to me that you did not say this to her.

[9218] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree.

[9219] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the reason you did not say that to her is because that did not happen.

[9220] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I disagree completely.

[9221] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you did not say to Ms Loh that, “I had made clear to Ms Khan on 3 October, but she did not follow through my instructions on 4 October?” You did not say that to her, right?

[9222] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that would be true, not in those terms.

[9223] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you did not give her any impression, whether in those words in any other similar words, that that was what happened, correct?

[9224] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree.

[9225] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the reason you didn’t do that is because, in truth, what happened on 4 October was not a breach of your instructions or an understanding reached on 3 October, correct?

[9226] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Completely disagree.

[9227] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that’s why, in a conversation about the conversation, in other words, on 12 October about 3 October, there’s just no mention anywhere by either Mr Nathan or Ms Loh about the fact that Ms Khan had breached your instructions, correct?

[9228] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Insofar as the communication, for the WhatsApp messages I’m seeing and this text that I’m seeing, that does seem to be the case. But insofar as what I communicated to Mr Nathan and Ms Loh, I’ve made it quite clear that this was an issue that she had to take ownership and responsibility for.

[9229] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Nathan and Ms Loh were perhaps the two closest Party members to Ms Khan.

[9230] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right.

[9231] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you would also know that they were closely discussing and advising Ms Khan on this issue of the lie in Parliament?

[9232] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I do not know that for a fact.

[9233] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You knew that by the time you met with them?

[9234] **Mr Pritam Singh:** By that time, yes.

[9235] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the first time you met with them, and I'll take you to the specific references, was on 10 August?

[9236] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9237] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.

[9238] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Wait. 10 August?

[9239] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You can put that down on your notepaper as something for you to think about and I will come back to it.

[9240] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me just put that down.

[9241] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But that was the first time you met with them and on their evidence, it was clear —

[9242] **Mr Pritam Singh:** First time I met with them about what?

[9243] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** First time you met with them after Ms Khan had told you about the lie.

[9244] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'll have to check that up.

[9245] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. You can put it down as a marker.

[9246] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I've put it down.

[9247] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But the point I'm making to you is: that you are now narrating to them, the two closest associates of Ms Khan, about an incident that has obviously given rise to some concern. Let's not argue about —

[9248] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, yes.

[9249] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At least some concern, if not more. And the most significant occasion or incident, in your mind, must have been the breach of instruction by Ms Khan on 4 October. And so, in that context, Mr Singh, it's inconceivable that in now telling the story and narrating what happened and what you said on 3 October, you wouldn't also have included that, and then, on the next day, Ms Khan did not follow those instructions, correct?

[9250] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Again, I have to disagree because there's a very precise scoping of what was said from your question. I did inform Ms Loh and Mr Nathan that I met Ms Khan on 3 October. I told her to take ownership and responsibility for the issue, and I told her I will not judge. And I told Ms Khan, "I will not judge you." And it was quite clear, that it was made clear to her that she had to tell the truth. Yes.

[9251] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, "take ownership and responsibility" we agreed earlier means "tell the truth", right?

[9252] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9253] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, it is very clear by the time you met with Ms Loh and Mr Nathan on 12 October, that she didn't do that, despite your instructions?

[9254] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Oh, that's true, of course.

[9255] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That she didn't take ownership and responsibility, and she didn't tell the truth?

[9256] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[9257] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, it strikes me as odd that in narrating this incident to the two persons most closely associated with Ms Khan, that you would not include this in your narrative if that really happened.

[9258] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Include what, sorry?

[9259] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Include the fact that you made it very clear that she was to come clean, and she failed to do so, in breach of your instructions.

[9260] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I lamented that. But insofar as putting it in those acute terms, I don't believe I did. But I certainly communicated to the both of them that I met her, expecting that she would come clean and she would tell the truth.

[9261] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We've seen Ms Loh's evidence. She doesn't say that.

[9262] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9263] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We've seen the internal chats throughout the period. We don't see that.

[9264] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9265] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I am now showing you Mr Nathan's evidence.

[9266] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Please do.

[9267] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Could you please pick up 3 December and turn to page 33.

[9268] So, if you look at about one-third from the bottom, Mr Nathan says: "Okay. So, essentially, the first time was on 10 August at that meeting with Ms Loh. The second time we discussed it was on 12 October."

[9269] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[9270] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Just pause for a moment. I'll ask you to please look a few lines above.

[9271] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[9272] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: My question, to which Mr Nathan was giving an answer, was [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 3 December 2021, from Para No 2848.*]:

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: So, if I understand your evidence correctly, between 8 August and 2 October, as far as you know, there were no discussions between Ms Khan and the senior leadership of the Workers' Party, comprising Mr Singh, Mr Manap and Ms Lim?

Mr Yudhishthra Nathan: As far as I know, no.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: As far as you were involved, this occasion we've just gone through on 10 August was the only occasion where you had occasion to discuss with Mr Singh or anyone else in the Workers' Party senior leadership about this issue?

Mr Yudhishthra Nathan: No, that's not true, because —

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Okay, tell me.

Mr Yudhishthra Nathan: Okay. So, essentially, the first time was on 10 August, at that meeting with Ms Loh. The second time, the next time we discussed it was on 12 October.

[9273] So, this answers the earlier point that you did meet with them and discussed the issue on 10 August. Does it jog your memory now?

[9274] Mr Pritam Singh: No, it does not. Because we did not discuss the issue in any detail on 10 August; not to my memory. Because the matter of what Ms Khan had said in Parliament, in my memory, no, I don't believe it had come up. I don't recall it coming up on 10 August.

[9275] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Okay.

[9276] Mr Pritam Singh: I'm trying to remember but —

[9277] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Okay. You keep this page open and I'll see whether I can help you in some other way.

[9278] Mr Pritam Singh: Can I also check my WhatsApp chats whether there was actually a meeting on 10 August?

[9279] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Of course, of course, if you can, do that. But let me show you the WhatsApp chats between Ms Loh, Mr Nathan and Ms Khan. And then, maybe that might jog your memory.

[9280] Mr Pritam Singh: Sure.

[9281] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: So, if you can leave that transcript open, because I'm not done yet. Pick up the thick bundle again.

[9282] Mr Pritam Singh: Sorry. This one, is it, or that one? This one? Okay.

[9283] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: And turn to page 36.

[9284] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes.

[9285] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay? Now, look around the middle of the page, 10 August, 8.23 am.

[9286] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay. I think I'm on the wrong folder. These are the messages? Okay.

[9287] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Page 36.

[9288] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, page?

[9289] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Page 36. [*A message was referred to.*]

[9290] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9291] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Pei Ying says at 8.23 am: "Have you decided if you want us to tell Pritam? We're meeting him in 30 minutes." Raeesah: "I told him already." She then says, "So, I think it wouldn't matter if you brought it up."

[9292] Just to pause for a moment. "I told him already" refers to a lie.

[9293] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's what Raeesah is saying?

[9294] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[9295] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Alright.

[9296] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** "Oh, okay, what was his reaction like?" Answer: "He looks at me different now but I think he empathises on why I lied." Pei Ying: "Okay." Raeesah: "I think it was the best outcome. I couldn't expect it given what happened. I'm just thankful that he didn't question it or didn't believe me."

[9297] Further down, at 11.00 am, "Hey, Rae, Yudhish and I spoke a lot to Pritam. Convo wasn't about you and it was really about —" something else.

[9298] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This is redacted. She doesn't say what the conversation was about.

[9299] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, she redacted it. "But we did discuss what happened this week a little. We shared our thoughts with him on a lot of matters and hopefully it registers." So, does this help you remember that there was a meeting?

[9300] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think it's helpful to the extent that we were meeting on a different issue altogether. The issue wasn't to discuss the Raeesah episode.

[9301] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But it did come up, according to them?

[9302] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, according to them, but I don't recall anything significant that was shared at this meeting about —

[9303] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, I will show you this meeting later.

- [9304] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, please do.
- [9305] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me not digress from my approach, which is 12 October.
- [9306] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, please don't.
- [9307] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, going back to where I left off from the transcripts.
- [9308] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This is Mr Nathan's transcript?
- [9309] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, cast your eye over the bottom one-third of that page.
- [9310] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [9311] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, we start to talk about 12 October.
- [9312] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I do apologise, Mr Tong. Page 33, 32?
- [9313] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Page 33, at the bottom.
- [9314] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.
- [9315] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 3 December 2021, from Para No 2858.*] "Based on what you found out on 12 October, on 3 October, Mr Singh went to visit Ms Khan at her home. Right?", "Yes." "Were you aware of what they had discussed?" Answer: "Only insofar as Mr Singh had relayed it us, 'us' meaning Ms Loh and I, at his residence on 12 October."
- [9316] And then, you cast your eye over the next few lines. I won't read it to you. But you will see that I put to Mr Nathan, Ms Khan's recollection of what happened and asked him whether that was what he remembered you telling him.
- [9317] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Wait. This is where you say "And did he discuss with you? Maybe, it's best I show you Ms Khan's recollection".
- [9318] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.
- [9319] **Mr Pritam Singh:** "And then I asked you whether it comports with what you discussed with Mr Singh so I don't put words into her mouth." Okay. What do you want me to make of this?
- [9320] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Have you read it until the middle of the page?
- [9321] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Oh. Okay, okay. Mm-hmm. Yes, he agrees with Ms Khan's rendition that there was a narrative to be retained and that "if I continued the narrative, there would be no judgement". That's completely untrue.

[9322] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, looking at the series of WhatsApp messages I showed you, Ms Loh's evidence, Mr Nathan's evidence, in totality —

[9323] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. Right.

[9324] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — it does not convey any impression that on 3 October, you had put in clear terms, unequivocal terms, to Ms Khan that she was to clarify the lie in Parliament. Do you agree?

[9325] **Mr Pritam Singh:** To the extent that these people remember, yes.

[9326] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[9327] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But I think they are basing their views on what Ms Khan has told them, it would appear, at least Mr Nathan.

[9328] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At least in Mr Nathan's case? But in Ms Loh's case, she's basing it entirely on what you told her.

[9329] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Can we go back to Ms Loh's transcript, please?

[9330] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 2 December.

[9331] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I beg your pardon, what page, please?

[9332] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Pages 23, 24. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 409.*]

[9333] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, what Ms Loh says is, you asked Ms Loh: "Can you describe the gist of their discussion?" And she says, "Okay. She didn't — I can't recall" —

[9334] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think you can read it to yourself, Mr Singh.

[9335] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, you see, this is the line that I shared. You said you are fixated on the line but that's not the line I was fixated on. I was fixated on this line that Ms Loh shared. She said, "I don't know the full details of what he said to her, but he shared with me that he said, 'I will not judge you'.".

[9336] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, what she's saying is that she's just basing it on what you told her because she wasn't there when you told Ms Khan.

[9337] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And she also says she doesn't know "the full details of what he said to her".

[9338] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, which is fair, because she wasn't present when you spoke to Ms Khan.

[9339] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[9340] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She's giving me an account, under oath, of the evidence, pertaining to what she heard from you. That's the only part I'm interested in at this point of time.

[9341] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And she has only shared that fragment of "I will not judge you."

[9342] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, I wouldn't say its "fragment". I would say that this is an impression she has from what you said to her.

[9343] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Indeed, indeed, I can't disagree with that.

[9344] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But let me put the point to you, starkly. As I said several times, if by this time, you had made such a clear and unequivocal instruction to Ms Khan on 3 October, and by this time, you by now know that she didn't comply with those instructions, you would have made that point clear to Ms Loh? And instead, the takeaway from Ms Loh, and certainly by Ms Khan, was that it was an equivocal position by you, at best, an open position for her to decide.

[9345] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree. As narrated to Pei Ying and Yudhish, I would have communicated the same thing I communicated to Ms Khan, which was to take ownership and responsibility of the issue. And I also told them that, "I will not judge you", vis-à-vis Ms Khan. That's my evidence.

[9346] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. And, in fact, Ms Loh further gave evidence to us that when you met with her on 25 November, you sought to recharacterise that conversation. And let me show it to you.

[9347] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Please bring it to my attention.

[9348] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And then you can give your evidence.

[9349] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[9350] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The same bundle that you have, please turn to page 73. No, sorry, page 74, top of page 74.

[9351] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9352] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I will ask you a series of questions from this. But let me give you the context, alright?

[9353] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[9354] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This took place at around, from my memory, around 2.00 pm.

[9355] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Where are you, Mr Tong?

[9356] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 2.30 pm. I'm giving you the context before you look into the transcript.

- [9357] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay, okay, I thought you were reading from the transcript.
- [9358] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This series of questions took place at around 2.15 pm. As I explained to you earlier, this is around the time that your press conference was happening, or shortly after.
- [9359] **Mr Pritam Singh:** 2.15 pm? I think it was done, the press conference was over.
- [9360] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And this was around the time when the news of your press conference first started hitting the press.
- [9361] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay. Okay.
- [9362] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At that time, there was a CNA article, which I believe attributed an answer by you, to a wrong question. I don't know if you're familiar with that?
- [9363] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, it has come to my attention.
- [9364] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you clarify that with CNA?
- [9365] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I have not done so yet.
- [9366] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But it was, I believe, subsequently clarified.
- [9367] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'd have to check on that.
- [9368] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, take it from me. It was clarified because I did use that article as it was first published. And I read that article to Ms Loh. And the article purported to ascribe an answer you gave to another question, to an answer about why didn't Ms Khan – or words to that effect – comply with your instructions, “your” meaning Mr Singh's instructions, on 3 October.
- [9369] And the article reported it as, quoting you and saying: “I don't know why she didn't comply with the order. You'll have to ask her” or, again, words to that effect. And CNA has since clarified that that portion was reported wrongly.
- [9370] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.
- [9371] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the context of my questions were, therefore, on that article, but the point that remains, which is the point that we are talking about right now, regardless of the article, is whether you gave a clear instruction on 3 October or not, to Ms Khan. So, that point still remains.
- [9372] So, look at the next parts of the evidence, with the knowledge that the CNA article has been clarified, but with the understanding that where I'm getting to is whether or not you had given those instructions on 3 October nonetheless. Okay?
- [9373] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I mean, I've already told you what I said on 3 October.

[9374] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, and the point I'm making to you, Mr Singh, is that Ms Loh then told us that you told her one version on 12 October, but on 25 November, when she was before you at the Disciplinary Panel, you sought to recharacterise that position.

[9375] **Mr Pritam Singh:** We can go through her evidence.

[9376] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I'm showing you where that arises, okay?

[9377] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, sure.

[9378] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At the top of the page, I said: "I'll go on to say that the press then asked Mr Singh some questions." And this is the part that I think, subsequently, it was clarified. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 1294.*] "First of all, to characterise the pre-4 October meeting as an instruction to speak the truth is quite at odds with what I think you had shared with us earlier."

[9379] So, as I said just now, leave aside the reference to the article, which has been clarified. Answer: "Yes." "Correct?" Ms Loh then says:

Ms Loh Pei Ying: Yes, and I would like to add a bit to this. When I met the Disciplinary Panel on 25 November, Mr Pritam Singh had tried to relate to me again this episode where he supposedly spoke to her and asked her to speak the truth, and the way that he had talked about it when I met him on the Disciplinary Panel was very different from what he shared with me at his place on 12 October, which is why I would like to stress that the only person who can account for what he said to me in the specifics of "I will not judge you", is Mr Yudhishtira Nathan, because we both heard it together.

[9380] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[9381] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me pause for a moment. She's recounting what happened first on 12 October, and then again on 25 November, right?

[9382] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. Yes, that's clear.

[9383] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, so that we get our timespan correct.

[9384] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[9385] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I go on to say: "Alright, I'll make a request to Mr Speaker to call Mr Nathan" and so on. And then I said, two questions down [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 1300.*]:

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: But I want to focus on what you said earlier about the difference between what was said on 12 October, that evening at his home, and what was said at the DP. There was an intervening period of about five weeks.

Ms Loh Pei Ying: Yes.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: And what I think I understand from you, which I would like you to clarify, is this: that on 12 October, the position taken was "we won't judge you", meaning "we will be behind you, you take a view, and you know, we know". But on 25 November, that characterisation changed to one where he's trying to impress upon you and Mr Nathan

that, in fact, prior to the October Sitting, he had told her, and in the words of the CNA report, “given her an order” to tell the truth, and that is the difference, correct?

Ms Loh Pei Ying: Correct.

[9386] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This — Sorry, go ahead, ask your question.

[9387] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, my question is this: is her evidence correct that at the meeting of 25 November, you sought to recharacterise what you told her on 12 October concerning your instruction to Ms Khan on 3 October?

[9388] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, that’s — Her evidence is faulty here. That’s my evidence. I think it’s also interesting that she takes the view on 12 October, that she interprets “we will not judge you” meaning, “we will be behind you, you take a view and we know.” This is certainly not what I communicated to her on 12 October. That is my evidence.

[9389] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But the shift that she’s trying to explain is, basically, that you are trying to say that the 3 October instruction carried more weight, the way you sought to put it, carried more weight, the way you described it on 25 November to her, more weight and force in favour of it being a clear instruction than you had described to her on 12 October. And that’s what she’s saying.

[9390] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I can’t be so acute to tell you what weight I placed on it on 25 November, at the Disciplinary Panel, and on 12 October. But I think I was clear, I was consistent on both occasions. I met up with Ms Khan on 3 October and I had told her to take responsibility and ownership and I would have communicated the same thing to Pei Ying on both these days. That ought to have been clear. That’s my evidence.

[9391] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, looking at everything that we have seen so far, the upshot of the evidence – and I’ve shown you as much as I can and the basis on which I reached this thinking – is that you had met with Ms Khan on 3 October, and you had said some words to her. You then give an account of what you said on the 3 October to Ms Loh and Mr Nathan on 12 November, and —

[9392] **Mr Pritam Singh:** 12 October.

[9393] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** October, I beg your pardon, you’re right, 12 October. And in that account, you were not as clear that your instruction on 3 October was an unequivocal one?

[9394] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree, I have to disagree.

[9395] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Hang on. But that you then sought to recharacterise that when you met Ms Loh again on 25 November. And by this time, you put forward the same conversation, but in a different light, and you sought, according to her, you sought to characterise it as one where you gave an instruction, it was a clear instruction to tell the truth, on 4 October?

[9396] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not true.

[9397] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You wouldn’t accept that?

- [9398] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I don't accept that.
- [9399] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Why would Ms Loh lie about this?
- [9400] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can't speak for Ms Loh, but I would suggest – I can only suggest that – again, she's a good person.
- [9401] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, you see —
- [9402] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me say that. But when you receive a message from Ms Khan, telling you a senior Party cadre —
- [9403] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh, I know you keep referring to this, but this is —
- [9404] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because it must be germane to your thinking. And I would say, and I know where you're going with this, you object to my going back to that. I can understand why.
- [9405] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I'm not objecting to your evidence, but I think we have to keep to a certain track, you see.
- [9406] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm going there, I'm getting there —
- [9407] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please get there faster then.
- [9408] **Mr Pritam Singh:** In my opinion, Ms Loh and Mr Nathan worked very closely with Ms Khan. They, I believe, that they tried to protect her. That's my view.
- [9409] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But, you see, by 12 October —
- [9410] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hm.
- [9411] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You already knew that she had disobeyed those instructions.
- [9412] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What instructions?
- [9413] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The instructions to take ownership, responsibility, come clean.
- [9414] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, if the issue comes up, yes.
- [9415] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And the issue did come up?
- [9416] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [9417] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And she didn't do that?
- [9418] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9419] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, it would have been logical for you to explain that to Ms Loh?

[9420] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I did, I did communicate it to them. I communicated it to the both of them.

[9421] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, I'll go back to my question. Why would Ms Loh lie about this? Because you see, and follow the evidence carefully, and I'll be honest with you —

[9422] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I hope you have been.

[9423] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I always will be. When I went through this exercise with Ms Loh, I had no inkling that she would volunteer this information. You look at the way in which it came out. She, voluntarily, on her own, offered: "I would like to add a bit to this." And she sought to tell us that you tried to reshape the way in which you conveyed your description of the meeting.

[9424] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I hear you.

[9425] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that suggests to me – which is why I'm asking this of you – this suggests to me that you now realise that your words on 3 October could be construed as equivocal, at best, and not a clear enough instruction and, therefore, run the risk that the public, people may construe you as not having been clear enough in giving an instruction to Ms Khan to come and tell the truth.

[9426] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree. And you asked me why she would lie. I can only share with you what Yudhish and both Ms Loh, we were talking about the drafts that Ms Khan prepared through the months of October, and they were agreeable with the Disciplinary Panel. Everything was — there was nothing untoward, no issue raised about "Pritam, you have knowledge"; nothing of that sort. Until, in my mind, somewhere halfway around November, they realised that the pressure on Raeesah was so severe to resign that they were concerned that really might be what was going to transpire.

[9427] To be honest, the Disciplinary Panel didn't take a view of what would happen to her. We wanted to go through the process and we are not the adjudicators. We present our findings and recommendations to the CEC. The CEC will decide. But I think they realised that she had no allies anymore and it was only left to the two of them. And you asked me that question, so, I believe that they were really close and they wanted to protect her.

[9428] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** They might have been trying to persuade the Disciplinary Panel or the CEC not to expel or force Ms Khan to resign.

[9429] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, it's entirely possible.

[9430] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But she gave this evidence on 2 December, by which time, all of that is water under the bridge.

[9431] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

- [9432] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, I go back to my —
- [9433] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Doesn't that strengthen my case?
- [9434] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No —
- [9435] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because she's already resigned and the axe has fallen.
- [9436] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, it's a fait accompli. She can't change that fact anymore. It's been announced —
- [9437] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [9438] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — within minutes of her resignation.
- [9439] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She may be very unhappy about that turn of events.
- [9440] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, are you citing that as a reason for her to lie, voluntarily?
- [9441] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Since you've asked me that question, that, indeed, would be a reason I would ascribe, yes.
- [9442] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I've taken some pains to show you the impression of the 3 October meeting you had with Ms Khan very carefully, because Ms Loh, Mr Nathan and Ms Khan, they all have the same impression of —
- [9443] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Indeed.
- [9444] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — of what you said, and all of them have a first-hand direct account from you.
- [9445] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [9446] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And two of them have a first-hand direct account from you after 4 October —
- [9447] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [9448] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Taking all of this together, taking all this together, all the evidence, it does not come out anywhere that you had given a clear instruction to Ms Khan on 3 October to come and tell the truth.
- [9449] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, if you listen to the evidence that I gave earlier on my reasons why I think Ms Loh would give the evidence that she did, it may affect your view as to why she would say what she did. But I had made it clear to Ms Khan on 3 October, since this is the issue that we are still on, that she had to take ownership and responsibility for the issue. I felt I was perfectly clear to her. And —
- [9450] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I cannot —

[9451] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — and Yudhish and Pei Ying, I mean, that meeting on 12 October was over pizza. So, it was a — I’m not saying that that suddenly changes the complexion to things —

[9452] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — and it does not, Mr Singh.

[9453] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely, I’m not making that point. But the fact is I communicated to them that I had spoken to her on 3 October, by “her” I mean Raeesah, and told Raeesah that she had to take ownership and responsibility for it. And I did communicate to them, I did say to them, and I also told her, “I will not judge you”. And the purpose of that is to – really, for lack of a better word – incentivise her to just tell the truth.

[9454] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I’ll come to the purpose later. But let me say to you that the three of them – which was my original train – have come with a position that is corroborative of each other.

[9455] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I am not surprised.

[9456] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I can understand why you might say Ms Khan, who is facing the inquiry, might be untruthful.

[9457] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9458] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And even then, I’m —

[9459] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You can’t make that point.

[9460] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I’ll leave it as that only, okay? But what’s the reason for Mr Nathan and Ms Loh to lie about this?

[9461] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think I just mentioned that I believe the reason why —

[9462] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Out of loyalty to Ms Khan? Basically, that’s what you’re saying.

[9463] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Out of loyalty to Ms Khan, and they certainly expected that the Party leadership would not go down the road of considering her resignation or even expulsion. But once we had started to gather public – not public, sorry – the Workers’ Party members’ feedback on the issue, I think that’s when they decided, “Oh no, she may really go and we’re not happy with the leadership” for whatever reason. Because they may well have been thinking that the leadership would not be under any pressure to expel her.

[9464] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you characterise or at least you offer a reason for why Ms Loh would come to this tribunal to lie on the basis that they are unhappy with the leadership for taking action against Ms Khan?

[9465] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can only speculate since you asked that question in an open-ended and speculative way.

[9466] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, as of 3 November, the day after the DP was set up, they had already been very consistent in their views that they felt – I showed you the messages earlier – they felt that you had your share of blame to take. You were there in Parliament when the untruth was being spoken. You have not made clear or known your position.

[9467] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me advance —

[9468] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So —

[9469] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, go ahead.

[9470] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, they did not develop an overnight dislike of the senior leadership. They have been very consistent in their views to us. They have made clear that this was their view. They discussed it privately. They came to the DP to explain it to you openly. They sent you messages – at least Ms Loh did, sent you messages, all of which are consistent. And I'll show you those messages in a moment. And they came here and they gave evidence without knowing – and this is important – without knowing what it is that you were saying at the press conference on 2 December.

[9471] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't think that's quite germane as to what I said at the press conference. I think the issue is how far would they go to protect Ms Khan. I think that's the issue.

[9472] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Besides this issue of loyalty that you mentioned, can you think of any other reason why Ms Loh might lie about this?

[9473] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I mean, I'm looking at these chats which share certain things between the three of them. I'm a bit surprised, actually quite surprised, to see some of this. But I haven't gone through it thoroughly because it's the first time I'm seeing it. I can think of no reason because I think I work pretty well with them, I would say.

[9474] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, you do. In fact —

[9475] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can only suggest, reasonably, that their loyalty to Ms Khan was more important than anything else.

[9476] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Even the truth?

[9477] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can't say that for a fact. It's not fair for me to put words in their mouth.

[9478] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But that's what you're suggesting.

[9479] **Mr Pritam Singh:** All I'm suggesting is what I said. I think their loyalty to Ms Khan was of prime importance.

[9480] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you're saying that because of that, they are prepared to sacrifice the truth and come up here to lie —

- [9481] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's your characterisation, not mine.
- [9482] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I think that's really what you're saying, because —
- [9483] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That can be your inference. You can hold on to that point of view. I said what I said.
- [9484] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, you are certainly saying that Ms Loh lied.
- [9485] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think Ms Loh —
- [9486] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes or no? Her evidence that I've just taken you through?
- [9487] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It's not fair for me to characterise her in that way.
- [9488] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh.
- [9489] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [9490] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm entitled to ask you —
- [9491] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You are entitled to.
- [9492] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — about an occasion where Ms Loh came before you, and she says that you – and she was giving direct evidence – sought to recharacterise the nature of the meeting.
- [9493] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [9494] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I think I've taken you through it.
- [9495] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But the only thing I see in that is "I will not judge you". I don't see her describing that meeting.
- [9496] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She is saying that you recharacterised the meeting. Right, so, is that true or not true?
- [9497] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it's not true.
- [9498] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you're saying she's lying.
- [9499] **Mr Pritam Singh:** To that extent, yes.
- [9500] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Going back to my original point, Mr Singh, the fact of the matter is that you did not put it in clear terms to Ms Khan on 3 October that she was to come clean in Parliament and tell the truth.
- [9501] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Disagree.

[9502] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that is the reason why none of this episode on 3 October appears anywhere in your press statement or in any of your answers to the press on that day.

[9503] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree and I've answered this question.

[9504] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In fact, Nicholas asked you directly and made this comment, if you look at page 3 of the press conference transcript. [*A transcript was referred to.*]

[9505] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9506] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The question has come up—

[9507] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Where are we?

[9508] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Middle of page 3, Nicholas: “What did the party know? When did they know about, which you’ve already clarified, but again, then it resulted in long-term damage to the party. The party had not come out and said this is what really happened.”

[9509] Why didn't you take the opportunity at this, and at several other junctures, to say, “I had a meeting with Ms Khan on 3 October” —

[9510] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn't think it was —

[9511] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — “I made it very clear to her?” Mr Singh, it's the most germane and the most proximate occasion to what happened thereafter on 4 October.

[9512] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think you have asked this question in another way and I've answered it already, why it didn't come up. There's no change to my evidence.

[9513] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm giving you an opportunity to look at it and reflect because —

[9514] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think I reflected on it enough when you asked me that question first. It was only the truth I had to say and I just said it.

[9515] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm going to suggest to you, therefore, that, in fact, the reason why it was not put in is because you chose to not to disclose this. And you, therefore, suppressed any mention of the 3 October meeting that you had with Ms Khan at her home the day before Parliamentary Sitting, which was in contemplation of the issue of the lie coming up the next day. You suppressed it because you know that you'd be pressed on details of what you said to Ms Khan and you will not be able to say that you gave an unequivocal answer. Do you agree?

[9516] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I completely disagree.

[9517] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that's the reason why it doesn't appear anywhere in your press statement. It doesn't appear —

- [9518] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I completely disagree again.
- [9519] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, I don't see it in the press statement.
- [9520] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, I have told you why it wasn't in the press statement a good — when we started this exchange.
- [9521] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, you were very careful in your drafting and I can see that. I can see that in the prepared speech, you were very, very careful. It comes through.
- [9522] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What's the point? Isn't that a good thing?
- [9523] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, it's a good thing, but I think you were very careful to try not to be drawn into questions on 3 October.
- [9524] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. Very creative, Mr Tong. But I think the only reason why there was no need for me to bring it up was because Ms Khan had already resigned. Why am I putting another piece of information out there which shows that she did not take heed of a very clear instruction to be responsible and to take ownership? As it is, she has already —
- [9525] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, but —
- [9526] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let's stop at that for a minute, Mr Tong, since that's a line of questioning that's important to you. I also don't say that Ms Khan lied to me after 3 August, telling me that she has a victim by the name of [redacted] at Bedok Police station.
- [9527] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Listen to me, Mr Singh.
- [9528] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't say that either, but you don't quibble with that.
- [9529] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I don't quibble with that because you know as well as I do that that's not germane to the question. Listen —
- [9530] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Understand my answer.
- [9531] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me stop you here. The press is interested in knowing what the Workers' Party knew, and when it knew, and what it did about the lie.
- [9532] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [9533] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. The lie is a lie on 3 August, repeated on 4 October.
- [9534] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [9535] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, it is relevant for you to say, I met with Ms Khan and told her, in no uncertain terms, that she was to come to Parliament to come clean, clarify, tell the truth, confess. But you didn't do that.

[9536] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn't see a need to do that. I didn't see a need to do that for the reasons I've laid out. And if there really was a need to put all of Ms Khan's linen in public, I would not have just said that, I would also have said that Ms Khan also lied to me about the episode. But I didn't do that. Why? Because there was no need to.

[9537] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We've heard your explanation. We can move on.

[9538] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9539] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We covered this briefly earlier, and I think your evidence is on the record. But let me just put this to you. If your evidence is correct that, on 3 August, you told Ms Khan, "If it comes up tomorrow, take ownership, responsibility" —

[9540] **Mr Pritam Singh:** On 3 October.

[9541] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On 3 October, I beg your pardon. "If it comes up tomorrow, on 4 October, take ownership, responsibility", meaning clarify, tell the truth.

[9542] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[9543] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What would have happened if the issue did not come up in Parliament?

[9544] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's very speculative. But —

[9545] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, it's not.

[9546] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not avoiding the question. Let me be clear about that.

[9547] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Don't avoid the question, and let me tell you why it's not speculative. It is not speculative because by 3 October, this lie had been on the record for two months.

[9548] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9549] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I don't need to refer you to your own statements here —

[9550] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You don't need to.

[9551] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — about how important it is to clarify. The only question in your mind was when, right?

[9552] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[9553] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if it didn't come up on 4 October, when, in your mind, would this happen? Because, and I remind you of some germane materials.

[9554] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[9555] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On no occasion, between 8 October, when you had a meeting at your home, and 3 October —

[9556] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. Third of —

[9557] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Sorry, I keep misspeaking. I beg your pardon.

[9558] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It's okay.

[9559] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** From 8 August —

[9560] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — 8 August, 3 October.

[9561] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. What's wrong with me? From 8 August to 3 October: at no point in time in that period did you check if Ms Khan had told her family and was, therefore, able to come clean in Parliament.

[9562] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[9563] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, on 3 October, and indeed on 4 October, if the matter had not arisen in Parliament, not been asked by MHA, what would have happened? When, in your own mind, would it have been an appropriate time to come clean?

[9564] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Shortly after the October session, in my mind.

[9565] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What does that mean? What does "shortly after" mean?

[9566] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, it would have to be addressed by Raeesah herself, because I know that it's not true. And she would have had to clarify the matter.

[9567] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, let me ask you this: why not on 4 October itself? Why didn't you make plans to come clean on 4 October?

[9568] **Mr Pritam Singh:** As I said, it was something that I had given Ms Khan time to think about and consider. This was the first time she was coming back after her episode with shingles. I can accept it is a criticism. Perhaps I should have pushed harder and earlier. And I think that's a fair conclusion for people to make. But in my view, in my judgement, I was prepared to give her time to come to me and say, "Look, Pritam, I've spoken to my parents and I'm going to come clean."

[9569] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, Mr Singh, it's not just about the criticism about your judgement. Because it's not just about, maybe you could've been harder or firmer, but it, I think, belies what really happened and what you intended to happen.

[9570] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree.

[9571] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because —

[9572] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, I thought that was a question, but I disagree anyway.

[9573] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because you have a lie that's on the record —

[9574] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't have a lie. Raeesah Khan has a lie on the record.

[9575] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, there is a lie on the record. And you know that it has got to be clarified quickly with only one criterion holding it up, as you said earlier. You have not checked throughout the preceding two months if that criterion had been resolved, so you have no idea if she had told her family. Why would you not have at some stage prior to October, if the intention was to come clean only after the family knew, at some stage earlier than 3 October, said, "Let's prepare to come clean. Have you told the family?"

[9576] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. So —

[9577] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If that was truly the intention to do so without having to, in the words of Ms Khan, being told, as she says, if it doesn't come up, don't raise it.

[9578] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. Well, Mr Tong, to me, this revelation that Ms Khan had shared of being [sexually assaulted] – of sexual assault – was a very serious one, an important one. And I, in my judgement, wanted to give her time and space to speak to her parents about it. It did not cross my mind as something which I was going to pressure her repeatedly, knowing that, of course, she also had a bout of shingles. But I had to cross this bridge at some point. And I said "speculative" earlier because of what had already occurred in Parliament, not because it was going to be left alone.

[9579] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, it's not about just October or even September. The point is this: there is a lie that Ms Khan had spoken on 3 August. You now know that there is a lie, from 7 August.

[9580] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9581] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you wanted to give her time and space —

[9582] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9583] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — which, I understand your perspective.

[9584] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9585] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What I don't understand is why you didn't follow up and check if that time and space that you have given had been used to tell her family so that she can now come forward and come clean, and make preparations to do that.

[9586] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Indeed, it was something that I would have had to do eventually. I just did not do it from 8 August right up until 1 October, where I'm already telling you, through my email, what is the consequences of doing what you do. It's quite clear from my state of mind that this is not going to be an issue that's going to rest.

[9587] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, I can't tell that, about your state of mind —

[9588] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can only give evidence in that regard.

[9589] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, because your state of mind is also manifest in the objective contemporaneous evidence. And I don't see any attempt whatsoever – you can correct me if I'm wrong – but I don't see any attempt whatsoever, throughout the whole of August, throughout the whole of September, and you said there's the 1 October email – we'll see it – and then the meeting on 3 October. Apart from these, I don't see any attempt that could be construed as consistent with wanting to come forward and come clean, correct?

[9590] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct. I gave evidence in this regard.

[9591] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, and so I'm trying to understand why.

[9592] **Mr Pritam Singh:** In my judgement, it was something for her to speak to me about after she had crossed the bridge with her parents.

[9593] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If it is so important that this bridge be crossed, you should check whether the bridge has been crossed.

[9594] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I mean, I agree, I agree.

[9595] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You should check proactively.

[9596] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I could have been more proactive about it, yes.

[9597] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, you were not just not more proactive. You did nothing, Mr Singh.

[9598] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I understand where you're going with this line of questioning, but it is —

[9599] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Answer my question first.

[9600] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't disagree with it.

[9601] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You did nothing, right? In this period of time? To check if she has told her family?

[9602] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, that's my evidence. I've given the evidence.

[9603] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, in that context, how do I objectively construe your intention you say, that you intended to come clean in Parliament —

[9604] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But that's the problem.

[9605] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — when there were no steps taken?

[9606] **Mr Pritam Singh:** When I said it is speculative, that's precisely why I said it was speculative. Because there is no way you can objectively come to a conclusion on that.

[9607] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, you could.

[9608] **Mr Pritam Singh:** How so? Because you, in your question to me, say I did not raise this with her —

[9609] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I am asking you why that is so. Wouldn't you agree with me that this is an important point and the only meaning there's a lie on the record has to be clarified, and the only barrier to being clarified was whether the family is aware, then it must behoove you, not just as a leader of the Workers' Party, but as a responsible Member of Parliament, and certainly as the Leader of the Opposition, to take steps to check if that family member or that criteria, where the family member is required to be told first, has been satisfied.

[9610] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And I, as also mentioned earlier, expected a Member of Parliament who's taken an oath, to close that issue with her family and come and speak to me about it. We can quibble who was supposed to do what. I am not shielding myself from any responsibility here. Indeed, I could have done it earlier, but I made the call, given what I've heard from Ms Khan, to let her settle the issue with her family and then come and speak to me about it. That was my expectation.

[9611] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I would suggest to you that not just that you could have done it earlier; that you should have done it earlier.

[9612] **Mr Pritam Singh:** At this present moment in time, you ask me to look back, how things transpired, of course, I would say I should have done it earlier. But given what I was under at that point in time, I decided, okay, she will come up. She's an elected Member of Parliament, she's a leader in her own right. She will speak to me and tell me, "Look, this has happened and I have to take responsibility for it." Good, let's get it done.

[9613] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you were in no position to know when that might happen?

[9614] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, that's correct.

[9615] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if it didn't come up in October, what would you have done? Would October have been the same as September and August?

[9616] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You see, this is where we're getting into speculative territory. I have told you, I would dealt with the issue. I would have had to go and speak to her, "Raeesah, have you spoken to your parents?"

[9617] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, if I had some evidence on the record where you said to Raeesah or Ms Khan, "I give you two weeks".

[9618] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, there's nothing. There's no evidence of that sort, Mr Tong.

[9619] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's not there. Or that you had discussed with her, also don't have, right? There's no such evidence?

[9620] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Except the email on 1 October.

[9621] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, we know that.

[9622] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, on 1 October.

[9623] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Or that you had met with the family in this period of time? Which you didn't do?

[9624] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that's correct.

[9625] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, there's just been not a single step consistent with wanting to come clean?

[9626] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is your reading of it, I've given you my evidence and I have told you that from 8 August right up to 3 October, I did not follow up with her, barring that one email. I've said it. I'm not sure how many more ways I can say it.

[9627] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I will say to you, Mr Singh, that I think that, in fact, is, therefore, consistent with Ms Khan's account of what happened on 8 August and again on 3 October.

[9628] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You believe her SMS, you believe her lie, that this was to be taken to the grave. Because that's what you're saying.

[9629] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm looking at the evidence.

[9630] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And you believe that evidence. That evidence is stronger than the evidence that I'm giving you?

[9631] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, as I said, I don't just look at one piece. I look at the entire substratum of facts.

[9632] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I hope you do and I trust that you do.

[9633] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I will certainly do. And I take into account that nothing was done at all in the whole of August and September, which might suggest that this issue is likely to be clarified by Ms Khan in Parliament in October or, in fact, at any stage thereafter.

[9634] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I agree. I think I've given evidence to that effect.

[9635] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I say to you that that's very suggestive of Ms Khan's evidence being correct, where she said she was told if it doesn't come up, if she's not pressed again, keep to the August narrative.

[9636] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, challenge that evidence. Challenge that evidence with Mr Nathan, Ms Loh, "Why didn't you bring this to the Party's attention?" You don't challenge that evidence, but you find that more believable. And I will explain later to the Committee why it's not believable. But I will do so after I have answered all your questions.

[9637] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm not making any judgement on it. In fact, I'm probing you so that I can understand your evidence and what you say supports your state of

mind, because, as I said to you earlier, your state of mind is one thing, but the objective, contemporaneous evidence is not consistent with that.

[9638] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Whatever I'm saying to you right now, I said it in response to questions from journalists as well. So, you take that for what it is; and it's on the record because you have it.

[9639] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm focused on the evidence you are giving here to this Committee under oath.

[9640] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9641] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, let me just see if I understand your evidence and we can move on. You were aware of the lie on 7 August. Ms Lim and Mr Faisal were also aware of the lie by 8 August, right?

[9642] **Mr Pritam Singh:** On 8 August.

[9643] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Throughout the rest of August, no steps were taken by you, and as far as you know, Ms Lim, Mr Faisal, to speak to Ms Khan about clarifying the lie in Parliament?

[9644] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I think I made this clear in my press conference on 2 December.

[9645] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No steps were taken by any of you, the three of you, to check if the family were aware, and then for her to prepare to clarify the lie in Parliament?

[9646] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can only speak for myself.

[9647] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, yourself.

[9648] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And I've given my evidence that I spoke to her on 3 October, telling her to take ownership and responsibility. That's all.

[9649] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Keep to my time period.

[9650] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Your time period, answer, yes.

[9651] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I want to be clear. The answer is yes. So, none —

[9652] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And I've given this answer I think about four or five times, Mr Chairman.

[9653] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I want to be very clear.

[9654] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You can't be more clearer than how I've put it to you.

[9655] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, but indulge me. So, nothing whatsoever in August.

[9656] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[9657] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Now, September. Same question. Were there any steps taken in September which would be consistent with saying that Ms Khan —

[9658] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Chairman, I've answered this question. I've already said no. I don't know what part of "no" Mr Tong doesn't understand.

[9659] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I think we better be clear.

[9660] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I'm telling you now, be crystal clear, and I've been crystal clear in all of my answers. Nothing for me to hide. Crystal clear on 2 December in front of the press, crystal clear with you today.

[9661] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm not so sure about the press, but the crystal clear position now —

[9662] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I said the same thing to the press. The press I think asked a question to that and —

[9663] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The crystal clear position now is that not a single step was taken by either you, or, as far as you know, Ms Lim or Mr Faisal towards ensuring that Ms Khan would come clean and clarify her lie in Parliament in October.

[9664] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Up to 3 August, yes.

[9665] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 3 October, you mean?

[9666] **Mr Pritam Singh:** 3 October, I beg your pardon.

[9667] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, up to 3 October, no steps were taken, correct?

[9668] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I've said so many, many, many times.

[9669] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, it's important for us to be clear, Mr Singh.

[9670] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's taking it too far, I think, a bit of a stretch.

[9671] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You say that and you said it to the press as well, she couldn't clarify the issue in September because Ms Khan had shingles?

[9672] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[9673] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right? She had shingles, first diagnosed with it, around 8 or 9 September, thereabouts, right?

[9674] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't know. I have to be sure. I have to check.

[9675] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Would it roughly accord with your recollection?

[9676] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'll have to check. But if that's the time that you have, let's take it as that's the date. It's not something that I'm going to dispute, that's for sure.

[9677] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, I can tell you that, from open sources, that Ms Khan published a Facebook post on 9 September to say that she's been diagnosed with shingles. So, you can take that from me.

[9678] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I think I referred to it earlier also.

[9679] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** A Sitting in Parliament was four days later, on 13 September.

[9680] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[9681] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You would not have known in August that Ms Khan would come down with shingles, right?

[9682] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Obviously not.

[9683] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, let me understand why no steps were taken to try and clarify the matter in September, because all along we've been focused on trying to clarify it in October. But, actually, there was an earlier opportunity for you to do it if you wanted to and this would be the September Sitting. 13 September.

[9684] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Logical, yes, it follows.

[9685] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And this would be about five weeks after you became aware of the lie?

[9686] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[9687] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, there would be enough time?

[9688] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Like I said, I expected Ms Khan to inform me when she had spoken to her parents, and she told me on 8 August that her therapist also knew of what had occurred. So, I wanted to give her sufficient time to confer with her parents, her therapist, because she was going to make very important revelations in Parliament. So, it is consistent with my earlier evidence that there was no follow-up.

[9689] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. But my question is: you could have considered September as a possible window for you to get her to clarify, right?

[9690] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Indeed, absolutely.

[9691] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, actually, shingles is not a reason why it was not clarified?

[9692] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, it would have been this. I would imagine – and, again, going into speculation here – that if I had known that she wasn't suffering from shingles, I may

have well communicated with her before that to say this issue may well come up, and “you better take responsibility and ownership”. But it’s speculative because she —

[9693] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you would only have done that very close to the September Sitting?

[9694] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I’m not sure. I really am not sure.

[9695] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At the risk of upsetting you again —

[9696] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You’re not upsetting me, Mr Tong. Trust me, you’re not upsetting me. Not at all.

[9697] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Prior to when she had shingles on 9 September, there was no attempt to speak to her to clarify the truth at the September Sitting, correct?

[9698] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I have given my evidence. Your earlier question stretched from 8 August right up to 3 October.

[9699] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. But now that you know that there was a September Sitting on 13 September, just indulge me. The answer would also be no, right? No attempt made?

[9700] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9701] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, thank you.

[9702] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would like to come back. I probably can confirm when she communicated with me she had shingles. I’m not sure whether it coincides with the day she makes the Facebook post, but I’ll have to check. I’ll give this evidence to the Committee.

[9703] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It would be that day or shortly after?

[9704] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Or shortly before. I don’t know.

[9705] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, Alright. That’s fine.

[9706] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I will put this evidence to the Committee.

[9707] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** After the sitting on 4 October, there was a meeting in your room, LO’s office, and she had told us that there were two issues that were discussed at that meeting, and I will just show you her evidence and then ask you some questions on them. Okay?

[9708] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, please. Mr Tong, I have two binders in front of me. Just confirm with me which date you’re referring to and time.

[9709] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, I will come back to it in a moment. Please turn to page 95.

- [9710] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Of?
- [9711] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Of the 2 December bundle.
- [9712] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay. Page 95?
- [9713] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, please.
- [9714] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I'm here.
- [9715] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You look just before the halfway mark of this page. I asked her about – let me just read it to you. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 1649.*] I said: “Yes, thank you. Now, you mentioned that after these statements were made on 4 October, that there was a meeting? I don't know whether it's physically or through messaging. Can you elaborate?”
- [9716] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I do apologise. Page 95, right?
- [9717] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 95. Of 2 December. Are you on 2 December?
- [9718] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This is 2 December, but just roughly where are you on that page?
- [9719] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Just past the middle.
- [9720] **Mr Pritam Singh:** “A meeting with”? That's in the middle?
- [9721] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.
- [9722] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay, we're on the same page.
- [9723] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, “meeting is with fellow MPs from the Workers' Party in relation to what happened in Parliament on 4 October.”
- [9724] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [9725] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if you just quickly cast your eye over the next few lines, it is the same meeting you described at the LO office with Ms Lim and Ms Khan and yourself, right?
- [9726] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [9727] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I said [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 1653.*]:

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: So, just three of you?

Ms Raeesah Khan: Yes.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Can you tell us what happened?

Ms Raeesah Khan: There was a discussion on what the next step should be, and that was it. That was the conclusion of the conversation.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: What do you mean by “next step should be”? What does that mean? Can you give me a little bit more clarity?

Ms Raeesah Khan: We had the discussion around possible Police investigation, the possibility of me being heard at the Committee of Privileges and there was a discussion that – and that was the main gist of the discussion.

[9728] Would this be an accurate reflection of what was discussed?

[9729] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it would not be.

[9730] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It would not be?

[9731] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it would not be.

[9732] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This was a short meeting, right?

[9733] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Very, very short. It was very, very short.

[9734] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Very, very short?

[9735] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9736] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you knew that either at this meeting or shortly thereafter, that she went to consult with lawyers?

[9737] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She emailed the advice to me, yes. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 15 December 2021, from Para No 13571.*]

[9738] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And without going into the nature of the advice, tell us why lawyers were consulted.

[9739] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I do not know why she consulted lawyers.

[9740] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you would have seen the advice. I’m not asking you to share the advice with me, but why were lawyers consulted?

[9741] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You have to ask this question to Ms Khan.

[9742] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** To your knowledge, because you saw the advice.

[9743] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would suppose the Police may have already written to her by then, and she sought legal advice on what the Police were requesting of her.

[9744] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This request by the Police, Ms Khan says that she was directed by yourself and Ms Lim not to respond. Is that true?

[9745] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is not true.

- [9746] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you tell her to respond to the Police?
- [9747] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I was of the view that this matter was —
- [9748] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, answer my question, because I asked you a question and you said “not true”. So, I, therefore, ask you the opposite, which is, so, did you direct her?
- [9749] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I do not recall directing her not to respond to the Police.
- [9750] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you didn’t direct her to respond to the Police and you didn’t direct her not to respond to the Police, what did you do?
- [9751] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, say that again? Sorry, there were two negatives in there, so, I’m trying to – could you just repeat that?
- [9752] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Ms Khan’s evidence is that yourself and Ms Lim directed her not to respond to the Police.
- [9753] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Oh, that’s not true. Let’s deal with that.
- [9754] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you advise her, counsel or direct her to meet with the Police?
- [9755] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I did not.
- [9756] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you neither told her not to meet the Police, nor did you tell her to meet the Police. So, what did you do?
- [9757] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You see, again, I come back to first principles, what does the —
- [9758] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, no, Mr Singh, not first principles. It’s a matter of fact.
- [9759] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [9760] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Simple fact. Did you tell her, “yes” or “no”, and if not, then what did you tell her?
- [9761] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I have to be very careful what I say because whatever I directed her to do was predicated on the fact that she had told a lie in Parliament. There is section 5 of the Parliament Act and the nature of the advice was similar to my own thinking, and I did not ask her to – “I expected you address this issue in Parliament because it’s a matter that has come up in Parliament, and the appropriate forum to address it would be in Parliament.” That was my thinking. I did not order her, “Don’t talk to the Police. Don’t do this. Don’t do that”. No, I don’t recall saying this to her.
- [9762] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This request by the Police. You know how they work, by and large.

[9763] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think I'm not sure.

[9764] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Would be not an unreasonable one. It follows from the lack of clarity on 4 October, correct?

[9765] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree. I think it was something they ought to be aware of, that a matter has come up in Parliament, we believe in the separation of powers schema, that an MP had said something in Parliament, and it's for Parliament to correct that problem and there's a good reason why that exists, there's a good reason why freedom of speech is on the statute in Parliament.

[9766] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, let me stop you there. Do you mean to say that if a Member of Parliament goes and makes a speech that accuses the Police or any public agency for that matter of behaving badly, that particular agency will have no interest in wanting to find out more?

[9767] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, they have all the interests in finding out more —

[9768] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, surely you agree with that.

[9769] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — but through what channel do they find out more.

[9770] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What other channel could there be?

[9771] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Very simple. Put your request to the Minister for Home Affairs, like they did and just say, "You have made this accusation against the Police. You are in Parliament now. This is the forum where you've made this accusation. Let us know what the truth is."

[9772] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, let me stop you there.

[9773] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That conforms with the law. That's my view.

[9774] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh. Don't throw the law at me and please —

[9775] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I am not throwing the law at you.

[9776] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — in this case, get real. Listen.

[9777] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm. I'm very real on this point.

[9778] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You've heard the Minister for Home Affairs seek clarification after clarification. It was not forthcoming, no details were coming.

[9779] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[9780] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You want to write to the same Minister for Home Affairs and ask for details. Well, that's not real, please. So, I'm saying to you that a natural step would be for the Police to ask for details and this is what happened, correct?

[9781] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right, and of course the Member of Parliament can rely on the Parliament Act to determine how to resolve this matter.

[9782] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Sure. But I'm asking you a different question. Let's go back to it.

[9783] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[9784] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The question that was asked by the Police was not an unreasonable one, right, to come —

[9785] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It was a request. It was framed as a request.

[9786] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Not an unreasonable one, correct?

[9787] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it was not unreasonable.

[9788] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, thank you. Not that difficult.

[9789] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, not difficult at all and I've also explained why. It was for her to say it in Parliament.

[9790] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If it was not an unreasonable request, why did you not advise Ms Khan to go and see the Police?

[9791] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, in my view, she had said something in Parliament. I knew what the truth of what she had said. It was untrue. She concocted this anecdote and it was for her to come to Parliament and correct it.

[9792] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You're not answering my question.

[9793] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's my answer.

[9794] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The Police is now putting forward a not unreasonable request.

[9795] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[9796] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Asking questions of a fellow Party member.

[9797] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[9798] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You, by this time, know that an untruth is on the record concerning the Police.

[9799] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9800] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The Police is trying to work out what the true position is.

- [9801] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [9802] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Why would you not advise Ms Khan to attend an interview with the Police and share her views?
- [9803] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because I know what the next step has to be. She has to correct her untruth in Parliament.
- [9804] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Why must it happen in that sequence?
- [9805] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's my reading of it. You're asking for my evidence. In my view, she had to correct what she had said about the Police in Parliament.
- [9806] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the only way in which she could give an answer to the Police was to stand up in Parliament and address it?
- [9807] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that's my answer. Yes.
- [9808] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you tell her that?
- [9809] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I believe I would have communicated this to her.
- [9810] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** How?
- [9811] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Verbally.
- [9812] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Not by email?
- [9813] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.
- [9814] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** After all, she sent you an email.
- [9815] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [9816] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** With a specific request of, "What would you like me to do?" Right?
- [9817] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I am not sure. I have to check my – you may have WhatsApp chats from her. Please present them to me and then I can try and address your question.
- [9818] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can I ask you to please look at what Mr Faisal Manap tendered to this Committee yesterday.
- [9819] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Where is that? At what page am I on?
- [9820] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please look at the bottom pagination, page 14.
- [9821] **Mr Pritam Singh:** One-four, is it?
- [9822] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[9823] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9824] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This is an email dated 7 October, at 5.07 pm.

[9825] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9826] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** By Ms Raeesah Khan to Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim, Mr Muhamed Faisal Bin Abdul Manap.

[9827] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I remember this.

[9828] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me read it to you. [*An email was referred to, with the following text.*]

Dear all, I received this email from SPF asking me to, ask to continue the investigations and for me to come down for an interview. I've shared this with [redacted] who is advising me and he will share his views tonight. Please let me know what you like me to do and I will share [redacted]'s thoughts on the matter as well. Thanks for listening to me, for caring for me and for guiding me through this without judgement.

[9829] So, she is asking you for what you would like her to do, right?

[9830] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I believe I have a WhatsApp communication with her about this email which I will be happy to tender to the Committee.

[9831] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, please do.

[9832] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And I believe she makes the same request to want to talk about it and I informed her that "I will talk to you," and I made some arrangements for some dates about it.

[9833] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, let me try to understand why you advised her not see the Police, but to see Parliament first. Is it because you felt that you didn't understand the full extent of the story yet?

[9834] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.

[9835] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Is it because you felt that you weren't sure what she's going to say to the Police?

[9836] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely not.

[9837] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Is it because you felt that with the Police she had no privileges whereas in Parliament, she had privileges?

[9838] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think that is a question which has some bearing on where I felt what the appropriate forum would be to address the matter.

[9839] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, from everything that you said earlier, what happened on the 4th at night, and thereafter, and I don't propose to go through it again.

[9840] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[9841] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You're telling us that by that time, the decision had been taken out of her hands. Remember you said that?

[9842] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think she had alluded to that. She had alluded to —

[9843] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You said it to us today.

[9844] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yeah, because it was clear to me that when she said "Perhaps, there's another way, honesty", that locks it in for me.

[9845] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, as far as you are concerned, you formed that view the moment she lied again in Parliament.

[9846] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.

[9847] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right? And you said it is now taken out of her hands and you control the process.

[9848] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Agree.

[9849] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, this is in 7 October. Police is asking for information on the same topic, and you now know that there is now only one way forward in your evidence earlier, which is to disclose?

[9850] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I knew that earlier already. I knew that by the 4 October.

[9851] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, you are now driving the process. The difference according to you —

[9852] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm driving —

[9853] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** According to you, the evidence before that you gave was that pre-4 October, it was for her, post-4 October, given that she lied again, you are now driving that process.

[9854] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I wouldn't draw the binary so clearly. I would say even post 4 October, in my instructions to her, I didn't draft her statement and so forth. "You drafted, you have to do it." But it goes to the point you are making that I am driving the process. I know there's no other way now, you have to tell the truth. To that extent, yes.

[9855] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Actually, on the evidence "There ought to be no other way earlier as well."

[9856] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, that's quite obvious, I mean. But you're asking me about pre-4 October and post-4 October. So, I'm directing my questions accordingly.

[9857] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you see, if that's the case, I struggle to understand why Ms Khan was not advised by you to explain her position to the Police despite being asked

not once, twice, but three times, three times by the Police and, in your view, a not unreasonable request.

[9858] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Once, twice and three times, what are the dates, what are you referring to?

[9859] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** From my memory, 7 October, 15 October and 18 October.

[9860] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay, I don't know about all these requests, but I know a request came in, and it was clear to me that this issue had to be addressed in Parliament, and I believe we communicated the same to Ms Raeesah. Ms Lim could be there, I can't speak for her, but we did tell her, "Just reply to the Police and tell them that you will address this issue in Parliament." And I need to check, but I think she did do that.

[9861] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, maybe you can check whether you did advise her on that.

[9862] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, yes, yes, for sure she was told to reply to the Police to say that she would address this issue in Parliament. I'm quite sure she said that and I think you will find it in the newspapers as well.

[9863] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That was a press release. If you have a reply to the Police, please let us know, because you seem to suggest that's your advice to her.

[9864] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, I mean I did tell her, "Look, if the Police —", I think it was the second time the Police had asked. I need to check my email records but, certainly, I am quite sure she replied to them to say she will address this issue in Parliament. I'm quite certain of them.

[9865] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you please check and let us know.

[9866] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me put a note on it. I will check. I will get back to the Committee. At the very least, I believe there was a Straits Times article where she communicated that she had replied to the Police.

[9867] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, that's on the 20 October.

[9868] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not sure of the date but I will check.

[9869] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm quite sure, but is, of course, quite late in the day, after three requests had already been made.

[9870] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not sure of the total number of requests.

[9871] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Take it from me, three requests all made before 20 October, before there was a press statement released.

[9872] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, we'll have to – I have to remember when I communicated to her to reply to the Police, but certainly there was no reason to delay any reply to the Police to say that “You’re addressing this matter in Parliament.”

[9873] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That’s what I would have thought, but why did you not have to – why was the response not given on 7 October? Why were there three requests by the Police?

[9874] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Again, the matter did come up, but I think, the focus, or at least, my focus, more importantly, was for her to come out and tell the truth. But I’m not sure exactly at what point I communicated exactly to her, “Just reply to the Police and say I’m going to address this in Parliament, because that’s where we’re going.”

[9875] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. But you see, Mr Singh, let me be direct and blunt, as I always am. I suggest to you that on 7 October, you did not advise Ms Khan to see the Police or advise Ms Khan to reply to the Police in any shape or form because you were yourself not clear at that stage that this matter would be clarified in Parliament. Agree?

[9876] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Disagree, I completely disagree.

[9877] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And there is no evidence, contemporaneous evidence, as of 7 October which suggests that you were taking steps to prepare for Ms Khan to clarify this statement in Parliament, correct?

[9878] **Mr Pritam Singh:** On 7 October?

[9879] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** As of 7 October.

[9880] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Correct, because she wasn’t speaking to us. After 4 October, there was no communication apart from that email that she sent to us about a Police request and, thereafter, it was about me arranging with her to actually talk to her about a statement. So, that meeting, I initiated and that was on 12 October, where she said she wasn’t prepared to come forward and that was not acceptable to us.

[9881] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This suggestion that she is not in communication with you, I mean, that’s not true. She was in active communication with you.

[9882] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, sorry, I think you didn’t hear me carefully. Apart from that email that was sent with regard to the Police —

[9883] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Not just the email, Mr Singh. I heard you very well. You were in constant communication directly on messaging.

[9884] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I mean, we’re referring to the episode, the fact, “What are you going to do with the fact that you have lied?” I mean that’s the main thing we have got to talk about, and she’s not referring to that until 12 October when I called a meeting. I sat her down.

[9885] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me tell you. Let me put to you this, that, as of 7 October, there had just been no steps taken, objective contemporaneous steps taken which would be suggestive of Ms Khan preparing to go to Parliament to clarify the lie. Correct?

[9886] **Mr Pritam Singh:** On 7 October.

[9887] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** As of 7 October

[9888] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, there wasn't.

[9889] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that's why you felt that she could not reply to the Police.

[9890] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, not true.

[9891] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She could not see the Police?

[9892] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree, disagree. The fact that the Police put in a request is completely separate from the point that Ms Khan had to go to Parliament and tell the truth. It may not be what you believe – you're nodding your head – you seem to suggest to me that you don't believe it. But from 4 October, it was clear to me what direction this was going – “You had to tell the truth.” Whether the Police had written to her or not written to her, she would have told the truth on 1 November.

[9893] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, Mr Singh, there might be different fora – Police, Parliament – but there's only one truth.

[9894] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There's also separation of powers. There's Parliament, the Judiciary and the Executive.

[9895] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, we don't need a lecture on that now, okay?

[9896] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not giving you a lecture.

[9897] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** There's only one truth. Whether you tell the Police or you tell Parliament, there's only one answer.

[9898] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[9899] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, what do you have to hide?

[9900] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Nothing to hide.

[9901] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What are you concerned about? Why didn't you advise Ms Khan, “This is not an unreasonable request. They are entitled to see you and ask you questions. Please attend. Be truthful.” Why didn't you do that?

[9902] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She has told a lie Parliament. In my judgement, you correct the lie in Parliament. “You have said something on the record in Parliament. When you go to the Police station, are all the cameras going to be there to record what you say, that admission that

you made to the Police “I actually lied”? You should do it in front of the House, in front of everybody. And that’s why she had to do it in Parliament.

[9903] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Is that your answer, Mr Singh?

[9904] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Of course.

[9905] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That you lied about the Police reacting badly to sexual assault victims in Parliament and you feel that you can’t go to the Police station to tell them, “I’m sorry, this didn’t happened.”

[9906] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Back up, back up, back up, back up.

[9907] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, answer my question.

[9908] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree with that characterisation. I’ve never avoided any question you asked me.

[9909] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, what’s wrong with being open and transparent to the Police? What you have to hide?

[9910] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You are a Member of Parliament. There is a Parliament Act. You have freedom of speech in Parliament. It means something, especially to an Opposition MP. You should be free to say what you want, but you should be free to be scrutinised for what you’ve said in Parliament, free to appear before a Committee of Privileges, because this is the institution that has processes/procedures to deal with what you do in Parliament.

[9911] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That’s just drawing lines, Mr Singh.

[9912] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Those are important lines. They are there for a reason, Mr Tong.

[9913] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, you are saying, as a Member of Parliament, you are free to go to Parliament to say as you wish, but you can’t —

[9914] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s what the Prime Minister said. You can even bring rumours to Parliament and let the Executive demolish those rumours.

[9915] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, please do not interrupt, firstly, and please do not bring up irrelevant material.

[9916] You are saying that you can go to Parliament, have the freedom of speech, in your words —

[9917] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The Statutes’ words.

[9918] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — to speak in Parliament, but you can’t go to the Police station to correct a lie spoken in Parliament about the Police? Is that what you’re saying? Answer my question.

[9919] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I am saying something different. So, my answer would be no.

[9920] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, please explain.

[9921] **Mr Pritam Singh:** My answer would be no because I believe that Parliament's Privileges, Immunities and Powers Act clearly delineates that Members of Parliament have the freedom of speech. They cannot be questioned in any other place outside of Parliament. That's the law. And in my reading, there's a reason why that exists, because you give Members of Parliament the freedom to say what they want to say in Parliament. But it doesn't mean Parliament is some toothless animal. If the truth does not come out, there are procedures like this, committees like this, which can get to the truth. And that's exactly what, in my mind, ought to have happened. She had to go to Parliament, correct the record and face the music.

[9922] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, you tell us that's the law.

[9923] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's my reading of the law.

[9924] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay You are entitled to it. Okay?

[9925] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[9926] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But, actually, I'm not really looking at legal niceties.

[9927] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, that was my state of mind. Sorry. Go ahead.

[9928] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm interested in making sure that the truth is corrected as soon as possible.

[9929] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So am I.

[9930] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And there is a request now by the Police. For Parliament, you might say, "Well, I need to make sure that there's another Parliamentary Sitting. So, okay, it's another three weeks or four weeks later, and that's the forum." That's probably what you're thinking. But the Police is available at any time from 7 October onwards for you to come clean and correct the lie. Why not take it? What is there to hide?

[9931] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There's nothing to hide.

[9932] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you have decided she has to come forward now and come clean, if you say, as you say, by the time she spoke the lie again on 4 October, there's only one outcome now, which is she's got to come clean. Then, why not on 7 October, go into the Police station? Whether or not she's entitled to privileges and rights and so on in Parliament is one question. But any citizen, even a Member of Parliament, can go to the Police station and clarify a fact.

[9933] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Indeed so.

[9934] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, why not?

[9935] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because, in my judgement, Parliament was the right forum to correct her mistake.

- [9936] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you told her that?
- [9937] **Mr Pritam Singh:** In the course of our communication about the Police request, I said, “Look, I think this is something that you should correct in Parliament.”
- [9938] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so, therefore, you told her not to go to the Police?
- [9939] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn’t say don’t go to the Police.
- [9940] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But that must be what you mean, right, if you tell her that —
- [9941] **Mr Pritam Singh:** If I telling you, correct it in Parliament, that’s what it says – correct it in Parliament.
- [9942] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, Ms Khan was right when she said she was directed by you not to go to the Police? Correct?
- [9943] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would have given her the instruct – I would have given her the guidance that, if you are asking me about this, my view is you correct it in Parliament.
- [9944] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And guidance and instruction not to go to the Police, right?
- [9945] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I wouldn’t go so far. She’s a Member of Parliament. She sought this legal advice on her own. She could, if she felt that my advice was irrelevant and that, actually, she wanted to go to the Police, there was nothing I could prevent to stop her.
- [9946] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, I’m suggesting to you, Mr Singh, that one possible reason why she didn’t go to the Police at your guidance or advice was that because, at that point in time, there was no plan to come clean in Parliament, not yet.
- [9947] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Completely untrue.
- [9948] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And it was only later on in October that there was a settled position.
- [9949] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.
- [9950] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But as of 7 October, that wasn’t the case. Could I be right?
- [9951] **Mr Pritam Singh:** As of 7 October, there was no confirmation of what she was going to say in Parliament. That’s true. That’s true.
- [9952] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I didn’t say that. I said there was no consensus that she would come clean in Parliament.

[9953] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Insofar as I was concerned, on 4 October, when she had verbalised this alternate path to be honest, I was clear that was the point, that was what was going to happen.

[9954] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. And so, you would disagree with my suggestion that you told her not to go to the Police because, by that time, meaning 7 October, there was no consensus that she would come and clarify her lie in Parliament?

[9955] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Can you repeat the question so you don't accuse me of not answering it?

[9956] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so, you would disagree with my suggestion that you told her not to go to the Police because, by that time, meaning 7 October, there was no consensus that she would come and clarify her lie in Parliament?

[9957] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Disagree.

[9958] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Chairman, I know that the transcribers need a short break. Do you want to take one now?

[9959] **The Chairman:** A short one.

[9960] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. A short one.

[9961] **The Chairman:** We can take a short break. We'll adjourn now. It's 2.55 pm. Let's come back at 3.05 pm, a 10-minute break.

[9962] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We'll take a short break because the transcribers need some time off.

[9963] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, sure. I fully understand.

[9964] **The Chairman:** Would you like to have more time to finish off your lunch?

[9965] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Maybe 15 minutes would be sufficient.

[9966] **The Chairman:** So, why not we adjourn and we come back at, say, 3.15 pm?

[9967] **Mr Pritam Singh:** 3.15 pm. Sure.

[9968] May I be discharged, Chair, for the purposes of the break?

[9969] **The Chairman:** Yes. Please do. Similarly for Members who didn't finish lunch just now.

(The hearing adjourned at 2.55 pm and resumed at 3.17 pm.)

[9970] **The Chairman:** Mr Singh, you managed to settle your lunch?

[9971] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, Sir.

- [9972] **The Chairman:** Okay. If we can resume?
- [9973] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, please.
- [9974] **The Chairman:** Mr Edwin Tong, carry on from where we left off.
- [9975] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Welcome back, Mr Singh.
- [9976] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [9977] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I wanted to just clear up one point that was on my mind earlier. You gave an account of Ms Khan having been quite distraught on 3 August, when she came into your room —
- [9978] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [9979] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — and asked you, spoke to you about the anecdote?
- [9980] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She was already in my room. I was alerted to her being in my room.
- [9981] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, on that occasion, I remember you said earlier that you drafted something for her and she went back, and she made a clarification.
- [9982] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yeah, so I drafted it on my phone. I did not draft it in the office. I believe I may have gone back to the Chamber and I drafted it. But substantively, yes, I drafted it.
- [9983] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Another point, not related to what I've just asked you: would it be fair to say that, for Ms Khan, throughout the rest of August, after her meeting with you on 8 August, and for the rest of September, barring the period when she was down with shingles, she was performing her constituency work and attending to her usual engagements, and there was nothing unusual about her performance?
- [9984] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There was no reason for me to conclude otherwise.
- [9985] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright, thank you.
- [9986] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think we also have to remember there were some, I wouldn't say, like I would make call it a temporary stoppage because of the evolving COVID-19 situation. So, there were points in time where we ceased house visits, for example, and stuff like that, yes.
- [9987] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That's across the board.
- [9988] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that's right.
- [9989] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm saying for Ms Khan in particular, right?

[9990] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, all the MPs would have been under those instructions, for example, all the WP MPs —

[9991] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And there was nothing unusual about Ms Khan's performance or attitude? Or whatever she was expected to perform, or do, as a Member of Parliament, she did?

[9992] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She's not an active – compared to the other WP MPs, she's not as active as some of the others are. For example, there were a number of Bills that came up in October. She doesn't speak very much on these Bills and to the extent it was that sort of performance, yes, that continued.

[9993] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But on 27 September, she volunteered to you that she'd like to seek feedback on a speech that she had made in support of the women's Motion, and wanted to see whether there's any basis to find common ground, work with other parties on the ground, and approached you for that?

[9994] **Mr Pritam Singh:** 27 September? I would have to look at my records.

[9995] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You might want to check and let us know if that's not your recollection.

[9996] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[9997] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But if that's correct, it would demonstrate that she was: (a), proactive, at least on this incident; and (b), she was thinking forward as to what she should be doing and generally performing her duties as a Member of Parliament?

[9998] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Which incident, sorry, you are referring to?

[9999] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm talking about the occasion where she wrote to you and she said she would like to seek feedback on the speech that she made for the purposes of finding common ground, building consensus.

[10000] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'd have to have a look at that before I say something conclusive about it. I can present the evidence to the Committee if I know where that communication was made to me.

[10001] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.

[10002] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Or you can bring it to my attention if she's already submitted it to the Committee.

[10003] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You were shown earlier Ms Khan's submission. Just use it as a reference point, see whether you remember, because it was a message to you. So, if you please pick up Ms Khan's bundle.

[10004] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There are two bundles, I do not have three bundles, yes. Which bundle, Mr Tong?

[10005] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** From Ms Khan, dated 7 December.

[10006] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay, I have that here. Could you please direct me to the relevant page?

[10007] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please turn to the very first page.

[10008] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[10009] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You will see, I think, your name appear on the top.

[10010] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10011] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That's her exchange of messages with you.

[10012] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[10013] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if you just have a quick look at 27 September, this is where it starts and you see that around 2.10 pm, she said to you [*A message was referred to, with the following text*]:

Ms Raeesah Khan: I reached out to [so-and-so] for a chat and cc'd Faisal. I'd like to reach out to [someone] as well if you think it's a good idea.

Mr Pritam Singh: What do you plan to raise and discuss?

Ms Raeesah Khan: I would like to speak about the speech I made in support of the women's Motion, get their feedback and see if perhaps we can have common ground and work on building the relationship

[10014] So, she's following up on the speech that she wrote and she's asking you for your views. Do you recall this?

[10015] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me check —

[10016] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because you said "Okay. "

[10017] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me check what pre-dates this, because I may have well sent her a message to ask her to speak to Malay/Muslim groups about the feedback to her speech, because I did the same for the mosque chairman in my ward, just to understand what the reception was to what she had said. So, I'll have to check whether she initiated this or I initiated this.

[10018] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But regardless, and I think it's actually better if you initiated it. Regardless, you thought that she was capable of handling her duties as a Member of Parliament?

[10019] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think to — Given the fact that she was messaging me, yes.

[10020] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. In fact, as you said, it might even have been because you thought she was able to do it —

- [10021] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Exactly.
- [10022] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you initiated it, right?
- [10023] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [10024] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'd like to go now to what happened in August. We spoke about that.
- [10025] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.
- [10026] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On various occasions earlier, but I would like to now go into it.
- [10027] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.
- [10028] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think we've got the timeline from you, so I'll see whether we can move quickly on this. 3 August, she made the speech, right?
- [10029] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [10030] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 7 August, she had a call to you and she owned up to her lie in Parliament?
- [10031] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Correct.
- [10032] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 8 August, there was a meeting at your home with Mr Faisal and Ms Lim?
- [10033] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.
- [10034] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 7 August, was it a long conversation?
- [10035] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it wasn't very long.
- [10036] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You said it ended up, it ended with you sort of giving her a short-shrift and you hung up?
- [10037] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. The beginning was really me badgering her about coming up with what actually happened, what really happened, because she really wasn't keen on revealing anything.
- [10038] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. On 8 August, how was that meeting initiated?
- [10039] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The meeting was to discuss, of course – Also, there was feedback from the speech that she had given. I had arranged with Faisal and Sylvia to come to my house and talk about that. I'd like to check exactly what time that meeting was arranged. And then, on the morning, itself, on 8 August, I believe I reached out to Raeesah and told her to come to my place. And she replied quite quickly because I suspect she knew what I was going to talk about.

[10040] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Prior to the meeting itself, did you discuss with Ms Lim and Mr Faisal the confession that Ms Khan gave you?

[10041] Mr Pritam Singh: No, I did not.

[10042] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: So, as of 8 August, prior to the meeting, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal were not aware?

[10043] Mr Pritam Singh: I may have —

[10044] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Of the falsehood?

[10045] Mr Pritam Singh: I may have mentioned something to Ms Lim on 7 August, but I can't remember exactly what it was. But certainly, definitely not to Mr Faisal. But I'm also not sure whether I shared it with Ms Lim, because all I knew at that point was she had lied. Why she had lied or what the circumstances were, I didn't know by the end of the phone call on 7 August.

[10046] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Can you check your text messages and see —

[10047] Mr Pritam Singh: Sure.

[10048] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: — how this was communicated?

[10049] Mr Pritam Singh: How what was communicated, sorry?

[10050] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: How this occasion was communicated, how the meeting was set up, what you told them, what was discussed, anything from 7 August and 8 August, and anything arising therefrom in relation to this issue.

[10051] Mr Pritam Singh: Okay.

[10052] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Can you give us an account of this meeting, in summary, beginning from the time when Ms Khan arrived, and at that time, who was there, how did the meeting proceed, what was discussed, who spoke, who raised what, and how was it responded to?

[10053] Mr Pritam Singh: Right. As far as my memory serves me, Ms Khan comes to my place. I think the time is 11.00 am, but my text messages will confirm. I think my daughters are playing, running around and so we moved to the dining table. We sit there, and then Raeesah says, "Can you ask your girls to go up?" Then they go up. And then, whether that happened before I asked, "Raeesah, you have something to share with us?" And Sylvia, Faisal, myself, we were there, she was there. And then she gets very emotional, she starts crying straightaway and the first thing she says, the first thing I remember, at least, that she said was, "When I was 18 years old, I was [sexually assaulted]." And then, of course, we're shocked to hear this, we're very shocked to hear this.

[10054] And then she explains it's because of that episode that she faced, it was very traumatic for her, and because it was very traumatic for her, she told an untruth in Parliament

because she feels strongly about issues of sexual assault. And arising from there, she did what she did in Parliament. That was the gist of it.

[10055] There was also another – actually, that part of the meeting wasn't very long. I think we felt sympathetic – we felt sympathy to her. I remember distinctly asking her, "So, who else knows about this [sexual assault] that occurred when you were 18 years old?" And she said, "My husband knows, Yudhish knows, Pei Ying knows and my therapist knows." And when she said "my therapist knows", I was relieved somewhat, because at least there's somebody there who she can turn to and seek advice and the appropriate counsel from with regard to what she is facing.

[10056] And the conversation actually was very short, and I told her, I said, "You'll have to speak to your parents about this." And she said, "Okay". And then – it was very – I mean, she was just crying and crying, and that's where we left it.

[10057] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, arising from this meeting, in your mind, there was no doubt that she had told you, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal that she lied in Parliament?

[10058] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10059] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you must have appreciated that one reason she told this to you and Mr Faisal and Ms Lim was because she sought guidance and counsel from the three of you?

[10060] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She didn't put it that way. Because you have to remember, on 7 August, this was literally forced out of her over the phone call.

[10061] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. But in this context, she's coming forward, she's made a confession about her lie in Parliament, it's a serious matter, which I think you'll agree. In this context, would it be reasonable to assume, for her to assume that the three most senior members of the Workers' Party would give her guidance?

[10062] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I believe we did and my guidance to her was to "speak to your parents about it" because, in my mind, this would have to be corrected in Parliament. But before we can even do so —

[10063] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you tell her that?

[10064] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry?

[10065] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you tell her that?

[10066] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, not on that day, not on that day.

[10067] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Why not?

[10068] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think, at that point, given her condition, given her state, it was more important for me to tell her that, "Look, speak to your parents." And when she left my place, I did tell her, "We'll have to deal with this issue, but speak to your parents first." I told her that.

[10069] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, Mr Faisal, did he say anything to her about the lie? And I'm focused on the lie.

[10070] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm really not sure, specifically for Mr Faisal, but I think he had some questions to ask her about therapy because he's a counsellor. And I think he may have asked her some questions, but I don't recall exactly what those questions were.

[10071] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But did Mr Faisal discuss with her what to do with the lie and how to clarify it?

[10072] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not that I can recall.

[10073] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did Ms Lim do so?

[10074] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not that I can recall as well. Because generally the flavour of that meeting was there was a lot of pity for her.

[10075] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, your recollection was that there was no substantive discussion on what to do?

[10076] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that's right.

[10077] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And there was certainly no instruction or directive by you to her to clarify the lie?

[10078] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, there was not.

[10079] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And, in fact, Mr Faisal told us yesterday that after Ms Khan confessed about the lie in Parliament, the focus was on her well-being and her experience as a sexual assault victim, and that there were no other discussions on the lie in Parliament.

[10080] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That would be correct, because we were more focused on her well-being and given the state that she was in.

[10081] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. So, she walked out of your home thereafter. Okay, maybe I'll back up a little bit. Mr Faisal also told us that thereafter, she had composed herself and was able to discuss with him, and perhaps with you as well, the statement that she was supposed to put out to clarify the speech that she had made in Parliament?

[10082] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right. There was another matter that was the subject of the meeting that we were having, and there were quite a lot of things to go through as well, and so we went through those, and I told her to "draft your statement and then send it to" either myself or Faisal, I'll have to check.

[10083] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, from what I understand from you, the thrust of the meeting was in relation to her talking about her sexual assault experience. Mr Faisal may have asked some questions about this from his perspective as a counsellor.

[10084] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10085] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** There was some discussion on the statement that she was going to put out concerning the Malay/Muslim speech she had made a few days ago?

[10086] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[10087] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that was the thrust of the meeting?

[10088] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right, those were the two thrusts.

[10089] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** As far as you can recall, there was no landing point on what to do with the lie in Parliament?

[10090] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Specifically as to the lie in Parliament, in my mind she had to speak to her parents first, and —

[10091] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, not in your mind. What did you tell her?

[10092] **Mr Pritam Singh:** "Speak to your parents", that was very clear.

[10093] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** As far as you can recall the words, tell me what you said to her, and using what words?

[10094] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I told her, "You'll have to speak to your parents about this issue", and I don't think it went beyond that. But as she left my house, I told her, "We'll have to deal with this issue, but speak to your parents first." So, I basically recall repeating that to her.

[10095] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. And so, she left your home after that?

[10096] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, yes, she did.

[10097] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Would I be correct to say that thereafter, there was no other communication with Ms Khan —

[10098] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's correct; that's the evidence.

[10099] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — on the lie?

[10100] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right, that's the evidence that I've given.

[10101] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that would be the case all the way until 3 October.

[10102] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10103] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right?

[10104] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[10105] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because you told me the only other occasion was the 1 October email.

[10106] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right, but that email wasn't about the lie. It was about conduct.

[10107] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, it was something in general, but in the sequence of events, you ascribed some weight to that.

[10108] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[10109] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the next time you spoke to her at all about the lie was on 3 October?

[10110] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[10111] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** As of the time she left your home on 8 August, she had, again looking at the event, as I understand it from yourself, from Mr Faisal, she had come, there was a traumatic experience, she recounted it. She also told you that there was a lie in Parliament, which was also traumatic and a difficult experience. And you, as a senior member of the Party, and I think that must be the case for Mr Faisal and Ms Lim as well, that must have been something that you were focused on as being an issue that had to be resolved?

[10112] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It had to be resolved in the context of dealing with someone who had suffered from a traumatic episode and who —

[10113] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand your point about the context, but a lie had to be sorted out, because as you said —

[10114] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's clear.

[10115] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — the untruth cannot be left on the record, right?

[10116] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's clear. That would have had to have been dealt with.

[10117] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But it is also your evidence that she left your home without any specific direction or instruction as to what to do with the lie, right?

[10118] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She left my home with a direction to speak to her parents and that we would have to deal with this issue. That was —

[10119] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Without any timeframe, right?

[10120] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Without any timeframe, that is correct.

[10121] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, it would be fair for her to leave with the impression that you're not particularly concerned —

[10122] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.

[10123] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — about the lie?

[10124] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I struggle to think how she would make that conclusion.

[10125] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because besides the few words that were spoken, and I heard from Mr Faisal, he didn't say a word to her about the lie, we'll hear from Ms Lim, not much was said by you and there was no specific direction as to what to do, no timeframe, besides speaking to her parents. That was your only instruction.

[10126] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But in my view, when I say "speak to your parents", I was concerned that to tell her straightaway "you've got to come up with the truth and all that", it would rattle her, and so, in my view, it was important for her to speak to her parents at her time because that would be a condition precedent to coming upfront in Parliament. They would have to know what had happened to her, which led her to tell this lie in Parliament.

[10127] **The Chairman:** Can I just clarify, what exactly did you say?

[10128] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, I told her to speak to her parents.

[10129] **The Chairman:** The second part, was it articulated?

[10130] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It was articulated as she was leaving my house. I remember that quite clearly.

[10131] **The Chairman:** Articulated that she should speak to her parents?

[10132] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She should speak to her parents and that we would have to resolve this issue.

[10133] **The Chairman:** So, you said that to her.

[10134] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I said that to her.

[10135] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you also confirmed earlier that there was no timeframe.

[10136] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[10137] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And there was no specific direction or instruction.

[10138] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[10139] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And as I just heard from you, you also said it was not the appropriate time for you to tell her "You got to speak the truth" and so on.

[10140] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right. That was in view of how she reacted to telling us why she told the lie.

[10141] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, we know what happened now on 8 August. We also heard what happened on 3 October in some detail before the break earlier. On neither occasion did you tell her that she has to tell the truth in Parliament, in those words, correct?

[10142] **Mr Pritam Singh:** On 3 October, yes, I gave my evidence earlier, and that evidence is on record.

[10143] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That's right. And now, on 8 August, same, you also didn't tell her —

[10144] **Mr Pritam Singh:** For sure. Certainly.

[10145] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish, so that the transcript can pick it up. You also didn't tell her on 8 August that she should come and tell the truth, in those words?

[10146] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not on 8 August.

[10147] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right.

[10148] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But it was, in my view, by telling her to speak to her parents and that we would have to resolve this issue, it would be very clear that this issue would have to be dealt with.

[10149] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. You probably remember this or you've seen this, but let me ask you to look at Ms Khan's account of what happened at the meeting.

[10150] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10151] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If I may invite you to please pick up 2 December.

[10152] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[10153] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And turn, please, to page 87.

[10154] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[10155] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you have it?

[10156] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I do. 87, did you say?

[10157] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 87.

[10158] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10159] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, again, please just cast your eye over it, so that I don't have to read it.

[10160] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No problem.

[10161] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 1495.*]

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: And you said at whose house again?

Ms Raeesah Khan: Pritam Singh's house.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Okay. And at this occasion, Ms Lim and Mr Manap were present?

Ms Raeesah Khan: Yes.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: And did you put it in clear terms to them as well that the statement you had made was false?

Ms Raeesah Khan: Yes.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Could they have misunderstood?

Ms Raeesah Khan: No, they could not.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: What was their reaction to this?

Ms Raeesah Khan: It was incredible disappointment. There was a lot of anger, but I think there was some compassion there as well. The reaction was that if I were not to be pressed, then the best thing to do would be to retain the narrative that I began in August.

[10162] Would you agree with this?

[10163] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Completely disagree.

[10164] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I said [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 1505.*]:

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Let me understand the last statement. You said if you were not going to be pressed, and then you would retain the narrative that you started in August.

Ms Raeesah Khan: Yes.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: It means, “If you can get away with it, we don’t need to clarify the lie”, correct?

[10165] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This is you putting it to her, right?

[10166] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, that’s me, yes. Answer: “I think in the simplest terms, yes, you are correct.” So, again, let me pause there. Would you agree with this?

[10167] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I completely disagree.

[10168] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Are you saying this didn’t happen?

[10169] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I’m saying it’s completely untrue and it’s a lie.

[10170] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Next question [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 1509.*]:

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: And, so, the Workers’ Party leadership was present there. Their initial reaction to being told that there was a lie or falsehood said in Parliament was to try and duck the issue, if possible, and if it doesn’t come up, then the truth may not be told eventually, correct?

Ms Raeesah Khan: I have to say, though, that Pritam Singh's initial response was that I should go to the Committee of Privileges. But after discussions and me explaining the circumstances that led me to the information in the first place, that changed.

[10171] Let me pause again at this juncture. Is that correct?

[10172] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, that's not correct. There was no discussion that I recall on the Committee of Privileges at that point.

[10173] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you did not tell her, even initially, that she should go to the Committee of Privileges.

[10174] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not at that point.

[10175] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Not at that point.

[10176] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Certainly not. The Committee of Privileges, I don't know how she recollects this on 8 August, but that discussion did not take place, because her condition was – she was not in a condition.

[10177] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The Committee of Privileges then came up at which point, since you say not at that point?

[10178] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can't remember exactly when, but certainly on 1 October in my email to all the Workers' Party members – Workers' Party Members of Parliament, I did mention quite clearly that "if you can't substantiate something, you will go to the Committee of Privileges".

[10179] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Then I picked up the point again and I said, "So, the upshot of the meeting a few days after 7 August". At that point in time, we weren't sure what date of that meeting it was, but now we know it's on 8 August. So, the reference to the meeting in this question should be to the 8 August meeting at your home.

[10180] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I beg your pardon. Sorry, where are you right now? Are you still at the bottom of 87?

[10181] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, the bottom of 87. And I'm trying to explain to you that the reason why I framed the question in that way was because Ms Khan wasn't sure what date exactly it was at this point in time.

[10182] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[10183] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Or at least I wasn't sure.

[10184] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay, this meeting was certainly on 8 August.

[10185] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 8 August, thank you. So, I said [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 1511.*]:

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: So, the upshot of the meeting a few days after 7 August was that the Workers' Party leadership decided that there would be no need to clarify the position,

they will keep the lie in place, since if you're not pressed, there's no need to clarify the truth, correct?

Ms Raeesah Khan: Correct.

[10186] You would disagree with that?

[10187] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.

[10188] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Go over the page. I asked her whether there were emails or messages exchanged which might corroborate the meeting, and Ms Khan said to me, over the page [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 1515.*]:

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Did you discuss this with Ms Loh thereafter?

Ms Raeesah Khan: Yes, I did.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: In those discussions, did you give an account of what happened?

Ms Raeesah Khan: Yes, I did.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Would that be by messages?

Ms Raeesah Khan: Yes, that would be by messages.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: And those messages would capture the thrust of what you had discussed with Mr Singh, Mr Manap and Ms Lim?

Ms Raeesah Khan: Yes.

[10189] Then I told her – she's making a note – to get copies, and I said, "These messages would have been contemporaneous, meaning they would have been roughly the same time as when you concluded the meeting with the three of them?", answer: "Yes."

[10190] And subsequent to this occasion, she furnished her messages. At the time that these questions were being asked, I had not seen those messages. I would like to show you the message, if I may.

[10191] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, please.

[10192] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We have this little bundle from Ms Loh earlier.

[10193] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you.

[10194] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And can you please go to the second page of that thin bundle?

[10195] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I'm at that page.

[10196] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's not paginated, so the second page, you see two messages.

[10197] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

- [10198] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The second one is titled “8 August”. You see that?
- [10199] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I’m on the wrong page then. Yes, I see that.
- [10200] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, and it says – it’s from Raeesah, and let me tell you that this is sent on a group chat where Mr Nathan and Ms Loh were also present.
- [10201] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I understand.
- [10202] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And she says says [*A message was referred to, with the following text.*]:
- 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.
- [10203] I know you have not seen this message contemporaneously, meaning at that time, but now you’ve seen her recollection of the meeting that she sent out contemporaneously.
- [10204] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.
- [10205] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Would this be accurate?
- [10206] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It would be highly inaccurate. It is a complete lie.
- [10207] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let’s break down this statement. First of all, there was a meeting on 8 August.
- [10208] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.
- [10209] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Which ended shortly before this message was sent at 12.41 pm, correct?
- [10210] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would think so.
- [10211] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** From your recollection?
- [10212] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Probably.
- [10213] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. And she then steps out, and she sends a message with four sentences. The first says, “I just met with Pritam, Sylvia and Faisal.” That’s correct, right?
- [10214] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.
- [10215] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The second is that “we spoke about Muslim issues and the Police accusation.” That’s also correct, right?
- [10216] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[10217] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The third sentence: “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.” The second half of that sentence, you would disagree with, I assume.

[10218] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, because I don’t know what the first half of the sentence is, and the second half is a complete lie.

[10219] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The final sentence “They also suggested that I write a statement to send out this evening” is correct?

[10220] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It is correct.

[10221] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, most of these messages correct but her recollection of what she was told to do by the three of you, as a result of the lie, is inaccurate?

[10222] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely. I would go much further than “inaccurate”.

[10223] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can I ask you why you think Ms Khan might lie like this, emerging from a meeting with you?

[10224] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I know something which she revealed to the Workers’ Party Disciplinary Panel on 29 November, which is quite telling to me. She told the Panel that she suffers from disassociation. It was the first time I heard of it. I asked her what disassociation was. She said, “It’s when I talk without thinking” and I asked her, “Don’t you think that’s dangerous for an MP?” and she said, “Yes.” So, I’m not bringing this up to suggest anything untoward. All I’m suggesting is that it may be helpful for this Committee to call for some psychiatric report or evaluation on Ms Khan. I say that only with the knowledge of what she shared with me on 29 November. Could it be a lie to me? It’s possible. But —

[10225] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[10226] **Mr Pritam Singh:** If we are talking about culpability and proportionality, I think it may be helpful. But things do add up now, as I hear what was said in the papers and what representations she gave and what she shared with the Committee.

[10227] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, this took place on 8 August, and I was very careful before I started this line of inquiry, to ask you if you thought that there was any untoward, unusual about Ms Khan’s performance as an MP.

[10228] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, that’s not your question. You can check back. You asked me —

[10229] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That’s my question earlier.

[10230] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s earlier, but immediately before you asked me what was my view of these messages —

[10231] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, that was earlier. Yes, I did. When I started this afternoon, after the break, I did ask you about her general performance. And I think you told

me that there was nothing that came to your attention which suggested that there was anything unusual about her performance, right?

[10232] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, of course. But you're asking me about this particular message now.

[10233] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, I am, but I'm now asking you to recall that I did start this afternoon's questions —

[10234] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not disputing that.

[10235] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And so, your answer was that she was normal, nothing unusual stood out?

[10236] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, vis-à-vis what you asked me on the 27, vis-à-vis that message of 27 September, that's my answer, yes.

[10237] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I also asked you about her performance generally.

[10238] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There was nothing out of the ordinary to me.

[10239] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm not sure it's fair to characterise what she told you on 29 October.

[10240] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Chair, I seek your indulgence.

[10241] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, let me finish.

[10242] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think that question needs to be read out by Mr Tong to me again. So, I can be given a chance to explain why I answered it the way I did, because it was an open-ended question, and you asked me what, why she could have, why she would have said that. And I know certain facts that I know now, and I believe I'm entitled to share that.

[10243] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, let me finish. I asked you a question. And I said why is it you think she might lie, and you offered to us what happened on 29 November. And I'm saying to you that in the context of the circumstances that I see, and I can't speak for my colleagues on this Committee, the context of what I see, evidence that you have given, I'm not sure that the event that you mentioned on 29 November, is basis for us to call for a psychiatric assessment of Ms Khan.

[10244] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I can only —

[10245] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I'm putting that across to you, and I don't think it is appropriate for us to have that debate now.

[10246] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not having a debate about it. I'm just replying the question you asked —

[10247] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I really think it is quite inappropriate to bring that up and suggest for this Committee to seek a psychiatric assessment of Ms Khan.

[10248] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, you asked me for my view, I've given you my view. What you decide is the Committee's prerogative. I just put my view across. I have this evidence. I know this knowledge. She told it to me and I'm sharing it with the Committee.

[10249] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, I think we know why you raise that suggestion and I think it is not appropriate.

[10250] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I have notes. What you want to believe and what you want to take into account is your prerogative. You asked me a question why. And I've given an answer. You don't want to deal with it, you want to ignore it, that's your call.

[10251] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let's come back to this.

[10252] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, please.

[10253] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This is a message in writing.

[10254] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. Not to me.

[10255] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. Anything that she might have told you which gave rise to what you might have concluded on 29 November, concerns speaking without thinking, in your words.

[10256] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think that's what she said, yes, but I'm not changing that, but it means the same thing, in my view.

[10257] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, here, she stepped out of the meeting with you in August. She put down her thoughts down in writing and sent it to her two closest associates.

[10258] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10259] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. Let me suggest to you that there really is no reason for her to lie to them, correct?

[10260] **Mr Pritam Singh:** On what basis do you make that suggestion?

[10261] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because she, by now, has confessed to you, to Ms Lim, to Mr Faisal. She knows that, according to you, it has to be clarified.

[10262] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10263] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And she has also confessed to Mr Nathan and Ms Loh.

[10264] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[10265] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And sought counsel from them as to what to do.

[10266] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[10267] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, why would she go to the senior leadership of Workers' Party and then lie in a closed forum to her own associates who are helping her, about your reaction? How would that help her?

[10268] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I cannot answer how it would help her. I can only tell you what she told us and what I told her, what was communicated in my house on 8 August. And this rendition of what has happened is a complete utter fabrication. It's a lie. It's a bare lie.

[10269] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand. I understand your position.

[10270] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It's my evidence.

[10271] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, I understand your position. I'm trying to understand why this might be so.

[10272] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You are asking the wrong person because I've told you that it's a lie.

[10273] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, when you look at contemporaneous evidence and circumstances, what people were discussing at that time, around that time, after that time, you can get a picture.

[10274] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not necessarily, not if people lie.

[10275] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, of course, so we are here to work out what the truth is. And I hope you will assist us.

[10276] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I've been doing so for the last six hours; or make it seven.

[10277] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Almost seven; I appreciate that. So, objectively – and I know you disagree with the contents, and I have that as a caveat – objectively, this conveys to Mr Nathan and Ms Loh a very clear picture of what she is to do with the lie, correct?

[10278] **Mr Pritam Singh:** To the extent that it's communicated to them, yes.

[10279] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And the objective interpretation of this is not to bring up the issue anymore if you can avoid it. "Take it to the grave" means don't disclose it, correct?

[10280] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That would be on a plain reading.

[10281] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, again, bearing in mind that this was sent minutes, barely minutes after she left the meeting, would it not reflect an accurate contemporaneous record of her takeaway from the meeting?

[10282] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would argue that it is an inaccurate record of the meeting. Whether it is contemporaneous, of course, it is contemporaneous by virtue of the time but it says nothing about the fact that it's a lie.

[10283] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But she walks away from the meeting not being – she was not told by you to go and tell the truth?

[10284] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I can continue this exchange with you, but here I'm dealing with someone who, on record, has lied to me. I have WhatsApp communication of her lying to me about the episode. If you are trying to impress upon me that this is the truth, I'll have to tell you, Sir, sorry, that's not the case.

[10285] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh, I —

[10286] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She has lied before, she has lied about this episode, she had to be pressed for it to come out and you are trying to impress on me that she's got no reason to lie because it's contemporaneous. And I disagree vehemently.

[10287] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Not because it's contemporaneous. The contemporaneity is one factor, but there is a reason I understand that you had to press for her to come clean on the fact that she could not substantiate her speech.

[10288] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What would that reason be?

[10289] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And she made a speech, and of course she was worried. I mean the leader of the Party was questioning her, and she held it back.

[10290] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, she had to tell the truth.

[10291] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Here is a different scenario. She's communicating it with her associates, people who she is close with and who is helping her, and she knows that they are helping her, they have her interests at heart. So, I'm trying to understand why it is, in that scenario, she would want to lie to them, because I can't work out how that helps her.

[10292] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She may have a problem.

[10293] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Unless you are saying that almost four months ago or more than four months ago, she contemplated that this very scenario might happen when she was put under an inquiry.

[10294] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn't mean to say that; I am just suggesting to you that this is not true.

[10295] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please don't cut me off.

[10296] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, I apologise for cutting you off.

[10297] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Surely, you're not suggesting that she had foreseen what would happen months down the road.

- [10298] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I'm not making that suggestion.
- [10299] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, good. So, the only other reason is that, in your words, she may have a problem.
- [10300] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [10301] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you genuinely think that?
- [10302] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Looking back at this entire episode, from her behaviour right from the point where she had to put the speech on the platform that we share, the anecdote is not there, it's suddenly inserted, from her SMS, which is clearly to me a lie, and, before that, hiding the truth and attempting to cover a lie with another lie – I'm afraid so, Sir.
- [10303] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You remember I told you that two days after this meeting on 10 August, you had a meeting with Mr Nathan and Ms Loh?
- [10304] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, which meeting on 10 August?
- [10305] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You had a meeting with Mr Nathan and Ms Loh, right?
- [10306] **Mr Pritam Singh:** When? On what date?
- [10307] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 10 August.
- [10308] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [10309] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You recall that I told you that earlier?
- [10310] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, you did.
- [10311] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you look at the chats, and I showed you this earlier, Ms Khan was aware that they were meeting you on 10 August?
- [10312] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not sure, but if it's on the chats, we don't have to go through it. I'll take your word for it because that's not public to me.
- [10313] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'd like to show it to you again.
- [10314] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, please do.
- [10315] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Pick up the big bundle of the chats between Mr Nathan, Ms Loh and Ms Khan.
- [10316] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Which page are we on?
- [10317] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Page 36. We saw this earlier, but I want to refresh your memory. *[A message was referred to.]*

[10318] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[10319] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, this is a group chat.

[10320] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10321] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 10 August. “Have you decided if you want us to tell Pritam? We are meeting him in 30 minutes.” She says “I told him already so I think it wouldn’t matter if you brought it up” and so on. You remember I read this to you earlier?

[10322] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I remember this.

[10323] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, I know you’re not part of this chat, but this tells us a few things. One, they speak to each and they keep each other informed. Two, Ms Khan is aware that Mr Nathan and Ms Loh were meeting with you on that morning.

[10324] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right.

[10325] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Number three, they were quite open in saying that she was prepared for you to discuss the issue with Pritam, which is you, the issue, meaning the falsehood in Parliament.

[10326] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right. She says, “I have told him already.”

[10327] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, in this context, Ms Khan knows that her close associates would be meeting with you.

[10328] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[10329] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** To discuss the issue that concerns her falsehood. She would not be there. Isn’t it inconceivable that she could think she could lie to them about what you said to her, knowing that you now be meeting with them to discuss this very same issue?

[10330] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, indeed, it would be inconceivable. I would think it’s something that she ought to know that I would never accept a WP MP saying that you take a lie to your grave. But, again, this is Ms Khan’s recollection to them, I don’t believe anything in those chats go into the statement that Ms Khan tells them again about the lie. Because if I look at page 36, all that it said is “He looks at me different now, but I think he empathises why I lied.” And then Pei Ying has a, well, not a smiley, a sad face emoji, not an emoji, just a semicolon thing.

[10331] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you. The point is this. That they’re quite open with each other. Ms Khan tells them that she has told you that she has lied.

[10332] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Which chat is this? And why is the other point not in this chat, this 12.41 pm chat? I beg your pardon.

[10333] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, please keep to what I’m —

[10334] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, no. I'm very interested in this because this is a chat on the 9 —

[10335] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you tell me what you're after, I will help you.

[10336] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I'm trying to understand them. In what context is this chat and the earlier message that Ms Khan sends to them because I don't see that —

[10337] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Ah, let me help you and let me explain. We initially got this which I showed you. But we subsequently wanted the entire context of the conversation to understand the flavour. And so, what you have now in front of you, which you are flipping is that context. And if you go to page 23, you will see that same message recorded at 8 August, 12.41 pm. So, it is there.

[10338] **Mr Pritam Singh:** At what time, sorry?

[10339] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 12.41 pm.

[10340] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. And then there is everything which is redacted thereafter. Raeesah says, talks about —

[10341] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh?

[10342] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10343] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You asked me a question and I've showed you.

[10344] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10345] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I want to go back to my questions, if you don't mind.

[10346] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Go ahead.

[10347] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, please go back to page 36.

[10348] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[10349] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The point I'm making to you is that Ms Khan is quite open to her two associates that she lied, she told you she lied.

[10350] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[10351] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She know that you are meeting them to discuss the very same issue. They asked whether you want us to tell Pritam or discuss with Pritam. And she says, I think it wouldn't matter if you brought it up. She was quite open.

[10352] If she had just two days prior to this, told her two associates a lie about what you told her to do —

[10353] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10354] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She would not be as open with them.

[10355] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Look, I cannot speak for Ms Khan, but I cannot also understand this behaviour on the part of Ms Khan then later to say, let me just quote from page 36: “What was his reaction like?” “He looks at me different now.”

[10356] It doesn’t still change the point that she makes this statement. Pei Ying and Yudhish don’t interrogate me with that. They don’t tell me that, “Look, this message has been sent to us by Raeesah. Is it true or not?” That’s not in my communication with them.

[10357] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I don’t disagree. I have no basis to disagree with you on that. Right?

[10358] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[10359] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, as I started by saying to you, I appreciate that you didn’t see this contemporaneously. Right?

[10360] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[10361] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But what I’m trying to now put across to you is the circumstances in which this is now being discussed between Ms Raeesah Khan and her two close associates. And they are well aware that she has confessed to you that she lied. She is well aware that the two of you are meeting you and expecting that this issue will come up.

[10362] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You’re talking about Pei Ying and Yudhish?

[10363] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. Expecting that the issue will come up.

[10364] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[10365] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And Ms Khan is saying to them, “Speak to him.” In her words, “I think it wouldn’t matter if you brought it up.”

[10366] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And so did they.

[10367] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The fact of the matter, Mr Singh, is that you did discuss with them that you knew that she had lied in Parliament.

[10368] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I knew she had lied in Parliament, yes.

[10369] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that was what was the subject matter, or what was discussed, not so much the 12.41 pm message from 8 August. So, what they did discuss with you was that Ms Khan had lied in Parliament and that you were aware. Correct?

[10370] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That would have been accurate, but at no point did either of them point out to me that there was an instruction to take this to the grave. And I notice that wasn’t queried of them.

[10371] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. And I have no reason to disagree with you, because they didn't tell me that they brought it to your attention. Alright? So, I'm trying to give you as much of the relevant evidence surrounding the issue as possible so that you have a clear picture.

[10372] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, thank you.

[10373] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On 10 August, this meeting that we have seen references to in the chats, you did meet with Ms Loh and Mr Nathan. And I'd like you to look at Mr Nathan's account of that meeting.

[10374] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[10375] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you could please pick up the bundle 3 December.

[10376] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I have it.

[10377] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And please turn to – just give me a moment – page 32.

[10378] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I'm at page 32.

[10379] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, at page 32, from the top, you will see a reference to Mr Yudhishthra Nathan.

[10380] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10381] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 3 December 2021, from Para No 2831.*]

Mr Yudhishthra Nathan: So, what had happened was that I was informed by Ms Loh that Mr Pritam Singh had wanted to meet the two of us on 10 August, but the thing is he hadn't told us why he wanted to meet us. So, we had assumed that, perhaps, because we found out on 7 August, so, we thought, okay, perhaps he wanted to discuss this with us or to find out our views, or to find out, perhaps, what we had known or had heard from Ms Khan.

But it actually turned out that when we met Mr Singh, the main purpose of the meeting was to discuss another Party matter, completely unrelated, which he wanted our input on. But on the sidelines of that meeting, we did discuss Ms Khan having, essentially, told us that – having come clean.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: What does that mean, "having come clean"?

Mr Yudhishthra Nathan: "Having come clean", in the sense, admitted that she lied.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Having admitted that she lied in Parliament?

Mr Yudhishthra Nathan: Yes.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Can you describe the nature of the conversation that you had with Mr Singh, with Ms Loh?

Mr Yudhishthra Nathan: From what I recall, we, of course, expressed disappointment that Ms Khan had lied and shocked. But I think, from what I recall, Ms Loh and Mr Singh were

talking about how—or, rather, Ms Loh was telling Mr Singh that sexual assault victims do experience trauma and that can sometimes make them, in some circumstances, be less likely to want to tell the truth, out of fear, perhaps. I remember Ms Loh saying that this was a point that she wanted to communicate to Mr Singh, just from her own. Ms Loh happens to be someone who has good knowledge about issues of women's rights and sexual assault cases in Singapore.

And so, just to summarise, my understanding of that meeting, as it relates to the lie, was that we were all on the same page in terms of knowing that she had lied to Parliament and in terms of knowing that she had cited the sexual assault as her reason for that.

[10382] **You recall this exchange?**

[10383] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't recall it to the detail that Mr Nathan recalls it. I remember what the completely unrelated Party matter was. But essentially, the thing I remember of this meeting was confirming with them that Ms Khan had lied in Parliament.

[10384] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, that was something that was discussed?

[10385] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I wouldn't say discussed.

[10386] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The gist of which would be accurately contained in Mr Nathan's evidence.

[10387] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would not go so far as to say that, because I think that this recollection of Ms Loh may well have taken place on 12 October in my house, rather than at this meeting. Ms Loh, being that sexual assault victim's experience trauma and so forth.

[10388] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. So, you think that, save for that part which was discussed later on 12 October, the rest —

[10389] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I believe so, because that meeting —

[10390] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Don't speak over me. Otherwise, they cannot catch it.

[10391] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry. Sorry. I beg your pardon.

[10392] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, save for that portion about what Ms Loh says, the rest of Mr Nathan's evidence is accurate about what was discussed on 10 August?

[10393] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me just look at that evidence again. I do not recall them expressing disappointment that Ms Khan had lied, and shock. I don't recall that.

[10394] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That would be quite a usual, I mean, it's quite an expected response, isn't it?

[10395] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You have asked me that question, I don't recall shock and disappointment from them that Ms Khan had lied. I don't recall that.

[10396] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** They must certainly be at least be concerned?

[10397] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think it was more a question of whether I had known by that point already. And I said, “I know, because she told me.” But in terms of these additional points made thereafter – Ms Loh telling Mr Singh sexual assault victims do experience trauma and so forth – I don’t recall this. Certainly, I don’t recall this being made on 10 August.

[10398] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Let me go on. Let me read on, bottom of page 32.

[10399] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[10400] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 3 December 2021, from Para No 2840.*]

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: A few questions. Did Mr Singh tell you or Ms Loh that Ms Khan had to come to Parliament at the next Sitting to clarify the lie?

Mr Yudhishthra Nathan: No.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Did Mr Singh say to you that it was important for Ms Khan to quickly inform her family of the sexual assault incident so that she could then proceed to clear up the lie in Parliament?

Mr Yudhishthra Nathan: No.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Did Mr Singh discuss with either yourself or Ms Loh any steps to be taken in relation to the clarification of the lie, perhaps, outside of Parliament, on social media, on other platforms that you might have had?

Mr Yudhishthra Nathan: No.

[10401] Would that be an accurate discussion?

[10402] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, indeed, I don’t think it was discussed in any significant way.

[10403] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** None of this was discussed.

[10404] **Mr Pritam Singh:** None of this was discussed.

[10405] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** A few lines down [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 3 December 2021, from Para No 2848.*]:

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: So, if I understand your evidence correctly, between 8 August and 2 October, as far as you know, there were no discussions between Ms Khan and the senior leadership of the Workers’ Party, comprising Mr Singh, Mr Manap and Ms Lim?

Mr Yudhishthra Nathan: As far as I know, no.

[10406] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That you will agree with?

[10407] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That was my evidence earlier already.

[10408] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. In fact, your very resolute evidence.

[10409] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I mean, it's the truth.

[10410] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, why did you not explain to Mr Nathan and Ms Loh that the intention was for Ms Khan to come forward at some stage to clarify the lie?

[10411] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There was no reason for me to do that. This was an issue between me and a sitting MP, Ms Khan.

[10412] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And they're coming to you, obviously, you know by then that she had also told them about the lie.

[10413] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[10414] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And, as I said, you know that they will help her.

[10415] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[10416] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Eventually, I think you do call upon them to assist you to deal with events post-12 October, that meeting, which you agreed with, right?

[10417] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[10418] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, why would you not have at least shared your plan with them, if that was indeed the plan?

[10419] **Mr Pritam Singh:** At that point, the only plan, if you use that word "plan", was for her to go and speak to her parents about it. She is an MP of the Party. She has to take responsibility of the matter. It was something for her to do and for me to hear from her, what's the resolution? So, I did not think at any point then it was relevant for me to raise this matter with Pei Ying or Yudhish because this is something for Ms Khan to take ownership of.

[10420] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you know that Ms Loh, you might disagree with it being said on this occasion about her knowledge of sexual assault victims and how to assist and perhaps counsel them, you might not agree with it, having spoken on this occasion.

[10421] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[10422] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you do know Ms Loh quite well. And you do know that she has an interest in this area. And if your concern was her state of mind, whether she has told her family, and those were questions that you had to ask yourself and satisfy yourself of before she could take the next step, which was an important step, to remove from the record in Parliament, the lie, then, it would be quite usual, expected even, to have discussed this with Ms Loh, to find out how she was, where she's going, has she told her family. And then, prepare for the next steps?

[10423] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Number one, I don't know that Ms Loh is this specialist in women's rights and sexual assault cases. What I do know is Ms Khan has a therapist, which she admitted to me on 8 August, who is aware of this episode. And I would think that would be a more appropriate person for her to seek counsel from.

[10424] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. But I know you'll say you've said this before. But at no stage did you make any attempt to find out whether the therapist sessions were going well, whether she was ready, whether she had told her family, at all?

[10425] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I've given you my evidence.

[10426] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right.

[10427] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10428] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, I'm producing all of these other related materials —

[10429] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I understand. But I've already given the evidence that you are trying to illicit.

[10430] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** To try to understand the entirety of the circumstances —

[10431] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I've told you the truth.

[10432] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'll be very upfront with you, Mr Singh.

[10433] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I've been very upfront with you too.

[10434] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I look at this and I find it surprising that, for someone with your experience and I would say, I've seen you with your force of conviction when you speak, when you make demands, when you set out your views clearly, it seems somewhat out of character for you not to have made it clear to Ms Khan, either on 8 August or on 3 October, that she should tell the truth, make it clear.

[10435] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I made it clear. Sorry. Go ahead.

[10436] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Or, in those words, okay, I know what you're going to say, but in those words. Or even if you felt you had made it clear, not to have taken steps to check with either her family or the progress of her therapy sessions. Or indeed with Ms Khan on several occasions when you met with her. Or with any of her close associates, as to how she's doing and whether she's ready to now take the next step, which I think we agreed, would be important, to clarify the truth that remains on the record.

[10437] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, sorry.

[10438] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, with that in mind, can you offer us a reason?

[10439] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, we're coming back to the evidence I have already given. I told her to speak to her parents. We will have to deal with this issue. And I told her that on 8 August. I also have given it in evidence a few times now that from there up to 3 October and in a different way on 1 October, I had communicated my view on what was the right thing to do.

[10440] I can't embellish or even attempt to want to embellish any further evidence I've already given, because that was the case. And I came to that judgement because here, I'm dealing with someone who is telling me that she is suffering from a trauma of being [sexually assaulted] in the past. And I, in my view, thank you for those comments about my character, but, in my assessment, this was somebody who needed time to deal with this problem. That was my view.

[10441] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand your explanation that time is needed, but what I don't understand about your explanation is why you don't take any attempt to find out whether the time has been taken to do so.

[10442] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I expect that she would be speaking to her parents, speaking to her therapist, and when she's ready and when she's decided, "Okay, look, Pritam, I can make this clarification now". So, I expected it to come from her.

[10443] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I know, but in your mind when? Two weeks? Two months?

[10444] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This is the same question you asked me earlier.

[10445] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But I have to understand that.

[10446] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let's say in October, since it's a hypothetical question, in October, let's say the issue didn't come up —

[10447] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. Am I asking it? I'm not.

[10448] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But the same person that you spoke of, whose character, his convictions, et cetera —

[10449] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm not asking you to —

[10450] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me finish at least.

[10451] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. No. I think maybe you heard me wrong. I'm not asking you to construct a hypothetical scenario. I'm asking you: in your position, when you decide on a framework for something to happen, speak to family first, then come clean and clarify the lie, when you decide on that, you must have some expectation as to when it's going to take place. So, it's not a hypothetical question, because when you put this out and you formulate this plan, in your mind, there must be —

[10452] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There must be a resolution?

[10453] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — a sense as to what would be reasonable for this plan to be carried out.

[10454] **Mr Pritam Singh:** When you say "plan", what plan are you talking about?

[10455] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That meaning for the family to be told and then come clean in Parliament.

[10456] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And this is something I would expect from to hear from Ms Khan, she has already —

[10457] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I'm asking for you —

[10458] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that's my answer.

[10459] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Your expectation as to the time frame for this?

[10460] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right. So, my expectation is by 3 October, it's – in fact even earlier, she obviously is not coming up. I sent this note to all the MPs.

[10461] On 3 October, I make it clear that she has to take ownership and that's actually a very important meeting. Because if I follow this direction, this line of questioning, if there was no plan, that you are, at carte blanche to decide on your own timeline, I wouldn't have met her on 3 October to tell her, "Look, you've got to take ownership and responsibility now." In the event —

[10462] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But according to you, on 3 October, ownership would only happen if it is raised.

[10463] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, indeed. I mean, if the matter had not —

[10464] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right?

[10465] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because she hadn't come up to me to say I'm ready to come up with all this, I've spoken to my parents, I've done my sessions with my therapist.

[10466] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, your answer is circuitous. I mean, on one hand you say —

[10467] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There's nothing circuitous about it, it's actually quite straightforward, it's very straightforward.

[10468] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Very circuitous. Because on one hand, you're saying "I have a timeline, 3 October is very important". You said so in your evidence?

[10469] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10470] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But, on the other hand, when I confront you with the proposition that actually 3 October, it may not come up the next day.

[10471] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Indeed, it may not.

[10472] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, and then you say: "Well then, it's up to her".

[10473] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I didn't say it's up to her. Look, on 3 October, I have put her on notice of what she would need to do if it comes up: "Take ownership, take responsibility." If it doesn't come up, I've already told her that. I will have to square away with her again, "You have to take ownership and responsibility." And after that, it's now

hypothetical when that would happen, but all this is not really relevant, I suppose, for the purposes of our exchange.

[10474] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Actually, it is relevant.

[10475] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Go ahead.

[10476] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The fact of the matter is you must have in your mind a time frame, and as I said, you would be acting in a manner consistent with that. You would check whether the criteria that you have set for yourself for clarification in Parliament to take place, has been met, has she told the family.

[10477] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10478] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I find out from you that, not only do you not ask about the family, you don't ask her, you don't ask her therapist, or you don't ask about her therapist.

[10479] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's the truth.

[10480] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You don't ask the associates, you don't ask anyone, you don't even ask – as far as I understand from Mr Faisal Manap's evidence – you don't even ask your fellow Workers' Party CEC Members?

[10481] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[10482] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Nothing?

[10483] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This is my responsibility, I know I'm the leader of the Party. I have made a judgement as to what I think is this lady's condition. And I believe that this is something that she will have to take ownership of, she will have to take responsibility for, she will have to close the issue with her parents, and when she's ready, we can deal with it. But it's not a case —

[10484] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you take no steps to find out when she's ready?

[10485] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's true, because I've already given evidence to that regard.

[10486] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. Let me move on, Mr Singh. On 1 November, Ms Khan made her personal explanation in Parliament, right?

[10487] **Mr Pritam Singh:** On 1 November, yes, that's right.

[10488] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And we agreed earlier that this was something that had been run through the CEC?

[10489] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[10490] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You had also given input to it, right?

[10491] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I had taken a look at it, but my inputs weren't heavy at all, actually. It was, in the main, from Ms Khan.

[10492] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you pick up this thick bundle you have with you.

[10493] **Mr Pritam Singh:** If you could just tell me the title, please.

[10494] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I will when I find it. Yes, the thickest one from Ms Loh. I'm not sure how it's titled on your page.

[10495] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Is it this one? This one, is it? Which page am I looking at?

[10496] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you turn, please, to page 142.

[10497] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10498] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Here, there's a discussion about the draft personal explanation? *[A message was referred to.]*

[10499] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[10500] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Starting from the top: "Are you okay to meet after?" Yudhish says: "I'm okay, should be okay. Three people can meet at the your place or HQ." And then at 12.19 pm, Ms Khan says: "Pritam had some comments and I made some slight edits as well."

[10501] Pei Ying says: "Did you change from Saturday? But Rae, if Pritam has signed off on it, is it necessary that we meet?" "I wanted to get any last input."

[10502] And then at 2.46 pm, she says: "If P has signed off on it, I think it's okay. We don't need to go over it and edit it one more time." Raeesah says: "Okay". 2.47 pm, she says: "It's just that he took big chunk out and asked me to mull over it." Do you recall this?

[10503] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't recall it, but it may well be, it was not anything which I commented was not substantive.

[10504] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But it says you took a big chunk out it.

[10505] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's what she says.

[10506] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. Do you recall it?

[10507] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't recall taking a substantive chunk, but I would have to, you would have to bring my attention to what that chunk she's referring to, then perhaps, I can share with you.

[10508] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I was going to ask you to help us. Would you be able to give to this Committee the drafts of the statement?

[10509] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't have those drafts. Those drafts were with – I mean, I can check. I can check. Whatever I have, I will submit everything I have to the Committee, but I'll have to check.

[10510] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. What we would like to have would be the draft of the statement and the various iterations which would show how they were revised and by who. Okay?

[10511] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I may have difficulty doing that because a lot of the drafts were returned to Raeesah, so I may not have copies of the drafts. But if I do have any, I will give them to the Committee.

[10512] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, alright.

[10513] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10514] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you please pick up the bundle, not the same one. It is now a submission by Ms Khan dated 7 December. We looked at it briefly just now at the start.

[10515] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Which month is this?

[10516] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 7 December.

[10517] **Mr Pritam Singh:** 7 December?

[10518] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 7 December.

[10519] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay, go ahead.

[10520] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You recall we were on the first page earlier on 27 September?

[10521] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[10522] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if you now go over the page to page 2, just quickly cast your eye over the messages. I think you should be familiar because these are your messages. [*Messages was referred to.*]

[10523] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[10524] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, 16 October —

[10525] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, these are my messages to who?

[10526] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Raeesah.

[10527] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[10528] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 16 October, 9.00 am: “Good morning, Pritam. I’ve dropped it off.” This would be the draft personal explanation.

[10529] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hm

[10530] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me pause for a moment. You had a meeting on 12 October with Mr Nathan and Ms Loh to discuss taking steps to prepare this explanation?

[10531] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right.

[10532] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And by the morning of 16 October, Ms Khan had dropped off the statement to you?

[10533] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She had drafted her statement, yes.

[10534] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It would appear that she really has no difficulty with preparing the statement and coming forward. She was quite proactive. Would you —

[10535] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I wouldn’t jump to that conclusion.

[10536] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, she was —

[10537] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She was instructed on 12 October that there was no way you could expect this issue to lie low. You have to come up with a statement.

[10538] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, but earlier on, you gave us the impression that she was still prevaricating.

[10539] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She was prevaricating on 12 October, when she met us, me and Sylvia. She was prevaricating because she did not want to tell the truth. She did not want to make a statement in Parliament.

[10540] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** By 12 October, the consensus was that she would make a statement.

[10541] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She had to.

[10542] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** To come clean, right?

[10543] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.

[10544] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And thereafter, she cooperated with you, correct?

[10545] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right, she agreed.

[10546] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, she drops off one draft on 16 October?

[10547] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10548] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Then, right after, you say: “How soon can a second draft be submitted?” That’s 18 October.

[10549] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10550] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, that’s the second one, at least, we can tell.

[10551] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10552] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Then, if you go further down the page, at 10.36 am on 20 October [*A message was referred to*], you say: “Hi, Raeesah. Please make time to come over today to my place, 8.30 pm. I’ll confirm again once Sylvia replies.” “Make that 7.00 pm.” So, 20 October was, it seems, another meeting?

[10553] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10554] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Then, on 22 October, Raeesah says at 12.15 pm: “Hi, Pritam, I spoke with my dad. Can we meet maybe this weekend or Monday?” Your answer: “Let’s meet tomorrow with Sylvia, 11.00 am, Party HQ.” That would be on 23 October?

[10555] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right.

[10556] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And further down the page, 27 October: “Hi, Raeesah, can you come to Parliament at 12.00 pm today urgently?” “Yes. Hi, Pritam. Yes, I will be there.”

[10557] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, let me bring my attention down. You said 27 October?

[10558] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[10559] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I see it.

[10560] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** “Come to my office”, right?

[10561] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10562] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, this exchange shows us that there at least four occasions when you met and looked at the drafts? And there are probably more?

[10563] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would think that this was, I’m not sure about the exact number. I can come back with an answer for the Committee. But on the basis of these exchanges, I think that’s a reasonable conclusion.

[10564] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On the same day as Ms Khan making the personal explanation, you release a press statement. You remember we saw that?

[10565] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn’t release a press statement. I just —

[10566] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, you put up a —

[10567] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I put up a Facebook post which then the Party carried on its pages.

[10568] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Let's look at that. I think you has it earlier with you, right?

[10569] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10570] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you still have it?

[10571] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Just bear with me. I'm sure it's around here. Ah, there we are.

[10572] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Look at the opening line of this [*A social media post was referred to*]: "MP Raeesah Khan should not have shared an account that contained untruth in the House." Alright?

[10573] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hm.

[10574] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the middle portion cites the Parliament Act, several other pieces of information. It's a short paragraph.

[10575] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10576] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me put some questions to you. You knew about this falsehood from as early as 7 August, right?

[10577] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10578] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, why does this not appear anywhere in the statement?

[10579] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn't see the relevance of that to this statement.

[10580] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, Ms Khan —

[10581] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It was for Ms Khan to tell the truth to Parliament.

[10582] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Of course.

[10583] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She didn't tell the truth.

[10584] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you see, Mr Singh, part of a holistic assessment of Ms Khan must include whether or not she had told the truth earlier to her superiors, that is, in this case yourself, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal, right?

[10585] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10586] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That would be relevant, correct?

[10587] **Mr Pritam Singh:** In the context of why she lied, because of this traumatic episode, I think it colours what ought to have been done quite significantly.

[10588] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Meaning that she had told her superiors earlier, would colour what ought to have been done quite significantly? Is that your evidence?

[10589] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10590] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, it's important for the public to understand that, in fact, that's what she did, isn't it?

[10591] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It is important to understand, and she admits to that in her statement on 1 November.

[10592] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, it is important for the public to understand that, in fact, she came to you and then also subsequently to Ms Lim and Mr Faisal, the three most senior people in the CEC of the Workers' Party.

[10593] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10594] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** To explain her position?

[10595] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10596] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And at least according to you, settle on a plan, settle on an approach to deal with the clarification subsequently, right?

[10597] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I wouldn't use the word "settle", but she was told to go and speak to her parents.

[10598] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, there was a plan, speak to the parents first.

[10599] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Those are your words. Those are not my words.

[10600] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, let's take it step by step. You told us that she was told to settle with the parents, tell them so that they know. And then that clears the deck for her to come to Parliament to clarify, right?

[10601] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[10602] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, that understanding was reached with her, according to you?

[10603] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. Where did I – where did I say that understanding was reached? Where in my evidence do I say that?

[10604] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** How else is she going to come to Parliament? She would have to first tell her parents, her family —

[10605] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She would have to – yes, go ahead.

- [10606] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And then she will have to come and clarify, right?
- [10607] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She will first have to tell her parents. She knows the issue has to be resolved. She has to tell me that the issue will be resolved and “this is what I will do”. And then she will come to Parliament and make that statement.
- [10608] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. Isn’t it relevant for the public to know that that was what happen and the 1 November clarification is the product of that plan?
- [10609] **Mr Pritam Singh:** If the situation was that we had indeed told her to cover up, take this lie to the grave, I think it would be highly relevant. But it wasn’t.
- [10610] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Remember this later on. Remember this.
- [10611] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I will remember it.
- [10612] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you had told her to do this, it would be highly relevant.
- [10613] **Mr Pritam Singh:** If we had told her to lie.
- [10614] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, remember this.
- [10615] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And to take this lie to the grave.
- [10616] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, coming back to this point, please explain to me why you think it is not appropriate, in the interest of open, transparency, honesty – these are words I think you speak more of than most people in Parliament. Why would you not include this fact in your statement, whether to the media or on your posts.
- [10617] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I did not see it as relevant.
- [10618] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I suggest to you, Mr Singh, you don’t see it as relevant because you know that disclosing that you knew about this falsehood from as early as 7 August, three months prior to the personal explanation, would cast you in a bad light.
- [10619] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I’m not so worried about my reputation in that regard, Mr Tong. I have answered your question. I hope I have.
- [10620] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I believe that that’s why you omitted it from this statement.
- [10621] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, that was not a consideration at all. It didn’t even cross my mind.
- [10622] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that’s why this statement presents a picture that suggests that it was Ms Khan alone who told the falsehood, didn’t share this with anyone else and is only now coming to Parliament to make this personal explanation.
- [10623] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Those are the material facts.

[10624] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But it's also material, when you want to assess: (a) Ms Khan, and, (b) as a broader whole, the Workers' Party, the fact that you and Ms Lim and Mr Faisal were aware earlier would also be material?

[10625] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I would not say it was material, because as I have mentioned earlier in my evidence, this was something that she had to take ownership of and this was more relevant. She told the lie. She had to explain why she told the lie, and she also had to explain why, on 4 October, she told the lie again. Those, I think, were the more critical factors, as far as I was concerned.

[10626] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. Mr Singh, this statement sounds like Ms Khan kept it from all of you and none of you knew. That would be one reasonable —

[10627] **Mr Pritam Singh:** How do you come to that conclusion?

[10628] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, because it doesn't say that you knew.

[10629] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But how to you specifically come to that conclusion? What sentence here gives you that impression that we are hiding something?

[10630] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's a complete absence of the sentence and that's the point. That's why you're hiding something.

[10631] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's the inference you're making. There's nothing for me to hide. I've given this on evidence now. There was absolutely nothing for me to hide. And this is where I come back to the point I made earlier and you reminded me of it, if we had told her to lie, then it becomes material, but we had never told her to take a lie, take it to the grave, nothing of that sort.

[10632] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's important for both Parliament and the public to know that Ms Khan had come to the senior leadership of the Workers' Party, confessed to them fully and worked out with them when she would, what would be the conditions for which she would then come to Parliament to clarify the lie.

[10633] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That may well be your view, but I don't agree with it.

[10634] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What's wrong with being open and transparent, honest, give all the information?

[10635] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, I agree with you, what's wrong? Nothing is wrong with that. Why don't you do the same — why didn't you do the same when Trace Together happened in late October? Why didn't the Government come and tell the truth straightaway, don't wait for a Parliamentary Question.

[10636] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, I thought you might say that.

[10637] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because it's very relevant. I'm not questioning it, but this is a decision that you've made. This is a decision you've made. This is a decision the Government made, a call the Government made. And this is the call I made.

[10638] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm suggesting to you that this call that you made was to suppress the information, suppress the fact that you knew because you knew it would cast you in a bad light. Come on, Mr Singh.

[10639] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I completely disagree.

[10640] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Cast your mind to 2 December, when you had the press conference. We saw the notes. Just have a quick look. Tell us what were the most searching questions that the press asked of you? When did you know?

[10641] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10642] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Why did you do what you did?

[10643] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[10644] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What did you do?

[10645] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[10646] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** When you knew —

[10647] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Those questions were even put out there already before the press put them to me. That's why I addressed them on the front foot.

[10648] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me suggest to you that it was because the public was asking questions about what you knew, what you did, when you knew, that you had no choice but to call this press conference.

[10649] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, there was a choice whether we wanted to call the press conference or not, but I believe that those questions were relevant because they were going around, and I wanted to answer them.

[10650] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** They were going around because your 1 November statement was less than open, Mr Singh.

[10651] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There was no connection with the 1 November statement. The connection was the resignation of Raeesah Khan.

[10652] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, it's absolutely connected. They all pertain to the same issues.

[10653] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, it's a nice attempt for you to question what we put in our press statements. You can take that view, but I'm telling you it's an incorrect view. There was nothing to hide and this idea of protecting myself, my reputation, sorry, this is not what I enter politics for.

[10654] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You may say that, Mr Singh, but you have not given us one credible reason why —

[10655] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not to you.

[10656] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — this material fact of your knowledge of the falsehood three months before it was disclosed in Parliament, why is that not in the statement? And the only logical inference is that you wanted to distance yourself from the knowledge of Ms Khan, rather, distance yourself from the lie that Ms Khan had told and the fact that you knew about it and chose to do nothing about it.

[10657] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And I had good reasons why I chose to do nothing about it.

[10658] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please don't interrupt me.

[10659] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm sorry, go ahead.

[10660] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And choose to do nothing about it, which I will remind you, I've asked you ad nauseum, and you've said ad nauseum that in fact you've chosen to do nothing about it all this while. So, the reality, Mr Singh, is that you chose to take this out because you knew that that would put you in a bit of a pickle.

[10661] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, completely incorrect, completely incorrect, but I must say, quite an imaginative conclusion.

[10662] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you.

[10663] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You're welcome.

[10664] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm not imagining it.

[10665] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I believe you are.

[10666] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And then, on 2 November, you see that maybe in the same bundle, the Workers' Party media statement is made, this time round announcing the formation of a Disciplinary Panel.

[10667] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10668] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me ask you to have a quick look at it. [*A media statement was referred to.*] The panel was approved – “the CEC approved the formation of the panel, the DP, to look into the admissions made by MP Raeesah Khan in Parliament on 1 November, arising from an earlier speech made by the MP in Parliament on 3 August 2021.” And the members of the DP are set out in that media statement.

[10669] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10670] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In this context, would it not be relevant, a relevant consideration for the DP that you and Ms Lim and Mr Faisal Manap had been aware of the falsehood from August and had been working with Ms Khan towards having this clarified in Parliament? Agree?

[10671] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Could you repeat the question, sorry?

[10672] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Yes. I said: in this context, would it not be relevant, a relevant consideration for the DP, that you and Ms Lim and Mr Faisal Manap had been aware of the falsehood from August and had been working with Ms Khan towards having this clarified in Parliament?

[10673] Mr Pritam Singh: It would have been relevant if our intention was, as Ms Khan interpreted, to take a lie to the grave, it would be very relevant. But we had no such takeaway to her in that manner. That was absolutely no way she could have interpreted it in that way and we looked at it as an issue that the Party had to resolve. A Party MP has made this, has told a lie in Parliament. She's finally come clean in Parliament on 1 November, told the truth. She confirms, as she did with us on 8 August, as to what exactly happened. And we didn't see that something untoward or out of the ordinary for us to consider ourselves, an information that had to be released, because we know why, we know exactly why it was difficult for us to share this beyond the three of us because of the personal and private nature of what she had shared with us.

[10674] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: You see, Mr Singh, this Panel is set up to look into the falsehoods and presumably to make recommendations as to what to do with Ms Khan, right?

[10675] Mr Pritam Singh: From a Party perspective.

[10676] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Yes, from a Party perspective.

[10677] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes.

[10678] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Wouldn't it be relevant that the senior leadership of the Workers' Party had been aware of the falsehood much earlier and had played a part in advising her on the steps to take to correct it?

[10679] Mr Pritam Singh: It doesn't change the fact that she was the one to —

[10680] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: No, answer my question.

[10681] Mr Pritam Singh: No, I don't think so.

[10682] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: It must be material because you're also determining her fate, what to do with her, what sanctions to be imposed on her, correct?

[10683] Mr Pritam Singh: We're not determining her fate.

[10684] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: You're making recommendations.

[10685] Mr Pritam Singh: CEC determines her fate. We are not judge, jury and executioner, the DP.

[10686] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Yes, but look, you know, three of you are the three most senior members of the CEC.

[10687] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, we're not. There are other senior members on that CEC as well.

[10688] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I think the reality is that the CEC included the three members on the DP. Right?

[10689] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The CEC is not a bunch of yes men and women.

[10690] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes or no?

[10691] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Ask that question again.

[10692] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The three members of the DP are from of the CEC.

[10693] **Mr Pritam Singh:** We are part of the CEC, yes, of course.

[10694] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the fact of the matter is that your conduct in advising her, well, first being aware of the lie and then advising her on the steps to take, would be relevant considerations, wouldn't it?

[10695] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Advising her on the steps to take?

[10696] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, to tell her family and then come clean in Parliament.

[10697] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10698] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Would it not?

[10699] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, that's all I told her. That's all we – that's all I told her on 8 August —

[10700] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Those are relevant considerations, and —

[10701] **Mr Pritam Singh:** To me, the point is at any point from August right up to 3 October, she's at liberty to come up and come and see me and say, "Look, I've squared this issue away. I am going to deal with it in Parliament."

[10702] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me ask you this question, let me approach it in a different way since you are either not understanding me or don't want to understand.

[10703] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I understand you perfectly.

[10704] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Then, maybe you don't want to answer the question.

[10705] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I've answered the question also.

[10706] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Why are the three of you, and only the three of you, looking into this, judging her, when it is the three of you who were aware of the falsehood three months ago and had been advising her and speaking to her about coming clean?

[10707] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You haven't reframed the question. It's still the same question. The answer is the same. We never saw it as something which was untoward. MP Raeesah has told a lie in Parliament. From a Party perspective, we have to deal with it. We know some facts about it, but those facts that we know do not include a narrative that we told her to tell a lie or to take it to the grave.

[10708] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's not about whether you —

[10709] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I am answering the question. So, for us, it didn't matter. It never even crossed our minds that the composition of the Disciplinary Panel would be a problem.

[10710] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, I'm surprised to hear that.

[10711] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm surprised you're surprised, because I've given you the answer.

[10712] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because the only three people in all of the Workers' Party's Members of Parliament who knew about the lie earlier were you, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal.

[10713] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. We established that a long time ago.

[10714] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And these are the only three people on the DP?

[10715] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[10716] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, even if you think, even if you think that you have done nothing wrong, you advised her, you didn't tell her to lie, I would suggest to you that that fact, that you were aware much earlier, MP Raeesah Khan had come to you to confess it and had taken your counsel on it and acted in a manner based on your advice, those would be material facts for the public to know, for Parliament to know, and indeed for the members of the Workers' Party to know.

[10717] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree.

[10718] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because amongst the submissions that you invited were submissions from the Workers' Party members, correct?

[10719] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10720] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And members of the Workers' Party who came forward, gave views to you on the DP, would include views as to whether they felt she should be retained as an MP or expelled as an MP, correct?

[10721] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10722] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And surely, the entire range of her conduct, her behaviour, whether she held on to the lie for three months or whether she confessed it to the senior leadership of the Workers' Party early, all of that must be relevant, surely?

[10723] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What would be relevant is if we had —

- [10724] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Answer my question.
- [10725] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, because it never crossed our mind in that way.
- [10726] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That's because you were blind to it.
- [10727] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree.
- [10728] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You were deliberately blind to it, Mr Singh, because —
- [10729] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There were no lies involved.
- [10730] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish. It's not about a lie only, Mr Singh. It's about honesty and disclosure, openness, concepts that you speak about all the time.
- [10731] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I see where you are going with this —
- [10732] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You are inviting members of the Workers' Party to come and give you a submission, give you a view on whether you should retain Ms Khan or expel her from the Party.
- [10733] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [10734] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Surely, it is relevant for them to know that Ms Khan had in fact come to you, the SG of the Workers' Party, the Chairman and the Vice Chairman, told the lie, made a clean breast of things, told all of you that it was a lie, and worked with you and get advice from you, and as early as 7 August?
- [10735] **Mr Pritam Singh:** "Worked with you and get advice from you"? I would disagree with that characterisation. But my view is —
- [10736] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Whatever you might disagree on, Mr Singh, the fact of the matter is that you didn't disclose the fact that she came up to you to disclose.
- [10737] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She didn't come up to us. We basically got it out of her, and, to me —
- [10738] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** How's that relevant?
- [10739] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's very relevant to me, now that I'm speaking of it, but what's more relevant is the DP didn't operate to hide things from the Workers' Party members. The DP did not tell a lie. The fact is Ms Khan had to correct a lie in Parliament. She told a lie in Parliament.
- [10740] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.
- [10741] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She finally came out with the truth and then we dealt with that issue from that perspective.

[10742] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And the DP is also making recommendations as to whether you should expel Ms Khan, correct?

[10743] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The DP is making recommendations as to what ought to be done from a Party perspective, and then it is up to the CEC to decide what to do with her.

[10744] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that includes whether to retain her or expel her from the Party, right?

[10745] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's the decision of the CEC.

[10746] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the gravamen of her conduct is relevant?

[10747] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The gravamen of her conduct is relevant. That's what the DP is looking at.

[10748] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you would agree with me – you are a lawyer by training and a very experienced politician – you would agree with me, Mr Singh, that there is a world of difference between someone like Ms Khan, who thought up the lie, spoke the lie in Parliament, kept it to herself, refused to clarify when called upon on 4 October to do so, did not share this with anyone else, and then only decided to confess and come clean three months later. That's one scenario.

[10749] The other scenario is an MP, like Ms Khan, who told a lie in Parliament, five days later, told the entire senior leadership comprising the Chairman, the Vice Chairman and the Sec-Gen of the Party that she has told a lie, and then the Sec-Gen tells her, this is what we do: tell your family, then we sort this out. And according to the Sec-Gen, this is what she does. She carries that plan out to a tee —

[10750] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She does not.

[10751] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — clears her draft with you several times, explains her position to the CEC and then goes and makes a personal statement in Parliament on 1 November.

[10752] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10753] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Don't you agree there's a world of difference?

[10754] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, now the two examples are – they were so long, but, in my view, the critical difference between both these examples —

[10755] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Answer my question.

[10756] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree, I disagree. The critical difference between the two examples is the conduct of the leadership. Are the leadership telling her to take her lie to the grave? We are not telling her to take her lie to the grave. I'm giving my evidence. And because we are not telling her to do that, there's no motive. Actually, we never even considered it to be a relevant issue, to be frank, not even relevant because we know what has happened. Ms Khan has not taken responsibility and ownership, and we dealt with it from that perspective.

[10757] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, you seem to try to impress upon us that – at least upon me – that it is only relevant if somehow the DP members incited her to tell a lie or did something wrong.

[10758] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely, I agree.

[10759] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But I'm suggesting to you that, actually, that's not just the only scenario where a full disclosure is relevant. A full disclosure is relevant because the DP is inviting members of the Workers' Party to come and make an assessment of her conduct and make a submission to the DP as to whether to expel Ms Khan or to retain her as an MP. And in that context, in that context, the fact that Ms Khan has come to the senior leadership of the Workers' Party and confessed three months prior and has worked with the CEC, worked with the senior membership – leadership, including yourself, on her personal statement, which you all approved, surely that's relevant —

[10760] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it's not relevant. I'll tell you why.

[10761] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — for a member – for a judging member of the public or a judging member of the Workers' Party to decide whether or not this is a person who should be retained as an MP or be expelled from the party.

[10762] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's if you assume that the DP's role was to decide on expulsion or retention.

[10763] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It was to make recommendations.

[10764] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But the DP didn't start with a conclusion in mind. We didn't prejudge the issue, not at all.

[10765] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you see, you were told, what I'm putting to you, you were not hearing for the first time, you were told this by Ms Loh and Mr Nathan.

[10766] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Told what?

[10767] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me show you. First of all, please pick up this bundle again.

[10768] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I know where you're going with this.

[10769] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I thought you would.

[10770] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I know where you're going with this, yes.

[10771] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Come, have a look. Okay? These are the screenshots.

[10772] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10773] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Go to the last page of that bundle, please.

[10774] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10775] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The second last message there is a message of 10 November, 9.56 am.

[10776] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Just give me a second. Let's just confirm whether we are on the same page. This is a message from whom?

[10777] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm told by Ms Loh that this was a message that was sent out —

[10778] **Mr Pritam Singh:** On 10 November?

[10779] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — on 10 November.

[10780] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that is correct.

[10781] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — by the Workers' Party, and I'm not sure who was responsible for sending it out, but it was sent out to all members, inviting them to provide their views to the DP.

[10782] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't have that communication here.

[10783] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The second last message —

[10784] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I may be on the wrong bundle. Is this the one? I don't think so.

[10785] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think that might be the one. Look at the second last message, Mr Singh.

[10786] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Second last message: "Pritam just told —"

[10787] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, on the last page. Go to the last page.

[10788] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There's nothing on the last page.

[10789] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can I see? I've circled it for you.

[10790] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay, thank you, but there was no last page. Yes.

[10791] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Now, we are on the same page, literally.

[10792] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[10793] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 10 November, Workers' Party sends out an invite to all members to provide their views to the DP. [*A message was referred to.*]

[10794] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[10795] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It says at 9.56 am: "Dear members, the DP is looking into MP Raeesah Khan's admissions and invites members' views."

- [10796] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.
- [10797] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** “If you would wish to meet the panel, please email Nathaniel Koh and so on so that arrangements can be made.” So, it is a general invitation to all members to come forward?
- [10798] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right. It is. Yes.
- [10799] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You are inviting members to come forward to offer their view as to how they see the episode and what they would say should be done to Ms Khan, right?
- [10800] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [10801] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Eventually, the DP would take into account those members’ views when deciding on the appropriate sanction to recommend to the CEC for Ms Khan, right?
- [10802] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [10803] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you recall being told by Ms Loh, after she got this message, that the DP has to be transparent?
- [10804] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, she mentioned that on 10 December — 10 November.
- [10805] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, on the very day that this —
- [10806] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.
- [10807] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. I’d like you to have a look at that series of messages, please, so you know exactly what we are talking about. Please pick up this bundle again, the thick one.
- [10808] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. What page are we on?
- [10809] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, we are on page 222.
- [10810] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [10811] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I beg your pardon, it should be 223. I’m so sorry.
- [10812] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.
- [10813] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, this is an exchange of WhatsApps between yourself and Pei Ying. [*A message was referred to.*] So, on 10 November, she says, “Hi, Pritam. I’ve tried to reserve my comments on the Disciplinary Panel so far, but I just saw the message that was sent out to everyone.” This was the message that was sent out at 9.56 am.
- [10814] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right.

[10815] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: No, the earlier message was 9.56 am, and her response an hour later is to you directly. Let me just show you what she says to you. *[A message was referred to, with the following text.]*

Ms Loh Pei Ying: I feel that it's plain as day to me and people involved in her apology that this is a little backwards-peddling. Clearly, the party didn't anticipate the backlash despite warnings, and it's trying to do something to quell people's anger. While I disagree with it, I can empathise with it. I don't think it is at all fair to let party members think that they have a say in this process. If this is done as a mock consultation exercise, then party members will be unhappy their opinions weren't really considered. If it is not a mock exercise, then they will likely all ask Raeesah to resign when they do not have the full facts. I welcome the DP to be transparent and share their involvement in this, their findings, barring personal information, so that the party can actually make an accurate decision.

Mr Pritam Singh: I hear you, PY, but I do think we need to give party members a platform to have their say on this important matter rather than commiserate privately or between each other and believe that the party leadership decides things without considering their views.

Ms Loh Pei Ying: I get that, but the DP hasn't exactly told the party of its knowledge and involvement.

[10816] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes.

[10817] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: You then say,

Mr Pritam Singh: Despite that, it will be good to hear people out.

Ms Loh Pei Ying: But their opinions are not accurate because they don't have the facts. Everyone is of the view that we can cut her loose and distance the party from her mistake, but if she's out of the party, she is still such subjected to the COP, and there's not much we can do to what she says and shares when it gets there.

Mr Pritam Singh: They have the same facts as the public does. I'm not so sure everyone feels that she should be cut loose.

[10818] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Let me pause for a moment. You remember this exchange?

[10819] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes, I do. Yes, I do.

[10820] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Pei Ying used to be your SA or LA, correct, for several years?

[10821] Mr Pritam Singh: She was my SA, I believe.

[10822] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: In fact, you spoke about her in your inaugural election rally in 2011, correct?

[10823] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes, I must have.

[10824] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: In glowing terms, right?

[10825] Mr Pritam Singh: Well, it was 10 years ago.

[10826] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Would you like me to remind you of it.

[10827] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think I know what I said.

[10828] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Your inaugural speech, in glowing terms.

[10829] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn't know who she was at that point.

[10830] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Exactly, but you made it a point to look for her —

[10831] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because it was an interesting —

[10832] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — and eventually she became your SA.

[10833] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10834] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You thought well of her?

[10835] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. I made that point earlier in my evidence.

[10836] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you. She speaks her mind, right?

[10837] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She speaks her mind, yes.

[10838] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She's a cadre member of the Workers' Party.

[10839] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10840] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And one of two who's closely associated with and helping Ms Khan in her work.

[10841] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that is correct.

[10842] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She's coming to you one hour after she receives this broadcast to tell you a few things: one, please be transparent, give the full facts, share your involvement, meaning yours, Ms Lim's and Mr Faisal's involvement.

[10843] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10844] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Why didn't you do that?

[10845] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, as I mentioned earlier, as far as I was concerned, the DP's role was to look at Ms Khan's conduct. She lied in Parliament. She then takes the lie forward again on 4 October, and that was the conduct we were looking at. We did not at any point think — and I think there's a good reason why you come at it from a different direction, because you have sight of an SMS from Raeesah to Pei Ying and Yudhish saying that we want to take her lie to the grave. I'm not sure whether Pei Ying is referring to that knowledge, because we didn't have that knowledge. And let me answer that question —

[10846] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh, don't speculate. I haven't suggested it, and neither does Pei Ying talk about that message, so —

[10847] **Mr Pritam Singh:** We can't be sure about that. We cannot be sure about that.

[10848] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** All she's saying is that, look, the members of the DP were involved themselves. It's only right that the members of the Workers' Party also be aware that you were involved so that they can make an informed decision.

[10849] **Mr Pritam Singh:** We were not involved in that. We didn't say any lies. We didn't tell any lies to Parliament —

[10850] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's not about —

[10851] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — and we also were not involved in the sense that we encouraged her to lie or to conceal the lie. Not at all. From that perspective, we saw ourselves as senior members of the Party. It's an MP here. We will look at the feedback, how people feel about — how members feel about an MP who lies in Parliament, and we'll deal with it and make our recommendations to the CEC who will decide what ought to be done. There was never any consideration that are we muzzling somebody, are we doing something out of the ordinary? What do we know? By this point on 10 November, it was very clear where the Party base, I would say, were leaning, and I think they —

[10852] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I don't need to get into that. All I'm interested in is in the process. It's your decision to make.

[10853] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn't find the process to be untoward —

[10854] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's your decision to make, right?

[10855] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10856] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But the process, as Ms Loh points out to you, is flawed.

[10857] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It's — but again —

[10858] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You're not transparent, she says.

[10859] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I can imagine she would say that, because I'm not sure whether — she never at any point clarified with me whether we had told her to take the lie to the grave. Is that the knowledge that she's referring to?

[10860] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, please don't ascribe to Ms Loh any knowledge.

[10861] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But she's talking about the knowledge of the Party; the Party, of its knowledge. What is she referring to?

[10862] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, she is not talking about that message that Ms Khan had sent her.

[10863] **Mr Pritam Singh:** How do you know?

[10864] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She's not talking about it.

[10865] **Mr Pritam Singh:** How do you know?

[10866] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you see it here?

[10867] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Do you? Do you see a reference to the fact? Yes, so, what is the knowledge that she is referring to? You seem to know what knowledge she's referring to.

[10868] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. Well, alright, if you want to be specific, we can take you to parts of her submission to you at the DP as well. She make the same points, correct?

[10869] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She made the same points, yes.

[10870] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, my question to you is: why don't you pay any heed to this?

[10871] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because I didn't see it as relevant.

[10872] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you didn't —

[10873] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It would have been relevant if we, indeed, wanted her to lie and take it to the grave.

[10874] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. Let me stop you there.

[10875] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It was not relevant to us.

[10876] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You don't say anywhere here to Pei Ying that it's not relevant.

[10877] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, it is what it is. Of course, I don't say that, but I have a view, I've put the view out there.

[10878] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, so, thank you, you didn't say that. In fact, this is what you say. On 10 November, 11.24 am, Pei Ying says, "But the DP hasn't exactly told the party of its knowledge and involvement."

[10879] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10880] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** "Despite that" — you understand the words "despite that"?

[10881] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You want to ask me what I meant by "despite that"?

- [10882] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** “That is true, but”, correct?
- [10883] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, that’s not what I meant. Nice try, but that’s not what I meant.
- [10884] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, let’s not play around with language. “Despite that”, that means you accept what she says, and even then, it would be good to hear people out.
- [10885] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Are you suggesting on a WhatsApp chat, you doublecheck what you write and read and send and then before you press the send button?
- [10886] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, I think we all know what “despite that” means.
- [10887] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think the context is quite clear. To me, I found it irrelevant —
- [10888] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you don’t say it here.
- [10889] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — and that’s why I said “despite that” – “put that aside”. That’s what I meant.
- [10890] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, “put that aside” means even though the DP hasn’t told the party of its knowledge and involvement, hasn’t been transparent, hasn’t come clean. “despite that”, it’s good to hear people out.
- [10891] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The knowledge that we knew she lied, that knowledge. She lied in Parliament, and this is what the DP is set up for. To find out what ought to be the appropriate course of action that ought to be taken. That’s my evidence.
- [10892] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Chairman, shall we take a break now? I’m not finished yet, but shall we take a break now? Is it okay?
- [10893] **The Chairman:** We can take a break. Shall we adjourn? It’s been a long day. I think there will still be many more hours ahead.
- [10894] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I’m happy. I’m looking forward to it.
- [10895] **The Chairman:** So, let’s adjourn. Let’s take an hour’s break so that we can gather our thoughts as well. Come back at 6.00 pm?
- [10896] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.
- [10897] **The Chairman:** Thank you.
- [10898] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you, Mr Singh.
- [10899] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You are welcome.

(The hearing adjourned at 5.01 pm and resumed at 6.47 pm.)

- [10900] **The Chairman:** Mr Singh, you managed to get your dinner?

[10901] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10902] **The Chairman:** If we may resume. Mr Edwin Tong.

[10903] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you. Thank you, Mr Singh.

[10904] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10905] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Before the break, Mr Singh, we were focused on these questions that Ms Loh had raised with you, and I showed you a couple of WhatsApp messages that she had sent to you, right?

[10906] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10907] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Just to put it in context again for, I guess, yours and also my benefit, we were talking about why there was no information given to members of the Workers' Party who were asked to come forward and give their submissions to the Workers' Party, and my contention to you, which you disagreed, was that it would be relevant for the Workers' Party members to know that Ms Khan had come and come clean to the senior leaders of the Workers' Party, made a clean breast of things, at least by 8 August?

[10908] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Forced to come clean.

[10909] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, but had come clean, anyway, and members should also be told that the Workers' Party senior leadership had then worked with Ms Khan, with some clear objectives in mind, and circumstances in which, if fulfilled, such as her family being informed, would result in clarification being made to Parliament?

[10910] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10911] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Remember?

[10912] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[10913] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. The point I was making to you is that it's relevant for members to know because they would have to judge the severity and culpability of her conduct, correct?

[10914] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10915] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because it makes a difference whether they come and tell the DP, "I think she should be expelled" or whether she would be given a censure or not. The gravamen of her conduct would be in focus, correct?

[10916] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree to that, the way you've put it.

[10917] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The level of culpability would be in force?

[10918] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I don't think it would make a difference.

[10919] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The extent to which it's felt that she either cooperated or did not cooperate with the Party would also be relevant, right?

[10920] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not exactly. I don't agree with that.

[10921] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, put it this way, Mr Singh. If you had someone who was on a frolic of his or her own, acted entirely on his or her own, without informing the senior leadership, whether forced to or otherwise, never discussed, never came clean, hid material facts from the senior leadership throughout, that is a very different scenario from one who gave the senior leadership an early account three months prior, all the facts were known, and worked with the senior leadership to achieve a clarification in Parliament, correct? Those two scenarios are different?

[10922] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Those two scenarios are different in the way you have put them, yes.

[10923] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. So, if the scenarios are different, then the factual matrix behind the second scenario, that is, whether there was such conduct, whether this person had come clean, whether they were working with senior leadership to fix the problem, all of that should be disclosed to the membership, right?

[10924] **Mr Pritam Singh:** To the extent that the second scenario is concerned, my answer is, no, I did not find it to be relevant, because, ultimately, this was about Ms Khan and her decision to lie in Parliament, to continue the lie. Whether the Party leadership – it would be very relevant if the Party leadership told her to tell a lie. We did not. To continue a narrative, we did not. And it is the same position I put to the Committee before our break that I did not see it to be relevant. This was specifically on Ms Khan lying in Parliament, and we have an MP who has lied, what's the Party's view on that.

[10925] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** An MP who has lied, whether that lie was held firmly and not discussed with senior leadership would be a different scenario from an MP who's lied, but confessed early, almost three months prior to coming clean in Parliament, right?

[10926] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But if she had confessed early, she would have told the truth on 4 October.

[10927] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. You're precisely right. And, therefore, the circumstances behind why she didn't tell the truth in October would be relevant, correct?

[10928] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The circumstances behind why she didn't tell the truth before October?

[10929] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[10930] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, those circumstances —

[10931] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, October.

[10932] **Mr Pritam Singh:** October. Those circumstances pertain specifically, as far as the DP were concerned, to the lies that Ms Khan had told in Parliament. We did not see the fact

that she had been forced to tell the truth as relevant for the purposes of what the DP wanted to do.

[10933] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh, I think you understand me, and I think I'll try again. It is not about whether the DP influenced it or didn't influence it, forced her to tell a lie or otherwise. That's a separate point. For the purposes of my contention to you, it doesn't matter whether the DP did or didn't do that. My contention rests on the premise of full, frank, honest, open, transparent disclosure to members because the members were required to make a submission to the DP as to what would be the appropriate sanction for Ms Khan. Right? Correct?

[10934] **Mr Pritam Singh:** In my view, that was not relevant.

[10935] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. That's what the members were asked to do.

[10936] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But you're saying full, frank disclosure, insofar as the information that Ms Khan had shared with us on 8 August, after I had forced her to make that information apparent, I did not see that as relevant to an understanding of Ms Khan's conduct to lie, lie repeatedly, lie again in Parliament.

[10937] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Put it this way: the admission on 1 November that Ms Khan did, that would be a factor that you take in her favour as a mitigating circumstance, right?

[10938] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, it would be.

[10939] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because she would have disclosed it publicly in Parliament?

[10940] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10941] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Why wouldn't the fact that she had disclosed it to the senior leadership also be a mitigating factor?

[10942] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because, in my view, that point rests on her telling the senior leadership, after she has been forced to tell the senior leadership what has happened. What is mitigating to me is her conduct after 12 October, when it's made clear to her, when she wants to retain the lie, to say, "No, you have to tell the truth."

[10943] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I am talking about that.

[10944] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Anyway, she makes that public on 1 November.

[10945] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you don't think that members should have information concerning whether she worked with or cooperated with members of the senior leadership of the Workers' Party?

[10946] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think for the purposes of —

[10947] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, answer my question.

[10948] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. I have already answered it a few times in different ways. I didn't think it was relevant.

[10949] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And surely to you, Mr Singh, as I said, you are a proponent of open, honest disclosure. What's —

[10950] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's a separate issue.

[10951] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What's wrong with disclosing? It's not a separate issue, Mr Singh. It goes to the heart of —

[10952] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It wasn't relevant to me.

[10953] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It goes to the heart of the integrity, of the entire integrity of the entire disciplinary process —

[10954] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it does not.

[10955] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — that you failed to be open and transparent, in the way that Ms Loh has put it to you, failed to disclose to your members that the senior leadership of the Workers' Party was well aware of the lie and was prepared for Ms Khan to take time to come clean in Parliament.

[10956] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree. I also have already made it clear that I don't know what Ms Loh was referring to when she said the senior leadership knew. Is she referring to knew by reliance or what —

[10957] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I will take you back to it in a moment. But, you see, you left the public and the Workers' Party members with the impression that Ms Khan sat on the lie and told no one for three months. Would you agree?

[10958] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I don't think that would have been the impression. Because this is specifically about Ms Khan —

[10959] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh, look at your press release on 1 November.

[10960] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[10961] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Look at your press release, 2 November.

[10962] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You're talking about the Facebook statement?

[10963] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Facebook statement and your press release announcing the formation of the DP. Where does it disclose that the senior leadership knew?

[10964] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, what I'm referring to is on 1 November.

[10965] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Answer me. Does it?

- [10966] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it doesn't.
- [10967] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you have not disclosed the fact that the senior leadership knew?
- [10968] **Mr Pritam Singh:** In my mind, it was not relevant.
- [10969] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's relevant because —
- [10970] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's your contention.
- [10971] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I'm putting it to you.
- [10972] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not accepting —
- [10973] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Don't interrupt me. I'm putting it to you that the members of the Workers' Party who are now asked to judge the level of culpability of Ms Khan —
- [10974] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [10975] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — surely, it's relevant for them to know that, in fact, she had not been sitting on the lie by herself for three months. That, in fact, four days after the lie, she told it to you. That's relevant for them.
- [10976] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She told what to me?
- [10977] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She told you that she had told a lie in Parliament.
- [10978] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, after being pressed and, as far as I was concerned, if, indeed, I follow your reasoning, then she would have told the truth on 4 October. So, as far as the members are concerned, this is an MP who has lied and continues to carry the lie on 4 October. We are judging her on that behaviour.
- [10979] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, I think you know the point and you are deliberately being obtuse about it.
- [10980] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not being obtuse about it. I am making my point. I am giving my evidence. This is my evidence to you.
- [10981] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You are actually someone who has made so many speeches on openness and transparency but, on this point, when it comes to your own openness and transparency, you take the position that it should be suppressed and I'm —
- [10982] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There's no question of it being suppressed. It's a question of relevance and, as I said, it's not relevant.
- [10983] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, you took it out. It's not in the press statement. So, it's suppressed.

- [10984] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn't take it out. It wasn't even in.
- [10985] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That's even worse.
- [10986] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, because you're making an allegation at me.
- [10987] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the reason you did so is because you wanted to protect your own position that, in fact, you and the senior leadership of the Workers' Party were already aware for three months prior to the disclosure in Parliament of the fact that Ms Khan had told a lie in Parliament.
- [10988] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.
- [10989] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that's the reason why this fact neither appears in your 1 November nor 2 November press releases. Neither does it appear in any of the materials that you circulated to Workers' Party members and that's why you resisted and ignored Ms Loh's plea to you for the DP to be open and transparent.
- [10990] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree.
- [10991] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that's the only reason why you would omit that fact.
- [10992] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Disagree. I've made it clear I did not feel it was relevant because of Ms Khan's own conduct.
- [10993] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you pick up Mr Faisal Manap's submission to the tribunal, please?
- [10994] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [10995] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We saw it a bit earlier. Yes, thank you. Can you please go to page 20?
- [10996] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I beg your pardon. Page?
- [10997] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Page 20. Actually, the document starts a bit earlier. So, perhaps, you start at page 18.
- [10998] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.
- [10999] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's titled "DP Recommendations to CEC". [*A document was referred to.*]
- [11000] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [11001] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm sure you've seen this document before, right?
- [11002] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I have.

[11003] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you'll be familiar. So, you have an extract of your Party constitution.

[11004] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11005] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You have a chronology of milestones for the DP.

[11006] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11007] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And right at the bottom, you see "Total signed up/invited: 27; total turned up: 24; emails received: 10."

[11008] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11009] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** "For info", over the page, "Total: 34". "Opinions: Leave WP: 26; Differences (re mode of departure); Stay as MP: 3. Non-committal: 5." So, this is the poll you took from members, right?

[11010] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This was of whatever we had received, all the information we received from members, yes.

[11011] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, your members are giving an opinion to you as the DP?

[11012] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11013] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** As to whether she should stay as an MP or otherwise, right?

[11014] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11015] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And this is the DP's assessment, go down the page.

[11016] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes,

[11017] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think you'll be familiar, "knowingly asserted an untruth of fact in Parliament on three occasions" and, if you just scroll down, you'll see the range of punishments, what the CEC can decide based on Article 20 and if you look at "Mitigating Factors: No malice or sinister motive; made public admission on 1 November to correct the record; she (likely) believed a survivor's account"?

[11018] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11019] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, these are the DP's characterisations of mitigating circumstances?

[11020] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[11021] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm suggesting to you that a relevant mitigating circumstance would also include the fact that she told you and Ms Lim and Mr Faisal the truth in August.

[11022] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I would not consider that to be a mitigating factor.

[11023] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that would be —

[11024] **Mr Pritam Singh:** By virtue of her own conduct.

[11025] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm sorry?

[11026] **Mr Pritam Singh:** By virtue of her own conduct later, she continues to tell the lie.

[11027] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me try a different approach. If it is determined that the instruction that you gave to Ms Khan on 3 October was equivocal at best and unclear at worst – I don't want to get into difficulties with you over definition – and as a result, Ms Khan was misled into thinking that she should not tell the truth, let's say, would that not be a relevant fact here?

[11028] **Mr Pritam Singh:** If she was misled into not telling the truth? I think let's deal with what the facts are and what's the evidence.

[11029] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I'm asking you —

[11030] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This is a hypothesis to me.

[11031] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, I am entitled to put a hypothesis to you because we should test the evidence.

[11032] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You don't test evidence with a hypothesis. But go ahead.

[11033] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But we do. I think we do. You understand my question, right?

[11034] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I understand your questions.

[11035] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you understand the hypothesis?

[11036] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I understand the hypothesis.

[11037] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, on that basis, don't you think that it would be relevant which goes towards her state of mind and, therefore, her level of culpability?

[11038] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree because what was told to her was to take responsibility and ownership.

[11039] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But if let's say, there is a finding, not necessarily by us, but let's say there's a finding that the instruction on 3 October was, as I said, less than clear,

equivocal, or perhaps even tending to lead her to believe that she should continue with the lie. If that is the case, then that would be relevant to the considerations of the DP, correct?

[11040] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, you're conceding that if, indeed, that was what had happened —

[11041] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, I'm conceding nothing. I'm framing a proposition to you, and I'm asking you for your evidence on this.

[11042] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, if it's not based on the truth, then I have to agree. But the truth of the matter is she was told to take responsibility and ownership. But if you're suggesting that her conclusion is "no"—

[11043] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That's fine. Who determines the truth of that? If let's say, that's an allegation that's made, who determines the truth of that?

[11044] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You have to — this is my evidence.

[11045] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I'm—

[11046] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There's a Committee here to determine that. I'm giving the Committee my evidence.

[11047] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, the hypothesis — maybe we go back and read the evidence, easier. I put it to you the hypothesis and you said, "Well, if it's not based on the truth, then I have to agree. But the truth of the matter is that she was told to take responsibility", alright?

[11048] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[11049] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you are saying that if it is not true, then you agree it's a relevant consideration for the DP, right?

[11050] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I mean, you can, but that also goes to my earlier evidence that if we had told her to stick to that lie, it follows that same train of thought.

[11051] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, who determines this truth?

[11052] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Which truth?

[11053] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The truth that you refer to. In other words —

[11054] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong —

[11055] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I haven't asked the question, so, please don't interrupt. You said, "Well, if it's not based on the truth, then I have to agree." Those are your words.

[11056] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[11057] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The truth of the statement, the truth or falsity of the statement, is a question of whether she was misled or not misled on 3 October, right?

[11058] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11059] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Who determines that?

[11060] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You tell me. I've told you. I've given you my evidence.

[11061] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In your case, the DP has decided that there's no truth in that, and that's why – you follow?

[11062] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I follow. I follow you, I follow you.

[11063] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And that's why the three of you on the DP are completely self-serving.

[11064] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it's not completely self-serving at all.

[11065] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You are determining – in proceeding to listen and hear this case and sit on the DP, you have made a decision or a judgement that her version of what happened is false, is wrong, and your version is the right one. That's —

[11066] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, because we —

[11067] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, let me finish.

[11068] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, go ahead.

[11069] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That is the premise on which you answered my question.

[11070] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, it was a hypothesis you put to me. I had no trouble answering it because I am aware of what the truth is, and I acted in good faith.

[11071] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Exactly.

[11072] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I put the DP together, got CEC's permission to do so, and that's because we know what we have to do. We have to look at Ms Khan's conduct, what she had done and, thereafter, determine what was the right thing to do and to move forward as a party.

[11073] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This entire DP and the fact that you continue on the DP includes the DP deciding that its own version, that is, the three of you, own version of what happened on 3 October, is the correct one.

[11074] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, Mr Tong, it's open to the CEC to ask any question to the DP to say, look, when did you know? And these questions – let me remind you – let me remind you they are already out in the public, free for the CEC to put those questions to us. Now, if we really were hiding it —

[11075] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh —

[11076] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me finish, because I let you finish. At least give me that courtesy. It was for the CEC, of course, at any point in time to ask us, “When did you know?” We had a CEC meeting on 29 October. Ms Khan doesn’t say anything about a lie that needs to be taken to the grave. Later on, we have another CEC meeting. There are more questions already out there in public. The CEC can ask all these questions.

[11077] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you, Mr Singh. I think your own last few seconds of evidence answers my question. Thank you very much.

[11078] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you.

[11079] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that’s why it’s relevant in this respect: at the time you made the CEC – or you asked the CEC to set up the DP and gave them these three names as the persons on the DP —

[11080] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I did, yes.

[11081] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — the CEC were not aware that the three of you knew of the falsehood in August, correct?

[11082] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think I’ve admitted that in earlier evidence.

[11083] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes or no?

[11084] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11085] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** They were completely unaware, right?

[11086] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Of course. I already said that earlier. I had said that very early, in fact.

[11087] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you. So, the CEC was unaware that the three of you knew of the falsehood in August when it appointed the three of you as DP members, right?

[11088] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s correct. That would be correct. Just give me a second. There could have been some members who had known earlier by virtue of Raeesah checking some information with them about what goes into her statement. So, she may have shared some information with them.

[11089] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you know this for a fact? Are you able to establish it now?

[11090] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would believe it to be true and that this is my evidence.

[11091] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, tell me which CEC members, and we’ll check with them.

[11092] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'll have to check and I'll have to come back.

[11093] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, you made an assertion. Please tell us, to the best of your knowledge now, who knew?

[11094] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm quite sure that she – because I saw it in the evidence that Raeesah spoke to Ru, at the very least, and Ru, being a CEC member, she would have known before the DP was set up.

[11095] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, Raeesah spoke to Ru because you told her to go and check if she still has the support of her Sengkang GRC teammates.

[11096] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[11097] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That reference is the reference you're referring to. I showed it to you earlier.

[11098] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, no. What you're asking me is, does Ru know that the CEC is aware —

[11099] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, you're making an assertion that some members of the CEC might be aware that the three of you already knew of the falsehood in August, and I'm asking you who.

[11100] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I believe it could be – Ru could know, based on what I saw very quickly on that documentation. But I have to check. I'm prepared to check with her.

[11101] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Is it only Ru?

[11102] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not sure.

[11103] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Is it only based on the document that you saw earlier?

[11104] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, one of those exchanges.

[11105] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you have any other basis to say that Ru was aware?

[11106] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, because the whole point was this was something personal that had happened to Ms Khan and only the three of us know, but I'll have to check that point out. Let me check it up and I'll come back to you.

[11107] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, you can check. But for the moment, we'll take it that Ru is the only one you're aware of, and the only basis on which you say she's aware is that document we saw earlier on the WhatsApp message where Raeesah was to speak to Ru?

[11108] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm basing it on that, yes.

[11109] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. And only that, right?

[11110] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11111] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And as far as you know, no other CEC member is aware?

[11112] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.

[11113] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. So, the vast majority of the CEC members were not aware of the three members of the DP's knowledge of the falsehood in August when it appointed the DP on 2 November, correct?

[11114] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think that would be fair.

[11115] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright, thank you. Ms Loh was one of those who came to see you and made her submissions to the DP, right?

[11116] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm, yes.

[11117] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you remember that meeting?

[11118] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I do. I have taken some notes of that meeting.

[11119] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Can you share those notes with us?

[11120] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I can.

[11121] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You can?

[11122] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I can.

[11123] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It doesn't have to be now, but —

[11124] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't have them now, but I will just take a note. Actually, hold on a second. I did tell all the CEC members who came to give us evidence that I will not share their information in public. Can I request Chair to confirm this with Ms Loh Pei Ying and Yudhish, if they are prepared – if they allow me to share this information, I will share this information, the notes that the DP took?

[11125] **The Chairman:** We can do so.

[11126] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you. If they agree, I'm happy to release those notes.

[11127] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, they came to this Committee and gave evidence on what they shared with you at the DP.

[11128] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[11129] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, let me take you to it.

[11130] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But I gave them the DP's word that we will not share what they say in public.

- [11131] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, I understand.
- [11132] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And we asked for the same, but never mind.
- [11133] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, we can check with them.
- [11134] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [11135] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you please pick up the 2 December transcripts?
- [11136] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Whose transcripts, sorry? Yes.
- [11137] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. Please turn to page 52.
- [11138] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [11139] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the evidence that we heard from both Ms Loh and Mr Nathan was that both of them went to see the DP jointly.
- [11140] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [11141] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Was that your recollection as well?
- [11142] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that was my recollection.
- [11143] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** They spoke with one voice, as far as you can recall?
- [11144] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, you can say that.
- [11145] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so they made the same points to you, right?
- [11146] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.
- [11147] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's a long page of evidence here, but you can start with Ms Loh, near the top, where she says, "We came prepared with quite a number of points." You see that? [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 914.*]
- [11148] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that's right, right at the top.
- [11149] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, just briefly read that to yourself, the first point.
- [11150] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I see them.
- [11151] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. And then I asked her, "What were your reasons?"
- [11152] And she says, "One of the reasons I gave was everybody makes mistakes." Right, that's the first paragraph. "Another the reason I gave", and she said, "this is my personal opinion: it's not responsible to leave a seat in Parliament unoccupied."

[11153] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[11154] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Look at the next paragraph. She says, "I also told them that the CEC, and especially the DP, should tell the public the true timeline of events which I have shared here today, that when they knew, what courses of action they took. I told them, you should make this public knowledge, barring confidential and personal information."

[11155] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11156] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Now, you were there.

[11157] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[11158] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You would have understood Ms Loh to mean that she wanted the DP to share the true timeline of events, meaning she wanted you to disclose to the public when each of the three members of the DP became aware of the falsehood, correct?

[11159] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right, she saw that to be relevant.

[11160] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. In fact, that's the same point I'm putting to you today, correct?

[11161] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I know, and I've answered why I don't think it's relevant.

[11162] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And she goes further to say, "That should include when they knew, what course of action they took, and you should make this public knowledge."

[11163] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[11164] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, earlier you said you're not clear what Ms Loh meant in her WhatsApp messages. I think, by this time, you are quite clear. Right?

[11165] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, no, I didn't say she was not clear in her WhatsApp messages. But, first, on 10 November, she actually makes this representation to me for the first time. She doesn't make – this is not the first time she's making this representation to me.

[11166] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, by 25 November, at this meeting, you were quite clear what the thrust of her submission was?

[11167] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I was not.

[11168] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It says here —

[11169] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But this is the – this is the evidence – not evidence, this is what she has shared with the DP, but by 10 November, she had already told me that she is of the view that what the DP knows and all that should also come out. But little did I know until she gave her evidence that she was told by Ms Raeesah Khan that a lie had to be taken to the grave. I'm not sure whether she's referring to those details, but, as far as I'm concerned —

[11170] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, Mr Singh. You see, you are very keen to bring us back to that.

[11171] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I'm not, because —

[11172] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That message. You brought it up.

[11173] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — I don't know what her knowledge is. I don't know what her knowledge is.

[11174] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You've brought it up on your own volition several times, more than I thought you might.

[11175] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I mean, I'm surprised you feel that way because that's a very critical part of the evidence —

[11176] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It is critical —

[11177] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — brought into the Committee of Privileges.

[11178] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It is critical, but, you see, I am asking you about a different piece of evidence and a different time span now.

[11179] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure. Yes.

[11180] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I think you would know very clearly what Ms Loh here means.

[11181] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11182] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She is saying, to “tell the public the true timeline of events, when they knew”, “they” refers to the DP, right?

[11183] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, that's not incontrovertible.

[11184] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And “knew” refers to your knowledge of the falsehood in August, right?

[11185] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[11186] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** “What courses of action they took”, and “they” refers to the DP, right?

[11187] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[11188] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, it's got nothing to do with the message that says, “take it to the grave”.

[11189] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let's take it —

[11190] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, answer my question.

[11191] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree, because I don't know what Ms Loh's intention is when she says, "what we knew". So, I'm sure you get my point on what I'm trying to say, with regard to Ms Loh's knowledge. But I think a more important fact I'd like to share —

[11192] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, don't see shadows when there aren't.

[11193] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not seeing any shadows.

[11194] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She's simply saying to you, Mr DP, when she was there, members of the DP, you should tell people when they knew, when you knew the facts.

[11195] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You know what? What facts? Tell me, Mr Tong, what facts is she referring to?

[11196] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, you're back-peddling.

[11197] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm not back-peddling. I'm asking you what facts is she referring to.

[11198] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'll answer you with reference to your own evidence.

[11199] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure. But I think you need Ms Loh's evidence.

[11200] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Page 407.

[11201] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Page 407?

[11202] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm reading to you so that the transcript can pick it up of my transcripts. I put to you. She is saying, with reference to this line, she is saying, "To tell the public the true timeline of events, when they knew." "They" refers to the DP, right? "No, no, that's not incontrovertible", your answer.

[11203] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11204] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And "they" refers to you, right? Answer by you: "Yes." And "they" refers to the DP, right? So, it's got nothing to do with the message "take it to the grave".

[11205] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What about facts? My question to you earlier was: what facts is Ms Loh referring to? That clarification does not answer that.

[11206] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Oh. Okay.

[11207] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You don't have it.

[11208] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, at page 406, you talked about the evidence, what she has shared with the DP. By 10 November, these are the messages. Then, you say,

“Little did I know, until she gave evidence, she was told by Ms Khan, lie had to be taken to the grave.”

[11209] **So**, I then reminded you, you don’t have to refer to that because that’s not on the face of this. You agree now?

[11210] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I don’t agree with you. It doesn’t make clear what Ms Loh’s knowledge is.

[11211] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, is that message referred to here?

[11212] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it’s not referred to here but knowledge is referred to.

[11213] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, thank you. You see —

[11214] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think I’ve made my point.

[11215] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. I’m not even trying to suggest to you that the knowledge includes that message, Mr Singh.

[11216] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s what I doing —

[11217] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, no, I have told you earlier on that I don’t have anything to disagree with you on the basis that, on your contention that, at the material time, contemporaneously, you have not seen that message. I think I made it clear to you several times.

[11218] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, we don’t know what’s on Ms Loh’s mind.

[11219] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, for you, to suggest that that message is somehow operative in these lines here —

[11220] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Why shouldn’t I assume that?

[11221] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — is far-fetched.

[11222] **Mr Pritam Singh:** How can it be far-fetched? It’s impossible for to you conclude that it’s far-fetched. The message was sent to her. You know that.

[11223] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think, Mr Singh, look, with respect —

[11224] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I know your case theory hasn’t worked in this regard but this is what I have put out there. Okay?

[11225] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. You see, the reality is this. You were told by senior cadre members, in this case Ms Loh and Mr Nathan, people who were close —

[11226] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There are no such thing as senior cadre members. They are just cadre members.

[11227] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright, cadre members. But someone you know and trust well, worked with as well, served you as well, that you should come clean.

[11228] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm. Sorry, that —

[11229] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That you should come clean, be public, tell the public the true timeline.

[11230] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[11231] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the reality is that she's telling you, "Tell people that you knew of the falsehoods in August".

[11232] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The falsehoods or is she referring to the fact that we told her to take a lie to the grave? You can't answer that question, Mr Tong.

[11233] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No —

[11234] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And let me just — Go ahead.

[11235] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me ask you this question. If you were not clear what she said, did you ask her when she was before you?

[11236] **Mr Pritam Singh:** My answer would be the same that I gave earlier. I did not find it to be relevant vis-à-vis Ms Khan's conduct.

[11237] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you don't even say it's not relevant in the messages. You said despite that — you remember?

[11238] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, are we going to quibble over that? Because I suggest you don't put too much weight on that.

[11239] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. I suggest you be careful with how you look at the language because I think if you disregard it, I would suggest you do it at your peril because —

[11240] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me tell you, it's not what you are imputing into it.

[11241] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish, let me finish. I think sometimes, you give it away when you try to interrupt.

[11242] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. I'm not giving anything away. I'm only giving the truth away.

[11243] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We'll be the judge of that.

[11244] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm sure you will.

[11245] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** When you are confronted with a plea by Ms Loh to please tell the public, tell the public that you knew, tell the public that you were involved, what

courses of action you took, make this public knowledge, the true timeline of events. You don't understand this?

[11246] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree with it and I tell you why. It's also referred to —

[11247] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. That's not my question, Mr Singh. Did you understand this?

[11248] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I understand it, of course.

[11249] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you thank you. Now, you don't think it's a reasonable request?

[11250] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't think in the circumstances, it is relevant. And let me suggest to you why, because the answer is also on this page.

[11251] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please.

[11252] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Ms Loh Pei Ying, at the top: "We came prepared with quite a number of points... we knew a lot of people had [this] on their minds", which was to expel her, that's what she says. "I mean, as you can see a lot of newspapers also called for that. So, we went in to try and prevent them from doing that, I guess – or not prevent, but to give to them our reasons for why they should not do that."

[11253] Basically, the whole idea, at least, from Ms Loh Pei Ying was that they did not want us to expel or recommend the expulsion of Ms Raeesah Khan. So, whatever would come out – again, this is where the knowledge of what Ms Loh is referring to is important. Because if she is labouring under the presumption that the leadership told – Raeesah was told to take a lie to the grave, I can see why it's important for her to say, "You should tell the public what you know". But that wasn't the case.

[11254] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, first of all, we will have to make an assessment as to whether or not, in fact, Ms Khan's message about taking the information to the grave, is a fair one or not, alright?

[11255] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It's sent to Ms Loh.

[11256] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You leave us to be the judge of that. Okay?

[11257] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11258] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Second, the true timeline, as you knew it then, I don't even think Ms Loh is coming to you and saying, "You know what, Mr Singh, you should have been aware of this message and you should disclose that." It's inconceivable for Ms Loh to come to you to ask you to talk about the true timeline of events which does not contain information you're aware of. Okay?

[11259] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She told, like I gave in my evidence. Sorry. Go ahead, go ahead.

[11260] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me finish. So, let's not try to ascribe a motive to Ms Loh. She may be a close ally of Ms Khan and she may well think that it is wrong to expel Ms Khan, and I think she was very forthright in telling you that. But she also gave you some strong words – if I may use it, put it that way – about the process. And it is the process that is important.

[11261] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[11262] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And she's telling you your process is flawed because you have just not come clean. You have not disclosed to the public your own involvement?

[11263] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I hear you, You've made this point a few times and my reply is still the same. I did not think it was relevant vis-à-vis what Ms Khan had done.

[11264] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** When you gave your press conference last week, last Thursday, you talked about the DP, and you used the words "natural justice". Correct?

[11265] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. Yes.

[11266] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's important, right?

[11267] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11268] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That justice be done, that justice be seen to be done?

[11269] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That Ms Khan has the opportunity address those issues, yes.

[11270] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, why is it that justice can be done and facts don't have to be disclosed, relevant facts don't have to be disclosed? How is justice to be done?

[11271] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, Ms Khan, the person who is under scrutiny, is at liberty to tell the CEC all that, that, "Look, I told these people. I cooperated. It's not fair that they judged me." If we really wanted to throw —

[11272] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, no.

[11273] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me finish. To throw natural justice – let me finish. I let you finish.

[11274] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, no. I'm trying to keep the evidence relevant.

[11275] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Could you let me finish? It's highly relevant. It's in response to what you're saying. Ms Khan was – you said natural justice —

[11276] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh.

[11277] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Are you going to let me finish. Mr Chairman, can I please finish?

[11278] **The Chairman:** Let Mr Tong finish. You will get your chance to speak.

[11279] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I will let you speak, okay? I'm trying to explain to you why it is not relevant. You are trying to answer my question with reference to what Ms Khan can say. I don't disagree with that for the moment. I was speaking about the members who were not aware and don't have the same level of facts as Ms Khan does. Ms Khan obviously knows, you knew on 7 August. But the members, all 26 of them who gave you a submission, didn't know.

[11280] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11281] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so that's the point I'm putting to you.

[11282] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I know that.

[11283] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Focus on that. That's the point on natural justice. So, focus on this. Now, give your answer.

[11284] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I have replied to you, I did not see it to be relevant insofar as what Ms Khan had done in Parliament. You've asked me this question a number of times. You're not making progress because my answer is still the same.

[11285] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, the reason I ask it again is because I'm trying to give you an opportunity to think about the position and reflect on how this is coming out, and think about it in the context of the fact that you have information about the DP's own involvement in the very matter that they are judging Ms Khan on.

[11286] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[11287] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Just take it at that level. And I cannot understand why you hold on, in my view, quite unreasonably to the position that this evidence is completely irrelevant, your members don't need to know, your members don't need to know the true timeline, or that you were involved, or that Ms Khan had actually come up to you and told you about the lie three months prior to when she was expelled from the Party or you were thinking of expelling her from the Party. So, I'm trying to understand that. That's why I asked several times. I apologise if it comes across as repetitive.

[11288] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, you don't need to apologise.

[11289] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But I'm trying to give you an opportunity to explain and understand from your perspective why that is so.

[11290] **Mr Pritam Singh:** As I mentioned, Ms Khan had told a lie in Parliament, she had repeated that lie, and the focus of the DP was on that particular conduct. Whether she had shared that feedback with the DP, to me, at least, I should not include Ms – well, they can give their evidence – to me, it was not relevant. What was relevant was an MP of the Workers' Party has told a lie in Parliament, what is the appropriate sanction?

[11291] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright.

[11292] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you.

- [11293] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Is that your last answer on this?
- [11294] **The Chairman:** Can I just build on that? So, you did not feel it was relevant to let the CEC know either when they formed the DP?
- [11295] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I did not.
- [11296] **The Chairman:** So, you decided that it was irrelevant and there's no need for the CEC to know that you knew about it. Is that correct?
- [11297] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me just say I did not actively say I'm going to withhold this information. It did not even cross my mind.
- [11298] **The Chairman:** My question is: you felt it was irrelevant, there's no need to inform the CEC —
- [11299] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It did not cross my mind.
- [11300] **The Chairman:** — that you, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap knew.
- [11301] **Mr Pritam Singh:** My answer is: it did not cross my mind.
- [11302] **The Chairman:** And the CEC formed the Disciplinary Panel —
- [11303] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [11304] **The Chairman:** — without knowing that actually the three of you knew a few months before that this was disclosed to you?
- [11305] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That the lie was disclosed to us? Yes. Yes.
- [11306] **The Chairman:** Would that be correct?
- [11307] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That would be correct.
- [11308] **The Chairman:** And you feel that it's irrelevant for the rest of all your members to know this fact because, in your view, it was irrelevant?
- [11309] **Mr Pritam Singh:** In my view, it was the focus of the DP's work on the lie.
- [11310] **The Chairman:** But you felt it was irrelevant for anyone else to know that you actually knew this as early as 7, 8 August?
- [11311] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [11312] **The Chairman:** Thank you.
- [11313] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you, Mr Chairman. Let me now come back to the grave message.

- [11314] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Oh, good god, yes, “back to the grave”.
- [11315] **The Chairman:** May I ask: if you feel that it was not relevant, I’m just curious why, in the press conference on 2 December, you disclosed this fact to the public?
- [11316] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because there were questions online about it.
- [11317] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, he answered that.
- [11318] **The Chairman:** So, therefore, it became relevant because of that? Or what were the reasons for that?
- [11319] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because —
- [11320] **The Chairman:** Because, you see, our contention is that it is important. I think, from a natural perspective, most people would feel that surely, this should be known, what you could feel that it is irrelevant. You saw no need to inform your CEC, when they were forming the Disciplinary Panel?
- [11321] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [11322] **The Chairman:** As you sought the feedback of your various members from WP, you didn’t see a need to let them know because it’s irrelevant. But yet, strangely, on 2 December, coincidentally, it was the first day that we held the Committee of Privileges hearing, of which actually, this fact emerged at the hearing.
- [11323] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.
- [11324] **The Chairman:** But you felt it necessary then, to respond to the questions. Why was that so?
- [11325] **Mr Pritam Singh:** As I mentioned, there was online chatter about it and I thought it would be relevant to answer it. And I would expect journalists to ask that question.
- [11326] **The Chairman:** So, at that stage, you felt it is relevant then to make it public?
- [11327] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, because the allusion was that we were hiding something. And we were not hiding anything.
- [11328] **The Chairman:** So, before that, you didn’t feel there’s any need to inform anyone?
- [11329] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, because we weren’t hiding anything.
- [11330] **The Chairman:** Thank you.
- [11331] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** How did that allusion come about?
- [11332] **Mr Pritam Singh:** How did what, sorry?

[11333] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, Mr Singh, I mean, just to pick up from what Mr Chairman said to you, there's a reason why there's chatter, in your words, and the press is asking questions. Because there's a one big, gaping hole.

[11334] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The press is not asking questions. One of our own Party members was asking the questions also.

[11335] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That's because your story has one big gaping hole: when did you know, what did you do with the information and why?

[11336] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because the whole inference is that we are trying to hide something. We were not hiding anything. There was nothing to hide.

[11337] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, what's wrong with coming out with it early and say, "We knew"?

[11338] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's precisely my point. It didn't even cross our minds. The question of it being relevant wasn't even active at that time. I hope I make this clear.

[11339] **The Chairman:** Maybe I can ask this question. I was curious as to the — The press conference on 2 December —

[11340] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11341] **The Chairman:** Was that pre-planned?

[11342] **Mr Pritam Singh:** We informed the —

[11343] **The Chairman:** It was activated fairly late.

[11344] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, not really.

[11345] **The Chairman:** Because in your process, would it be correct to say that the Disciplinary Panel would have gone on for longer, before you convened the CEC, to report to them?

[11346] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The disciplinary panel finished its work on the — I'll have to double-check — 29 or 30 November.

[11347] **The Chairman:** I understand. But prior to that, the plan was that it would stretch a little bit beyond —

[11348] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There was an original plan for it to go up to 4 December.

[11349] **The Chairman:** That's right.

[11350] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And then we decided that the gap was too far apart between members —

[11351] **The Chairman:** When was the decision taken?

[11352] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Oh, sometime in late November.

[11353] **The Chairman:** About late November?

[11354] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yeah.

[11355] **The Chairman:** So, the fact that you had an activated for a press conference to be held on 2 December, which happened to be the same day that the Committee of Privileges was sitting, was purely coincidental?

[11356] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, we had informed the public, through the Facebook post, that we were going to give a press conference. This was —

[11357] **The Chairman:** Just a few days prior?

[11358] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yeah, we did publicly inform it, so it was not a case of like, suddenly we activate the press in the morning that we're having a press —

[11359] **The Chairman:** I understand, because by that stage, I think there was — we had already fixed, and those who were involved would have known that we were sitting on —

[11360] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[11361] **The Chairman:** Would the consideration that the fact that the three of you knew of Raeesah Khan's lies as early as 7 and 8 December, which would have emerged, as it did, at the Committee of Privileges hearings, did they weigh on your mind that perhaps —

[11362] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, not at all.

[11363] **The Chairman:** — therefore, you needed to then have that press conference?

[11364] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely not.

[11365] **The Chairman:** Not at all?

[11366] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely not, because, look, the Committee of Privileges, in my mind, would continue its work, so it would have come out anyway and it didn't even occur to me, to be honest.

[11367] **The Chairman:** So, am I correct to say that all this while where you felt there was no need for anyone to know because it was irrelevant, even as important as your own CEC members, as they form the DP —

[11368] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11369] **The Chairman:** — in the process of gathering feedback, which is why I would suggest Ms Loh, when she felt strongly — and as you alluded to in the report, as highlighted by her points — that she felt that she wanted to try to make right the situation because maybe, you know, Ms Raeesah Khan might be asked to step down because she had felt that the feedback given was given without knowledge, that, for example, the three of you knew —

[11370] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't understand the question.

[11371] **The Chairman:** Let me come to that. The point is: through all this stage, you felt it was irrelevant, but by 2 October – 2 December, you felt that it was really important to get this message out, and coincidentally that was the very same morning that these facts emerged here at the Committee of Privileges?

[11372] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No connection between the two.

[11373] **The Chairman:** No connection, whatsoever?

[11374] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No connection between the two. But I would say vis-à-vis the CEC because I think the allusion being made is information was kept from them. Raeesah was before the CEC on 29 October, so if at any point there was some remark that she wanted to raise, some concern she wanted to raise about where this is going, I don't think there was any —

[11375] **The Chairman:** I understand that.

[11376] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — implication for her to raise —

[11377] **The Chairman:** I understand. But when you put it to the CEC, your own CEC members, you didn't feel it was necessary for them to know that yourself, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap actually knew of the fact that Ms Raeesah Khan lied as early as 7 and 8 August?

[11378] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It did not press on our minds, but if they would have asked, of course we would have —

[11379] **The Chairman:** Yes, but you didn't feel that it was relevant to let them know?

[11380] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[11381] **The Chairman:** Just as you didn't feel it was relevant to let the rest of your members know as you gathered their feedback on what they thought should be done.

[11382] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right, because it was fundamentally dealing with Raeesah Khan's lies in Parliament.

[11383] **The Chairman:** Thank you.

[11384] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** To pick up on those points, Mr Singh, you said earlier that the sitting had planned for members to meet with the DP on 4 December?

[11385] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[11386] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Which means that the contemplation was that the Panel would not complete its work until after 4 December, right?

[11387] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Repeat your question, please, sorry.

[11388] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you're meeting members on 4 December, you can't complete your report until after the 4 December, right?

[11389] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right, that's right.

[11390] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And, in fact, Ms Lim had informed Ms Khan that the panel has decided that it would need more time and there would unlikely be a November decision?

[11391] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't know – where does she say this?

[11392] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please pick up Ms Khan's bundle, 7 December.

[11393] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Which page, please?

[11394] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please turn to page 9.

[11395] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, page 9, did you say?

[11396] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Page 9, yes.

[11397] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11398] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 8 November, 4.43 pm. [*A message was referred to.*]

[11399] **Mr Pritam Singh:** 8 November?

[11400] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You'll see it as "11/8".

[11401] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11402] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** From Sylvia Lim: "Hi, Rae, FYI the account panel has decided to take more time. Unlikely to be a November decision." This is on 8 November?

[11403] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I believe she may have – you would have to check with Ms Lim, but I believe this was because we knew we wanted to get members' feedback, that's why we weren't — And then we also had to organise our schedules and stuff.

[11404] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. So, at least as of that time, and at least as of around 18 November, where you saw a reference earlier to Mr Nathan's messages, he said the Panel was still meeting members on 4 December, which you just corroborated, right?

[11405] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. Let me just clarify that, because when we told members to write in, those who wanted to speak to the DP, we gave them three blocks of dates. This was very, very early on, I think shortly after 10 November and then we decided that, look, the December one is really far apart, let's try and – we've already got the gist of what members feel. There are still some members we want to meet, so we decided to move it forward.

[11406] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On 29 November, this Committee of Privileges met for the first time. You didn't know it then, but by now you would know because of the special report?

[11407] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn't know.

[11408] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. And it was also at this first meeting that the Committee resolved to call three witnesses; Ms Khan, Ms Loh and Mr Mike Lim.

[11409] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn't know that.

[11410] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, I'm telling you as a matter of public record. By now, you would be able to check the public record. On the same day, if you would just pick up the same page, on 29 November —

[11411] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What am I looking at, sorry?

[11412] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The same bundle I showed you earlier.

[11413] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This is the messages from Ms Khan to Sylvia? Yes.

[11414] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You will see that Ms Khan had informed Ms Lim that the interview would take place on 2 December?

[11415] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Let me — where are we?

[11416] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right near the bottom of the page.

[11417] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay. Okay, I don't know of this. I am seeing it for the first time.

[11418] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.

[11419] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yeah.

[11420] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Over the page, page 10 [*A message was referred to.*], Ms Lim says: "CEC will meet on Wednesday, 1 December, to decide what to do." So, there was the CEC meeting planned for 1 December, right?

[11421] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[11422] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And this CEC meeting, as of 29 November, at 6.44 pm, was still fixed for 1 December, based on Ms Lim's message and she can't be wrong, right?

[11423] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I will have to check.

[11424] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Maybe you can think about it and tell me whether that's the case if it's just three days ago, Mr Singh.

[11425] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I know we had a CEC meeting scheduled. Then we moved it a day forward.

[11426] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yup.

[11427] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yeah.

[11428] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, as of 29 November, therefore, I'm correct, 6.44 pm, there was a CEC meeting scheduled on 1 December, right?

[11429] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11430] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. You look a bit further down the page.

[11431] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[11432] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you see that Ms – at 7.01 —

[11433] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11434] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you see that?

[11435] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11436] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 7.01 pm [*A message was referred to.*], Raeesah says: "Pei Ying received an email for the COP"?

[11437] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11438] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, at least by this time, Ms Lim had been aware that Ms Loh would come and give evidence?

[11439] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's for Ms – I don't know of this.

[11440] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You don't know of this?

[11441] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't know of this.

[11442] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You're sure?

[11443] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm sure.

[11444] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Ms Lim didn't tell you?

[11445] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.

[11446] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No?

[11447] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No.

[11448] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you didn't know that the Committee of Privileges was sitting on the 29, on 2 December?

[11449] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I know that the Committee of Privileges was going to sit, but it was not active in my mind as to precisely when it was going to sit, yes.

[11450] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. Okay. Go further down the same page at 8.37 pm.

[11451] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11452] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** A few hours later: "CEC meeting is now tomorrow, Tuesday."

[11453] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[11454] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, it was moved earlier?

[11455] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[11456] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, after at least Ms Lim and you said you didn't know – after Ms Lim became aware that Ms Loh would be called as a witness, the CEC meeting was brought forward?

[11457] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right. Well, from what is said here, yes, what is alluded to here at least.

[11458] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What's the reason for that?

[11459] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Actually, there was no – nothing untoward, in my mind, to move the date forward. I believe the intention really comes back to what we asked Raeesah on 30 November, whether she would like the CEC to deliberate on what to do before the Committee of Privileges starts its work or after. This question was put to Raeesah, and she said, "I would prefer it to be before." So, that's all it was to it.

[11460] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, as of 29 November —

[11461] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[11462] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — which is the date on which these messages are being exchanged, the DP had just met Raeesah in the morning, right?

[11463] **Mr Pritam Singh:** We met her in the morning, yes, that's right, that's right.

[11464] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that was the morning of 29 November, and you had planned for there to be a CEC initially on 1 December?

[11465] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[11466] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But sometime in the evening, you changed and accelerated the CEC.

[11467] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11468] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. Mr Chairman asked you if that was in reaction to the Committee of Privileges proceedings and your answer was “no”, is that correct?

[11469] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Look, as I recall it now, I believe the change was made because Raeesah had, herself, suggested she would prefer the CEC to come to a decision before the Committee of Privileges started its work. That’s – that’s my – that’s what I recall.

[11470] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That’s correct, but that’s – it’s also the case that by the evening of 29 November, at least Ms Lim and possibly other senior members of the Workers’ Party was aware that Ms Loh would be giving evidence to the Committee of Privileges?

[11471] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn’t know that.

[11472] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But based on this, Ms Lim would be aware, right?

[11473] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It would – yes, from the message she sent to Raeesah, yes, because Raeesah is the one who told her.

[11474] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And it is likely that the evidence that Ms Loh would give would include what we have just gone through; telling the DP to come clean, disclose public information, disclose timelines? That was contemplated, right?

[11475] **Mr Pritam Singh:** In what context was what contemplated?

[11476] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It’s a very simple question.

[11477] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You jumped, so I’m trying to —

[11478] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No.

[11479] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I’m trying to see where you’re jumping to.

[11480] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** By the evening of 29 November, Ms Lim and possibly other senior members of the Workers’ Party will find out – became aware that Ms Loh will be giving evidence before the Committee of Privileges, right?

[11481] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don’t know.

[11482] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Based on this?

[11483] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Based on this, yes.

[11484] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And —

[11485] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Based on this, only Ms Lim, at least.

[11486] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Ms Loh would be coming to give evidence and that evidence will probably include her submissions to the DP, her views on the fact that the DP were not open and honest and transparent, and what she had told you, you should be doing so that the members of the Workers' Party had a full picture, right?

[11487] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I wouldn't know.

[11488] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You wouldn't know?

[11489] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I wouldn't know, yeah.

[11490] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm picking up on the point from Mr Chairman earlier, because it's a funny coincidence, don't you think?

[11491] **Mr Pritam Singh:** There was no plan to try and outflank the Committee of Privileges, because the Committee of Privileges can meet for very long and take its time to go through the evidence.

[11492] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And, sadly, that seems to be the case.

[11493] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it's fine, this is what you have to do. We are paid to do this.

[11494] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But bear with me, Mr Singh. You see —

[11495] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It's nothing more than a coincidence.

[11496] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, indulge us. I mean, Mr Chairman asked some questions. Let me do as well.

[11497] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I will.

[11498] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Chairman approached it from the perspective of why did you not have, in your previous press statements, or in fact anywhere else, anything about your knowledge of the falsehoods until the press conference on 2 December.

[11499] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[11500] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think I will be a bit more direct and blunt than Mr Chairman, and I'll suggest to you that the reason it appears in the 2 December press conference is because, by that time, the Workers' Party knew that that fact would come out in the evidence given to the Committee of Privileges, which was then sitting at exactly the same time on 2 December.

[11501] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I wholly reject that connection.

[11502] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so, your press conference was designed to disclose the information first —

[11503] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, that's not —

[11504] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — ahead of what you expected Ms Loh and possibly Ms Khan to come to this Committee of Privileges to say?

[11505] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Completely disagree.

[11506] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Disagree.

[11507] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Completely disagree.

[11508] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's a pure, complete coincidence that at 12.00 pm, when your press conference was on, this is the first day of sitting at the same time as the Committee of Privileges?

[11509] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.

[11510] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. You're sure?

[11511] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I said "absolutely" with absolute conviction.

[11512] **The Chairman:** Perhaps if I can – I think in a pile, I don't know which pile this is. There's a series of conversations. Page 196, this is in Ms Loh's submissions. There was some exchange between Raeesah and Ms Loh Pei Ying.

[11513] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, what page are we on?

[11514] **The Chairman:** Page 196.

[11515] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I hope we're referring to the same thing. Yes, go ahead.

[11516] **The Chairman:** Somewhere midway down, let's look at 30 November submissions.

[11517] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11518] **The Chairman:** So, Raeesah starts with [*A message was referred to, with the following text.*]:

Ms Raeesah Khan: Nope. Hey, guys, can we have a quick call this morning?

Ms Loh Pei Ying: What about?

Ms Raeesah Khan: About the CEC meeting tonight.

Ms Loh Pei Ying: There's one? I thought next week?

Ms Raeesah Khan: Nope, it's tonight.

Ms Loh Pei Ying said: Did they change it?

Ms Raeesah Khan said: Yep.

Ms Loh Pei Ying: When?

Ms Raeesah Khan: Yesterday, after the meeting. After they found out about the Committee of Privileges date, I suppose.

Ms Loh Pei Ying then said: Okay, that's important, Rae.

[11519] And then, she goes on to talk about – Raeesah talked about “they are going to vote to suspend me, demote me” and so on. We don't need to cover the rest.

[11520] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, we do. She says, “I want to resign, guys.”

[11521] **The Chairman:** Yes, yes. But I think the point here I'm making is this and which is why I was I was asking a series of questions earlier, because you were very convicted in your sense that, the fact that the three of you knew about Ms Khan lying at 7, 8 August was really quite irrelevant in the overall scheme of things, which is why —

[11522] **Mr Pritam Singh:** In the overall scheme of things, yes.

[11523] **The Chairman:** — which is why you did not feel it necessary to inform your own CEC members, or senior members —

[11524] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[11525] **The Chairman:** — while they are deciding on whether this – you feel that this fact was irrelevant because you saw that as the truth and the reality, and you decided that, but you didn't see that it was necessary for the CEC to then decide whether it was relevant because you felt it was irrelevant for them, when they were considering who to form on the Disciplinary Panel?

[11526] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm, yes.

[11527] **The Chairman:** So, you did not disclose to them because in fact, it didn't occur to you, you didn't think it was necessary. You felt the facts are very clear. There's no ambiguity whatsoever. There is no need to raise that?

[11528] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[11529] **The Chairman:** Neither did you see any need to inform any of your members even as you sought their feedback, or as Mr Tong alluded to, the feedback and points that members might raise may be different had they knew that Ms Raeesah Khan, actually a few days after she made that lie, she actually had confessed, arguably, as you said, was proper. But you felt it was still irrelevant?

[11530] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11531] **The Chairman:** And the chatter about what was known, what was not known, online, about the what the leadership did or did not do, existed for some time. It was not new.

[11532] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11533] **The Chairman:** So, throughout this whole time span, as you had quite forcefully made the point that these were not relevant points —

[11534] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11535] **The Chairman:** — and even as response to what Ms Loh highlighted, you felt there was no need to address it because, yes, you recognised what she raised, but it was not relevant to the point. But it then so happens then there was changes in the date of the CEC and coincidentally, and as you said, no coincidence, it just so happens – it was pure coincidence, rather, that you therefore had a press conference on 2 December, the very same morning that we sat.

[11536] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11537] **The Chairman:** And when we were sitting here, I could remember, for the first time, I heard that the leadership, the three of you, actually knew this on the 7 and 8 August.

[11538] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But you would have known at least 36 hours earlier that we are going to hold a press conference.

[11539] **The Chairman:** Say again.

[11540] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You would have known at least a good one-and-a-half days earlier we were going to have hold press conference on Thursday. It wasn't something that we sprung.

[11541] **The Chairman:** I know. But the dates that when we are going to hold the Committee of Privileges and who we are going to call on 2 December.

[11542] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I didn't know who you were going to call.

[11543] **The Chairman:** As you said. But on that occasion, you felt it was necessary, almost at the same point, after all this while feeling that it was irrelevant, and as you said just now, that it was to respond to online chatter. But the online chatter has been going on for some time.

[11544] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. And I have – sorry.

[11545] **The Chairman:** And you have issued out various press statements, articulating issues but no mention whatsoever of this point?

[11546] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[11547] **The Chairman:** And so, in your view, it is just pure coincidence that on the very same morning, you shared the fact that the three of you knew for the first time, pretty much to everyone else —

[11548] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It wasn't a —

[11549] **The Chairman:** — that the three of you knew that actually, on 7 and 8 August, you knew that Raeesah Khan lied at that stage. That was the first time it was made public?

[11550] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It wasn't a coincidence that we made that fact public. What we had made known was what we knew. We knew Ms Khan had resigned and we wanted to establish the full facts of what had happened.

[11551] **The Chairman:** I understand. Yes. But, up to that stage, as you have said earlier, the point that you knew on 7 August and 8 August, is really quite irrelevant.

[11552] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[11553] **The Chairman:** So, there was actually no need to even highlight that at the press conference?

[11554] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree.

[11555] **The Chairman:** But you felt, as you said, because there is online chatter, it is important to address that?

[11556] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right. I expected the reporters to ask those questions.

[11557] **The Chairman:** So, it's really pure coincidence that the very same morning where these facts emerged at the Committee of Privileges, that you just so happens that you shared that same information, which for the longest time, you felt was actually quite irrelevant?

[11558] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. That's right.

[11559] **The Chairman:** The whole scheme of things?

[11560] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct. Thank you.

[11561] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the only ground on which it became an irrelevant fact became relevant for the purposes of 2 December was online chatter and members' queries?

[11562] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. It was because I expected this chatter to have been picked up by journalists as well and I was quite sure they were going to ask the question. So, I came prepared for it.

[11563] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But if it's not relevant to Workers' Party members' in their deliberation of something which is more serious than just interest, why does that become relevant suddenly?

[11564] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because now, it's about – you see, as far as the Party is concerned and you saw reference to the DP report, we are making reference to Article 20 about the conduct of a member, prejudicial to the good conduct of the Party. That was something we felt that Ms Khan had to answer to. And it did not matter that she had shared the information with us earlier because the fact is, we are looking into her lies in Parliament and her decision to continue the lie in October. Those were the material facts that were on our mind.

[11565] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. Like Mr Chairman said, but the queries that have been going around have been going around since 1 November, when Ms Khan came clean in Parliament. Same questions that the Workers' Party knows.

[11566] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. Yes.

[11567] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** How long has it been sitting on it?

[11568] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It would be definitely a question that the members could also ask us. It wasn't as not we said, "Please don't ask us this question." I mean there was nothing for us to hide. If the members had brought it up, we would have had to deal with it.

[11569] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, but you and I know that disclosure means saying so before you're asked?

[11570] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think, it again comes back to relevance and our state of mind about that relevance. I certainly didn't feel it was relevant for the purposes of understanding what had to be done to Ms Khan, from a Party perspective.

[11571] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But by 2 December, it became relevant because people were asking questions about it?

[11572] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Because there was a press conference I was going to hold and I know that the question would come up.

[11573] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's completely circuitous, Mr Singh.

[11574] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It's not. If you try to look at my thinking, you'll see it's not circuitous.

[11575] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I asked you: why it relevant? You said there's a press conference. Why did you say it in the press conference? Because it's now relevant. Circuitous.

[11576] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I mean, for the purposes of forming an argument, theoretically, I can see what you're saying, but I'm sure you understand the substance of where I'm going with the press conference.

[11577] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, back to the DP, okay?

[11578] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11579] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Now, the mandate you have is to look into the falsehoods? Right?

[11580] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[11581] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Now, can I invite you to please pick up the bundle dated 8 December from Mr Nathan?

[11582] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, from Mr —

- [11583] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** From Mr Yudhishttra Nathan.
- [11584] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay, yes.
- [11585] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This is a bundle of chat logs that he has with Ms Loh.
- [11586] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.
- [11587] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, there's no Ms Khan on it. Alright?
- [11588] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yeah. We are looking at the chat log with who? Sorry.
- [11589] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Between Mr Nathan and Ms Loh. Again, the redactions are done by Mr Nathan.
- [11590] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, go ahead.
- [11591] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Now, I'd like you to look at it. I'm going to ask you a series of questions about the DP and the conduct of the DP.
- [11592] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.
- [11593] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The work done by the DP.
- [11594] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [11595] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But to give you the full context, to be fair to you, I'm just going to show you the preceding messages. So, you can start with 2 November. I'm afraid this is not paginated.
- [11596] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Just to confirm, we are looking at part 1, 2 or 3?
- [11597] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I have it only as one part.
- [11598] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I have it as three parts.
- [11599] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's Mr Nathan to the Committee of Privileges. This is the first page. Yes. That's right. So, go to this page, this one, 2 November.
- [11600] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thanks.
- [11601] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, this starts from around 2.26 pm on 2 November.
[A message was referred to.]
- [11602] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [11603] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, "YN" is Mr Nathan and Pei Ying is Ms Loh. "Rae messaged me just now, 2.26 pm, to ask me if I think the Party will ask her to step down." This is in the aftermath of the announcement of the DP?

[11604] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11605] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Pei Ying says, “I don’t know, I don’t know”. Then, there’s a message and that’s an attachment of a photo, and I don’t know what it is. “Here it comes, he also being dragged.” Pei Ying says: “So, I don’t trust Pritam to put himself above things.”

[11606] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Woah.

[11607] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Over the page: “Like when it affects him personally, I’m worried he’ll cut the cord.”

[11608] Then, there’s a series of messages which have been redacted by Mr Nathan. And then, the next day, on 3 November, the next complete message that you see. Pei Ying says: “Can I just say, I’m glad Pritam is getting some of the mud in this slinging contest.”

[11609] She goes on to say: “He knew before us, in every instance. He flagged the anecdote, but didn’t ask her to take it out. He knew before she told us. He had many opportunities to really take charge of the responsibility, but he’s only doing it now.”

[11610] Let me pause for a moment. Earlier on, when I put some of Ms Loh’s messages to you, one of your answers was that they were worried and they were not in favour of the Party taking action against Ms Khan to expel her.

[11611] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that’s also in her own communication.

[11612] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That was what Ms Khan was asking them. This is right at the start of the process and before 10 November, when you sent out the all parties message. You remember that?

[11613] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. 10 December or 10 November?

[11614] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 10 November.

[11615] **Mr Pritam Singh:** 10 November.

[11616] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, would you also say at this point in time, their views are motivated by a sense that you’re being unfair to Ms Khan?

[11617] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, from what I read, this is, of course, the first time I’m seeing this.

[11618] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Of course.

[11619] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It has to be read as how it is put across. But, again, I’m quite surprised to see “he flagged the anecdote but didn’t ask her to take it out”. I mean, I think they’re looking for, they’re really spreading – splitting hairs here, because it was highlighted to her. I mean, she had the responsibility as an MP, to substantiate an anecdote when I pointed it out to her.

- [11620] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You did say that to her?
- [11621] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Absolutely.
- [11622] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But I'm just trying to fix a timeframe because earlier on, the messages were later in November.
- [11623] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.
- [11624] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And your reason for, at least one reason that you offered was that at that time they were not happy that you were, or they perceived you to be unfair to Ms Khan and wanted Ms Khan to step down.
- [11625] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And what? Sorry, Mr Tong.
- [11626] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It was your own evidence.
- [11627] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. At what point are you referring to that anecdote?
- [11628] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It was at a period of time later in November.
- [11629] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.
- [11630] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, would that also apply to these messages which come at the start of November?
- [11631] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Again, it comes as a surprise to me, because around these dates, I communicated with Mr Nathan and Ms Loh to tell them that a DP was going to be formed, and they didn't share these views on this – the extent of their unhappiness, suggesting that "I'm glad Pritam is getting some of the mud in this slinging contest". In fact, it was a very, very different communication between them and I at this period.
- [11632] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright.
- [11633] **Mr Pritam Singh:** At least vis-à-vis what they said to me. I mean, obviously, they are saying something else behind my back.
- [11634] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand. Now, can you go maybe two pages down, because the thrust of the – that was the background, but the thrust of the messages here now start on 8 November. And the reason why that's relevant, Mr Singh, is because on 8 November, Ms Khan had an interview with the DP. Right?
- [11635] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.
- [11636] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you look at the bottom of the page, 8 November, 12.29 pm.
- [11637] **Mr Pritam Singh:** 12.29 pm, yes.

[11638] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. Over the page. At the end, they only said they would make a recommendation to CEC and CEC will vote on it. They didn't tell her what the recommendation is. Mr Nathan then says: "But also they barely asked her about the incident, support group, why she lied."

[11639] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. That's not true.

[11640] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Pei Ying then says [*A message was referred to, with the following text.*]:

Ms Loh Pei Ying: "Is this him trying to be accountable and impartial of something? "

Mr Yudhishthra Nathan: Based on what she told me on the phone, she has started saying that she doesn't have her team members' support, that she hasn't been contributing to the thesis and discussions, and basically calling the question her aptitude as an MP. Faisal asked her if she has the mental willpower to continue going. She says she does and she will work hard.

[11641] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And over the page, "and Sylvia didn't say much.", "Yeah, I think she met them." And then, go further down the page, "because I asked Rae again. He needs to know from Pei Ying."

[11642] Mr Nathan: "and she confirmed he knew before the Sitting when Shanmugam asked her. He knew before she told us, Yudhish."

[11643] "I asked her, who knows?" And, "Yeah, and we spoke to him about it at TC right after. We are her witnesses, we are."

[11644] So, was it the case that the questions asked of Ms Khan at the interview related or had barely anything to do with the relevant incident, the support group and why she lied?

[11645] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, the questions that we put to her concerned, I'm coming from memory here, why she lied, why was it that she uploaded her speech, number one, so late?

[11646] After uploading the speech so late, it was still pointed out to her that, "You had to substantiate. What did you read into that."

[11647] We asked her a series of questions on that episode; where the anecdote came from; was she still in touch with this group, because I think by then she had given us some information about, because we had asked her, "Give us more information about this support group that you attended and whatever other information you can find". And I think Ms Lim proceeded to get in touch with some of the organisers of the group.

[11648] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right.

[11649] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, those facts did come up. The point about her – I'm just going to refer exactly to how it's put here – her contributions and all that came really down because of a point about self-discipline. It is in the rules of prudence that self-discipline is important and that would mean uploading speeches on time, and that would mean making sure that you don't just do things at the last minute, and there have been deadlines that had been

given to her in the past. She does not follow those deadlines. And we thought questions like that were relevant to try and see if, really, this is a pattern of conduct that we expect.

[11650] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Can I ask you to look at Ms Khan's own account of the interview.

[11651] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. Sure.

[11652] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Pick up Ms Khan's bundle, 8 December, if you can find it.

[11653] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. What page am I being referred to?

[11654] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please turn to page 12.

[11655] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11656] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And at 8 November, 12.39 pm, Raeesah says—

[11657] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry, Mr Tong, I missed out your timeline.

[11658] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 8 November, 12.39 pm.

[11659] **Mr Pritam Singh:** 12.39 pm.

[11660] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** *[A message was referred to, with the following text.]*

Ms Raeesah Khan: Hey, I just met the DP. It was basically Pritam telling me his grievances against me and my character and how he feels that I don't contribute much, and that people don't have a good perception of me.

Ms Loh Pei Ying: I heard from Yudhish. He's very upset for you, and so am I. His language doesn't show that he's taken any responsibility for this. Mike and I are doing what we can, and remember, no matter what, he and I are here for you. We are both ready to leave if they ask you to do so.

Ms Raeesah Khan: I just don't understand why someone would say so many mean things in one go. Do you think it's best for the party if I resign? Yudhish mentioned that Ru said it's the noble thing to do.

[11661] Is her account a fair account?

[11662] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think it is a very – she sees herself as a victim. But I don't think it's an account where she's even prepared to take responsibility for what she has done in Parliament. So, I don't think, to that extent, it is a fair account.

[11663] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You see, Mr Singh, I'm asking about these questions because, again, I am trying to work out, being very candid with you as to how I'm looking at this. I'm trying to work out, based on her account, if she is right, whether this would be consistent.

[11664] **Mr Pritam Singh:** What would be consistent?

[11665] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Whether the facts that happened, the subsequent conduct, would be consistent. Right?

[11666] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Subsequent conduct? What conduct are you referring to?

[11667] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The subsequent conduct of the parties.

[11668] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I don't get it. You'll have to repeat what you getting at.

[11669] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Never mind, I'll move on. I'll put it to you this way. If Ms Khan's account is correct, that is, that she was told in August not to raise it if it doesn't get raised, and I'm paraphrasing —

[11670] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Okay.

[11671] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay? Take the case as it is presented.

[11672] **Mr Pritam Singh:** By who?

[11673] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** By Ms Khan.

[11674] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Ok. Alright.

[11675] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm telling you this is her position, her case. On 3 October – you saw her evidence, I showed it to you earlier – her takeaway was that you told her, continue with the narrative, you won't judge her. She goes and continues with the narrative, that is, tells her lie, and now she thinks that you have been too harsh on her and not taking responsibility for your part.

[11676] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[11677] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This would be consistent if her position was correct, right?

[11678] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would disagree. If she was of the view that there was some undue harshness meted out towards her, nothing is stopping her from meeting the CEC or anything like that. So, I don't agree.

[11679] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, I'm not going into whether she should tell the CEC, make a complaint and so on. I'm simply saying that the sentiments expressed here, if she is right that she was told on 3 October to continue with the narrative, and she did so on 4 October, and now an inquiry is being launched into her behaviour, her conduct, including what she did on 4 October, we can understand why she's aggrieved by it, right? If she's right.

[11680] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, she's not right.

[11681] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But if she's right?

[11682] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But I cannot agree with that. She's not right. That's a conclusion you have to draw.

[11683] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you can't agree or disagree.

[11684] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. In this particular case, I think it is, again, a very skewed reading of what the DP was trying to do. I think she was very uncomfortable with the fact that she had been called out for lack of discipline.

[11685] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Is there a DP report of the meeting with Ms Khan? Both meetings?

[11686] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I have notes for both meetings. My first set of notes are not very complete, but I have them and I'm prepared to give them. But my second set is much – the second set, I mean, but the second meeting, I have. But I'm quite sure the other members also took notes.

[11687] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, please, if you can, that would be good.

[11688] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. Those notes I'm prepared to share with the Committee of Privileges.

[11689] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Were these notes made available to the CEC?

[11690] **Mr Pritam Singh:** If they had been asked for, they would have been made available. I brought them along when we have the CEC meeting. But because they were handwritten notes, the typewritten copy of the DP's recommendation was flashed on the screen.

[11691] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. Ms Khan's account of what happened, I know what she says and what you say happened at the meeting. So, we'll look at the notes that you took.

[11692] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[11693] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But she takes the view that you were asking her various questions concerning her role as an MP, her work in Compassvale, her performance in Parliament, how many PQs she has filed, how many SQs she has spoken about.

[11694] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[11695] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And did that happen?

[11696] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11697] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Was this part of the conversation?

[11698] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, of course, of course. It was part of that whole enquiry into self-discipline.

[11699] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Was this a major part of the discussion?

[11700] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It was —

[11701] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Because it appears to have been, based on the message that Ms Khan had sent.

[11702] Mr Pritam Singh: It was a part of the discussion. Major, I would disagree, because we had other questions about this diagnosis of PTSD, this document that she had given us, and we had questions about that.

[11703] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Alright. In addition to that, you also asked her to seek the views of her Sengkang GRC teammates, correct?

[11704] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes. Yes, I did.

[11705] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: The three other Sengkang GRC MPs, were they aware that Ms Khan had told you of the falsehood on 7 August?

[11706] Mr Pritam Singh: I do not believe so but, offhand, my state of mind was to just keep it within Sylvia, myself and Faisal.

[11707] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Right. So, as far as you know, they don't know, right?

[11708] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes.

[11709] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: And the first time they would have come into knowledge of that fact would have been —

[11710] Mr Pritam Singh: I believe — sorry, go ahead.

[11711] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: — would have been — well, you tell me. It's either at the CEC meeting, at which I assume they were present on 29 October, or they might have found out on 1 November, when the speech was made in Parliament?

[11712] Mr Pritam Singh: It would have been earlier, but I don't recall exactly at what point they would have known. It could have been earlier, but I don't know exactly at what point.

[11713] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: By "earlier" — can you give me a rough timeframe?

[11714] Mr Pritam Singh: I can't, but if I recall, I'm happy to submit that information to the Committee of Privileges. Offhand, I don't exactly recall this.

[11715] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Alright.

[11716] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes.

[11717] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: So, maybe you can check on that, because it's useful to know whether whilst Ms Khan has been approaching them and discussing and canvassing their views as to whether they feel she should carry on, what level of knowledge they have.

[11718] Mr Pritam Singh: Right.

[11719] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm going to put forward a series of propositions to you. You can agree or disagree, but I want it for the record so that —

[11720] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure, go ahead.

[11721] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — when we finish, we are very clear what your position is.

[11722] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11723] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Over the course of today, we have heard evidence from you that it was made clear by you to Ms Khan that she had to come and clarify the lies on 4 October if she was asked about her anecdote, the false anecdote, again in Parliament, agree?

[11724] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not in those words, but in the words that I communicated to the Committee of Privileges.

[11725] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the words that you communicated would be for her to take ownership and responsibility, and that you won't judge her?

[11726] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct. I won't judge her, of course, comes after she starts looking panicky and uncomfortable. It is to encourage her to come out and tell the truth.

[11727] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This is on 3 October.

[11728] **Mr Pritam Singh:** 3 October, that's right.

[11729] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that is the thrust of the message that you conveyed to her on 3 October?

[11730] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct, that is correct.

[11731] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I think you agreed with me earlier that you did not tell her to tell the truth in Parliament, to clarify the lie, in those words?

[11732] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not at that point.

[11733] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You also did not tell her, same formulation, to tell the truth to Parliament, in those words, on 8 August?

[11734] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct, I did not, yes.

[11735] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You did not tell her to tell the truth in Parliament, in those words, at any time until after 7 October, correct?

[11736] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That would be correct, but there's a slight qualifier. She spoke about telling the truth on 4 October in my office, and I took that as the indication that that's something, because she has said that herself, and I think that's important, she's taking ownership of the issue, and at that point —

[11737] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** First of all, my question is focused on what you said, so, that's not —

[11738] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right, I beg your pardon.

[11739] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you're referring to where she said, "Maybe we take a different path", or words to that effect?

[11740] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right, but to answer the question that you put, the answer would be yes.

[11741] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. The answer would be yes, you did not tell, right?

[11742] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Could you repeat the question? Let's just make sure it's correct.

[11743] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, I want to be sure.

[11744] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11745] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** My question was: you did not tell her to tell the truth in Parliament, to clarify her lies, in those words, at any time until after 7 October, correct?

[11746] **Mr Pritam Singh:** In those words, yes, correct.

[11747] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If she was to come clean on 4 October, which means clarify the lies and, in your words, take ownership and responsibility, tell the truth, and you won't judge her, then you would have asked to see the draft response and the draft statement that she wished to make in Parliament, correct?

[11748] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Please repeat the question. I am — I'm sorry, Mr Tong, please repeat the question.

[11749] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Sure. If it was clear that you had asked her to come clean in Parliament on 4 October, then, prior to that, you would have asked to see a draft of her response or her speech prior to her making it in Parliament.

[11750] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Disagree.

[11751] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you would have reviewed that draft and given your comments and input, as you did, prior to the 1 November sitting.

[11752] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree, because this was not her coming up and admitting what she had done.

[11753] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you would also have informed the CEC before Ms Khan went to Parliament on 4 October to make a speech to admit a falsehood that she said in Parliament two months prior?

[11754] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree. If she had admitted that she was prepared to come out with a statement, then it would have been important for me to inform the CEC first.

[11755] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. But in this case, the CEC was unaware.

[11756] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It was unaware because no such moment.

[11757] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the whole CEC, including Mr Low Thia Kiang and other members which exclude the other members of the DP as well, correct?

[11758] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's correct.

[11759] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Correct. On 4 October, and after Ms Khan lied in Parliament again and failed to come clean, I suggest to you that had there been a clear indication that she was to come clean on 4 October, you would have asked to see her immediately and asked her why did she lie again, in contravention of the understanding that you had with her. Agree?

[11760] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Please repeat the question.

[11761] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Sure.

[11762] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you.

[11763] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** My question is: on 4 October and after Ms Khan had lied in Parliament again and failed to come clean, I suggest to you that had there been a clear indication that she was to come clean on 4 October, you would have asked to see her immediately and asked her why did she lie again in contravention of the understanding that you had with her. Do you agree?

[11764] **Mr Pritam Singh:** If that condition precedent took place, yes.

[11765] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Which condition precedent?

[11766] **Mr Pritam Singh:** If she had – if there was an instruction that you referred to in that—

[11767] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, on your case, there was an instruction?

[11768] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. On my case, it was for her to take ownership and responsibility, to tell the truth and —

[11769] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, if it came up again on 4 October, your instruction was to tell the truth?

[11770] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11771] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And now I'm on 4 October when she didn't tell the truth, in contravention of that instruction, because it did come up.

[11772] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11773] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm suggesting to you that you would have asked to see her immediately and asked her why did she lie —

[11774] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I saw her on —

[11775] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — in contravention of the understanding that you just had with her.

[11776] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, that was what the meeting in my LO office was for, "Raeesah, what happened?" and then she said —

[11777] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** "Perhaps, to take a different path?"

[11778] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[11779] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In those circumstances, given what happened on 3 October and your case that she was clear in her mind that she would have to tell truth if it came up, given that she didn't tell the truth on 4 October, you would have asked her to immediately correct the record the very next day when Parliament was sitting again on 5 October. Do you agree?

[11780] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I disagree.

[11781] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And even if none of the above was done, meaning on 4 October and again on 5 October, if you failed to do that, at the very least, sometime between 4 and 12 October, you would have taken clear steps and made clear your direction for Ms Khan to come clean immediately.

[11782] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I believe I had made that direction clear on 4 October when she, herself, volunteered that honesty was the way forward. I said, "Good, we'll talk about it."

[11783] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And that's the sum total of your words then?

[11784] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11785] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You did not tell her to tell the truth in Parliament in those words?

[11786] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It would have been very obvious to her.

[11787] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you didn't tell it to her in those words, right?

[11788] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not in those words, yes.

[11789] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you. I know you've covered this before, but let me just put to you that you did not see any response from her or any explanation from her, you did not see any steps being taken throughout August and September, all the way until at

least 7 October which would be suggestive of coming clean in Parliament to clarify the lie, correct?

[11790] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I disagree. 4 October was the time where it was clear to me that she would be clarifying.

[11791] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. So, before 4 October, the answer would be yes, there were no steps whatsoever, correct?

[11792] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that was the evidence that I've already given, barring, of course, what I had informed her on 3 October to do.

[11793] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And by the same token, you, in the same period, had not checked that her family was aware and, therefore, she was in a position to come clean and clarify the lie in Parliament, correct?

[11794] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's correct.

[11795] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you. Thank you, Mr Singh. You've been very patient with me, and I thank you very much. Mr Chairman, I have got no further questions.

[11796] **The Chairman:** If I may just build on a few questions that Minister Tong asked, just so to be clear.

[11797] On 8 August, when you met with Ms Raeesah Khan with Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap, as you've described, you were surprised by her revelations, and obviously a lot of empathy when she revealed —

[11798] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, it was generally —

[11799] **The Chairman:** And obviously traumatic for her?

[11800] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11801] **The Chairman:** Crying and, as Mr Faisal Manap also shared with us, actually a lot of times, as far as he was concerned and the rest were trying to console her, trying to come to terms with it, checking whether she's having counselling and so on and there were really no conversations thereafter regarding her lie per se. Once you are settled, move on to the statement on the MM issues. As you yourself have shared, the main thing that you, at the end of it, conveyed to her was to make sure she clears with and let her parents know because you wanted to know who else knew, and that was pretty much it.

[11802] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And, of course, to tell her that we've got to settle this issue.

[11803] **The Chairman:** Very briefly but you didn't belabour the point?

[11804] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11805] **The Chairman:** So, when she left that session, it would be fair to say it's not necessarily very clear in her mind that she received very clear instructions from the leadership

as to how exactly to deal with it, save for those two points which you just briefly mentioned and that's it.

[11806] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Save for those two points. Yes, but certainly not to lie or to take things to the grave.

[11807] **The Chairman:** As we have described, you see, for us in the Committee, we're trying to determine, as it emerges, there is a "he said", "she said" version. So, there are two versions, right?

[11808] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[11809] **The Chairman:** So, we have to ascertain which was correct and I guess it would be difficult to prove it because it's a matter of what, for example, you felt was the truth, what she perceived and what she told us to be true. And what we need to ascertain is, therefore, the whole series of events; contemporaneously, what else was shared; any evidence of any sort that could corroborate and we try to figure out which seems to make more sense, which is where we are.

[11810] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[11811] **The Chairman:** Which is why the questions are asked. So, I hope you don't get offended by it because we are trying to —

[11812] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, I wasn't offended at all. I think these are fair questions.

[11813] **The Chairman:** So, one version of it was that she walked away as she has shared with us that is to, well, take it to the grave, and pretty much immediately after the meeting, she texted her colleagues, of which a couple of points were made, of which all of them were accurate, save that one assertion. So, which is not inconceivable, it's possible. Then the question is why would she have done that. That's something we need to determine. So, that was one interpretation from that meeting.

[11814] From your sense, it was that it is absolutely untrue, there was none of that communication to her to take it to the grave. So, that's a second version.

[11815] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11816] **The Chairman:** What transpired after 8 August, there was a conversation you had with Ms Loh, Mr Nathan, I think on 10 August?

[11817] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. I —

[11818] **The Chairman:** We touched a little bit about the conversation but didn't go into a great deal of details.

[11819] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Not —

[11820] **The Chairman:** And pretty much as you have also shared, in your mind, it was very important to set the record right. The lie needs to be made right. Your priority was to make

sure that at least a precondition was her state of mind, her parents were informed. But, as you shared, no action pretty much was taken, pretty much until 3 October.

[11821] So, from the actions that were taken or not taken, it's very difficult for us to read as to what exactly was the intent. And following from 8 August, save for, perhaps – because you didn't belabour the point at all, I'm not sure necessarily the directions were very clear to Ms Khan what exactly she was supposed to do. She had a certain interpretation. But you didn't follow up with her, with the family, her state of mind and to ascertain what's the current state of affairs were until 3 October, when you met with her.

[11822] You've taken a lot of pains to emphasise to us very specifically your message to her was to take ownership and responsibility —

[11823] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11824] **The Chairman:** — and also the line that “I won't judge you”, of course, as you put in the context that she was – what was it that you said? She was unclear or seemed a bit dazed and —

[11825] **Mr Pritam Singh:** She was a bit – she didn't seem to be very comfortable —

[11826] **The Chairman:** So, you were very particular that these were the words used and, in your own mind, when you talked about ownership and responsibility, it was very clear that it means that “you need to tell the truth” but you didn't in any way state that “you needed to tell the truth”. You used the terms “ownership and responsibility”?

[11827] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You have miss out something, Chair. You missed out something. You missed out the fact that this is an MP who has signed rules of prudence with us. She has knowledge of how I have dealt with this matter from the point the lie was communicated. I think that's quite important.

[11828] **The Chairman:** I understand but it doesn't preclude you from telling her quite directly, “Please tell the truth.”

[11829] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I made certain calls in the situation I was in.

[11830] **The Chairman:** So, you have been quite particular because you keep going back to these few terms, “ownership and responsibility” and, in your mind, it should be very clear.

[11831] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11832] **The Chairman:** Clearly, from her own sharing, she had a different interpretation of it. But we don't just take her interpretation of it. In fact, you shared with Ms Loh and Mr Nathan on 12 October. In fact, I think Ms Loh didn't know about this conversation you had with her on the 3 and you shared with them. They had the same interpretation.

[11833] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's not what I —

[11834] **The Chairman:** You shared with us also that you were very clear with them. You told them about the ownership, what you shared with Ms Khan on 3 October about ownership,

responsibility, “I won’t judge you in that context” and you felt that that was clear. But they didn’t interpret it that way.

[11835] **The difference** on 12 October also is that this actually happened after 4 October when you said that it should have been very clear and, in your mind, Ms Khan would have come clean on 4 October if she had been asked and which you didn’t, which I’m sure, to you, you must have been quite shocked.

[11836] But at no point did this come across to the two of them. You may have conveyed in some ways, but, obviously, that wasn’t something they took away with them. Would that be correct? So, that’s an interpretation that they had which would be consistent with what Ms Khan interpreted from your message on 3 October.

[11837] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Well, I don’t know whether this Committee has – I mean I don’t want to be accused of going back to something, but I’m not sure how much the message that was sent by Ms Khan, in so far as her reading of the meeting of 8 August was internalised by Pei Ying and Mr Nathan.

[11838] **The Chairman:** So, that’s your contention.

[11839] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It’s not just a contention because if, indeed, this was what was put to them by Ms Khan, they had numerous opportunities to challenge me on it.

[11840] **The Chairman:** I understand.

[11841] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, and so I’m actually very surprised that it did not come up.

[11842] **The Chairman:** So, as I said, that was how they interpreted it. And the whole series of events and, basically, as we’re trying to determine from 7 August, 8 August, 10 August and then from August to September, where there was a Sitting and there was no evidence whatsoever and, as you’ve also admitted, in terms of needing to make any clarification or seeking from Ms Khan to make any clarification at the September Sittings. As it later turned out, she contracted shingles and she wasn’t able to be there. And on 3 October, you felt that perhaps on 4 October, this might crop up and, therefore, you made it quite clear, in your mind, to her that she needs to come clean.

[11843] I’m also trying to understand, because as Minister Tong shared, in the lead-up to 1 November, when she admitted in Parliament that she lied, a whole series of efforts was put in, which is totally understandable because, as you agree, lying to Parliament is a serious matter.

[11844] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11845] **The Chairman:** And it impacts the individual, it impacts the Party politically as well, and it’s something that you need to take seriously, how you do it, how you phrase it. That’s sensible. It would be a responsible thing to do as a Leader of the Opposition for your Party to make sure that it is done properly, to make sure at least the facts are stated correctly, you don’t misspeak, and so on and so forth, which explains the accounting to the CEC as to what was going to be done, the messages, the exchanges, the preparation of the materials, just going through it to make sure that it was ready, and that would be reasonable, wouldn’t it, when you know that a statement is going to be made, that that kind of preparation should be made?

[11846] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, and it's also to make sure that she says what has happened.

[11847] **The Chairman:** Indeed. So, if you expect that on 4 October and you don't know for sure whether it will crop up but it might and, therefore, you need to make sure this, "you come clean". But yet there was no action prior to that that indicates – because, obviously, if she had told the truth on 4 October, it would similarly be a very significant statement to be made.

[11848] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This is where I have a different point of view, as I also shared —

[11849] **The Chairman:** Understand. So, what I'm trying to put across is, as I look at it, it is significant – and you might disagree that it's different from the one on 1 November, but, basically, asking your member to admit to Parliament that you actually lied in your account earlier.

[11850] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11851] **The Chairman:** Perhaps, slightly different. First, we could consider but important enough that one should really want to, at least, make sure that the statements are correct, it's done properly and so on. But there were no activities done at that stage because, as you also said, you also don't really know whether it would crop up or not.

[11852] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And she admits on her own volition to come forward to say "I'm ready to say this to Parliament".

[11853] **The Chairman:** But you didn't emphasise that your message of taking ownership and responsibility and yet adding the "I won't judge you" was sufficiently clear.

[11854] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11855] **The Chairman:** I will put it to you that another interpretation that, maybe, it wasn't so clear because she had a different interpretation and Ms Loh and Mr Nathan, when they heard the account from you, had fairly similar interpretation. So, that's one trend.

[11856] But in terms of activities, there were no activities that were done to ascertain what she would say, to verify, to the same level – in fact, nowhere close – in fact, nothing was done, save your conversation on 3 October, in anticipation of a possible confession on 4 October.

[11857] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[11858] **The Chairman:** But yet from 1 November, a whole series of activities had taken place. So, that contrast is quite significant.

[11859] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Can I —

[11860] **The Chairman:** Let me just complete and then you can respond.

[11861] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[11862] **The Chairman:** So, what we're trying to determine is that there are versions of events as described by Ms Khan and her two associates which you feel that a number of the points made were not true and they were lies. But it allows us to look at the development of events through a certain lens.

[11863] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, Absolutely, sure.

[11864] **The Chairman:** Then, there is your version which you have described to us and there were a series of events or non-events, as the case may be and we're trying to determine whether – how valid they may be.

[11865] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[11866] **The Chairman:** So, this is where I think we are at, because if, as you said, that it is actually really important to come clean, to make sure that it's clear as you said to Minister Tong —

[11867] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Take responsibility and ownership.

[11868] **The Chairman:** — to take responsibility and ownership, both individually and I would suggest, would the Party also need to take responsibility and ownership of this issue?

[11869] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think the primary individual who would have to deal with the issue first would have been Ms Khan.

[11870] **The Chairman:** I agree. But would the Party also need to take responsibility and ownership on this matter as well?

[11871] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Which matter? The —

[11872] **The Chairman:** On the lies that are being made by one of your members.

[11873] **Mr Pritam Singh:** By virtue of her being a Workers' Party MP, yes.

[11874] **The Chairman:** And you feel that this should be made clear, and you felt that it needed to be made clear at some point?

[11875] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[11876] **The Chairman:** What I'm also trying to understand is at which – and I think as what Mr Tong was asking is – which point was this going to be made. Certainly, no indication from that short statement made at 8 August, at the end of the conversations on that issue, and all the way until 3 October, nothing was done, so whatever the intent might be, difficult for us to determine —

[11877] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It would be much harder to determine if I didn't say anything on 3 August. 3 October, sorry.

[11878] **The Chairman:** 3 October, you made certain statements that alluded to expecting possibly making a confession then, but similarly no other activities to verify the statement, and

so on and so forth, but we accept that as you've described. But that's the paucity of activities leading up to that stage. And then thereafter from 4 October, I think tellingly you were also sharing with us that when you met her in your room, she said that – what was it – this wasn't working?

[11879] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no, she said, "Perhaps there's another path."

[11880] **The Chairman:** "There's another way, there's another path, —

[11881] **Mr Pritam Singh:** "Perhaps there's another way. That's honesty."

[11882] **The Chairman:** There's another way, we need to tell the truth. At face value, it would seem that clearly the path that we're taking doesn't work, we need to tell the truth. That would be the other path. That's one interpretation of it. And if you take the line that she had shared as how she had interpreted the various events, then it would seem that the line to maintain the narrative isn't working and we need to tell the truth. That would be fair if you accept that that was how she interpreted that view. You have a different version of it, which I accept.

[11883] So, but from that point on, and especially on 12 October onwards, it's very clear the preparations leading up to 1 November and so on was there. And I suppose that's really where the last series of questions that Minister Tong was asking is really to determine what exactly was her position, because it would help us try to understand the context of which, clearly, there are two lines of possible truths here.

[11884] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mm-hmm.

[11885] **The Chairman:** One as shared by Ms Khan, and then, to some degree, supported by her two associates in some form, contemporaneously some of it being shared. One could argue why would she be sharing some of this misinformation, untruth, at that very stage, at that stage, some of which, through their interaction with yourself as well, walking away with certain interpretation that seems to be consistent, and which as you shared, was it shaped by that original narrative by her, and that is something that you have raised.

[11886] The other narrative, of course, is as you have shared, and we need to determine, therefore, which seems to make sense, because what we're trying to determine here, there's no doubt in anyone's minds, because it's been admitted, that a lie has been made in Parliament by Ms Khan and repeated on several occasions, and so, really what we're trying to determine is why was it done —

[11887] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And she also lied to her own S-G after the event.

[11888] **The Chairman:** And the degree of responsibility that she should bear and so on, if she had shared with anyone else, was she acting on advice of others or not, as the case may be. And I guess that's really what's before us to determine. Any other questions from other members? Dennis, anything else? Dennis.

[11889] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Mr Singh, I just have a few questions. Do bear with me. I know it's been a long day.

[11890] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it's okay, go ahead.

[11891] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Just to clarify certain facts that some of which may have been touched on earlier. I go to the 12 October meeting between yourself and Ms Sylvia Lim and Ms Raeesah Khan. Are you able to tell the Committee who initiated the meeting?

[11892] **Mr Pritam Singh:** This meeting was initiated by me. Raeesah wanted to meet earlier to discuss the advice that she had received, but insofar as dealing with the untruth that she had communicated in Parliament again, the lie in Parliament, I initiated this meeting to discuss that subject.

[11893] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** What advice were you talking about?

[11894] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sorry?

[11895] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** What advice? Was it the legal advice?

[11896] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, the legal advice, that's right, but that was not – this meeting was – I called this meeting to discuss the fact that she had not come back to us with anything on the way forward insofar as what she was going to – what explanation she was going to give to Parliament.

[11897] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** So, at the start of the meeting, did it look to you like she was ready to now admit that she had lied in Parliament and prepared to go back to Parliament to make this admission in Parliament?

[11898] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. I think I gave evidence to this effect earlier. She did not – she turned around. She did not actually want to make this personal explanation, she said she was not comfortable with it, and I remember Sylvia getting very upset with her and I said, "Look. This is something that has to be done, there's just no two ways about that." That was the meeting on 12 October.

[11899] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** So, at this meeting – at this point in the meeting, did you know whether she has told her parents about the – her sexual assault experience?

[11900] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I didn't know.

[11901] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Did you or Ms Lim ask her again to speak to her parents?

[11902] **Mr Pritam Singh:** At this particular meeting, I'm not sure, but – because it was very clear that she had to – we told her that she had to be – make this statement in Parliament, she would have had to speak to her parents to get that done, yes.

[11903] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Thank you.

[11904] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But I can't be precisely sure whether that was communicated to her in those terms. But, it would have been, since we had told her that she had to make that personal explanation.

[11905] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Are you aware of what Ms Khan’s lawyers had advised her?

[11906] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I’m aware.

[11907] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Is there anything you want to share about that?

[11908] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think that may be privileged, so I want to be a bit careful. But suffice to say that that information was consistent with her addressing the issue in Parliament.

[11909] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Thank you. On the – was it on 12 October evening that you also met up with Ms Loh Pei Ying and Mr Yudhishthra Nathan?

[11910] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, they asked to see me.

[11911] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Just to be absolutely clear here, at this meeting, did they ask you about their allegation or, rather, Ms Khan’s allegation that you had told them – in August that you, Mr Faisal Manap and Ms Sylvia Lim had told Ms Khan to – that they should bring the statement of the sexual assault anecdote to the grave?

[11912] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I – that did not happen at all.

[11913] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** So, they never asked you?

[11914] **Mr Pritam Singh:** They never raised it to me. They never raised it to me at any point in time. I think I’ve given this evidence.

[11915] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** So, they never asked you at the Disciplinary Panel meetings?

[11916] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, at no time did they bring this up.

[11917] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Talking about the Disciplinary Panel meeting, when the DP was being set up, did you at any time communicate directly with Mr Nathan or Ms Loh Pei Ying about the setting up of the Panel?

[11918] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I believe I informed them after the decision had been made.

[11919] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** What means was this by?

[11920] **Mr Pritam Singh:** WhatsApp and I’ve committed to share that – those details.

[11921] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** And how would you say – how would you describe each of them? How did each of them respond to your message to them about this setting up of the Panel?

[11922] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yudhish thought it would – it was – I don’t think he used the word “good”, but I’ll have to – it will be in the messages that I submit to the Committee, but he said it will quell the Party – some Party members’ views about what had happened. And so, it was a positive thing in his eyes and I would say similar for Pei Ying.

[11923] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Going back to the 8 August meeting at your home, I think you shared earlier with the Committee that you said something along the lines of, “Look, we’ll have to speak on this, but you have to speak to your parents first.”

[11924] **Mr Pritam Singh:** “You’ll have to speak to your parents”, yeah.

[11925] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** So, “We’ll have to speak about this” or “on this”, “but you’ll have to speak to your parents first.” Did you remember when did you say this? At which point in the meeting?

[11926] **Mr Pritam Singh:** “To speak to your parents”?

[11927] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Yes, about both part of it, yeah.

[11928] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I’m quite sure the “speak to the parents” was when we were sitting around the table and I remember, because when she left, I walked her to the door, and I said, “We’ll have to settle this, we’ll have to resolve this issue.”

[11929] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Is there anything else you wish to add?

[11930] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, but, Mr Chairman, I have a request. I have seen some documentation and WhatsApp messages which I think this comes from Pei Ying and Yudhish. My home address is not redacted and I think it happens in a few places. So, I would appreciate it if the Committee of Privileges preserve my privacy in that regard.

[11931] **The Chairman:** Of course. Yes, we’ll do that. Yes, I remember noticing it and we’ll redact it. There’s a couple of other things that probably needs redaction as well. We’ll do that. Not to worry.

[11932] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Thank you, Mr Singh. Mr Chairman, I don’t have anymore questions.

[11933] **The Chairman:** Thank you. Any other questions? Minister Tong? Ms Rahayu? Okay. Well, if there are no other further questions for now, thank you very much. I know it’s been a very long session.

[11934] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, it’s fine. I’m happy to have been given —

[11935] **The Chairman:** We thank you for your patience and coming before us and sharing with us your perspectives. A transcript of the proceedings will be shared with you for verification. Do go through it, and if you have any other minor amendments, please make the changes and send the transcripts back to us.

[11936] Do note that the transcripts and any evidence given to the Committee are not to be disclosed to anyone or published. They must be kept strictly confidential until the Committee has presented the relevant report to Parliament. This would include, I guess, discussing with your other teammates who might still be coming forward to the —

[11937] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I will be mindful to that.

[11938] **The Chairman:** — to the Committee for interview. You may withdraw now. We obviously won't be calling you back today. We might need to call you back on other days to share if they need to follow up. But otherwise, once again, thank you very much.

[11939] **Mr Pritam Singh:** You're welcome, Chair.

[11940] **The Chairman:** The staff will accompany you out.

[11941] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you very much.

[11942] **The Chairman:** Serjeant-at-arms, please accompany the witness out.

(The witness withdrew.)

(The hearing adjourned at 8.43 pm.)

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

MONDAY, 13 DECEMBER 2021

12.00 pm

PRESENT:

Mr Tan Chuan-Jin, Speaker (*Chairman*)

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

[Mr Speaker in the Chair]

[11943] **The Chairman:** Sergeant-at-arms, please invite Ms Sylvia Lim to the witness table.

Ms Sylvia Lim was examined on oath.

[11944] **The Chairman:** Ms Sylvia Lim, please take your seat. For the record, please state your name, occupation and the positions you hold.

[11945] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Chairman, my name is Sylvia Lim. I am a Member of Parliament for Aljunied GRC and I am also the Chairperson of the opposition Workers' Party. These are my main posts.

[11946] **The Chairman:** Thank you. The evidence will be given today before the Committee will be taken on oath. If you so desire, you can also take an affirmation. Clerk, please administer.

(The witness made an oath.)

[11947] **The Chairman:** Please be seated. Ms Lim, the Committee of Privileges is looking into the complaint made by the Leader of the House, Ms Indranee Rajah, against former Member of Sengkang GRC, Ms Raeesah Khan, for breach of privilege. Thank you for attending today's hearing to give evidence before the Committee and to answer the questions which Members of the Committee would like to put to you.

[11948] You do have a solemn obligation to answer our questions truthfully. If you refuse to answer questions directly or attempt to mislead the Committee, such behaviour will be an offence and in contempt of this Committee. I would like now to call upon Minister Edwin Tong for his questions.

[11949] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Good afternoon, Ms Lim.

[11950] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Afternoon, Mr Tong.

[11951] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Ms Lim, thank you very much for being here to assist the Committee of Privileges. In the course of this afternoon, I'll be asking you questions and if there are any documents which we think might be relevant, I will also be asking you to produce them, subject to the Chairman's confirmation. There's a piece of paper and some materials on your side. I would be grateful if you could please take a note of the documents, as and when we discuss them, and I'll ask you to produce them, is that okay?

[11952] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I will take note of them, yes.

[11953] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. If there's anyone else who might be able to corroborate what you say in the course of giving the evidence, please also let us know.

[11954] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[11955] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Ms Lim, let's start with 8 August. I understand that that was the first time on which you became aware that Ms Khan had lied in Parliament on 3 August. Would that be correct?

[11956] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** On 8 August that was the time when she, Ms Khan, told Pritam Singh, Faisal Manap and myself that what she had said on 3 August was not true.

[11957] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. My question was that the first time you became aware?

[11958] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** That was the first time that she told us, yes.

[11959] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The first time that you became aware, Ms Lim?

[11960] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, that was the first time I became aware.

[11961] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you. How did you become aware? Was it at Mr Singh's home or were you aware of it prior to arriving at Mr Singh's home?

[11962] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I was aware of it after I arrived at Mr Singh's home.

[11963] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Were you aware of it before Ms Khan told it to you?

[11964] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** If I recall correctly, what had happened was that the night before, Pritam contacted me to ask me whether I could come for a meeting at his home the next day. So, I said fine and then we arranged the time. And upon arriving at his home the next day, which was 8 August, I think that was prior to Ms Khan and Mr Faisal arriving at the home, because I came a bit earlier.

[11965] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[11966] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** And he mentioned to me then that he had had a conversation on the telephone with Ms Khan the night before and that he had been querying her on the anecdote that she had shared on 3 August. And he didn't find her answer satisfactory, so he told me that he put the blunt question to her, something along the lines of, "Just tell me. Did this thing even happen or not?" And he said that she had said that no, it didn't happen. And he told me that he was angry and I think he slammed down the phone. So, he narrated this to me when I was at his home on 8 August.

[11967] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, just to be clear, this was told to you on 8 August at his home but he was narrating a conversation he had with Ms Khan the day before, correct?

[11968] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** The day before, yes, correct.

[11969] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you. Can you describe to us what happened thereafter from the time Ms Khan arrived? Perhaps, it is too open-ended. It was a meeting that started at 11.00 am if I'm not wrong.

[11970] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** About that time, yes.

[11971] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The meeting lasted for one hour or just past an hour, I understand.

[11972] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Something like that, yes.

[11973] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And just to frame the issue, I believe that the meeting was initially called to discuss a clarificatory statement in relation to a speech that Ms Khan had made on 3 August on polygamous marriage as well as female genital cutting. That was what Mr Faisal told us.

[11974] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I can't remember what I myself knew about the purpose of this meeting because I was only asked to come the night before. But I think in the course of the communication between me and Pritam, I can't remember whether it was on 7 or 8 August, I knew that Faisal as well as Raeesah would be there. And at that time, of course, after the 3 August debate on the Women's Motion that was filed by our Party, we do understand that there was reaction from the Muslim community about certain topics that she had raised. I didn't think too much about it, but I assumed that it was related to that, yes.

[11975] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, the reaction that you spoke about were some questions from several quarters, questioning the veracity of what Ms Khan had spoken about on 3 August, is that right?

[11976] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** No. I'm sorry, I don't know what you mean exactly by that, but —

[11977] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you describe what you mean by reaction then?

[11978] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Oh, that was actually reaction from the Muslim community about those issues that were raised. I believe these were polygamy and female genital cutting. From what I understood because I wasn't personally monitoring that feedback, but from what I understood, it did not go down well, so it was in relation to that.

[11979] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. The purpose of meeting was to discuss, I guess, further follow-up or a response to what didn't go down well, is that right?

[11980] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I assume so, but, like I said, prior to coming for the meeting, I was not aware of this other issue, this development, regarding the anecdote that she shared about going to the Police station.

[11981] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand. I'm focused on what you had understood going into the meeting, which was that Ms Khan and Mr Faisal would be there, you said that earlier, right?

[11982] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, that's right, I knew that.

[11983] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, as far as that was concerned, before you had a conversation with Mr Singh at his home, on 8 August itself, your understanding was that, the issue to be discussed at his home was one that pertains to Ms Khan's speech concerning polygamous marriages as well as female genital cutting, is that right?

[11984] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Well, prior to arriving at his house, I knew that Faisal and Raeesah would be there. So, it was a logical assumption that I would have that it's related to that issue.

[11985] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm asking because I wanted to be clear that prior to arriving at his house, you had no inkling that another issue that would be raised would be Ms Khan's admission that she had spoken a lie in Parliament on 3 August. Would that be right?

[11986] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, I didn't know that this would come up before I arrived at Pritam's house.

[11987] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, when Ms Khan arrived, can you walk us through what happened in gist, and then if you feel that there are specifics to go into, we'll come back to it again. So, give us the gist of what happened when Ms Khan arrived and how the meeting proceeded.

[11988] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I'll try to recollect the best as I can. I can't remember whether she arrived first or Faisal arrived first but I was definitely the first to arrive, and that's why Pritam shared with me that this other conversation had happened the night before. So, when Faisal and Raeesah, well, when, basically, everybody had arrived, I think Pritam started the meeting or the discussion by asking Raeesah whether she had something to tell us. And Raeesah started to get quite emotional.

[11989] And so, after, I guess, a few seconds of hesitation, I can't remember exactly, but she became quite tearful and started to say that what she had shared in Parliament on 3 August regarding going with the crime victim to the Police station was not true, but it was an anecdote that she had heard in a survivors' group. And then she started saying – almost in the same breath – that she was a victim of a [sexual assault] when she was 18, and she was getting all distraught and saying that she had not gotten over the trauma and so on. So, that was what started off the conversation on this topic. That was how it started.

[11990] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you tell us, to the best of your recollection, the recount by Ms Khan on this?

[11991] **The Chairman:** Perhaps, before that, just for Ms Sylvia Lim, this issue of [sexual assault] had cropped up before. We've decided that, perhaps, we will use the term "sexual assault".

[11992] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Fine, yes, but because she did say that.

[11993] **The Chairman:** I understand. We note that for our own internal understanding, but more for the purposes of when this goes out, we want to redact it accordingly.

[11994] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I'm fine, so long as you don't think I'm recalling inaccurately what she told us.

[11995] **The Chairman:** Not at all.

[11996] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** And when we use the word "[sexual assault]", it also makes it very clear the seriousness of the sexual assault.

[11997] **The Chairman:** I understand.

[11998] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** So, in that sense, there is some relevance in the word used.

[11999] **The Chairman:** Indeed. It is something we've deliberated and we thought that, perhaps, we will keep to the term. But we are fully cognisant that that was exactly the term used —

[12000] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12001] **The Chairman:** — and which is why we will respond accordingly. Thank you.

[12002] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, sure.

[12003] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Ms Lim, I also wanted to assure you that we have notes of what was said and Mr Singh and Mr Faisal had put it in the same terms as you have, and we know the point you're making, severity of the account that Ms Khan made to you when she saw you. And you can be assured that that's something we will take into account, not only the word she used but the impact it has on the three of you at that meeting. So, you can be assured of that.

[12004] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Thank you. So, am I to continue?

[12005] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I have forgotten what I'd asked you. Or maybe you have forgotten what I'd asked you.

[12006] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think the question was whether I can recount in detail what she narrated to us, something along those lines.

[12007] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. You had started off the account and then Mr Chairman interjected to speak about the term.

[12008] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12009] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, perhaps, you can continue.

[12010] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Alright. So, as I said, she was distraught, she was crying, she said that she had been a victim of sexual assault when she was 18 when she was overseas and she didn't have the courage to report it. So, we started to get quite concerned about her emotional state. I recall that Pritam asked her who else knows about this past incident involving herself and she mentioned that her therapist knew, her husband knew and also Loh Pei Ying and Yudhish Nathan also knew about this. And then the question was asked, I think, by Pritam also, "How about your parents?" and then she said her parents didn't know about this past incident.

[12011] Then, of course, Faisal, I suppose, being professionally a trained counsellor, he started to observe that she didn't seem emotionally stable. So, the questions from him were more about whether she had sought any professional help to process what had happened to her, to help her to overcome the trauma and so on, and the answer we got from her really was that she didn't really seek any significant professional help. So, it appeared that she was still traumatised by the incident. So, the conversation at that meeting was centering around these themes, I would say.

[12012] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In relation to her admission that she had spoken a lie in Parliament, now, of course, this is the second time you heard it because Mr Singh gave you an account of it earlier that morning.

[12013] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Just a few minutes prior, yes.

[12014] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What was your reaction?

[12015] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** My reaction was that this is something that needs to be corrected. But, of course, how and when, I didn't apply my mind strictly to it at that time because when she came and told us all these things, we were a bit overwhelmed by her well-being and trying to see how she could, in a sense, stabilise herself and sort out her personal matters before taking the next step, in that sense, to correct the record.

[12016] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Faisal also told us that he was overwhelmed as well. Would you say that that's a fair description, what you just said, a fair description of how the three of you – Mr Singh, Mr Faisal and yourself – reacted to her admission?

[12017] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think our first instinct was that because she was in such a fragile condition, that we certainly wanted to show her as much understanding as possible because, after all, I mean, perhaps, apart from Faisal, who has some professional training, Pritam and myself, we are not trained to assess or deal with victims of sexual crime. So, we decided that it was best for us to give her some encouragement and emotional support and focus on stabilising herself first before talking about the other issue which had to come, which was about how to correct the Parliamentary record.

[12018] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh told us that when he was aware that she was consulting a therapist, he was relieved or assured because she was getting professional help. Did that also strike you?

[12019] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** She did say that she had a therapist and, in that sense, yes, at least she wasn't alone but, of course, we were not aware of the intensity of the therapy or what was being done. She had someone that she had consulted but we didn't know the frequency or whatever.

[12020] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But coming back to the admission of the lie, Ms Lim, you're an experienced politician, you would have immediately appreciated that this was a serious matter that had to be addressed, correct?

[12021] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, it was.

[12022] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's a question of time as you have put it, when is the appropriate time, right?

[12023] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, that was my consideration, correct.

[12024] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You have told us what you thought or your reaction to what she told you and Mr Singh and Mr Faisal about the lie. Tell us what then did you say to Ms Khan about this admission of the lie in Parliament?

[12025] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** On 8 August?

[12026] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On 8 August.

[12027] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't recall saying anything to her about that specifically because I didn't feel at that moment that it was appropriate for me to add to the emotional pressure that she seemed to be facing. So, I decided to not address that issue on 8 August. I did not say anything to her about it.

[12028] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you didn't ask her a question, you didn't give her any guidance as to what to do nor did you talk about the next steps concerning the lie in Parliament, would that be right?

[12029] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** We were mainly focusing on stabilising her as we saw her, so our questions were more about for her to square the circle with her family, for her to get professional help, but I did not talk to her about the next steps about correcting the record, yes.

[12030] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the answer to my question would be no, those steps were not taken and those steps —

[12031] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I did not say anything on 8 August about this.

[12032] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. I'd like to show you parts of Mr Singh's and Mr Faisal's evidence of the same meeting. I'll just ask you some questions from there.

[12033] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Sure.

[12034] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Beginning with Mr Faisal, there is a bundle of edited transcripts. This is Mr Faisal's evidence. He gave it on 9 December. If I could please ask you to look at page 109 of this bundle. Sorry, Clerk, it's the edited one. Yes. Do you have that?

[12035] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Page 109, right?

[12036] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. About one-third down from the page, you will see I had asked Mr Faisal, "Okay. I'm referring to your reaction", do you see that? Ms Lim, do you see that?

[12037] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** No. Sorry.

[12038] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can I just check with the Clerk that we are on the same page literally? Come, I will have a look.

[12039] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Different?

[12040] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, now you have it? One third down.

[12041] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Okay. "I'm referring to your reaction." Yes, I have it, yes.

[12042] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, I was asking him about the same occasion on 8 August and I asked him too about his reaction. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 9 December 2021, from Para No 5400.*]

Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap: As I mentioned, I was shocked because I was overwhelmed by the first statement that she made.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: So, let me be clear, okay? I have heard in detail your evidence earlier and I don't need to revisit that. I'm focused on whether you or Ms Lim or Mr Singh had any reaction to her admission that she had lied in Parliament just a few days before that.

Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap: Mr Edwin, as I mentioned just now, we were overwhelmed by the first statement. And, as I mentioned, as a human being, can I be overwhelmed by certain things and suddenly I changed to become like startled, "Why are you lying?"

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: No, I mean —

Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap: No, because you're asking me whether there is a change of reaction.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Mr Faisal, perhaps I put it this way. We all have a range of emotions.

Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap: Correct.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: But we also have responsibilities.

Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap: Indeed.

[12043] And then, over the page, he continued to give us evidence as to how he felt overwhelmed by it; and you can quickly cast your eye over the next few lines.

[12044] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Where? Sorry.

[12045] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay?

[12046] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Where are you referring to?

[12047] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm over at page 110.

[12048] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12049] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** There is a portion just before the midpoint of the page, where he talks about the sequence, when Raeesah mentioned the sexual assault and "we were overwhelmed". He talks about his concern about the lie but also his concern for her.

[12050] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12051] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And then – I'm sorry, there's no line reference, but about one-third from the bottom of the page, I asked him: "Were you so overwhelmed that you could not say anything at all to the admission that she had lied?" And he says: "This is the truth, I am telling you." Now, can I ask you to turn to page 114?

[12052] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12053] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I asked him at the bottom of the page: "You told us very clearly that throughout the time at the meeting, after she uttered those words, none of you discussed it and there was" —

[12054] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Sorry. Where is it?

[12055] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Page 114, three questions from the bottom. Do you have it? Mr Faisal was answering my question. I said: "Hang on." Do you see that? Do you see those words?

[12056] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** "Hang on". Yes, okay.

[12057] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I said [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 9 December 2021, from Para No 5497.*]:

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Hang on. You told us very clearly that throughout the time at the meeting, after she uttered those words, none of you discussed it and there was —

Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap: Yes.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: — zero discussion on it, correct?

Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap: Yes.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Do I characterise your evidence correctly?

Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap: Correct.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Zero evidence on it. Not a word was spoken about it by any of you?

Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap: Yes, that I recall.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Not a question was asked at all, whatsoever?

Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap: Yes, not asked to her.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Amongst yourselves?

Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap: No.

[12058] And basically, his point that there was zero engagement on this issue with her and by the three of you. Would that also fit with your own recollection of the meeting?

[12059] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** What I recollected, yes, it's in accordance with what Mr Faisal described, that we were more focused on her emotional well-being and also that she needed to square the matter with her parents before anything else could be done. So, we did not speak on what were the next steps because, I mean, for me at least, I thought that the pressure at that point in time would have been perhaps too much for her. Speaking for myself, I mean.

[12060] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. I understand. You were describing to us what were the considerations on your mind.

[12061] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12062] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But these were not articulated to her, correct?

[12063] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, not articulated.

[12064] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Could I please ask you to pick up Mr Singh's evidence? And this time, it is the unedited one, the raw ones. Because I didn't have time to make reference to the edited version that just came. So, this is the raw version, Ms Lim.

[12065] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Sure.

[12066] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This is Mr Singh's evidence on 10 December. If I could please ask you to go to page 296?

[12067] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Page 296.

[12068] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You will see the page numbers appear at various junctures throughout the page.

[12069] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes. Does it start with "But I'm also not sure whether I shared it with Ms Lim"?

[12070] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** There, there. You are right.

[12071] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Okay.

[12072] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if you go to line 14 – this one has line numbers so it's easier to focus. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 10 December 2021, from Para No 10052.*]

[12073] So, I asked him: “Can you give an account of this meeting in summary beginning from the time when Ms Khan arrived” and so on. I’m giving you the reference point to when he started giving the evidence. And Mr Singh then proceeds to talk about the meeting. If I could invite you to turn over the next page to page 297 and somewhere about line 10.

[12074] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** It’s same page, right?

[12075] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It’s 297 but line 10.

[12076] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Okay. Yes.

[12077] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It runs over the next page physically. She says: “It was very traumatic for her”, lines 9 and 10, “and it was very traumatic for her, she told an untruth in Parliament because she feels strongly about, you know, issues of sexual assault. And arising from there, she did what she did in Parliament. That was the gist.”

[12078] He goes on to say that: “Actually, that part of the meeting wasn’t very long.” At page 298, line 1, “And a conversation actually was very short.” Do you have that, Ms Lim?

[12079] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Are you still at page 297?

[12080] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, I’m at the bottom of page 297 but moving on to the start of page 298.

[12081] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Oh, okay. Yes.

[12082] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Still part of Mr Singh’s testimony: “The conversation actually was very short.” And if I could invite you to look at the start of page 299? [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 10 December 2021, from Para No 10056.*]

[12083] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12084] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** He says [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 10 December 2021, from Para No 10062.*]:

Mr Pritam Singh: I believe we did and my guidance to her was to “speak to your parents about it” because, in my mind, this would have to be corrected in Parliament. But before we can even do so —

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Did you tell her that?

Mr Pritam Singh: Sorry?

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Did you tell her that?

Mr Pritam Singh: No, not on that day, not on that day.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Why not?

Mr Pritam Singh: I think, at that point, given her condition, given her state, it was more important for me to tell her that, “Look, speak to your parents.” And when she left my place, I did tell her, “We’ll have to deal with this issue, but speak to your parents first.” I told her that.

- [12085] Do you recall this part of the conversation that Mr Singh had with Ms Khan?
- [12086] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you recall this part of the conversation that Mr Singh had with Ms Khan?
- [12087] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** About page 299, is it?
- [12088] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, what I've just read back to you.
- [12089] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Because it's quite long. It started at page 296, right?
- [12090] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, it did.
- [12091] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Am I supposed to confirm the whole —
- [12092] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. I wanted to give you the context to the conversation. But the only parts which Mr Singh said he spoke directly to her, appears at the quotes in page 299. But rather than just show you page 299, I wanted to give you the context to which this statement was said. But as far as Mr Singh's evidence is concerned, those parts in quotes at page 299 were the words he spoke to her.
- [12093] So, my question to you is: do you recall Mr Singh speaking these words to Ms Khan and were you there?
- [12094] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I recall him saying that she had to speak to her parents. That I recall.
- [12095] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That you recall?
- [12096] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.
- [12097] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The rest of page 298?
- [12098] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Which part exactly is it that you're asking?
- [12099] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Look at the start of page 299.
- [12100] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Okay.
- [12101] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** "...my guidance...was 'speak to your parents about it' because, in my mind", I read that to you earlier.
- [12102] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.
- [12103] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And then, over the page, at line "I think, at that point, given her condition, given her state, it was more important for me to tell her that, 'Look, speak to your parents.' And when she left my place", so I assume this is a different occasion, "I did tell her, 'We'll have to deal with this issue, but speak to your parents first.' I told her that."

[12104] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** The part where he said: “And when she left”, what he told her, I don’t think I was there.

[12105] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, you would have been there and heard him say, “Speak to your parents first.”

[12106] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12107] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you weren’t there as she was leaving and those words were said.

[12108] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I didn’t accompany her out so I don’t think I heard what he may have said to her at that point.

[12109] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. We heard what Mr Faisal said, that there was zero evidence, zero statements and discussions. Did Mr Singh say anything else to Ms Khan on this issue, on the lie?

[12110] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think the main thing was that she had to speak to her parents. That’s what I recall; and I understood it to be in the sense, a first necessary step before anything else could be done. That’s what I understood.

[12111] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Understand. And, to the best of your knowledge, nothing else was said by Mr Singh?

[12112] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Like I said, I wasn’t with him and Ms Khan throughout, so I —

[12113] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I know. To the best of your knowledge. Nothing else?

[12114] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I mean, it was basically about telling her parents, about making sure that she gets therapy to stabilise herself. That was the main concern of that 8 August discussion on this topic.

[12115] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, your takeaway from all of this – when I say all of this, I mean the discussion on the lie on 8 August – would be that it is important to clarify this in Parliament, but in your words a necessary step would be for her to speak to her family first, correct?

[12116] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** That’s how I understood it, yes.

[12117] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that’s your main takeaway from the 8 August meeting concerning the lie? Would that be right?

[12118] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Main takeaway? I suppose so, yes.

[12119] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Faisal told us that the meeting then proceeded to discuss the statement that she was asked to put up, concerning clarifications on the speech that she made a few days ago.

[12120] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** So, the part that you just referred me to at page 299, and “when she left it”, that, of course, took place when she was leaving, I would presume so.

[12121] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[12122] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** So, now you’re coming back again, back to the —

[12123] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, I’m coming back because I wanted to look at it from the angle of, the issue of there being two separate issues being discussed: one was the lie and the other one was the statement. So, I wanted to follow through on the point of the lie and I think we’ve done that. So, now, I’m going back to the part of the meeting where we were discussing the clarificatory statement she was to make on her speech.

[12124] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Regarding polygamy and FGC, I think, yes.

[12125] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you give us a gist of what was discussed, how you had left off and what conclusions were drawn from the meeting on what steps to take?

[12126] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I mean, my impression personally was that I was probably coming into that discussion on the reaction of the Muslim community to polygamy and FGC, that I was probably coming in a bit late into that discussion. My impression was that I think Faisal had been engaging Raeesah, that was my understanding, on this issue prior to going to Pritam’s house. So, I wasn’t part of that initial background to it.

[12127] So, when this topic came up at the house, it appeared that they had already sort of reached a point where they could more or less agree on what needed to be addressed. And from what I understood, from what I recall, there was some discussion about the points raised and what she wanted to say to explain about her speech. So, there was some discussion on that. But it was a bit detailed for me because, like I said, I was coming late to their discussion and I don’t really understand those issues very well.

[12128] And then, I suppose, a final point of conclusion of that was that she would leave the meeting on 8 August to draft a statement and then she would run the statement by us or at least by a few of us and then, if the statement was deemed to be appropriate, then she would post it on Facebook.

[12129] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, if I may summarise it, the issues concerning FGC and polygamy had, prior to 8 August, already been discussed between Mr Faisal and Ms Khan.

[12130] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I believe so. And I think Pritam was also aware of it. But I myself wasn’t involved in that.

[12131] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. And at the meeting, I assume the meeting would have discussed the kind of content that the statement should contain in clarifying. Would that be right?

[12132] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** It would be because it has to be relevant to what would be posted up, yes.

[12133] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. Because the purpose of the meeting was really to put out a clarificatory statement in light of the adverse reactions, correct?

[12134] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't know whether you call it clarificatory statement but perhaps a further explanation, yes.

[12135] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. I understand. And the upshot of the meeting was that Ms Khan would leave the meeting, go back, put up a draft, discuss it further and then eventually put it up.

[12136] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12137] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Which to your recollection, happened? Correct?

[12138] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I believe so.

[12139] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Were you privy to the discussions on the draft?

[12140] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I believe that the final draft was sent to me. And I didn't have any issue with it myself so I didn't object to it and I was okay with it, yes.

[12141] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In your view, did the draft that was prepared by Ms Khan that was sent to you, comport with the matters discussed at the meeting? In other words, did it reflect what you discussed at the meeting?

[12142] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** You mean on the FGC and polygamy?

[12143] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That's right.

[12144] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** It was on those topics from what I remember, yes.

[12145] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But she would have taken on the board the comments, discussions made at the 8 August meeting in preparing the draft, I assume?

[12146] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think the whole tenor of the discussion was more — It was not an instruction-giving session, let's put it that way. Because these were issues that she wanted to raise because she felt strongly about them. And certainly, I don't think it was the intention of Faisal or Pritam or anyone to force her to say anything in the explanatory post that she was not comfortable with. So, the general understanding was that she had to own those things that she was explaining but, the role I guess of Faisal and us, is just to see that it's worded appropriately, yes.

[12147] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, I understand. She made the speech and she will be making the post so she has got to own it, from that perspective, I think that's what you're saying.

[12148] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Right.

[12149] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But at the meeting, did she display any reluctance to put up a post or did she appear to take on board the points that yourself and Mr Faisal and Mr Singh were making to her?

[12150] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** My reading is that, she agreed that there would need to be some follow-up from her side to address some of the concerns that had been raised about her initial speech on these topics.

[12151] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And was she receptive to and understand the points that Mr Faisal was making at the meeting?

[12152] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I didn't sense that she was resistant. I mean, she listened and was processing it.

[12153] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And eventually, when you saw a draft of the post at some stage before it was posted, you were quite happy with it?

[12154] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I didn't see an issue with it because, I can't recall distinctly now, but my sense was that it, generally, was in line with the conversation.

[12155] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Alright. Thank you. After Ms Khan left the meeting and I understand from Mr Singh that she left first.

[12156] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I can't remember but it may have been.

[12157] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. He told us that he walked her to the door and she left first and that yourself and Mr Faisal left probably shortly thereafter. Was that your recollection?

[12158] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Likely, I suppose.

[12159] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Was there any conversation amongst the three of you, without Ms Khan present, concerning the lie in Parliament?

[12160] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't think there was.

[12161] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No?

[12162] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes. So, we were kind of, I suppose, in a bit of a shock and we knew the situation was serious in that sense but, at the same time, needed careful handling.

[12163] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand. I'm not going into what you thought. I just want to know whether anything was said and discussed amongst the three of you.

[12164] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't think so.

[12165] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm asking this because I understand why it may not have been raised with Ms Khan at the meeting, given the evidence that we've heard from yourself, Mr Faisal and Mr Singh, given her emotional state. But now she has left and the three of you are the senior leaders of the Workers' Party. You have just heard an admission by one

of your Party MPs that a lie has been said in Parliament. I think all three of you and you this afternoon have told us that that's a serious matter that has to be corrected. So, now she has left the meeting. The question is would you not have wanted to discuss with your fellow colleagues what next steps should be taken, at least from your perspective?

[12166] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I mean, I knew in my mind that the next steps would have to come but, at that point in time, we didn't talk about the next steps.

[12167] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, nothing was discussed amongst the three of you and these thoughts that you have just explained were unarticulated, correct?

[12168] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't think I said anything about it at the time, yes.

[12169] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** To be clear, neither did Mr Faisal or Mr Singh?

[12170] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't recall that being discussed.

[12171] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm still on 8 August meeting.

[12172] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Sure.

[12173] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At any stage thereafter – and I'm now focused on the broader period for the rest of August – whether or not this issue had come up between yourself and Ms Khan. First of all, did you talk to her about it, did you ask her has she spoken to her family, has she decided on how to clarify the lie? Did you discuss this with her?

[12174] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I did not speak to Ms Khan myself as far as I recall and the reason for that is that I left the matter really to Pritam to follow up and I would like to explain why.

[12175] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. I'll let you explain why. But can I just understand your evidence?

[12176] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12177] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** To be clear, you did not speak to Ms Khan or communicate with her on the lie at all for the rest of August?

[12178] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I did not do that, yes.

[12179] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Would that be the same for the rest of September as well?

[12180] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think in September also I did not talk to her because I found or rather, she had come down with shingles in September and then I think she got leave of Speaker not to attend the Parliamentary Sitting. So, my own assumption was that it could have been stress induced, so, I decided that I would just wait for a while.

[12181] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, for the rest of August and September you did not discuss with Ms Khan the question of the lie in Parliament, correct?

[12182] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I did not, yes.

[12183] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you send her any text messages or email messages, any other communication in writing over this issue?

[12184] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't think I did, yes.

[12185] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You were going to explain to us why you left it to Mr Singh to deal with the matter.

[12186] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12187] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you please do that?

[12188] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes. Basically, I left it to Pritam to follow up with her because he knows her best and, historically, she was helping him in his Meet-the-People session in Eunus for about a year prior to the GE and I think he had some communications on and off with her family and so on. So, even throughout her stint as a parliamentarian, I think he was the one that, basically, was guiding her and she would go to him with questions and so on. So, he was the one that was closest in that sense and knew her best.

[12189] So, as I mentioned earlier, I was concerned that if she was pressured in that sense by a thing she couldn't handle because of her emotional condition, then it might not be the best thing. We don't know what reaction she would have. So, I decided that I would leave it to Pritam to follow up on the matter with her for these reasons.

[12190] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, those are the reasons why you left it entirely to Pritam to follow up with Ms Khan, right?

[12191] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12192] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Going back to my previous timeframe, for the rest of August and September, did you have a discussion with Mr Singh or with Mr Faisal on the lie that Ms Khan spoke in Parliament?

[12193] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't think I spoke with Faisal. For Pritam, I also can't distinctly remember. I may have asked him certain questions about how Raeesah was but I don't think that I spoke about the issue of the lie.

[12194] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me understand it quite carefully. Did you discuss with either of them what steps would be taken to clarify the lie in Parliament?

[12195] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I did not discuss with them, I don't think, from August to September.

[12196] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On this issue at all?

[12197] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I can't recall. I don't think so.

[12198] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What about any discussion on when that might happen? For example, you were aware of the lie on 8 August.

[12199] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Right.

[12200] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The next Sitting was on 13 September, about five weeks away. Did you, prior to that, discuss with Mr Singh or Mr Faisal as to whether the lie would be clarified in Parliament in September?

[12201] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I did not discuss it with them.

[12202] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. Did you have a sense as to what Mr Singh's timeframe would be? Did you discuss that with him?

[12203] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I did not discuss any specific timeframe with him. But what I did note, of course, was that, prior to the October Sitting on 1 October, he had sent an email to all the MPs in WP reminding everyone, I would say, alright, of the standards expected in Parliament and that if anything that was said in Parliament could not be substantiated, then the MP would face being hauled up before the Committee of Privileges. So, I do not know whether the Committee has seen this email because I brought it along.

[12204] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We have it. Mr Singh helpfully gave us a copy over the weekend.

[12205] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Sure. Alright.

[12206] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This email was not addressed to the question of the lie by Ms Khan specifically, correct?

[12207] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** To me, I mean, it was a big nudge to her, that's how I read it. But if you look at the words, it is just to the team, yes.

[12208] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, it's to all the Workers' Party MPs.

[12209] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** That's right.

[12210] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And there's no express reference to Ms Khan's lie in Parliament, correct?

[12211] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** No express reference.

[12212] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the only persons on that email chain who were aware that it was a lie would be yourself, Mr Singh, Mr Faisal and Ms Khan herself, correct?

[12213] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, and I read this myself as, basically, that Pritam had his eye on the matter and that's why he sent this email. He probably assessed that this was an appropriate way to move the issue forward with Ms Khan and that's why it was sent. I was actually comforted to see the email.

[12214] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Going back to my original sequence of questions, in this same period throughout August and September, did you have occasion to speak to Ms Khan about whether her family were aware of the sexual assault?

[12215] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** You mean, whether she had informed them?

[12216] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, that's right.

[12217] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't think I spoke to her about that.

[12218] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Whether she had informed them or whether, through some other means, they became aware?

[12219] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't think I asked her anything about that, yes.

[12220] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I ask you this question because earlier on you told us that your takeaway from the meeting on 8 August was that her family knowing would be a necessary step for clarification in Parliament, correct?

[12221] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** That's right.

[12222] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, one of the things that would need to be done is to ensure that her family became aware of the sexual assault before it became public, correct?

[12223] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** And as I mentioned earlier as well, I had my reasons for leaving the matter to Pritam to follow up on. So, I did not myself speak to her on these matters to confirm what had been done or not done.

[12224] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. But your understanding from the 8 August meeting was that the family being aware of it would be a necessary step or a precondition to the matter being ventilated in Parliament, correct?

[12225] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I believe that that was necessary and that was how she also perceived the issue, because she mentioned that her past experience was very integral to explain why she told that untruth in the first place and, because her parents didn't know, she would not be able to publicly come forward with it until her parents knew. So, that was our understanding, yes.

[12226] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You drew that understanding also from what she said?

[12227] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12228] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. Earlier on, you articulated various reasons on which you say led you to leave Mr Singh to deal with Ms Khan and handle the problem, right?

[12229] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12230] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did Mr Singh know that this is how you saw the problem and how you chose to leave it to him?

[12231] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I believe he would know because that had been the way that he had been dealing with Ms Khan for quite a while.

[12232] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You said you believe he would know. Do I take it that you did not articulate this to him?

[12233] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I did not articulate this to him, yes. But I believe he knew that that was my thinking.

[12234] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Were there any messages, emails, anything on social media messaging or any other form of written communication between yourself, Mr Faisal and Mr Singh concerning what the Workers' Party would do to clarify the lie spoken by Ms Khan in Parliament on 3 August?

[12235] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Was there "anything", you mean, in written communication?

[12236] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. Did you discuss by email with Mr Singh and Mr Faisal, did you send any messages concerning what to do, when this would come up, are the parents aware, anything that concerns clarifying the lie?

[12237] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think all our discussions were not written in emails or social media, as far as I know.

[12238] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** For example, would you have discussed what Ms Khan would say if she were to clarify the matter in Parliament?

[12239] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Which timeframe was that?

[12240] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm focused on August and September still.

[12241] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** No, not yet. No.

[12242] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Not yet. Okay. You asked me which timeframe because, obviously, in October, in the lead-up to the November Sitting where she did clarify it, there was exchange of messages concerning what Ms Khan would say, right?

[12243] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Not exchange of messages but, in October, there were some drafts that Ms Khan came up with and then we provided our input as necessary, yes.

[12244] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. That's what you referred to?

[12245] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, because I just wanted to clarify the question.

[12246] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. I wanted to also understand what you were saying so that I'll come back to it because I'm not in the October time zone yet, okay?

[12247] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Okay, sure.

[12248] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if I understand your evidence correctly, you appreciated that lying in Parliament was a serious and grave matter. It had to be clarified in

Parliament at some stage. All three of you were concerned with Ms Khan's, if I may just use a general term, emotional ability to cope with clarifying with Parliament at that stage and, more importantly, you were concerned that her family was not yet aware of the issue. And both yourself and Mr Faisal left it to Mr Singh to handle the problem. Would that be an accurate summary of what happened?

[12249] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I can't speak for Mr Faisal, though.

[12250] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** To your knowledge.

[12251] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** He will have to speak for himself on that matter, yes.

[12252] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, first, for yourself, would that be correct?

[12253] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** For myself, yes. As I mentioned earlier, on 8 August when this revelation was made to us that she had told this untruth in Parliament, her condition was such that she was very emotional and we felt that, at that point in time, it was important for us to show her some emotional support and she needed to stabilise herself as well as square that past trauma with her family before any next steps could be made.

[12254] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, the answer to my question as to whether it is an accurate summary would be yes, along with the points that you have just made?

[12255] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, I prefer to summarise myself.

[12256] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright, sure, I don't want to put words in your mouth. So, always be happy with what you say.

[12257] You said you can't speak for Mr Faisal. But, certainly, from your perspective as the Chairman of the Party, knowing that at least two other senior members of the Workers' Party were aware of what is a serious and grave issue and which had to be dealt with, from your perspective, did you know or think that Mr Faisal was actively dealing with the problem himself or did you know or think that Mr Faisal was leaving it to Mr Singh to deal with?

[12258] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I have to say that I'm not aware. I mean, I do not know what Faisal did or did not do.

[12259] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, from your perspective, you left it to Mr Singh?

[12260] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, I did.

[12261] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you did not know if Mr Faisal similarly did so or if he actively spoke to Ms Khan or dealt with Ms Khan on that?

[12262] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, I'm not sure because it is entirely possible that he may have followed up with her on the therapy part, for example. So, I don't think I want to speculate because I don't know for a fact.

[12263] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, I understand.

[12264] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Throughout this period of time, we've heard your evidence that there was nothing exchanged between the three of you in writing concerning the case and so on.

[12265] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't think so.

[12266] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We heard that. As far as you're aware, were there any other objective steps taken in August and September which would prepare and tend towards Ms Khan coming to Parliament to explain the lie and clarifying her position?

[12267] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** For myself, I'm not aware. Like you said — what was the question again, any —

[12268] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Sorry, maybe I'll rephrase it. And again, I'm still in the August and September time period, okay?

[12269] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I understand.

[12270] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Throughout this time period, were there any objective steps — that means any steps that we can look at now and point to — which were taken, which would be consistent with Ms Khan coming to Parliament to clarify the lie and explain the truth in Parliament?

[12271] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I'm not aware of any, as you mentioned — what was the word you used?

[12272] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I said objective steps but I think that's the lawyer in me speaking. You can say any steps.

[12273] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, as I mentioned, the event happened in August. We got to know about the fact that she said that she told an untruth on 8 August. By the time September came, she was down with shingles. So, I do not think that anything, in that sense, concrete was done.

[12274] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. To the best of your knowledge, no such steps were taken.

[12275] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** As far as I know.

[12276] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Throughout this period of time, again, August and September, there would have been occasion for you to have interacted with Ms Khan, correct? That means you — I know you're not from the same constituency or GRC, but you would have occasion to meet at public events, perhaps at Party meetings, would you not?

[12277] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** During this period of August to September, the only thing I can recall is that we probably had a Zoom meeting to discuss some preparations for Parliament. So, she attended; I mean, I didn't have any one-to-one interactions with her as such, not that I recall, yes.

[12278] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Again, in this period of time, did you discuss or consult with anyone in your Party about Ms Khan's lie and the steps to be taken, besides, I know you say you didn't speak to Mr Singh and Mr Faisal, but were there anyone else that you spoke to?

[12279] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** No.

[12280] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Were you aware if anyone else were aware of Ms Khan's lie in Parliament?

[12281] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** You mean amongst the MPs?

[12282] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Amongst the Workers' Party MPs.

[12283] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** As far as I knew, only Pritam, Mr Faisal and myself were aware.

[12284] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What about the broader Workers' Party membership and I'll —

[12285] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Okay.

[12286] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'll give you some context. Ms Khan told us that she had confided in Mr Yudhishthra Nathan and Ms Loh Pei Ying. So, at least those two who are cadre members of Workers' Party were aware. From your perspective, I know you may or may not have known about that at that time, but to the best of your knowledge, in August and September, were there any other Workers' Party members who were aware that Ms Khan had spoken a lie in Parliament on 3 August?

[12287] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** From my understanding, I mean, Yudhish and Pei Ying were told by her. When she did that, I don't know but I believe they were aware.

[12288] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Was anyone else, to your knowledge, aware?

[12289] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I can't recall anyone being aware.

[12290] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. It must therefore follow that you did not tell this to anyone else, period, right?

[12291] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes. August, September, right?

[12292] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, August, September. I'm now past the August to September period.

[12293] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Sure.

[12294] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You told us that on 1 October, there was an email that was sent by Mr Singh.

[12295] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12296] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, we heard that. Mr Singh also told us that subsequent to that email, on 3 October he went to Ms Khan's home and had a discussion with her concerning the 4 October Parliamentary Sitting. Were you aware of that at that time?

[12297] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I was aware of it the next day when Pritam told me that he had gone to her house the night before or the day before.

[12298] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you were not aware of it on 3 October itself.

[12299] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** No.

[12300] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. On 4 October, when you became aware of it, can you tell us when you became aware? At which point of time on that day?

[12301] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I'm sorry, I really can't remember what time it was, but I remember Pritam telling me about the fact that he had gone to her home the day before. Quite likely, it would have been after the exchange with Minister, I think, but I can't recall exactly.

[12302] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. To give you some timeline, Parliament sat at 11.00 am on 4 October. The first hour and a half were Parliamentary Questions, and by 12.30 pm, Minister Shanmugan had stood up to make a short Ministerial Statement and it concerned this issue. That entire exchange took place over the next 12 to 13 minutes and then the rest of Parliamentary business continued. So, as far as you remember, it was after this exchange, correct?

[12303] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Most likely.

[12304] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Most likely?

[12305] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** But not like immediately, but sometime during the day.

[12306] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Were you present during the exchange?

[12307] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, I was present.

[12308] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you heard what she said.

[12309] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, I did.

[12310] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** When she first stood up and explained – you remember she was asked various questions – and if you like to refresh yourself, there is a copy of the Hansard somewhere around.

[12311] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I can remember.

[12312] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Were you surprised at her response?

[12313] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I wouldn't say surprised but I was very frustrated at that point.

[12314] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Why were you frustrated?

[12315] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I was frustrated because it didn't appear that there had been any progress made on moving towards correcting the record, and in fact, at that exchange or the clarifications, there was a doubling down on the untruth.

[12316] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Earlier, you told us that after 8 August meeting, thereafter there was no other communication, discussion whatsoever in August and September, and you had left it to Mr Singh and also did not discuss with Mr Singh or with Mr Faisal.

[12317] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12318] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The next point in time in the timeline that this issue confronted you, after 8 August, was this occasion on 4 October in Parliament.

[12319] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12320] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You said you were frustrated with Ms Khan's answers. I'm just trying to understand that because you would not have known by that time what Mr Singh had discussed or agreed with Ms Khan that she would do, if this matter came up, correct?

[12321] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I mean I didn't know, yes.

[12322] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** For all you know, this may have been an answer consistent with Mr Singh's directions.

[12323] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I would find that unbelievable.

[12324] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Fair enough, but you would not have prior knowledge of what the game plan would be, so to say.

[12325] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I will not be able to believe that Pritam had asked her to lie or give her a choice to lie. I mean, that was definitely not our understanding of what should be done.

[12326] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the fact that she then stood up and did continue to lie and in fact, more than once, you said frustrated you, but would also have caused you some alarm and I would presume some degree of consternation as well. I mean, you are the Party Chairman, this exchange has just happened, it has exacerbated the lie that was first spoken, and now, at least three senior members of the Workers' Party are present in Parliament whilst the lie was being spoken. So, what was your reaction, given what I've just described? What was your reaction in the immediate aftermath of hearing this exchange with Minister Shanmugan?

[12327] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** No, of course, when she basically doubled down on the untruths, like I said, I was very frustrated because the situation had been made worse, in that sense. After the exchange was over, okay, I was actually thinking through some of the, what should be done next and with what urgency, because to me, the matter had become more urgent now. So, I think about an hour later or so, I messaged Ms Khan because I was also concerned about where she was, what she was doing and so on. So, we agreed to meet, I think at the LO's office, Leader of Opposition's office, sometime in the afternoon.

[12328] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Thank you. Just so I get the timeline right.

[12329] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12330] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You messaged Ms Khan sometime in the afternoon, shortly after —

[12331] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think it was about an hour after the exchange, something like that, yes.

[12332] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Would this be before or after you spoke with Mr Singh? Because remember you told us that you spoke to Mr Singh.

[12333] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Before, I think.

[12334] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you please pick up the submission by Ms Khan to the Committee of Privileges dated 7 December? Do you have that?

[12335] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12336] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** To give you some context.

[12337] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** What page is that, sorry?

[12338] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You have the submission with you, 7 December. The page number appears at the bottom and I'm going to refer to page 8, but I wanted to tell you what these documents are about to give you some orientation, because I think this is the first time you're seeing them.

[12339] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Right, right.

[12340] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In the course of testimony, various of the witnesses would offer additional documents, in this case, WhatsApp messages.

[12341] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Sure.

[12342] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, this came from Ms Khan, and she disclosed this to us, and if you go to the top of page 8 —

[12343] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12344] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You will see that's when her messages start with you at 1.57 pm. Do you see that?

[12345] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Mm.

[12346] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It's from you. It says, "Rae, where are you? Was looking for you."

[12347] She didn't reply. A minute later, "Here, Sylvia. I went to the women's room for a while."

[12348] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, that's right.

[12349] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** "Are you still outside the Chamber?" And then you said, "In library. Want to meet at LO's room." "Yes, that will be great. I'll see you there."

[12350] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** That's right.

[12351] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Then, you said, "Okay." That's the exchange you referred to, right?

[12352] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12353] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you would have met her shortly after this exchange.

[12354] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, I think probably half an hour or an hour after the last message.

[12355] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Would Mr Singh have been aware of this meeting?

[12356] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't think so. Because at that time, if I'm not wrong, the Foreign Interference (Countermeasures) Act (FICA) debate was on, so he was quite involved in that.

[12357] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. You were meeting in his room, which I take since you didn't ask him first, you can walk in at any time.

[12358] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** It is sometimes locked, but I think on Sitting days, it's generally unlocked, yes.

[12359] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. When you met Ms Khan there, around this time or shortly after this message, can you describe the meeting?

[12360] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes. So, I had two purposes, actually, of wanting to meet her. The first was also, of course, to see emotionally how she was after the exchange with Minister, which I think most people would find stressful in any event, so that was the first.

[12361] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Really, why?

[12362] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I'm just saying most people. So, just to square that circle with her.

[12363] At the same time also, certain things which the Minister had said in his speech also made me consider certain things which I think were important. For example, he mentioned in his speech that the Police would be contacting Ms Khan to find out more about the statement that she had made. And at that point in time, what struck me— this is me thinking myself — is that, well, MPs who make speeches in Parliament, they have Parliamentary privileges, and at the same time, if there's any issue with any speech that's made in Parliament, Parliament is the proper body to handle it. So, I was wanting to share those views with her, so, I told her that, look, this is my view, that whatever is said by an MP in Parliament, if this is any issue with it, Parliament is the proper place to handle it.

[12364] I didn't think that the Police – this was just me quickly thinking – I didn't think that in this case – although, of course, the Police may want to know more about the nature of the complaint and things like that, but I didn't think that the Police would be exercising powers as such because they were not really investigating a criminal offence at that time. So, I told her that, please get your own legal advice on this. This is just my preliminary view that whatever issues may arise from what an MP says in Parliament, Parliament is the proper authority to handle it, and please go and get your legal advice on this.

[12365] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, to unpack it a little, there are two broad reasons why you wanted to see her. The second one that you just articulated is as a follow-through and to prepare for the eventual request from the Police for an interview, and for her —

[12366] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, yes, and also for her to be clear of the legal position as well.

[12367] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At that stage, did you already tell her to consult with lawyers? I think I heard you say so, but I just wanted to be clear.

[12368] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I suggested to her to get legal advice.

[12369] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Your first reason to see her was also to ascertain her emotional circumstance at that point in time.

[12370] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12371] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What was your assessment?

[12372] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** She seemed highly stressed, not in a good place.

[12373] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you ask her, “Why did you repeat the untruths?”

[12374] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I didn't ask her that.

[12375] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you ask her, I mean, again, I'm asking you this question, let me give you the premise, okay? The last time you spoke to her was on 8 August on this issue?

[12376] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12377] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And on your evidence, the last time you spoke to anyone on this issue was actually 8 August too, right?

[12378] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** 8 August, yes.

[12379] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, because I was quite careful in finding out what happened throughout August and then September, and then you told me on 3 October, you weren't aware at that time. So, now we're on 4 October afternoon.

[12380] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12381] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, when you're seeing her, this would be the first occasion after 8 August that you will be talking to anyone about this issue, right? Correct?

[12382] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Talking to someone, yes.

[12383] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Anyone, actually.

[12384] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think so, yes.

[12385] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, in your mind, this was something that Mr Singh was managing, right?

[12386] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12387] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so, from that perspective, did you ask her "What did you discuss with Mr Singh? How did you end up repeating the lie again, a few times?"

[12388] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I didn't talk to her about that, no.

[12389] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Were you not concerned about that?

[12390] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Of course, there would be concern but, at the same time, I mean, the fact is that I didn't shout at her to ask her why she lied again or what Mr Singh had told her, because never in my mind would I expect that Mr Singh will tell her to double down on the lie. So, that was not a consideration.

[12391] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No, fair enough, but even taking that on board, assuming that Mr Singh would not ask her to double down on the lie, even taking that on board, you would be concerned to know how she has now come to, in fact, double down on the lie actually, right?

[12392] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I suppose I would, yes.

[12393] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You would have but you didn't ask anything about that?

[12394] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I didn't ask her about it at that point, no.

[12395] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you ask her whether her family was already aware of the sexual assault issue?

[12396] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I did not ask her about that at that time.

[12397] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Again, I raise that because you said it was a necessary step for it to be disclosed.

[12398] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12399] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you would have been aware that the very next day was another Parliamentary Sitting. So, did you entertain the prospect that, given that she's

now just repeated the lie, which of course has made the circumstance worse, would it have been an option for her to go to Parliament on the next day to clarify the lie?

[12400] Ms Sylvia Lim: I think, theoretically, yes, it's an option but, practically, I don't think it's an option.

[12401] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Why?

[12402] Ms Sylvia Lim: Because such a matter where she has to come to explain how she came to tell the untruth and, in her mind, she has to talk about her past experience and also the fact that she repeated it on 4 October, it would require careful structuring, I would say, drafting, and to make sure that she's able to be very emotionally stable and comfortable with her statement of clarification. So, if I can just talk about a reason why this would make sense, on 3 August, you will remember that that was the day when the speech was first made.

[12403] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Yes.

[12404] Ms Sylvia Lim: And after the speech, I know that Pritam was basically chasing her to give details of the incident and so on. And based on certain information which she gave to him which turned out to be further untrue – I do not know whether he actually went through those details —

[12405] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: He did, he explained it —

[12406] Ms Sylvia Lim: — that she doubled down and said that it was Bedok Police Station and so on and so forth. Then, there was a clarification that she made that evening on 3 August and I believe that Pritam did help her with that clarification, and it turned out to be actually a clarification which further told the lie, you see. So, I would say that haste, in this circumstance, even on 4 October, is not wise and we needed to do it calmly and, in that sense, with due deliberation.

[12407] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Okay, but, I mean, I can understand what you say about 3 August because the clarification that Mr Singh drafted which Ms Khan then delivered subsequently in the later part of the same proceeding, I can understand that, that was on the same day. But when you say haste should not be the principal consideration, I mean, right now, we are about more than two months since the lie was spoken in Parliament. Would you not agree that in this context and plus the added fact that the lie had just been repeated, doubled down, as you say, actually haste would have been important to come and explain that what was spoken in Parliament was a lie, there was no such incident, the Police can stop looking and sexual assault victims need not be concerned that this might be an issue that could be true and might affect the way in which they look at whether they're prepared to come forward to see the Police, in that context?

[12408] Ms Sylvia Lim: Well, I mean, Mr Tong, the fact of the matter is that we have this thing happening on 4 October and the Sitting continued on 5 October.

[12409] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Yes.

[12410] Ms Sylvia Lim: Yes. And based on the normal timetable, there would still be a further Sitting in November, that's what we understand. So, it is a question of judgement,

alright? I mean, if you want to rush through a clarification on 5 October, it might be possible but we would need time to go and ascertain from her exactly what she wants to say and whether it can withstand scrutiny. So, it's a judgement.

[12411] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand. I understand all that of what you said but I'm adding to it the complexion of it being a lie that was now repeated, which I think as a senior politician, you would appreciate actually makes the situation worse.

[12412] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** No, of course, I mean, as I said earlier, what happened on 4 October of course made the situation worse, yes.

[12413] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, in that context, number one, and number two, in the context that there is now out there continued to perpetrate a lie which adversely affects not just the integrity of Parliamentary proceedings but also the Police and, perhaps, sexual assault victims as well?

[12414] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Well, Mr Tong, or Chairman, I should say, as I said earlier, we appreciated the seriousness of the situation and, of course, the events that took place in Parliament on 4 October had worsened the situation. And, in my mind, it was urgent for us to take the necessary steps to correct the record but I did not think that 5 October was an option.

[12415] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, on 4 October up till as far as I can recollect, based on what Mr Faisal and Mr Singh had said earlier, there were no attempts to inform the Workers' Party CEC of this matter until 29 October. Would I be right in those dates?

[12416] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, we had a meeting on 29 October because we called the CEC to prepare them for the statement that she was going to make on 1 November. So, it was the Friday before the November Sitting.

[12417] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand, and that would be the first time the CEC became aware that there was a lie in Parliament and that Ms Khan would come to Parliament to clarify the lie, correct?

[12418] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, I believe so.

[12419] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh gave evidence that later that evening, towards the end of the Sitting – and I think you remember that Sitting, because it went on till almost midnight or past midnight – 4 October. At around 11.15 pm, he gave evidence that there was a meeting which involved yourself, Ms Khan, again in the LO's office, with Mr Singh as well, do you remember that?

[12420] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I remember, that, yes.

[12421] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you give us an account of that meeting?

[12422] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't think the meeting lasted very long, from what I recall, because it was, I think at the end, the FICA debate had ended and it was about 11 something in the evening. And, meanwhile, there was an Adjournment Motion on mental health going on. So, we went to the LO's office and then all I remember at that time was that it's very likely

that Pritam probably asked her what she's going to do about this matter. And what I recall was her saying something to the effect that there is another path, honesty.

[12423] That's what I recall her saying and then the meeting ended off by saying, "Okay, we'll talk about this". And then, that was basically all I can remember about that meeting.

[12424] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Just to dial back a little bit. Was she present already with Mr Singh when you arrived there or was she the last to arrive?

[12425] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I cannot remember that.

[12426] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You can't remember.

[12427] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** No.

[12428] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I asked that because I wanted to know whether there was an opportunity for yourself and Mr Singh to speak without Ms Khan being present. Was there?

[12429] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't think so.

[12430] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No. So, you didn't discuss that separately with him?

[12431] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** No.

[12432] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Throughout the rest of the day, and I know that the FICA debate was going on and Mr Singh did say that his mind was focused on that. But was there any occasion between the time that Ms Khan spoke the lie again in Parliament on 4 October and when you met with Mr Singh at 11.15 pm, did you exchange any messages, did you speak to him via text or email in any way to ask him what had happened and to talk about why Ms Khan had repeated the lie?

[12433] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't think there were any exchanges like that —

[12434] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No?

[12435] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** — or during that day itself.

[12436] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Not at all?

[12437] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, I don't think so.

[12438] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Again, let me verbalise why I ask you this, because in your mind, you felt that he was the best person to deal with the issue and handle the matter, moving forward, which, to you, must lead to, naturally, an honest clarification in Parliament, right?

[12439] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12440] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you had just witnessed a double down on the lie.

[12441] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Right.

[12442] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And, in your mind, putting the two together, this has happened, it's made it worse but "I left it to Secretary-General Mr Singh to deal with the problem". Would not one of your first instincts be to ask him, "What happened? How did we end up in this situation?"

[12443] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Well, on that day itself, on 4 October, I did not ask him further about this matter because he was very heavily involved in the FICA debate at that time, which was a very heated and acrimonious debate, and then we were tabling amendments and so on. So, there were a lot of things going on at that time, so, I mean, like I said, I didn't think myself that 5 October would be an option to make a clarification, so, we could always talk later.

[12444] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, just to be clear, apart from this short meeting at 11.15 pm in the LO's office, you did not have any other discussion with Mr Singh over, by this time, the repeat of the lie, correct?

[12445] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** On 4 October itself?

[12446] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On 4 October itself.

[12447] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** No.

[12448] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you have a discussion with anyone else, Mr Faisal, perhaps?

[12449] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Not on that day, I don't think so.

[12450] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, now on 4 October meeting —

[12451] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Which one?

[12452] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 4 October, 11.15 pm meeting.

[12453] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Okay.

[12454] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You said Ms Khan came and said — and these are the words that Mr Singh used to describe what Ms Khan said — he said, she said, "Perhaps there's another way. That is, to tell the truth." You heard this statement as well said by Ms Khan?

[12455] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Words to that effect. What I recall was what I mentioned earlier, yes, that "there is another path, honesty", yes.

[12456] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What was your response to this statement that she made?

[12457] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I wasn't quite sure what to make of it because she had just chosen another path earlier in the day, you see. So, I was just listening to her uttering that statement and I really didn't know what to make of it, really.

[12458] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If in your mind, which you explained very clearly earlier, there was only really one outcome, which is to clarify the lie —

[12459] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Right.

[12460] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It was a question of when. But now, that was done earlier that day, would you not have said to her, “What do you mean there’s another path? There’s only one path which is to come and tell the truth.”

[12461] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I didn’t say anything because Pritam, I think, responded. And what I recall him saying was something to the effect that, “Haven’t you chosen your path by what you said today?” Something like that.

[12462] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mm-hmm. Okay, and did Ms Khan reply to that?

[12463] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don’t think she did. I don’t recall any reply.

[12464] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Besides this exchange on those words that she used, what else happened at this meeting?

[12465] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don’t recall that the meeting lasted long, as I said, because it was quite late in the evening. So, we sort of ended off by knowing that we would have to meet again, you know, to take the thing forward and that was about it.

[12466] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.

[12467] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** It wasn’t very long I don’t think.

[12468] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh has told us that he did not say to her at this meeting that she had to tell the truth, or words to that effect. Would this also be your recollection that this was not said?

[12469] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** He probably said something to the effect that we’ll discuss this further, after she said there’s another path. And then, he said, we’ll discuss it further and I think that was it.

[12470] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That was it. Nothing else was said.

[12471] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I can’t recall.

[12472] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did either of you ask her if by that time her family members were aware of the sexual assault experience?

[12473] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Not at that meeting.

[12474] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Would it not have been something that you would want to find out?

[12475] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Of course.

[12476] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, because the context was in your mind, it was a necessary step, right?

[12477] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12478] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Why not ask her directly since she's before you now?

[12479] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I didn't think of it at the time.

[12480] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because if this step had not been crossed —

[12481] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Right.

[12482] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That is, her family was not aware, then did you can't come to Parliament to clarify, correct?

[12483] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Like I mentioned at 4 October meeting, late in the evening, it was not a very long meeting and near midnight. And, you know, basically, it was, I think, called to tell her that the matter had to be taken forward and then that was the main purpose, I think, of the meeting. And it didn't last very long as well.

[12484] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But what does taken forward mean?

[12485] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Meaning that, we would have to go to a Parliamentary Clarification.

[12486] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But those were not the words used with Ms Khan.

[12487] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** No, not at that meeting, yes.

[12488] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, at that meeting, how would she know that "take it forward" means to clarify the truth in Parliament, because Mr Singh didn't say that, Mr Singh didn't tell her to tell the truth in Parliament? And your last few words were also not articulated at least in those terms to Ms Khan. And the only impression she's left with at that stage is, "We'll have to speak further" and that was the end of the meeting.

[12489] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Well, earlier, as you know, I met Ms Khan in the afternoon, right?

[12490] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[12491] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** So, as I said earlier, during that conversation that I had with her, I told her that my initial view is that any issue with a speech made by an MP in Parliament should be clarified in Parliament because that's the proper organ of state to do it in. So, I had said that to her, you know.

[12492] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mm-hm. Yes, but which Sitting, you see? As I tried to, hopefully, clearly articulate earlier, there was still the option of another Sitting the next day.

[12493] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Right.

[12494] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I know you have explained why you felt it was too hasty, but was that something that was discussed? And if not, then why not because it could have been raised with Ms Khan to say, “Look, your family is aware? If they are aware, let’s start working on a statement”. Because the longer this remains on the record, which I think you would appreciate, the worse it will be.

[12495] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Of course, we wanted the matter to be clarified sooner rather later, especially after 4 October exchange where the situation did get worse. But as I mentioned to you, at the meeting on 4 October, late at midnight, in my mind, 5 October was not an option for the reasons I mentioned. But what I understood was that we would be moving quickly now to assist and guide her towards doing what was necessary to correct the record in Parliament.

[12496] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Ms Khan gave evidence that this meeting also discussed the possibility there might be a Committee of Privileges hearing, as a result of what had happened. Do you recall is that?

[12497] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I can’t distinctly recall. It may have happened, but I can’t distinctly recall.

[12498] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. After this short meeting and you left, was there another occasion, either on 4 October itself – I know it was already very late at that time – or on 5 October at the next day in Parliament, where you had occasion to discuss with Mr Singh what then would the next steps be?

[12499] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I cannot remember whether I discussed it with him or not, on 5 October; I can’t remember that.

[12500] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** No? Would you have exchanged messages with him, text messages, emails?

[12501] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I doubt so. I can’t remember whether we discussed it on 5 October or not.

[12502] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Again, in context and to explain why I’m asking this question: you had just seen what happened on 4 October, you had spoken with Ms Khan twice. You had, prior to, thought Mr Singh – in fact, assumed Mr Singh – would be doing it, dealing with the problem. But now, the problem has been exacerbated. Why is it on that on 5 October, there is no discussion with Mr Singh on what the next steps ought to be?

[12503] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think we left off on 4 October on the understanding that we would be meeting again very soon, so we will take those steps, you know. So, on 5 October, I can’t remember whether we discussed anything or not. I really can’t. Because the Parliament was still sitting, I think. And I think I spoke on one of the Bills, so, in that sense, I mean, there were other things going on.

[12504] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Could you check the messages that you have and see whether in this period, on 4 or 5 October, you have discussed it with Mr Singh or indeed anyone else, as to what next steps to take?

[12505] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** 4 or 5 October?

[12506] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. I ask you to start from 4 October because you told me earlier that there was nothing prior to that you discussed with anyone else at all.

[12507] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12508] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, on 5 October, did you speak to Ms Khan at all, again, on this issue?

[12509] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I can't recall that.

[12510] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because you were both in Parliament again.

[12511] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, but I can't recall whether I spoke to her or not, I can't recall.

[12512] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you did speak to her you would probably recall, am I right? Because —

[12513] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I suppose so, but I'm not 100% sure, but I do recall speaking to her on 4 October.

[12514] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But on 5 October, now in the aftermath of this? Again, the context is both yourself and Mr Singh did say that Ms Khan was distraught, she was affected by what had happened, which I think I can understand. But on 5 October, the next day, perhaps after, you know, a night when things are calmer, would it not have been an occasion to, even if you felt that it was too hasty to come clean on 5 October, would you not have wanted to discuss with Ms Khan, what the next steps ought to be?

[12515] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** As I said, I mean, the understanding that I had was that we would be meeting very soon to talk about this matter, so, speaking on 5 October to me was, it didn't matter one way or the other because it would be happening soon.

[12516] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Did you on 5 October have any sense as to when you would be meeting? Was there a plan already?

[12517] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think — Let me try and remember now. I think a few days later we met.

[12518] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. But as of 5 October, had you already made plans to meet?

[12519] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** There was no date fixed, I think.

[12520] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. As of 5 October, can you tell me if there were any other steps taken, as of 5 October, which would be consistent with preparing for Ms Khan to come to Parliament to clarify the lie?

[12521] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I can't recall any steps because Parliament was sitting so we were at the Sitting, you know, doing our work.

[12522] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. On 7 October, Ms Khan received an email from the Police requesting for an interview and she forwarded it to you, correct?

[12523] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12524] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She also sent, I think, subsequent to 7 October, also sent you a note from her lawyers which set out, I think, advice to her. Do you recall that?

[12525] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I recall reading that, yes.

[12526] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In the email which she sent to both yourself as well as – in fact to Mr Singh and Mr Faisal as well – she asked you what should she do or words to that effect. Do you recall that?

[12527] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Something to that effect, yes.

[12528] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** How did you advise her?

[12529] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** So, the email, as you mentioned, came on 7 October, and we arranged for a meeting with Ms Khan on 12 October, the following Tuesday. Maybe I'll talk about the Police reply first before we talk about the actual or other things.

[12530] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Sure.

[12531] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** So, at the 12 October meeting, she – okay, maybe to tell it more logically, I'll just describe the meeting as it went. On 12 October, this meeting took place in Pritam's house again and the meeting started off by Pritam saying, "So, have you decided what you're going to do about this?"

[12532] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Sorry, to interrupt but can you give me a time, roughly, what time was this on 12 October? Morning, afternoon, evening?

[12533] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I can't recall the time, but it wasn't in the evening.

[12534] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, sometime in the morning or afternoon?

[12535] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Something like that, yes.

[12536] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please go on.

[12537] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Okay, so, Pritam started off the meeting by asking her, "Well, what are you going to do about this?" And then, she said, "I still don't think I want to tell the truth." So, at that point I got angry. And I think Pritam was also angry. And we told her this correction has to be made and we tried to persuade her by saying that, look, if you do not make the correction, this is going to weigh on you for the rest of your life and it will be too much of a burden for anyone to bear. You need to correct this so that everyone is clear and then, you know, we can move on from there.

[12538] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.

[12539] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Okay. So, then, coming back to the Police thing.

[12540] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[12541] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** So, at the end of this meeting, I can't remember whether it was she or raised or I who raised this issue of the Police request, and this was after she agreed with us that she would be making a clarification in Parliament at the next Sitting. So, I told her that as far as the Police request is concerned, I think it is okay for you to leave it because you're going to clarify the matter in Parliament and in your clarification, you're going to be retracting the anecdote anyway, so, let's just do this in Parliament and leave the Police reply, I think you can leave the Police reply.

[12542] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, when you first met with her together with Mr Singh on 12 October, she had expressed reluctance to speak the truth in Parliament and clarify the lie, right?

[12543] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12544] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This would have been completely against what you would have thought would have happened; meaning, when you walked away on 8 August and again while you left the matter to Mr Singh to deal with, in your mind, it must have been there's only one conclusion, which is she will come and clarify the truth.

[12545] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** She has to clarify, yes.

[12546] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, hearing from her, first of all, on 4 October, where she did not, not clarify the lie but she doubled down on it several times. And now, on 12 October, almost a week later or more than a week later, she's still telling you that she's not prepared to tell the truth and clarify, you must have taken this to be a very direct affront to what you understood to be the correct path, the right thing to do, isn't it?

[12547] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, it was not an option for her to continue the lie.

[12548] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And did you turn to Mr Singh and say what did you all discuss and agree?

[12549] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** It didn't strike me that this would have been agreed between her and him to double down the lie. I mean, that never crossed my mind.

[12550] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand. But not so much double down the lie but rather, you see, again, understanding your evidence, your touchpoints were limited. 8 August there was one; whole of August, whole September nothing else; 3 October you weren't aware at that point of time, you only knew on 4 October when you met with Mr Singh and Ms Khan at the meetings, right? And then you said 5 October, nothing. And thereafter, you were aware of the Police report on 7 October but you didn't respond.

[12551] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Police request.

[12552] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm sorry, Police request on 7 October. And the next time, you had to deal with this again is on 12 October. So, those are your touchpoints to this

matter. And your state of mind would have been this is something Mr Singh is handling and it would be handled such that there really only can have one outcome, which is come and tell the truth.

[12553] But here in front of you is an episode playing out where Ms Khan had not told the truth on 4 October and it is now coming to you again, with Mr Singh present, and saying “I’m not going to come and clarify.” So, in this context, would you not have wanted to know what had been discussed, what had been agreed, what had gone on between Mr Singh and Ms Khan which gave rise to this situation now?

[12554] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** You see, it never crossed my mind and I cannot fathom this possibility that Pritam would have given her the option to choose between telling the truth or continuing the lie. That never crossed my mind and I do not believe it to be true. So, when she comes and says “I don’t think I want to tell the truth”, I think it’s just her. It’s nothing to do with Mr Singh at all.

[12555] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you ask her if at that time she had not yet told her family about it?

[12556] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think it emerged during the meeting but I don’t recall —

[12557] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you ask?

[12558] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** — who asked it, whether me or Pritam. I can’t recall that distinctively. But we concluded somehow that she had not done that.

[12559] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Concluded somehow? Was that because you asked or —

[12560] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** You see, I can’t remember very clearly who asked this question but it seemed like she hadn’t closed the loop with her family yet. Exactly the words used, all that, I’m sorry I really can’t recall that.

[12561] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That’s fine. But, again, going back to the context, you had said this was a necessary step.

[12562] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12563] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, again, although the circumstances I appreciate are quite different now in October, 12 October and that day on 8 August, quite different circumstances which I appreciate. But, nonetheless, if your principal concern was her well-being and that this matter should not come to public domain without her family knowing, one the key considerations still on 12 October would be whether her family was aware. Would you not agree?

[12564] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Well, that loop would definitely have to be closed but I have to say that, of course, as time wore on and now it was already 12 October, I was a bit impatient.

[12565] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That was the thrust of what I was saying earlier when I asked you why you felt it was hasty on 5 October because now the dynamics have changed, the circumstances have changed, right?

[12566] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Agreed. So, it is a judgment as to when is the best and earliest possible time to do it. And it's a judgment as to which day is appropriate, 5 October or not 5 October, the next Sitting.

[12567] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, as of 12 October had you worked out whether her parents were aware?

[12568] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I concluded probably that she had sat on matter, I think.

[12569] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, her family was not yet aware?

[12570] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** That was my conclusion, yes.

[12571] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, as of 12 October, despite the fact that the family being told was a necessary step, you all have insisted that she now has to come clean and she has got no choice but to do it at the next available Sitting, would that be right?

[12572] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12573] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, at least to that extent, there is a change in the circumstances on which she would now have to come clean.

[12574] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** In the sense that it was made clear to her that our view was that she needed to make a clarification at the next available Sitting, which was scheduled for 1 November. And to that extent whatever needed to be done prior to that, had to be done prior to that.

[12575] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In other words, by this time, unlike in August, no ifs and no buts, it is just next Sitting, you come clean and by that time —

[12576] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** We convinced her. We convinced her of it. And after some discussion, she agreed with us that that was the best thing to do.

[12577] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the upshot of that meeting on 12 October was that she would come clean in Parliament and explain her lie at the next Sitting, right?

[12578] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** At least she would set the record straight in Parliament, yes.

[12579] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** As far as you're aware, you will confirm this, that was the first time that you were aware that she would come and make a statement to clarify the lie in Parliament, right?

[12580] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** It was the first, I would say, express confirmation that this would happen, that she would be making that statement in Parliament to correct the record.

[12581] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[12582] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Her first express commitment, yes.

[12583] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** To you at least. To you, right?

[12584] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12585] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because your previous experience or touchpoints with this matter, as I said earlier in my timeline, were just on 8 August and, probably, fleetingly on 4 October, correct? And neither at those occasions was there a confirmation by her that she would come to Parliament to clarify the lie?

[12586] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** The confirmation was obtained on 12 October, yes.

[12587] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And not prior to that?

[12588] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** No. Not expressly, no.

[12589] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The other difference on 12 October is that this time it was, as I understand your evidence, articulated clearly to her that she has to go to Parliament to tell the truth, correct?

[12590] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, we articulated that to her.

[12591] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That's the difference also between what happened on 8 August and again, on 4 October, where the phrase for her to go to Parliament to tell the truth, was not spoken to her, correct?

[12592] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** On 8 August, as we mentioned earlier, we did not touch on this, the steps to be taken in Parliament to rectify the record because of the immediacy of the other issues: her emotional state, the fact her family didn't know and so on. So, it was not articulated at that time. On 4 October, as I mentioned earlier, I had a brief conversation with her in the afternoon to tell her that in my view at least, my initial view is that any issues with what an MP says in Parliament should be resolved by Parliament, settled in Parliament. So, that general statement I made to her. But on 12 October we got her commitment to make the statement.

[12593] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The statement, meaning to tell the truth, you expressed that to her.

[12594] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, to correct the record.

[12595] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The difference being on 4 October, your words, and I appreciate what you've just said, did not include an exhortation to her to tell the truth in Parliament, correct?

[12596] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** But I think the general direction, I did articulate it. So, I said to her that any issues with what an MP said in Parliament should be clarified in Parliament, Parliament handles its own affairs. And in that context, I asked her to get legal advice as well.

[12597] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the turn of phrase that I've suggested to you was not used but in your mind it was clear enough to her that that's what you meant. Is that what you're saying?

[12598] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I'm saying that what I meant on 4 October in that conversation with her was to steer her to say look, this matter has to be clarified in Parliament. So, I put it in more general terms but that was what I meant.

[12599] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, alright. From 12 October onwards, we see quite a number of steps being taken to prepare for Ms Khan to make a statement in Parliament. And you have been privy to some of these steps and I would just like to walk through them, okay?

[12600] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Sure.

[12601] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On 12 October itself, I presume shortly after or sometime after the meeting that you've just described, there was a meeting that Mr Singh had with Mr Nathan and Ms Loh. First of all, were you present at that meeting?

[12602] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I wasn't present at the meeting.

[12603] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Were you aware that there was such a meeting?

[12604] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think I was told by Pritam about the meeting but when, I can't remember.

[12605] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, sometime after the meeting took place.

[12606] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12607] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Were you aware why he had a meeting with them?

[12608] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** The impression I got was that they asked to see him.

[12609] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And, eventually, since he was reporting to you after the meeting took place, did he tell you what it was about?

[12610] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think he did but I can't recall distinctly what he said.

[12611] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you give us the gist of what he said the meeting was about?

[12612] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I'm trying to recall whether I even – because I know that he did tell me that Pei Ying and Yudhish asked to see him because they are the closest assistants, in that sense, to Ms Khan. So, I would assume that it is in relation to what she was going to say in Parliament on 1 November. I believe so but the details I can't remember.

[12613] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'll just summarise. From what we heard from Ms Loh and Mr Nathan, they made the request to see him at the meeting and the purpose of the meeting was because they had learnt, I assume subsequent to the meeting that you had with Ms Khan, that she was now going to make a clarificatory statement or a statement to tell truth, to

clarify the lie. And they wanted to meet with Mr Singh to work out the preparatory steps towards that and in their minds they were concerned with making sure that, for example, Ms Khan's social media handles would well be taken care of, that should there be queries by constituents in Compassvale, that they will also have something to deal with and also to talk through the process of what might happen as a result of such a statement being made, which they appreciated would be big news in Parliament. Would that be something that would accord with your recollection of what happened at the meeting based on what Mr Singh told you?

[12614] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I wasn't at the meeting but, based on the timeline, I would say that what you've described to me, it would not be surprising that they would be discussing these things.

[12615] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thereafter, and I mean from 12 October onwards — Okay, so, just to give you a sense of the timeline that I have in mind, 12 October was this meeting where you persuaded Ms Khan to come clean. And then you mentioned earlier that there was a 29 October meeting with the CEC, right?

[12616] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12617] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Within this window, would you agree that there were several drafts of the statement that were canvassed, looked at and edited and you were involved in that, correct?

[12618] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I was present at some of these meetings, if not all, I can't remember how many there were. Yes, there were drafts, different versions exchanged during this period of time from after 12 October and before 29 October.

[12619] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** From what I can piece together from the various WhatsApp messages that went on and this is, of course, somewhat second-hand information, there were something like five or six drafts and there were also about five or six meetings which took place, either at the Eunos Town Council office or at Mr Singh's home or at Party headquarters. Would that accord broadly with your own recollection?

[12620] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I do not recall going to Eunos Town Council office for any meeting. But I attended a few at Pritam's house and there was one at the Workers' Party's headquarters, yes.

[12621] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, would it be fair to say that the draft was very carefully looked at by yourself, Mr Singh and Ms Khan, and I think, in some cases, some of the drafts also Mr Nathan and Ms Loh?

[12622] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, they were always, I mean, her confidantes and they were quite — how shall I say — quite into the contents of the statement that Ms Khan would be giving so they had their views and so on. But, in the end, the drafts were all drafted by her.

[12623] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** My question was a bit broader than that. It covers yourself and Mr Singh. So, let's focus on the two of you in particular.

[12624] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Okay.

[12625] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The various turns of the drafts would include comments that you made and edits that you suggest, correct?

[12626] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** We tried to be judicious about that because it's going to be her speech.

[12627] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Her statement.

[12628] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** It's going to be something that's very highly personal that she wanted to share in the public domain.

[12629] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[12630] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** So, we didn't really want to curtail, in that sense, the way she wanted to tell the story.

[12631] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Of course.

[12632] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** We did give comments, yes.

[12633] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Content and the truth and falsity of the statement, she has to take ownership of it but, I suppose, Mr Singh and yourself would also be looking out at the draft from the perspective of the Workers' Party as a party, the impact that this will have because, as we said earlier, or as I said earlier, this is a high signature move. There will be and you expected there to be some significant adverse publicity. So, you would be keen to ensure that at least to those extents you give your input, correct?

[12634] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I would say that what was in my mind at the time looking at the drafts was that it was my feeling that one or two of the drafts were placing too much emphasis on the past experience that she had, and the apology and the retraction for the untruth in one or two of the drafts was not very clear. So, that was my focus that "Look, you want to make a clarification in Parliament to apologise and retract an untruth, you have to say it clearly". So, that was it and I didn't think that an over-emphasis on the past, sexual trauma and so on would be helpful, in that sense, because it might be read the wrong way.

[12635] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, would it be fair to say that by the time you arranged for a CEC meeting on 29 October, you would have been satisfied with the way the draft looked like?

[12636] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I can't say for sure because the drafts were still being looked at and amended, and Yudhish and Pei Ying were also looking into it. So, I can't be very sure about that.

[12637] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you were —

[12638] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** But she came with the draft and we all looked at the draft at the meeting.

[12639] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if there were any final views, comments that you had, you would have given those to her at that meeting?

[12640] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12641] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. Earlier on, we agreed that this was the first time the CEC was aware of this incident and aware of the lie in Parliament and also aware of the fact that she will then be, in a few days' time, going to Parliament to clarify it, correct?

[12642] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** On 29 October, that's when the CEC was informed that she would be making this clarification on 1 November, yes.

[12643] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Can you describe the CEC's reaction to being told about this? First of all, was the entire CEC present at this meeting?

[12644] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think some people could not make it for the meeting.

[12645] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Do you remember who?

[12646] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think Ting Ru was not there. Louis Chua, I think, also could not make it and, let's see, one or two others.

[12647] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Can you give us a broad description or a gist of the meeting with the CEC?

[12648] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Okay. So, Raeesah addressed the CEC and told them that she was going to make a statement of clarification in Parliament on 1 November and she explained briefly that she felt very strongly about this issue of victims of sexual assault and she was a victim herself prior to that. And then, she was telling them that she's trying to work on herself and then I think the draft was circulated or, at least, read out with a few copies circulated as well.

[12649] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Were there comments made by the CEC to this draft?

[12650] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** There were some but I can't really distinctly recall. There was one query about whether it was necessary to bring up her past. So, that was discussed, yes.

[12651] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did anyone else address the CEC?

[12652] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Sorry?

[12653] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did anyone else address the CEC?

[12654] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think Pritam did.

[12655] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What did he say to the CEC?

[12656] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think he gave the background that this statement is coming to be made, yes.

[12657] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Can you give us a gist of that background, to the best of your recollection?

[12658] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** It was just an explanation that on 3 August – okay, I’m actually not very sure now whether she gave the background or him – I can’t remember. But, anyway, the CEC needed context. So, it was explained to them there was a speech made in Parliament on 3 August by her, that it contained something that is not true and that she would be making a statement to correct it, and she explained the circumstances of that.

[12659] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.

[12660] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I mean, this is just a broad picture thing because I can’t recall distinctly who said what.

[12661] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The purpose of this meeting, Ms Lim, on 29 October would be to apprise the CEC ahead of time that this statement would be made in Parliament by a Workers’ Party MP, correct?

[12662] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** We wanted the CEC to know first before it became public, yes.

[12663] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. In fact, that’s, I would say, good order, but only correct for the CEC, which is the highest body in your political party, to be aware of it before it becomes public, correct?

[12664] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** That was why we called the meeting.

[12665] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. At this meeting, was the CEC aware that Ms Khan had already informed you, Mr Singh and Mr Faisal about the lie on 8 August?

[12666] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think that topic was not specifically discussed at the meeting on 29 October.

[12667] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, but my question is a different one. Was the CEC aware at this meeting, or any time prior to that, that Ms Khan had already informed you, Mr Singh and Mr Faisal about the lie on 8 August?

[12668] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** The date of 8 August was not mentioned. But I believe that it would have stood to logic that if we’re calling the CEC meeting for this, then we would have known about it earlier. Exactly when, I don’t think they knew.

[12669] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, it’s possible that they would have been aware or they would have thought that you would have been aware shortly before the meeting was called?

[12670] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don’t know what they thought but it’s possible.

[12671] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, the fact that three members of the Workers’ Party – and I think, for short, I’ll just say the senior leadership, referring to yourself, Mr Singh and Mr Faisal – the fact that the senior leadership was aware of the lie a few days after it was told in Parliament by Ms Khan, was not something that, as far as you know, the CEC was aware of on 29 October, correct?

[12672] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I cannot recall what they knew. But at the meeting on 29 October, the date of 8 August was not mentioned.

[12673] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, certainly, as far as speaking for yourself, you did not tell anyone on the CEC that you were aware of the lie on 8 August, correct?

[12674] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** At the meeting itself?

[12675] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At the meeting or anywhere else.

[12676] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I did not say, yes, when I knew.

[12677] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. Thank you. The statement was then made in Parliament on 1 November, the following Monday, I think it was, right? And on Tuesday, 2 November, the Workers' Party CEC set up a Disciplinary Panel, correct?

[12678] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12679] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** As of the date on which the DP – again, I'll call it the DP, for short – was set up by the CEC. The CEC was also not aware at that time that the senior leadership of the Workers' Party had already been aware of the falsehood by 8 August, correct?

[12680] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** The CEC, I think, the members were not aware of when we came to the knowledge, yes. So, 8 August, I think they may not have known it, yes.

[12681] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Sorry, the Chairman is asking whether I want to take a break.

[12682] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I know.

[12683] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Well, maybe I'll ask you, Ms Lim. Would you like to take a break, Ms Lim?

[12684] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** It depends on how long more we have to go on for.

[12685] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think I'll be about 10 to 15 minutes, and then I don't know about my colleagues. So, I am in your hands. So, if you'd like to take a break —

[12686] **The Chairman:** Why not you carry on with the 10 to 15 minutes, and then we take a short break?

[12687] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Is that okay, Ms Lim?

[12688] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Sure, yes.

[12689] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Let's check where I was.

[12690] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Disciplinary Panel.

[12691] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, and I think you said, “the CEC was not aware when we came to 8 August. I think they may not have known.” Okay. Amongst the steps taken by the DP, of which you were a member —

[12692] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12693] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — was an invitation to Workers’ Party members to make submissions and to offer their views to the DP on this matter, correct? “The matter” meaning the lie in Parliament by Ms Khan.

[12694] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, we sought their views. It’s just part of also including Party members in this process.

[12695] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, I understand. But in that context, would you not agree that the fact that Ms Khan had told the senior leadership of the Workers’ Party about the lie as early as 8 August, which is about almost three months prior to the set-up of the DP, would that fact not be relevant to be disclosed to members of the Workers’ Party who are being invited to offer their views?

[12696] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I didn’t see the relevance of that, actually.

[12697] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Because as a lawyer – both of us are lawyers – we would appreciate that one of the usual mitigating circumstances that come up would be the extent to which how early and whether an accused person admits to guilt, correct?

[12698] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes. But if you look at the letter that we wrote to Ms Khan about the proceedings that we were engaging in, and I believe that you would probably have seen the letter.

[12699] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.

[12700] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I sent it to her, I think, on 2 November. May I have it as well?

[12701] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It is in the records there, but I forget the Committee of Privileges reference number. Can you help me as well? I think it’s in one of Ms Khan’s submissions, if I remember. Ms Lim, do you have it?

[12702] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, I have my email to her.

[12703] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you’re referring to that?

[12704] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, yes.

[12705] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.

[12706] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** So, I wrote to her on 2 November formally to inform her of the Disciplinary Panel set-up and what we were looking into. And it was explained to her – I don’t know whether you all have the email.

[12707] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, I have the email.

[12708] Ms Sylvia Lim: Okay. So, it was explained to her that what we were inquiring into were the untruths, okay? So, the untruths told on 3 August and also the fact that she repeated the claim on 4 October. So, that was it. We were inquiring into the untruths told by her in Parliament on 3 August and 4 October which she subsequently clarified on 1 November.

[12709] We told her that this is what the committee is looking into. And, at the same time, this is actually constituted under Article 20 of our Party constitution, which is the article which allows the Party CEC to take action against members who have acted contrary to the principles of the Party or prejudicial to the welfare of the Party. So, she was put on notice that this was a proceeding that may lead to disciplinary action in accordance with that particular article.

[12710] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Yes.

[12711] Ms Sylvia Lim: Right? She was invited to provide an explanation in writing as to why this incident happened and, if there is any supporting evidence to corroborate what she said on 1 November, which was the clarification statement, then she should provide them.

[12712] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Okay.

[12713] Ms Sylvia Lim: So, the DP was looking into the untruths, and that's it.

[12714] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: I appreciate the email that was sent to Ms Khan and I think she would have understood it in the way that you've just outlined. But this is to Ms Khan directly.

[12715] Ms Sylvia Lim: Yes.

[12716] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: The question I had was somewhat different. You were also on — and we have heard evidence that — on 10 November, a WhatsApp or a text message blast was sent to all members of the Workers' Party, inviting them to make comments and offer their views. And the views, as I have said earlier, included what the appropriate sanction would be for the DP to consider recommending to the CEC. A range of —

[12717] Ms Sylvia Lim: Yes, I would say —

[12718] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Let me finish this. A range of whether she should be expelled or whether she should be retained as an MP. So, it is in this context that I'm saying that the information about Ms Khan's coming to the senior leadership of the Workers' Party to admit her guilt and to say that this was a lie and falsehood in Parliament, would that not be relevant to the gravamen and level of culpability of her conduct? And I'm putting to you that, in this context, it is relevant because you are asking members to make a recommendation to you, as a DP, for you to decide what to do with her, what punishment is appropriate for her. So, it is in that context.

[12719] Ms Sylvia Lim: So, as I mentioned, the DP was focusing on looking at the untruths that were told, why were the untruths told, and why is it that it was repeated and, in the end, clarified on 1 November. So, this was what the DP was looking at. Our SMS blast to the members was, basically, a feedback gathering exercise. I mean, look, we're not bound by what the members tell us and the members, in the main, their focus was whether it's okay for an MP to lie in Parliament or not. That was the focus of their feedback to us.

[12720] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I know, but they also gave you a recommendation as to whether they felt you should expel or retain her.

[12721] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I mean we took that on board. But, as I have said, in any case, the DP is not a decision-making body. The DP recommends to the CEC and the CEC can decide otherwise as well, contrary to what the DP recommends.

[12722] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand.

[12723] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12724] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But, well, two points. First, on the side of the members, them not knowing that Ms Khan had, in fact, told the senior leadership of the Workers' Party about the lie very early on, that would have an impact on whether they assess her to be more culpable or less culpable, right? And, hence, leading to your view as to whether they think the DP should expel her or retain her as an MP. Would that not be a fair assumption?

[12725] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** As I mentioned earlier, as in our letter to her, we were focused on the fact of how the untruth came to be told in Parliament in the first place, and the fact that she had repeated it two months later and clarified it subsequently that it was untrue. So, that was our focus and our SMS to the members was, basically, to get their sense of what is expected, what do they think is expected of a Workers' Party MP. I mean, that was the gist of it. And as I have mentioned, we would still need to make our own recommendations to the CEC and the CEC could decide one way or the other. They don't have to accept our recommendations.

[12726] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. But at this point in time, that means by the time you made the recommendations eventually to the CEC, which I believe was on 30 November, correct?

[12727] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12728] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** As of this date, the CEC was also not aware that Ms Khan had come to the senior leadership of the Workers' Party by 8 August to explain that she had told a lie in Parliament, correct?

[12729] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** If I recall the CEC meeting correctly, Pritam did address the CEC and inform them that we had known for some time. But I cannot recall distinctly the words that he used. But it was told to the CEC at the meeting.

[12730] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I see. Well, that's a little different from what Mr Singh told us.

[12731] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I see.

[12732] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And also a bit different from what Mr Faisal told us. But we'll leave it. Perhaps, we'll compare the evidence.

[12733] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12734] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The point is at the time the CEC appointed the three of you as members of the DP, which I think was done on 2 November itself, just before you sent out a press release, I believe?

[12735] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** 2 November, yes.

[12736] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At that stage, certainly, the CEC was not aware that the three of you were already privy to the information from Ms Khan from as early as 8 August, correct?

[12737] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I believe the CEC was not aware, yes.

[12738] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, thank you. In this case, would you not agree that the people on the DP include the very people whom Ms Khan has said to her she should continue the lie that she started in August in Parliament.

[12739] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I beg your pardon, again?

[12740] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me repeat the question. I said that in this case would you not agree that the people on the DP include the very people who Ms Khan had said, said to her should continue the lie she started in Parliament in August.

[12741] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** You mean the evidence she gave before the Committee of Privileges, you mean?

[12742] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Both the evidence that she gave before the Committee of Privileges as well as in other occasions in which she said that she was told to continue the lie.

[12743] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** We never said any such thing to her, so I don't accept the premise of your question.

[12744] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you would agree that if she is right, then the DP would comprise people who she says told her to continue the lie.

[12745] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** That's a hypothetical. I don't agree with that.

[12746] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You're not answering that? I asked you earlier whether you were aware of what Mr Singh had been doing. Your evidence was, you left it to him, you did not know what steps he was taking with her.

[12747] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** August, September.

[12748] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** August, September, culminating in the October period.

[12749] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12750] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the first time back discussing this issue with anybody was after she made this speech on 4 October, correct?

- [12751] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** The first time that I spoke to anyone?
- [12752] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, that's right.
- [12753] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.
- [12754] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you would therefore not be aware of what Mr Singh told her precisely to do or not to do, correct?
- [12755] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I was not present.
- [12756] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you were therefore not aware what Mr Singh might have told her directly or indirectly, correct?
- [12757] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** You mean what? On 3 October or when?
- [12758] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You would not have been aware as of 4 October what Mr Singh was saying to Ms Khan prior to 4 October, correct?
- [12759] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Including 3 October or what?
- [12760] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me perhaps explain this and break it down for you. You said earlier that you spoke to no one about the lie or falsehood, spoke to no one verbally, in writing, anything, throughout August and September, right?
- [12761] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, I believe I said that, yes.
- [12762] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you also told us at the 3 October meeting you did not know on 3 October?
- [12763] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.
- [12764] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The first time you came into contact with any issue concerning the lie was in Parliament itself on 4 October when you heard her repeat the lie, right?
- [12765] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.
- [12766] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thereafter you had a conversation with Ms Khan at around 2.00 pm.
- [12767] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Or 3.00 pm.
- [12768] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 3.00 pm and later that day with Mr Singh at about 11.15 pm, right?
- [12769] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** We spoke on 4 October, yes.

[12770] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At no time prior to her making the speech on 4 October would you have been aware of what guidance Mr Singh gave to Ms Khan, what he said to Ms Khan, what he may not have said to Ms Khan, correct?

[12771] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I was not present, yes, at those, whatever he discussed with her, yes.

[12772] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It stands to reason you wouldn't have known what he may have discussed with her?

[12773] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I can't attest to it, in that sense.

[12774] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I heard you say earlier that you would not even fathom that he told her to lie.

[12775] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12776] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I heard your evidence clearly on this. But the point I'm making to you is that, actually you would not be aware of what Mr Singh may have said or may not have said to Ms Khan.

[12777] And given her evidence and given what she is now saying – at least to the Committee of Privileges – and I don't know if she'd made this point to you earlier, but at least to the Committee of Privileges, would you not agree that the DP all the more so, should not be in a position to discuss or to decide on these very issues? Because she is suggesting, at least now, that at least one or more members of the DP had told her to continue with the lie that she started in August. Do you agree?

[12778] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** As far as I know she had never —

[12779] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** First of all, sorry to interrupt, did you understand my question?

[12780] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** No, I think it is important to explain this. Chairman —

[12781] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you understand my question?

[12782] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** It's very long.

[12783] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I just want to make sure you understand and then you please explain.

[12784] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** As far as I know, she had never asserted that we had told her to maintain the lie or anyone had told her to maintain the lie, right up to the conclusion of the DP proceedings. In that sense, I can't answer your question because it assumes something that I don't think is correct.

[12785] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Now that you know that that's what she has said under oath at least to us —

[12786] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I mean belatedly, right? I suppose.

[12787] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Fair enough. I don't know if she said it earlier but I know that she did say it to the Committee of Privileges. Now that you know this, would you accept that, if she is right, this might mean that the members of the DP should not be deciding and judging whether or not she was acting consistently with what she was advised to do, allegedly by senior leadership of the Workers' Party, or whether she was working on her own. Would you agree?

[12788] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Chairman, I think this question is not right because it is a hypothetical and all this while, we had no knowledge that she was going to make this allegation against any member of the DP, so it is a hypothetical which I think is not right for me to answer.

[12789] **The Chairman:** The point that you're making, I understand, that you were not aware of this until, I guess, what has been presented to the Committee of Privileges. But for the Committee of Privileges —

[12790] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** She never raised this in any of her submissions, nothing.

[12791] **The Chairman:** I understand. So, from the Committee of Privileges' perspective, we are trying to determine what exactly happened.

[12792] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Right.

[12793] **The Chairman:** So, we have a version that has been shared by Ms Khan and the Committee of Privileges which stated that she was told to continue on with the lie which you disagree with, as well as the other members have disagreed. That's one perspective. The other perspective is one that you shared that no such directions were given.

[12794] We are trying to ascertain as to how these two possible lines developed and all the associated activities. What Minister Tong is asking is, with regards to the composition of the Disciplinary Panel is that, if this version as Ms Khan has shared, that she was told to continue the lie by one or more of the members who now comprise the Disciplinary Panel, now with knowing this as a possible scenario, would you agree that there is a conflict that the same three persons would be on the Disciplinary Panel? I know that you disagree with that as being the truth, but if that allegation is valid, would that also suggest therefore the composition of the Disciplinary Panel, there's an issue with that?

[12795] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** So, Chairman, I still feel that this is a hypothetical put to me because it was never raised.

[12796] **The Chairman:** It was never raised to you.

[12797] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, I don't recall any.

[12798] **The Chairman:** We're not asking —

[12799] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, so if you're going to —

[12800] **The Chairman:** We're asking as of now, as one of the allegations made, would it be fair to say that there would be an issue with the composition of the Disciplinary Panel?

[12801] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** If the matter had —

[12802] **The Chairman:** If indeed what she claimed was true, would that be an issue?

[12803] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** If she had raised this matter earlier, then perhaps the composition could be different. But this was never the case and it is a belated allegation so we don't see any issue with the composition of the Disciplinary Panel at that point in time.

[12804] **The Chairman:** In hindsight, now looking that if indeed that allegation was true, would that be an issue, the composition of the panel? If.

[12805] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Chairman, it is still a hypothetical. I'm asked to assume something that —

[12806] **The Chairman:** I understand.

[12807] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** It's not — I don't think I want to answer this question.

[12808] **The Chairman:** Because from your perspective, this allegation that this Ms Khan has made is not true.

[12809] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12810] **The Chairman:** Right? But what if? And we're trying to determine who is telling truth, which line makes sense. One perspective is that she was told to carry on with this lie. From your perspective that was not said at all.

[12811] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** No.

[12812] **The Chairman:** So, we have to determine the series of events that flowed from that and what seems to make sense. So, if indeed, that what she said was true. If indeed, let's suppose if that's true, would that therefore mean that the composition of the Disciplinary Panel, there's an issue with that, which is really the question at hand.

[12813] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Chairman, I think if she had raised this issue earlier on we may have dealt with it at that point in time. But the fact is that we did not see any such issue.

[12814] **The Chairman:** I understand.

[12815] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** And the issue was never raised. So, that's how events unfolded.

[12816] **The Chairman:** So, that's your version. But what I'm saying is that if she had been told that and she had continued along that position, then would the same composition of the Disciplinary Panel be an issue? If assuming that's true.

[12817] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Chairman, if at any time she had taken objection to the composition of the Disciplinary Panel, the CEC would have to assess the nature of the complaint and whether there was any reason to change the composition. But the fact is that —

[12818] **The Chairman:** Understand.

[12819] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** — this was never an issue.

[12820] **The Chairman:** I understand. So, this is not the question at hand. The question is —

[12821] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think it is not right for me to answer this question because then —

[12822] **The Chairman:** The question is, would you think it is an issue, if indeed what she claimed was true.

[12823] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** If she raised it earlier, the CEC would have looked at it. That's my answer.

[12824] **The Chairman:** Okay, Minister Tong.

[12825] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you, Mr Chairman. I'll leave that point and maybe put it in another way to you. Regardless of whether Ms Khan is right in making the point that one or more of the members of the DP had told her to continue with the lie, would you not agree that the broader issue, the larger issue, is that all of you on the DP, the senior leadership, knew about Ms Khan's lie in Parliament some three months before it came out in the open on 1 November? Would you not agree that the CEC, the members of the Workers' Party and the public would be entitled to know this so that they can come to a fully informed, unbiased view particularly the membership of the Workers' Party as well as the CEC who are involved in several decision points in this process?

[12826] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think the consideration of the CEC at that point in time about the composition of the Disciplinary Panel, and I speak for myself but I believe I'm not alone in this, is that, first of all, this issue concerns a sitting MP. And secondly, because it concerns a sitting MP, it makes sense for the most senior officials to be the ones in the Disciplinary Panel to make appropriate recommendations to the CEC on what to do. The choice of Secretary-General, Chair and Vice Chair, it was proposed by the Secretary-General and all of us did not see any issue with it because it just stood to reason that the most senior people needed to look into this matter.

[12827] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It didn't occur to you or cross your mind that it would be relevant to disclose the fact that even if you were the most senior and most appropriate, which, on that score, I have no reason to disagree, but these are the same people who knew of the matter, some three months prior to it coming out in the open in Parliament. Would you not think that that's a relevant fact to disclose to the public, to members of the Workers' Party and indeed to the CEC?

[12828] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** That was not the primary consideration on our minds at the time.

[12829] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. I would like to show you the WhatsApp message that Ms Khan had sent after the 8 August meeting. You may already be aware of it says but I'd like to show it to you. It is found in Ms Loh's submission on 2 December. [*A message was referred to.*]

[12830] It is a series of screenshots, Ms Lim. If you can please turn to the second page of this bundle. On the bottom of that page, you'll see a screenshot which is titled 8 August, right?

[12831] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12832] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** These words were put in by Ms Loh, 8 August, Raeesah Khan updates that she told a few Party leaders.

[12833] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Mm-hmm.

[12834] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'll read this message to you. It is from Raeesah Khan, dated 8 August, the time is 12.41 pm. For context, this is sent on a group chat where the other members of the group would be Mr Nathan and Ms Loh, okay?

[12835] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Alright.

[12836] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She says [*A message was referred to, with the following text.*]

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 have 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.

[12837] Can I just get your reaction to this statement? I know you didn't see it at the material time and certainly not at the time it was sent contemporaneously. But now you've seen it, this was a message that was sent by Ms Khan shortly after she finished a meeting with you and Mr Singh and Mr Faisal on 8 August. Can you give me a reaction to the contents of this message?

[12838] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I'm not sure what she's referring to when she says they've agreed that the best thing to do is to take the information to the grave.

[12839] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She gave evidence that this means that the lie that she told in Parliament on 3 August, the consensus between the three of you at the meeting of 8 August was that if she was not to be pressed on this matter again, in other words, if this matter didn't come up again, then the best thing to do is to continue with the narrative that she told in August, which means to continue with the lie.

[12840] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** That's not true.

[12841] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That the evidence that she gave.

[12842] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** That's not true.

[12843] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Okay. It's not true because on your account, there was a confession by her on 8 August and there was no response from the three of you?

[12844] Ms Sylvia Lim: We did not talk about the next steps, yes.

[12845] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Your position is that this is not true because you simply did not address the next steps at all, correct?

[12846] Ms Sylvia Lim: Nothing was told to her to suppress anything, I mean, it's not correct.

[12847] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: There was also nothing told to her to come to Parliament to clarify the truth, right?

[12848] Ms Sylvia Lim: On 8 August, as I mentioned earlier, because of her emotional condition and the fact that she had kept her past away from her parents, those were the immediate things that we were addressing.

[12849] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Okay. I understand. The reason I'm asking these questions and I also put some, what you call, hypothetical questions to you earlier is really because of this and I wanted to explain this to you.

[12850] Ms Khan has come and given evidence that she's close to Mr Nathan and Ms Loh. And, in fact, as I have you shown you, they have a group chat amongst each other. They talked about the events pertaining to the falsehood in Parliament a lot and all three of them have come to this Committee to give evidence. And from what we see of the group chat that they have, what they discussed with each other, what they tell each other, corroborate contemporaneously occurring events. Sometimes, it also corroborates events that you're involved in.

[12851] So, for example, on 25 November, Mr Nathan and Ms Loh came before the DP of which you are a member, to make certain submissions to you, including why don't you tell the public the timeline, who was involved and so on. So, there's a corroborative element to the messages that we're seeing. And I'm sharing this with you because I want to get your reaction to this.

[12852] On the other hand, on the side of the senior leadership of the Workers' Party, there is no communication in writing at least, with Ms Khan. While I understand that and I also understand why on 8 August, you refrained from addressing the issue head on with Ms Khan, what I also want to understand is why it is that, even internally between the three of you, there's also not one message or one email or something in writing which speaks to what the three of you would want to do or have decided to do to address the problem. You understand what I'm getting to? And I'm trying to understand why that is so and whether or not, you're able to offer us some explanation as to why there was no internal discussion between the three most senior leaders of the Workers' Party. And I say that because I understand your evidence and that of Mr Faisal and Mr Singh about the sensitivity with Ms Khan, about taking into account her well-being, all of which I think are good and I understand.

[12853] But the question is, in private, between the three of you where the emotional questions don't exist, why is it that there's no discussion between the three of you that speaks

to what you plan to do, what you want to do and what you intend for Ms Khan to do, which is to speak the truth?

[12854] Ms Sylvia Lim: So, I think we went through the earlier timelines, right? For myself, I became much more involved in the month of October. And during that period of time, it was a stage where we were organising in-person meetings to discuss this matter and decide what to do. So, that was how we communicated.

[12855] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: I mean, we went through this, I know. But now I'm asking you why. Why is there no correspondence between the three of you in writing that discusses your plans, when this might come up, maybe have some contingency or maybe Mr Singh updating you on when he has spoken with the family or when the family is aware and what might clear the decks for Parliament to then be told about with the lie. I'm just trying to understand why there isn't that contemporaneous internal correspondence between the three of you who are the senior leaders and who were aware of the lie from 8 August.

[12856] Ms Sylvia Lim: I think during the month of August, this is when the speech was made and, subsequently, what was told to us on 8 August. And then we go into the month of September when Raeesah was not well. So, as I have said, at that time, I left it to Mr Singh to manage for the reasons which I described earlier. And, therefore, it was just left in that way. And I didn't speak to him very much about this matter until October came along.

[12857] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Okay. Alright. Thank you. Mr Chairman, I have got no further questions.

[12858] The Chairman: We will take a break but maybe just a quick check for our Members. Any of you would like to ask questions: long, short? Yes, Ms Lim.

[12859] Ms Sylvia Lim: May I also produce some documents to the Committee after the break?

[12860] The Chairman: Yes, you may. Perhaps, let's take a break now. Shall we adjourn? It's 2.35 pm. Let's come back at —

[12861] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Sorry, Mr Chairman, can I just Ms Lim one question?

[12862] The Chairman: Yes, please.

[12863] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: You said that there are some documents you want to produce. Do they relate to the points we have just covered?

[12864] Ms Sylvia Lim: It's more to do with the DP actually. Because I believe that the Committee was interested to know about the work of the DP. And from what I understood, there were some suggestions that the DP was not doing the work that it was supposed to be doing. So, it's in relation to that.

[12865] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Okay. I know what you're talking about. There were some messages that were being sent by Ms Khan in the closed group with Ms Khan, Ms Loh and Mr Nathan, where they were recounting what she was asked and the suggestion there in

that group was that she was being asked questions which exceeded or did not fall within the scope of looking into the falsehood.

[12866] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Something like that, yes.

[12867] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, is it that you're referring to?

[12868] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Not just that.

[12869] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, maybe, you make those available to us so that we can decide whether we can ask —

[12870] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** So, perhaps I can do that after the break because I feel it's important for me to explain the context of the documents.

[12871] **The Chairman:** We can do that. We can get the staff to make copies and distribute later after the break. We will adjourn to 2.50 pm. Why don't we just round it up to 3.00 pm, so that you can have your lunch? I think we all need that. Thank you very much.

[12872] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you, Ms Lim.

(The meeting adjourned at 2.37 pm and resumed at 3.05 pm.)

[12873] **The Chairman:** Let's resume. Sergeant-at-arms, please invite the witness to come in. Thank you. Mr Dennis Tan.

[12874] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Good afternoon, Ms Lim.

[12875] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, good afternoon, Mr Tan.

[12876] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Just now before our short break, a question was put to you by Mr Tong about the WhatsApp message of 8 August, where Ms Raeesah Khan – just to jog your memory – sent a message in a group chat thread to her volunteers, Mr Yudhishtira Nathan and Ms Loh Pei Ying, and you were asked about a particular statement in this WhatsApp chat. Maybe we could place the WhatsApp chat in front of you? *[A message was referred to.]*

[12877] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, I have it.

[12878] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** It's at 12.41 pm on 8 August.

[12879] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12880] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** So, you would have seen that in the chat itself, the message itself, in the third sentence, she said that: "I told them what I told you guys and they've agreed and the best thing to do is to take the information to the grave." Okay?

[12881] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12882] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Ms Lim, I think it is quite public knowledge that you were an ex-Police officer?

[12883] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I suppose it is.

[12884] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** How many years did you serve in the Police Force?

[12885] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Not long. Three years.

[12886] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Sorry?

[12887] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** About three years.

[12888] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Three years. Thank you. Given that you're a former Police officer and knowing that Police do keep their records very carefully and, of course, we know that there will always be the presence of CCTV footage outside Police stations. In your view, do you think that agreeing to do something like taking the lie that Ms Khan said in Parliament on 3 August "to bring the information to the grave", as in her message, would be something plausible, as an ex-Police officer?

[12889] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I'm not sure what you're asking me, Mr Tan, actually. But we never told Ms Khan any such thing. What we know from the news, of course, is that after the statement was made on 3 August, that the Police were looking into the matter. So, I would assume that they would dig up all necessary evidence to try to confirm or disconfirm what was said.

[12890] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** My question is actually that, given that you were an ex-Police officer and you know our Singapore Police Force better than those of us who have not served in it, would it even be possible to hide such information for long, given that Police records —

[12891] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I suppose it is unlikely, it is unlikely, yes.

[12892] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Ms Lim, I would also like to ask you, in the course of dealing with Mr Khan, including in the couple of months between 3 August and to her eventual resignation, what is your knowledge of her mental state of mind or does she suffer from any mental condition, to your knowledge?

[12893] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Actually, I got to understand her much more, I felt, during the time when we were conducting the Disciplinary Panel (DP) work because we had to interact with her, both in dealing with her responses as well as two interviews that we conducted with her. And, as part of the Disciplinary Panel (DP) response, she submitted documents from a psychotherapist saying that she requires some therapy to stabilise herself. I need to look at the document to be very accurate in quoting that. So, may I see the document?

[12894] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Which document is this?

[12895] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Her reply to the Disciplinary Panel invitation for an explanation. Maybe this one. Yes. Okay. *[An email was referred to.]*

[12896] So, in one her submission, it was from a clinic. I'm not sure whether I should read it out actually because it is medical information, but it was mentioned that she has got certain symptoms of PTSD and that she is undergoing some therapy to try to overcome that. In the course of our interviews with her and perhaps I may refer to my notes.

[12897] **The Chairman:** Whose documents are these?

[12898] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** This one was actually the response by Ms Khan to the Disciplinary Panel which is submitted by email on 4 November. So, it is one of the attachments.

[12899] **The Chairman:** Okay.

[12900] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** So, it's her document in that sense, yes.

[12901] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Yes, Ms Lim, you were going to mention something?

[12902] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes. So, in the course of our work in the DP, besides her own tendering of, in that sense, medical documents to the effect that she may have some mental health issues, during the course of our interviews with her as well, we did find that it could be stress-related. I don't want to judge anything. But the fact is that, during our interviews with her, she was actually extremely fragile and emotional. And I think I did tender my typewritten notes to the staff to tender to the Committee during the break.

[12903] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Would you like to refer to your notes?

[12904] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes. Okay. If I can refer the Committee then to the first interview that we did with her on 8 November.

[12905] **The Chairman:** Are these your documents?

[12906] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** These are my typewritten notes.

[12907] **The Chairman:** Would you like it to submit it to me to take a look. Then, we can circulate it as well?

[12908] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Oh, I'm sorry. I forgot to do that. [*The notes were handed to the Chairman.*]

[12909] **The Chairman:** I think with regard to some of the mental health concerns, perhaps just exercise your judgement as to what needs to be shared or not, if possible.

[12910] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Sure. Okay. So, I will just try to stick to the facts as we observe them rather than any diagnosis or such matters. If I could refer the panel to my notes of the first interview we had with her on 8 November — Does the Committee have the notes?

[12911] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Chairman, may I just ask one question. Ms Lim, these were notes taken contemporaneously at the DP meeting itself?

[12912] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Those were my notes, yes.

[12913] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** They were handwritten and then subsequently transcribed?

[12914] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes. So, the handwritten ones, actually, I should tender to the Committee to compare.

[12915] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That's fine, but I wanted to know whether these were prepared contemporaneously at the DP.

[12916] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Contemporaneously. Yes.

[12917] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Thank you.

[12918] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** And I believe that the others may have submitted to you also their notes, I suppose so?

[12919] **The Chairman:** Yes, carry on.

[12920] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes. Okay. So, to answer the question of, I guess, thought processes, I'll just put it that way, the Committee started off on 8 November by asking her certain questions on how the untruth came to be in the speech in the first place. And it was put to her by Mr Singh that, actually, he had written on the draft that she needed to substantiate that paragraph. Her response was that she did not process the gravity of that and she thought that it was enough that she believed that the anecdote was true. And then she was subsequently asked what about the part about following the victim to the Police station, she said she did not process it properly.

[12921] And, of course, we started asking her why the draft was put up so late and so on and so forth, and we started to look into, in a sense, the root causes of why such an incident happened. Basically, she ignored or was not able to appreciate the Secretary-General's advice to her and continued with it anyway. So, to us, that was something of concern because how likely is that to happen in the future, if such a thing can happen this time?

[12922] And we also noted that she was saying, further down the page, that because of her age, she has imposter syndrome and that she will not speak unless she's very sure of something. So, we also noted from that that she was trying to attribute her actions to her age.

[12923] And then, over the page, we did ask her some questions about the fact that, since she says that she's has some psychological needs, that it was important for her to address those issues and to ask what she had been doing to address those issues. And we noted that the documents that she submitted to us were actually of a therapist that she had seen in October 2021. So, our question was what about the therapist that she saw prior to that. Why are they not producing reports and it is only this most recent one that's producing a report to say that she shows symptoms of PTSD?

[12924] Finally, we also tried to ask her why she feels she needs to stay on – and that will be on the last page of my typewritten notes. She says she can understand why some people think that she should resign but if she does not show that she can turn the matter around and contribute, there will be repercussions on her personally and also how people view minority women. So, that is her thinking.

[12925] If I can move on to the second interview that we did with her, which was on 29 November. First of all, throughout this interview, she was crying most of the time. I can imagine that she is under a lot of stress but this was the fact. She called for the meeting actually, the second meeting. So, she tried to talk about the work that she had been doing as an MP on the ground and so on. And if you look at the second page, the committee actually wanted to come back to the main issue and, therefore, that was why on the second page, we asked her, near the top, why was she bringing all this up. And she said that she had to build her confidence and so on.

[12926] After she had finished what she wanted to tell us, we then went into clarifications again to find out again more about the incident and what caused the incident on 3 August to happen. She was asked about the original draft that she put up of that speech which was, I think, two days before the Motion itself, that anecdote was not in the first draft. And then, her explanation was she was dissociated and she did not realise what she was doing and she had gone for therapy. So, that was worrying to us because what she was basically saying, as far as we could understand it, was that she was doing things without thinking about what she was doing.

[12927] Then, later on, when we went further down the page, on page 2, I asked the question whether she has ever accompanied any victims to the Police in Singapore. Because that part to me was not very clear because she had said she had not accompanied that victim that the anecdote was about, but I asked her whether she had accompanied any victims to the Police in Singapore and her answer was: "I didn't go with them inside, but I dropped them off", and then, "they were my friends." And then, she went on to say: "but this didn't happen in Singapore but I've done it in Australia." So, we were trying to grapple with, really, what was the truth; as far as this whole episode was concerned, we were very unclear.

[12928] The other issue which cropped up during this second interview to me was that she appeared to not be very careful about the things that she was doing in general. For example, she had apparently among her team mates, talked about the fact that she should not leave the team because if she left, there would be a by-election triggered. And I asked her how she came to that conclusion. She said she was informed by someone that this was the case. I asked her whether she had checked and she said she had checked and her checking revealed that the Prime Minister can decide whether a vacancy in a GRC would trigger a by-election. We all know the law on this is quite clear. This also raised alarm bells with me because, I mean, I think as an MP, we would be expected to check such a thing before perhaps believing what people tell you or at least do your research. So, this was another area of concern; I wasn't sure of her ability to actually exercise due diligence to check matters and so on.

[12929] So, she continued. Subsequently, the part that follows is actually questions about whether she had wanted to resign as an MP or to resign as a CEC member earlier on. Initially, she said that she had not told anyone that but later on upon further questioning, it emerged that she agreed that she had actually drafted some messages earlier on intending to, wanting to resign for one reason or another.

[12930] This was another cause of concern. Mr Singh highlighted to her that she had messaged him on 4 August to ask whether she has a future in the Party. So, in that sense, in terms of emotional stability, we felt that there were causes for concern on our side.

[12931] Finally, towards the end of the interview, pages 5 and 6, I just touched base very briefly with her on whether at that time, the Committee of Privileges had contacted her and whether she was making any preparations for the Committee. So, she said that the Committee had not contacted her at that point, which was 29 November, had not contacted her at that point but she was preparing for the Committee of Privileges, her lawyer was going through the matter with her.

[12932] And last of all, from these notes, I'd like to also highlight on the last page, page 6, that, and this concerns the 3 October meeting, which I wasn't present at, between Mr Singh and her, and the question was put to her by Mr Singh as follows, it says: "Before the October session, I met you and I told you that it was your call. Did the need to tell the truth in Parliament occur to you?" And her response was: "Yes, but I was consumed with guilt in my own experience and I thought that it wouldn't come up." That's her response. She was consumed with guilt at her own experience and she thought that it wouldn't come up. And Mr Singh says to her: "You can't lie, right?" And then she says: "Yes."

[12933] As far as the 3 October meeting, I was not there but that was her response to the Disciplinary Panel when asked why she didn't tell the truth at the October Sitting. She said she was consumed with guilt in her own experience, that was what she narrated.

[12934] **The Chairman:** If I may ask just a quick question since you raised this.

[12935] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12936] **The Chairman:** In that last page, you mentioned regarding the conversation on 3 October. At the top of the page where Mr Pritam Singh said: "Before the October session, I met you and told you it was your call." So, meaning that it was really up to her to decide what to do.

[12937] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I don't know the context but he phrased it in this way.

[12938] **The Chairman:** From this, it would seem to be that it's really for her to decide, which is, I guess —

[12939] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** She has to decide, yes.

[12940] **The Chairman:** — I guess, if you follow from this, when he said that: "I will not judge you", is that, "You decide what you want to do, I will not judge you for that". Would that be a fair interpretation, as you see it? I know you were not there —

[12941] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I wasn't there.

[12942] **The Chairman:** I am saying that as from what he has recounted here, as you have recorded, and what we know now of what had been said specifically, this would be a reasonable interpretation of it?

[12943] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Chairman, I think it would be fair to put to her that, that line came from which witness, because there is differing —

[12944] **The Chairman:** Yes. That line came from Mr Pritam Singh himself who said: “to take ownership and responsibility, I will not judge you.” So, I’m just asking based on what Mr Pritam Singh has shared, and given what he said now here, would that be a reasonable interpretation, that it was really left for her to decide?

[12945] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Well, I mean, I don’t know what he said because I’ve put myself on a news block-out for the last few days. But in any case, it is recorded as it is recorded, yes.

[12946] **The Chairman:** Just to remind you, the specific line he said was: “to take ownership and responsibility and I will not judge you.” So, these few lines came out across clearly as what he conveyed.

[12947] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Okay.

[12948] **The Chairman:** And I’m just asking you, that based on what you’ve recounted here, it would suggest that the option was left to Ms Khan to decide what to do.

[12949] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I think it also has to be looked at in the whole context, because what we recorded here was that: “I told you it was your call, did the need to tell the truth in Parliament occur to you?” Then she says: “Yes, but I was consumed with guilt in my own experience and I thought it wouldn’t come up.” Of course, she’s not saying here: “You gave me a choice, so I made that choice.” She says: “I was consumed with guilt in my own experience and I thought it wouldn’t come up.” And he says: “But you can’t lie, right?” and she says: “Yes.” So, it has to be taken, I think, in totality to understand it. Like I said, I wasn’t there but this is what I recorded.

[12950] **The Chairman:** Mr Dennis Tan, please proceed.

[12951] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Thank you, Mr Chairman. Thank you, Ms Lim, for recounting what was shared to you by Ms Khan and your own understanding of her mental condition. I have one follow-up question on that.

[12952] You will recall that before the break that you dispute that Ms Khan’s statement to Ms Loh and Mr Nathan in her WhatsApp message on 8 August, that the three of you, namely, you, Mr Singh and Mr Faisal, agreed with her that they should take the information to the grave, right? Given your understanding of her mental condition, including dissociation, would you rule out that any of her mental conditions could have caused her to make this statement in her WhatsApp message?

[12953] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I can’t rule anything out, yes.

[12954] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Ms Lim, is there anything else you would like to tell the Committee?

[12955] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Just also to share one more document which I think the staff have provided, that the committee did follow up on the response that Ms Khan gave to us when we wrote to her on 2 November. On 4 November, she replied. She gave some attachments and we did follow up on one important piece of information, which was that she said, because we had asked her specifically about the women’s survivor group that she attended and whether she could give us any information about this group.

[12956] And our reason for asking that is, we wanted to ascertain whether what she had said was untrue, only with regard to the part of accompanying the victim to the Police or was it the case that the anecdote itself, her having heard it in a women's survivor group, was that part true or not? We wanted to verify that as far as we could. So, based on the reply that was sent to us, we did contact the person who was supposed to have been a key organiser of those groups.

[12957] And I spoke with this person on the phone on 6 November and I confirmed what she told me by email and the confirmation is this: that this person could confirm that she saw Ms Khan there at these sessions that were organised by this group. She saw Ms Khan there in 2018 and 2019. But the anecdote itself as to whether it was the case that the survivor shared that anecdote in the session, this lady was not able to confirm because she said that there were too many stories and too many sessions, and it happened some time ago so she was unable to confirm that part of it.

[12958] So, our conclusion from this is that, we should give her the benefit of the doubt because there is some verification at least that she attended these sessions. Of course, what is shared in the sessions is confidential, so our ability to check further on this point would come to an end.

[12959] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Thank you, Ms Lim.

[12960] **The Chairman:** Any other questions? Minister Tong.

[12961] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On the notes that you have provided, I would be grateful if Ms Lim could make available the actual contemporaneous handwritten ones.

[12962] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Sure, sure, that's fine.

[12963] **The Chairman:** Any other questions, anyone?

[12964] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Just one question. The notes that Ms Lim have taken us through, as you recorded it, do you recall that this is as close as possible the words used by the individuals whom you recorded the statements?

[12965] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** I tried my best to do it in a Q&A form.

[12966] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, I noticed that.

[12967] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes.

[12968] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, it seems to suggest that, as far as you can recount verbatim.

[12969] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** As far as possible, yes, as close as possible.

[12970] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you.

[12971] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Thank you. So, may I provide the original – I mean, the handwritten notes?

[12972] **The Chairman:** Yes, please. Thank you very much. If there are no other questions for now, we would like to thank you, Ms Lim, for coming before the Committee. Transcript of the proceedings will be shared with you for verification. So, do go through it and if you have any minor amendments, do make changes and send the transcript back to us.

[12973] Do note that the transcripts and any evidence given to the Committee are not to be disclosed to anyone or published, it must be kept strictly confidential until the Committee has presented the relevant Report to Parliament. You may withdraw from Parliament. I don't think we will be calling you back later today but should there be a need, we'll let you know.

[12974] Do also provide us with any documents corroborating some of the points you've made, conversations you may had with your fellow team members, anybody else with regards to the particular issue.

[12975] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Sure.

[12976] **The Chairman:** There being no other matters, our staff will accompany you out to the waiting room. Thank you very much.

[12977] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Thank you.

[12978] **The Chairman:** Serjeant-at-arms, please accompany the witness out.

[12979] **The Chairman:** Thank you.

(The witness withdrew.)

[12980] **The Chairman:** Shall we proceed with the next witness? Ready? Serjeant-at-arms, please invite the next witness, Assoc Prof Jamus Lim, to the witness table.

Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim was examined on affirmation.

[12981] **The Chairman:** Hi, Jamus, please take a seat.

[12982] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Thank you.

[12983] **The Chairman:** You can take off your mask. For the record, please state your name, your occupation and the positions you hold.

[12984] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** My name is Jamus Jerome Lim. I am an economist. I am an associate professor in a French business school, a Member of Parliament representing Sengkang GRC. The deputy head of the policy research team for the Workers' Party and a proud father of a two-year-old daughter.

[12985] **The Chairman:** The evidence you'll be giving today before the Committee will be taken on oath. If you so desire you can also take an affirmation. Clerk, please administer the oath.

(The witness made an affirmation.)

[12986] **The Chairman:** Please be seated. The Committee of Privileges is looking into the complaint made by the Leader of the House, Ms Indranee Rajah, against former Member of Sengkang GRC, Ms Raeesah Khan for breach of privilege. Thank you for attending today's hearing to give evidence before the Committee and answer the questions which Members of the Committee would like to put to you.

[12987] You have taken a solemn obligation to answer our questions truthfully if you refuse to answer our questions directly or attempt to mislead the Committee, such behaviour will be an offence and in contempt of this Committee. I will hand over to Minister Desmond Lee for questions.

[12988] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Good afternoon, Dr Lim. Maybe I'll just give you some background. You would be familiar that the Leader of the House had referred former Sengkang GRC Member, Ms Raeesah Khan, to the Committee of Privileges after her personal statement on 1 November this year.

[12989] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** That's right.

[12990] **Mr Desmond Lee:** You would recall that statement.

[12991] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** The statement?

[12992] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Yes, she made in Parliament.

[12993] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.

[12994] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And therefore, the remit of this Committee at to ascertain the following: first, the facts whether Ms Khan did or did not lie to Parliament on those two occasions, 3 August and 4 October this year.

[12995] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I understand.

[12996] **Mr Desmond Lee:** The second responsibility of the Committee of Privileges is to determine the level of responsibility assuming that she did indeed state untruths to Parliament; and in determining the level of culpability, we need to understand the circumstances: what happened? What was she motivated by? Did she speak to anyone? Did she get any advice? What were the aggravating or mitigating circumstances? And then we'll be in a better position to make a recommendation to Parliament.

[12997] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I understand.

[12998] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, we would welcome your assistance to the Committee to help us understand what had happened.

[12999] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I'm here to help.

[13000] **Mr Desmond Lee:** You were in Parliament when you heard the personal statement by Ms Khan on 1 November.

[13001] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** That's right.

[13002] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And that related to 3 August and 4 October statements she made regarding an anecdote about the Police and a sexual assault survivor that she had allegedly accompanied to a Police station and that turned out to be a false statement. Do you recall that?

[13003] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I recall, yes.

[13004] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Prior to the 1 November personal statement by Ms Khan, there was a CEC meeting by the Workers' Party on 29 October.

[13005] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I cannot remember the date but it was that Friday just before the statement, yes.

[13006] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And you were present?

[13007] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I was present, yes.

[13008] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Was that a usual CEC meeting day or was it specially called?

[13009] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** No, it was an extraordinary CEC meeting.

[13010] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Extraordinary meeting. And who called for it? If you recall.

[13011] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I cannot recall but my guess would generally be either the Organising Secretary, who would be Dennis, or it would have been Pritam or Sylvia, one of the two.

[13012] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Thank you. And at that extraordinary meeting, the Committee of Privileges is given to understand that Ms Khan had read out a draft of the statement that she was going to make on 1 November?

[13013] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** That's right.

[13014] **Mr Desmond Lee:** You heard her recite the draft orally?

[13015] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Correct, yes.

[13016] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Do you recall if any member gave any feedback, suggestions?

[13017] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** We discussed what she would say. In particular, she had shared – and that was the first time that I had heard it – that she was a sexual assault survivor. And there was some discussion among us about that. I cannot speak for the others but, for myself, I had felt that that was something that was important to state. I think, since then, others have shared online as well as elsewhere that it could sound like an excuse. I disagree with that. I recommended that she share that background, that context, because – I'm a professor of economics, I traffic in rationality – for me, what she shared was a little bit irrational in terms of why she lied, not what she shared, but why she chose to speak out an untruth in Parliament to back up the background. So, I thought it was important that she shared with the House her thinking, as – I hesitate to use the word "convoluted" – but it conflated incidents and, so, I felt that it was important that she shared that context.

[13018] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Thank you. So, you're saying that there were some suggestions that she not include her personal experience in her personal statement but, on the contrary, you felt it was necessary for her to state this? This was all on 29 October?

[13019] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** This was on 29 October. I wouldn't say that there were some suggestions but there was discussion about this part, why she chose to share this aspect. And my view was that it was important that she shared.

[13020] **Mr Desmond Lee:** What you said was said on 29 October itself, at the meeting?

[13021] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** At that meeting, I shared what I just shared with you.

[13022] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Okay, yes. Prior to this CEC extraordinary meeting on 29 October, were you aware when the meeting was called, what the meeting would be about?

[13023] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I vaguely knew it might be about Raeesah but I did not know the contents of that meeting. I didn't know what we were specifically going to discuss.

[13024] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, by 29 October, you would have known that Ms Khan had said untruths in Parliament in August and October?

[13025] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** That Friday, yes.

[13026] **Mr Desmond Lee:** That very day itself or prior to that?

[13027] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** No, that day itself.

[13028] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Prior to 29 October, you were not aware?

[13029] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I was not, unfortunately.

[13030] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Not aware that she had made falsehoods to Parliament?

[13031] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes, I was not aware.

[13032] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, the first time you found out was when she read out her statement and you realised she was, in fact, saying to you and the rest of the CEC present that she was actually confessing to a lie on 3 August and 4 October?

[13033] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** That's correct. So, prior to that, I believe she had shared with Parliament that she had lost contact with the person and that was public knowledge. And that was what I thought was the issue.

[13034] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Thank you. When did you, as a member of the CEC, receive a request for approval to form a Disciplinary Panel? Was it on 1 or 2 November, if you can recall? Or was it much earlier?

[13035] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I cannot recall. But I believe it occurred after that statement was made in Parliament.

[13036] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Okay. Maybe I'll just draw you to the document in front of you. Maybe the Assistant Clerk can help. Page 152, this is a WhatsApp exchange between Ms Raeesah Khan, Ms Loh Pei Ying and Mr Yudhishthra Nathan. [*A message was referred to.*] I'm not sure if you're acquainted with Ms Loh Pei Ying?

[13037] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes. I have heard of this, yes. Assuming that it is the same, I have not seen it quite yet.

[13038] **Mr Desmond Lee:** If you look at page 152. Is that before you?

[13039] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.

[13040] **Mr Desmond Lee:** You see, 2 November, 11.35 am, somewhere near the middle?

[13041] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I see it, yes.

[13042] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Ms Raeesah Khan, before that, she's basically telling Ms Loh Pei Ying, please don't share this message with anyone. So, it's: "Dear CEC, I seek your urgent approval to set up a Disciplinary Panel to look into the admissions made by MP Raeesah Khan in Parliament. The panel will comprise of Chair", which should be Ms Sylvia Lim, "myself", I presume this is Mr Pritam Singh, "and Vice Chair for your urgent consideration and approval." Was that what you received?

[13043] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I'm a little confused because I guess that was probably a forwarded message?

[13044] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Yes, a forwarded message.

[13045] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Of course, I cannot recall the precise wording, but it looks very similar to — It would have been consistent with what I thought I received, yes.

[13046] **Mr Desmond Lee:** You received the message roughly of this form and you replied to approve as part of the CEC?

[13047] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I believe that I would have replied to approve, yes.

[13048] **Mr Desmond Lee:** When you approved, you would know that the DP would comprise Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap?

[13049] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** It says so there, yes.

[13050] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Yes, "myself, Chair and Vice Chair".

[13051] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.

[13052] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Can I draw your attention to an email from Ms Sylvia Lim to Ms Raeesah Khan forming the Disciplinary Panel? This would be in the submission by Ms Khan dated 2 December and it's a Gmail. You have it in front of you? [*An email was referred to.*]

[13053] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I see it now, yes.

[13054] **Mr Desmond Lee:** It's a formal letter transmitted via email dated 2 November, 6.35 pm, by Ms Sylvia Lim to Ms Khan, copied to Mr Pritam Singh and Mr Faisal Manap. [*A letter was referred to.*]

[13055] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Okay.

[13056] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And if you look at the text: "As you are aware, CEC of Workers' Party has constituted a DP comprising the following persons to inquire into your recent conduct as a WP Member of Parliament. The specific episode to be inquired into is that you had conveyed untruths in the course of your Parliamentary speech on 3 August" and then it sets out the anecdote about the Police and the sexual assault survivor. "And you repeated this claim on 4 October when again asked in Parliament on the matter. However, it is not true" and it went on to set it out. "You told the House on 1 November that you had instead relayed what was shared by a survivor in a women's support group in 2018." So, basically, this letter telling Ms Khan that the two episodes are in relation to 3 August and 4 October.

[13057] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I understand.

[13058] **Mr Desmond Lee:** The next paragraph: "The DP is tasked to investigate this episode and recommend to the CEC whether there are grounds to take action against you for violation of Article 20." Okay?

[13059] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mm-hmm.

[13060] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, you would agree that this DP was set up to look into the facts involving those two episodes and then to make recommendations on appropriate action, yes?

[13061] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** To be clear, I did not receive this particular email. So, I'm reading the text for the first time. But it does seem consistent with the text we received, as the CEC, to form the Disciplinary Panel.

[13062] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, would that mean that the DP would then make findings and tell the CEC facts as to why Ms Khan lied, what were the surrounding circumstances, what would be aggravating or mitigating circumstances, and then put to the CEC some recommendation on appropriate next steps?

[13063] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** To be quite honest, as you all know, I'm a political rookie. So, I don't know what a disciplinary committee is meant to do. But my sense was that it would gather the facts, as you described, and it would make a recommendation to the CEC.

[13064] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, in essence, find out whether she did lie or not and then what is the level of culpability, whether it is a serious matter or is it mitigated by some circumstances, right?

[13065] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** It was to investigate the episode. As it says here, I don't know whether specifically in your words. I would rather go with the words here, which is that they were tasked to investigate the episode and recommend to the CEC subsequent actions.

[13066] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And as a member of the CEC appointing a Disciplinary Panel, you would assume that the panel looking into this matter would be disinterested from the episode and the surrounding circumstances, that means no personal interest, no involvement in the facts for which they're supposed to investigate. Would that be a fair assumption, no doubt, as a rookie member, as you've called yourself?

[13067] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I understand. I think that if there was anything material, I trust that the leadership would have shared that with us.

[13068] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Okay. We have been sitting for a number of days and hearing evidence from the senior leadership of the Workers' Party as well as Ms Khan herself, former Member of Parliament, as well as some Workers' Party cadre members who also came to testify before the Committee. And we have gathered some facts and claims from all the different witnesses and we are asked to consider the evidence.

[13069] When you gave your approval for the formation of this DP as a member of the CEC, did you know, at that point in time, that Ms Khan had already confessed that she had lied on 3 August to Mr Pritam Singh on 7 August?

[13070] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** No, I did not.

[13071] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Did you know, at that point in time, that Ms Khan had not only on 7 August confessed to Mr Singh, but on 8 August confessed to Mr Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap about her untruth on 3 August?

[13072] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** No, I did not.

[13073] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Do you recall that on 4 October, the Home Affairs Minister had, in a Ministerial Statement, asked Ms Khan to verify whether her anecdote was true or false and she repeated that it was true, do you recall that?

[13074] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** This was Minister Shanmugam?

[13075] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Shanmugam, yes.

[13076] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I believe I recall something of that. Again, I cannot recall the specificities.

[13077] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And the uncontested evidence by all the witnesses was that on 4 October, when Ms Khan repeated that falsehood in Parliament, there were three other people in Parliament who were aware that it was a repeated lie: Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and

Mr Faisal Manap. They sat in Parliament or they later came into Parliament on that day, found out about or heard what she had said, knew that it was untrue. Were you aware when you approved the CEC forming the DP that these facts were existing?

[13078] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** No, I did not. And, of course, contemporaneously, I did not know that this was the case.

[13079] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Thank you. Can I bring to your attention this WhatsApp exchange between Mr Pritam Singh and Ms Loh Pei Ying? This is from the bundle submitted by Mr Pritam Singh. [*Messages were referred to.*]

[13080] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Okay.

[13081] **Mr Desmond Lee:** It says “WhatsApp messages between Pei Ying and Pritam”.

[13082] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Thanks.

[13083] **Mr Desmond Lee:** It is a few pages of WhatsApp message reproductions.

[13084] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Would you like me to read through it myself?

[13085] **Mr Desmond Lee:** I’ll take you through and, as I go through, stop me if I’m going too quickly. The first page is from Ms Loh Pei Ying, whom you are familiar with, yes?

[13086] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes. I know her.

[13087] **Mr Desmond Lee:** You know her. She says: “Hi Pritam, I’ve tried to reserve my comments on the DP so far, I saw the message that was sent out to everyone.” I’ll stop you there. You see that first paragraph, the very first paragraph?

[13088] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** This was the copied picture or the —

[13089] **Mr Desmond Lee:** This one here. Is this the one that Dr Lim has?

[13090] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Sorry, did I not get the right page? Mine starts with a snapshot followed by: “Hi Pei Ying, how are you —”

[13091] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Sorry, I should have realised I jumped quite a few pages.

[13092] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Okay, so which page?

[13093] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Just a second. The fourth page.

[13094] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** It begins with “will Yudhish and I”?

[13095] **Mr Desmond Lee:** No, “Hi Pritam, I’ve tried to reserve my comments”. Wednesday, 10 November.

[13096] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes, okay, I’m at the page. At 16.33.

[13097] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Yes, correct. You see the first paragraph? “But I just saw the message that was just sent out to everyone.”

[13098] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mm-hm.

[13099] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And there was a message that the DP sent out to all Workers’ Party members. I presume you would also receive that message blast, asking for Workers’ Party to give their views about the incident involving Ms Raeesah Khan’s personal statement and confession.

[13100] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.

[13101] **Mr Desmond Lee:** You recall that message?

[13102] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I recall that message.

[13103] **Mr Desmond Lee:** That message was just a plain message asking for inputs.

[13104] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.

[13105] **Mr Desmond Lee:** There was no facts, no —

[13106] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** It was just, yes.

[13107] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And if you just read down, continue reading, “ I feel it’s as plain as day, people involved in apology, back peddling”. Then, the third paragraph is about she thinks it is not fair at all to let Party members think they have a say in this process, this is done as a mock consultation exercise, and Party members would be unhappy their opinions weren’t really considered —

[13108] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Okay.

[13109] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And if it was not a mock exercise, then they would likely all ask Raeesah to resign, when they do not have the full facts. You see it?

[13110] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.

[13111] **Mr Desmond Lee:** If you would turn over the page, Dr Lim. She goes on to tell the Secretary-General, “I welcome the DP to be transparent and share their involvement in this, their findings, barring personal information, so that the Party can actually make an accurate decision”. Yes?

[13112] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mm-hm.

[13113] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Then, Mr Singh replies, “I hear you, PY,” which is Pei Ying, “but I do think we need to give Party members a platform to have their say” and so on.

[13114] And then she replies, “I get that but the DP hasn’t exactly told the Party of its knowledge and involvement.” Okay?

- [13115] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mm-hm.
- [13116] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And there may be some differences of opinion, but in essence, this has got to do with —
- [13117] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes, I understand.
- [13118] **Mr Desmond Lee:** — what Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap knew prior to 1 November about what Ms Khan had done, essentially.
- [13119] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.
- [13120] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, you see that exchange —
- [13121] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I see that exchange.
- [13122] **Mr Desmond Lee:** — between the cadre and a member of the DP.
- [13123] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.
- [13124] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Can I now take you to the DP report submitted to the CEC. I believe you would have seen that on 30 November. This is the report of the Disciplinary Panel. *[A report was referred to.]*
- [13125] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.
- [13126] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And Mr Faisal Manap and I believe Mr Singh had also told this Committee that a report was submitted and it was also flashed on the screen in front of the CEC and the panel members brought you all through.
- [13127] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I recall this document.
- [13128] **Mr Desmond Lee:** You recall this document?
- [13129] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.
- [13130] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And if you see this document, the first page is the rules, the Party constitution, the Singapore Constitution. Look at the second page. It sets out the —
- [13131] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** — chronology of milestones.
- [13132] **Mr Desmond Lee:** — chronology of work, milestones. And then, at the bottom, you see that total turnout, members consultation. 24 members turned up, 10 emails were received, so, 34 representations, right?
- [13133] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mm-hm.
- [13134] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Opinions: leave the Workers' Party. Differences re mode of departure. I presume that means that 26 representations were for Ms Khan to leave —

[13135] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mm-hm.

[13136] **Mr Desmond Lee:** But how she should leave is a matter of difference.

[13137] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Okay.

[13138] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Stay as MP: 3. Non-committal: 5.

[13139] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mm-hm.

[13140] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And just over the next page you see the DP's assessment. Nature of misconduct. They're telling the CEC that she had knowingly asserted an untruth on three occasions, and down to the number of occasions they counted, set out the constitution of the Workers' Party about their responsibilities to be honest and frank with the Party and Singapore.

[13141] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mm-hm.

[13142] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And it goes on to say she has admitted that she told the untruth, viz that she did not accompany the victim to the Police station and so on and so forth. "While she has stood up to correct the error, her conduct is *prima facie* disciplinable as it is a breach of the Party constitution in an official national capacity". Do you see that?

[13143] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I see that.

[13144] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And then, it goes down with the range of punishments that the CEC can decide on. So, they're setting out what the CEC's powers are. And then it goes down, and I just draw your attention to two paragraphs that are significant. One would be "mitigating factors" and it was presented to you that they think there was no malice or sinister motive. And they say that "she made a public admission on 1 November to correct the record, and that she (likely) believed the survivor's account". So, that's mitigating. They feel that she had lied, yes, but there are some mitigating factors —

[13145] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.

[13146] **Mr Desmond Lee:** — that ameliorate her level of culpability.

[13147] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mm-hm.

[13148] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Then, it goes on to say "aggravating factors". What are the matters that may aggravate her level of responsibility: "First, it was a deliberate act, knowing it was false. Second, it was a belated insertion into a final version of her speech. Third, she had ignored or did not appreciate Secretary-General's advice to her on the need to substantiate that particular paragraph".

[13149] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I see it.

[13150] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And that was probably the start, when the draft was prepared. Do you see that?

[13151] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mm-hm. I see it.

[13152] **Mr Desmond Lee:** The DP had placed before the CEC for its consideration what are the factors that mitigate or aggravate her level of culpability. And then, they make a final recommendation and observation, as such: “she doesn’t appear to be stable”, “conduct shows sign of lack of due diligence”, “party would take a big gamble on its reputation if she were to continue in Parliament”. And lastly, the DP recommends that “she be asked to resign, failing which she would be expelled”. So, that is after weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances which they’ve laid —

[13153] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mm-hm.

[13154] **Mr Desmond Lee:** — I presume you would believe it was a full disclosure of all the factors and then made the recommendation to ask the CEC to consider asking Ms Khan to either resign, failing which the CEC should expel her from the Party, and in essence, cause her to step down as a Member of this Parliament.

[13155] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I see the recommendations as listed, yes.

[13156] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And so, can I just next draw you to an exchange between Ms Khan and your good self?

[13157] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.

[13158] **Mr Desmond Lee:** If I may present it to you. She had given this to the Committee of Privileges on 8 December: “WhatsApp messages with Mr Jamus Lim”. [*WhatsApp messages was referred to.*]

[13159] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.

[13160] **Mr Desmond Lee:** This is on 13 November.

[13161] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I see it.

[13162] **Mr Desmond Lee:** You recall this conversation with this conversation, this message?

[13163] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I do.

[13164] **Mr Desmond Lee:** She wanted to speak to all the Sengkang MPs to get their advice on what to do moving forward.

[13165] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mm-hm.

[13166] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And you reply on the same day, shortly after a message, that you are and I quote, “I’m for second chances. Moreover, I believe that being an MP was a decision by the electorate and hence, removal is not a decision that should be taken by the Party. All that said, the feedback I’ve received,” that means you’ve received, “both from within the Party and without has been overwhelmingly, about 90%, although feedback providers are always more polarised than the majority,” —

[13167] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** That's an academic qualification, yes.

[13168] **Mr Desmond Lee:** — “negative insofar as continuing in the role is concerned. So, the bottom line is that you need to reflect on not just what the implications of continuing would be, for not just yourself and the people of Sengkang, which seems to be mixed, but also the impact on the Party, especially in terms of morale among volunteers and the overall reputation of the Party.”

[13169] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.

[13170] **Mr Desmond Lee:** “In an ideal world, I'd like that we adopt a different, more compassionate approach to errors. Thus far, however, we seem to be living in a society that isn't such.” Can I draw your attention to the point you made about the feedback that you received from within the Party and outside and you say it has been “overwhelmingly negative”.

[13171] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.

[13172] **Mr Desmond Lee:** The public or the people who gave you feedback as well as the people who gave feedback to the DP, the number of people who made representations in the DP's report.

[13173] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I do not know who spoke with the DP.

[13174] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Basically, those people would, like you, not be apprised of the fact that she had confessed to lying in Parliament to senior leadership a few days after her first lie. They and you would not be aware.

[13175] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** We would not have been aware but as I shared, I had trusted the Party leadership that if that was relevant, if that was material, they would have shared that with us.

[13176] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, when the DP report was presented on 30 November to you and the rest of the CEC by the DP, barring what was given to you in this report, you would not be in command of any other facts, am I right?

[13177] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** No, that's not correct. Of course, as I shared here — may I elaborate?

[13178] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Yes.

[13179] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** As I shared here, when I spoke — So, I'm, of course, a member of the GRC team, so it is important that I understand in my role the sentiment of our volunteers, the various professional staff that work for us, my sense of ground feedback from the voters. And so, when the DP report was presented, it was part of an evidence base that I had independently been building myself, as I shared here. When I said the feedback I've received and, I cannot recall, but I would be pretty sure that this predates the disciplinary committee.

[13180] **Mr Desmond Lee:** This is 13 November.

[13181] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes, this predates the CEC meeting —

[13182] **Mr Desmond Lee:** By two weeks, thereabouts.

[13183] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** And that's why I was able to say that I have received broader feedback than just what was presented during the CEC meeting.

[13184] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Thank you. But on 30 November — You said on 2 November when DP was formed and you gave your approval as CEC member to form the DP, you were not aware: one, that Ms Khan had confessed to Mr Singh on 7 August that she'd lied; and two, that she had confessed to Chairman, Vice Chairman and Secretary-General on 8 August she'd lied; and on 4 October when she had repeated her untruth, that the three senior Workers' Party leaders in Parliament knew that she had lied. You were not aware of that on 2 November and you were not aware of that on 30 November.

[13185] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** 30 November?

[13186] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Which is the DP report to the CEC. So, when you were receiving —

[13187] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes, that is correct.

[13188] **Mr Desmond Lee:** — the DP report, they presented to you, you were not aware of those set of facts.

[13189] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I was not. As I explained earlier on, when I sought feedback, I sought it not on the basis of whether – of course, I wouldn't have known that, as I said, the leadership was aware of this set of circumstances – but I sought feedback on the basis of what had occurred in the first instance, including the additional instances, but especially the first instance, which is when she had first told the untruth to Parliament. And the feedback I received was that, there was overwhelmingly no way that they would be comfortable with working with someone that had lied. And, of course, I did not ask them whether the fact that she repeated it mattered. I think it was, and I think this is for any layman, it would be something along the lines of the fact that she is willing to lie on the record even once in Parliament was sufficient to disqualify her as an honest representative. And the negative feedback I received was on that basis, that they did not believe that they could work with someone that had made false representations.

[13190] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, they looked just purely at the instances of lying in Parliament on those two dates.

[13191] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Again, I didn't ask them whether it was the first time or the second time or the fact that they were repeated, but it was that they felt that she was not trustworthy.

[13192] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, in your mind, as a member of the CEC, what you knew were as follows, right? That Ms Khan had told an untruth in Parliament on 3 August, and she had told another untruth on 4 October, and it took her almost a month, 1 November, before she came to Parliament to come clean. So, those would be about the only facts that you had to work on.

[13193] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Which is more or less what the public knew. I suppose I did know a few days before her statement in Parliament that she was going to make it but beyond that, I learned of various facts as they were presented, only when it became public.

[13194] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Yes. So, the very fact that the DP sought to set out aggravating and mitigating circumstances – and while you say you’re new to the CEC, new to the Party – but looking at how they approached things, they’re trying to tell the CEC these are the factors that mitigate her responsibility and these are the factors that make it seem a bit worse, make it worse, higher level of culpability, and let’s weigh what the right decision should be.

[13195] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Again, I cannot speak for the rest of the CEC, but for myself, what was listed here as mitigating and aggravating factors were part of the entire body of evidence, including what I described when I spoke to other people, with which I made my final decision.

[13196] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Okay. So, let me now set out what appears to be two sets of factual assertions that had been made by different witnesses before this panel, before this Committee.

[13197] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Okay.

[13198] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And I broadly summarise them as Ms Khan’s evidence and broadly as Mr Singh’s evidence. Both have a common position: both say that Ms Khan had confessed to Mr Singh on 7 August that she had lied and that again on 8 August to the three senior leaders of the Party, Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal Manap; she had again repeated and came clean and confessed that she had lied and gave more reasons. So, that is undisputed more or less, yes?

[13199] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mm-hm.

[13200] **Mr Desmond Lee:** And then here’s where the evidence diverges. Ms Khan’s evidence is that on 8 August, when she confessed that she’d lied in Parliament, her takeaway from the meeting with the senior leaders was that she was told to take this lie to the grave. And that’s what she’s told this Committee, and that a day before 4 October Sitting, Mr Singh had visited her and told her she could continue the lie or narrative if not pressed. He would not judge her. That is what she’s telling the Committee, right?

[13201] But Mr Singh’s evidence before the Committee is as such. And I really summarise and —

[13202] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I understand.

[13203] **Mr Desmond Lee:** — I don’t do justice by summarising. But just to give you a broad view.

[13204] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I have some familiarity, so that’s fine.

[13205] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, Mr Singh told this Committee that on 8 August, he had told Ms Khan that “We will deal with the issue, but go tell your parents”, “please inform your parents”. And that was on 8 August. On 3 October, a day before the Parliament Sitting on 4

October, he felt that this issue may arise the next day in Parliament, and he told her to “take responsibility and ownership” of the issue. He will not judge her. In his view, that meant that she had to come clean on 4 October with what she had said in August.

[13206] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I understand.

[13207] **Mr Desmond Lee:** That’s where the two narratives —

[13208] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** The narratives diverge.

[13209] **Mr Desmond Lee:** — diverge quite significantly and are in stark contrast with each other. So, let’s just take Mr Singh’s evidence; put Ms Khan’s one aside for the time being.

[13210] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** That’s fine.

[13211] **Mr Desmond Lee:** That Ms Khan had lied on 3 August but had confessed to senior leaders on both 7 and 8 August, a few days later, right?

[13212] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.

[13213] **Mr Desmond Lee:** As compared to what you had known at the 30 November CEC meeting and before, which is basically she lied, she lied and then she confessed, right? August, October, November.

[13214] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.

[13215] **Mr Desmond Lee:** There’s this evidence by Mr Singh that actually, Ms Khan had confessed on 7 and 8 August, and come clean, would that be a relevant fact in this episode? Relevant. Relevant fact. I’m not talking about aggravating, mitigating. Is it relevant that you lied but you confessed a few days later?

[13216] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** As I explained earlier on, what is material, of course, is potentially subject to some degree of independent interpretation. But I think without additional information on context, it is not possible to assert whether it is material or not, definitively.

[13217] **Mr Desmond Lee:** I’m not talking about material. I’m talking about whether it is relevant.

[13218] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Well, I guess I use the terms interchangeably, but let me explain, perhaps, if you are willing.

[13219] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Sure.

[13220] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** So, for instance, if, and this is purely hypothetical, but if she had shared with the leadership and the leadership said, “We hear you. We would like you to, nevertheless, subsequently tell the truth but we’ll give you some time.” In my view, the fact that they knew would not have been material, would not have been relevant. This would be consistent with, as you said, the narrative that Mr Pritam Singh, had

shared. If instead it is consistent with the narrative that Raeesah had shared that they had told her to, in her words, “take it to the grave”, then, that would be relevant and material.

[13221] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Thank you.

[13222] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** So, for me, whether it would have been relevant or material would have depended on the context. And I had trusted at the time and still do, that if it was material, they would have shared that with me. So, given that they did not, I trusted that it was not material.

[13223] **Mr Desmond Lee:** You know from the constitution of the Party that there is the CEC that decides on the final course of action to take, with regards to Ms Khan. So, the DP recommends but the CEC —

[13224] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes, of course.

[13225] **Mr Desmond Lee:** — has to take that act whether to expel her, make her resign, keep her so and so on and so forth. So, CEC is the decision maker.

[13226] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes, I know. I’m aware of that.

[13227] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, just taking from what you just said now, whether or not her confession to Party leadership was an aggravating or mitigating circumstance, whether it was material, would depend on context, would depend on circumstances.

[13228] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** As I explained to you.

[13229] **Mr Desmond Lee:** As it unfolded.

[13230] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** It would have depended on the truth of the matter.

[13231] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Correct. Truth of the matter which the CEC would have to determine based on the recommendations, disclosures that the DP makes to the CEC. Because you’re the ultimate decision maker.

[13232] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** So, I agree with that. I will just point out at least, again, I cannot speak for the rest of the CEC but, for myself, my decision was not based solely on what was presented by the disciplinary committee. My decision took the entire body of evidence into consideration, as I shared with Raeesah.

[13233] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Yes. But at that point in time when you made the decision, you were not aware of those facts that, I put to you earlier, that Ms Khan had come clean on 7 and 8 August. And just taking Mr Singh’s evidence, for now, that that was what he heard on 7 and 8 August; and then secondly, on 3 October, what he tells the Committee of Privileges is that he had told her to take responsibility and ownership and he will not judge her; and, in his mind, what he meant was that “you must come clean on 4 October if the matter is raised or if the matter is not raised, you must come clean.” He had two different versions of evidence. And then on 4 October, he was unhappy that she had, in his mind, gone against his instructions.

[13234] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Okay.

[13235] **Mr Desmond Lee:** From his perspective that was breaching what he had told her to do or what he thought he had told her to do. Would that fact not also be relevant as potential aggravating circumstances: Party leader told you and you breached it. Would that not be something that the CEC ought to be aware of in deciding on the final outcome?

[13236] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Again, I cannot speak for the rest of the CEC. As I expressed, what was in this document, firstly, was in any case I viewed as an incomplete set of factors in any case. So, that is the start. And secondly, I believe that if there was any material information, that would have been presented to us.

[13237] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, you trusted the DP, comprising senior leaders, to lay before the CEC all matters that you felt the CEC ought to have sight of and to consider? Because the CEC makes the final decision and there are many people, and you're not able to speak for other members but, all the more so, right, you have to be presented with everything?

[13238] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes, you're correct in saying I trusted the Disciplinary Panel to have laid out what was material and necessary. But it would have been irresponsible for me to have made a decision of this gravity without also reflecting independently on what I could gather, as I explained, as well as – and something that had I shared with Raeesah as well – what the philosophy and principles behind what that decision would entail. So, I did spend an extended amount of time deliberating within myself, personally, again, almost to an extent where the few points that were made by the Disciplinary Panel during that CEC meeting would, essentially, be secondary for my decision.

[13239] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, you say that you supplemented the DP's findings and recommendations with your own discovery. That means you went outside.

[13240] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** But yes, my own discovery. I guess that is the legal term.

[13241] **Mr Desmond Lee:** That discovery did not lead you to the information that I shared with you that Ms Khan confessed —

[13242] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** No, of course, it would not have. That was, I guess, extremely confidential information known to only a few people. At that point, there was no way I would know. My discovery process is not unlike many of you lawyers, very different in nature. I think about the propriety of it. I think, as I shared, as you can see. I thought about what it meant to continue to have Raeesah as a member of the Sengkang team. What it meant for us to be able, for the volunteers and Party members to continue to work with her. So, they went significantly beyond just what was listed there.

[13243] **Mr Desmond Lee:** But to you, as a CEC member, would it not be relevant to consider whether or not Ms Khan had confessed, when she did so or whether she had followed instructions – as in the case of what Mr Singh is telling us, that he had given her some instructions, she disobeyed. Would all these facts be relevant or irrelevant to you as a CEC member determining the fate that is to befall one of your team-mates?

[13244] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I think I've explained earlier on: it just depends on the context. If they had instructed her to keep this information, this untruth to the grave, yes, that would have been material. But if they felt that they wanted to give her space, as Mr Singh

had shared, and what was important at that time, at the time of deliberation, was the rest of the facts of the case, then for me that would not have been material.

[13245] **Mr Desmond Lee:** What is important is that it has to be laid before you and then you'll make up your mind whether it is relevant or not?

[13246] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I wouldn't, no, I don't think I would say that. I would say that ultimately, in a sense, it depends on the truth of the matter which would then determine the context.

[13247] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Thank you. On 2 December, there was a press conference by the Workers' Party and I saw that you were present on the panel.

[13248] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes, I was.

[13249] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Do you recall what was said or shall I put it before you?

[13250] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I recall what was said. Well, I was at the press conference but I only participated on stage in the second half of the press conference when the Sengkang team made a statement. The first half I sat at the back of the room but I was aware of the proceedings.

[13251] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Maybe I put the transcript in front of you. [*A transcript was referred to.*]

[13252] **Assoc Prof James Jerome Lim:** Sure.

[13253] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, that you can refresh your memory. This is a transcript of Mr Singh's prepared statement, then followed by Q&A and if you have any queries about the transcript we can play the recording back for you to listen. "Statement by Mr Pritam Singh". You look at the first, second, third, the fourth paragraph from the top.

[13254] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** The one that begins "There have been"?

[13255] **Mr Desmond Lee:** "There have been some queries from members of the public about the knowledge the Party had about the original speech Raeesah delivered on 3 August and what action was taken thereafter. I'll address these directly." And four paragraphs down from that one and it says, "Raeesah shared that her personal trauma and sexual assault explained why she was not truthful about accompanying the victim to the Police station as she had asserted in her speech on 3 August. She had admitted this to the party leadership about a week after she had delivered her speech." Would this be possibly the first time you have learned that Ms Khan had admitted her falsehood to Party leadership after the August speech.

[13256] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes, I believe so. That's when I first learned.

[13257] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, here we have a situation where a DP was formed with only three members of the CEC, senior leadership, who were aware of Ms Khan's untruths before Parliament in August and then repeated again in October.

[13258] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mm-hm.

[13259] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, they asked the CEC to let them become the DP and in their presentations to the CEC, they do not place before the CEC any of the facts pertaining to their involvement or their knowledge. I respect what you say that, all of it really depends on context and, therefore, the CEC has to be in command of the facts in order to make up their mind as to whether it is relevant, material, aggravating, mitigating. But would you agree that all the facts pertaining to 7 and 8 August, of 3 October and so on, ought to have been placed before the CEC, for you all to consider?

[13260] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I think all the material facts should have been in place, yes.

[13261] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Thank you. Thanks, Dr Lim. No further questions.

[13262] **The Chairman:** To build on the questions that Mr Desmond Lee asked, which I don't think you actually answered.

[13263] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Okay, I apologise.

[13264] **The Chairman:** You mentioned about things that are material. Mr Desmond Lee mentioned that, as conveyed by Mr Pritam Singh, he had told Ms Raeesah Khan on 3 October to take ownership and responsibility, and also the fact that he wouldn't judge her. And, in his mind, as he shared with us, his intent was for her to come clean and to tell the truth on 4 October should the issue arise. Would that not be an aggravating factor? You didn't quite answer this question. In terms of her culpability because she had lied once on 3 August and then, again, on 4 October, especially if, indeed, it's true expressly told by her leader that she should tell the truth. Wouldn't that be material in your assessment of her level of responsibility in terms of disciplinary action? It would be, wouldn't it?

[13265] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I'm trying to process what you mean by whether that information would —

[13266] **The Chairman:** You said that it would be relevant only if it is material.

[13267] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mm-hm.

[13268] **The Chairman:** So, I'm asking you the fact that if she was told to tell the truth, if indeed that's true, and she didn't on 4 October, would that not be material for the CEC to evaluate as to her level of responsibility, culpability, disciplinary action?

[13269] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Well, if she had been told to tell the truth and if she planned to ultimately tell the truth, I do not think that that would necessarily be material.

[13270] **The Chairman:** So, basically, in your mind, nothing is material. The fact —

[13271] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** No, that is —

[13272] **The Chairman:** The fact that the three of them knew, so there's actually no circumstances in which it would be material except that if, indeed, they told her to suppress the truth. Otherwise, any other scenario wouldn't be material, would that be correct?

[13273] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Well, I have not thought through all the possible hypothetical scenarios for which something would be material or not. What I have thought through was what I shared with you, based on the two competing narratives, as shared with this panel. If you're asking me to think about additional hypothetical questions based —

[13274] **The Chairman:** We're not really asking about hypothetical scenarios. Basically, the fact of the matter is that Ms Raeesah Khan, and this is it under no dispute, had confessed to the leader and the rest on 7 and 8 August. And they knew that she had lied. No one else knew, it would seem so, until pretty much 2 December, when this was revealed. During the course of that period, there is an allegation by Ms Khan that she was told to maintain that lie. There is an alternative view, as proposed by Mr Pritam Singh, that he was quite clear and told her on 3 October to make sure that she came clean. But the fact of the matter is that they knew and this was not shared to members of the CEC.

[13275] You went on great pains to explain how you gathered feedback from your members, all of who didn't know that she actually had confessed this a couple of days after. There is no doubt in anyone's mind that she lied and clearly it is a serious mistake, but she admitted it a couple of days later. One could imagine whether it is so that she might be seeking advice from the leadership. As we have tried to determine is, whether was she given definitive direction as to what to do. As we have gathered from 8 August, it didn't seem compelling what exactly was said. There are different versions as to what the directions that were given on 3 October, corroborated by two other cadre members, who heard this from Mr Pritam Singh on 12 October, as he narrated to them. They didn't walk away with the same conclusion either, that he was definitive in wanting her to come clean. So, there are different versions.

[13276] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Okay.

[13277] **The Chairman:** The fact of the matter is everyone you've spoken to had no idea that actually this was shared to the three senior party leaders, as of 7 and 8 August.

[13278] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I think we established that nobody knew.

[13279] **The Chairman:** Indeed. And in your mind, this is in no way material? There is no need for anyone, and even if you were to determine that this was immaterial, at least should this fact have been put forward to the CEC and key members before they gathered the feedback?

[13280] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** So, let me be clear. I think there are in fact circumstances in which it would have been material.

[13281] **The Chairman:** I am not asking you in what circumstances. I am saying in this particular case, are you echoing the same view that actually, it is irrelevant for this fact to be shared to the CEC, and whether this fact should be shared to the rest of the members for them to then decided for themselves whether it is relevant or not.

[13282] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** As I have explained to you, I don't know how many times I would need to repeat myself, if, for instance, she had planned to subsequently come clean with that information, if there was a plan to subsequently confess, then I think that the fact that they knew that she had confessed to them in advance would not have been material.

But if that was not the case, if, instead, they had told her to lie, then that suppression of that fact would have been material.

[13283] **The Chairman:** But the fact of the matter is who determines this truth?

[13284] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I don't know about who determines the truth. The truth is, in fact, out there. It's what we are trying to do, to uncover the truth.

[13285] **The Chairman:** So, you have not answered the question. Basically, it's this: there is a fact that this was shared to the three of them and then the CEC was asked to form a Disciplinary Panel without knowing the full facts. The members were asked for their feedback and think one of the observations surfaced was that she lost the support of her team-mates who, at that stage, didn't know the full picture.

[13286] So, the question I have for you, quite straightforward, is that should this be something that should have been surfaced so that the CEC members or the other Party members can decide for themselves whether it is relevant or irrelevant, and then make their decisions accordingly. Should it be relevant or, in your view, actually, it's irrelevant?

[13287] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Let me once again — Let me try with a slightly different example, if I may. Perhaps, one way to rephrase this is to say that —

[13288] **The Chairman:** So, in all your hypothetical scenarios, how would you know? Because you wouldn't know these different situations and scenarios, right, because you've not examined the case?

[13289] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** That is correct and that's why —

[13290] **The Chairman:** But would you expect, as a reasonable course of action, to at least be told that, "Look, this was what happened". And then you decide and evaluate whether it was relevant or not. Would that not be a reasonable way of approaching it or do you feel that, no, we can let the leaders decide. If they feel it's relevant then, therefore, it's relevant.

[13291] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** As I have explained in the beginning, I trust that the leadership would have put all the material facts on the table.

[13292] **The Chairman:** So, in your view, the fact that they did not surface this to the CEC nor surfaced it to anyone else when seeking their feedback on Ms Khan and of which some of the feedback and adverse feedback or lack of support would then also have some bearing on the final actions taken against her, you feel that because they have made the call not to let all of you know about the fact that she had divulged this on 7 and 8 August, therefore, it is irrelevant for everyone else to know, would that be correct? Would that be correct?

[13293] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** You said a lot of things. So, which part is correct? As I have explained to you —

[13294] **The Chairman:** The part that they had already assessed that this was irrelevant and you trusted your leaders and, therefore, if they have deemed it irrelevant, then there is no need for the rest of you to actually know those details. Because whatever hypothetical scenarios you've painted is not obvious to anyone because you don't know those scenarios. But because

they have determined that, therefore, that's good enough for you that you don't need to know. Even now, in hindsight, knowing what you do know, you feel that it's perfectly fine.

[13295] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** In fact, what you have just said, now, in hindsight, ex-post facto, even now when we sit here, I think whether it was material or not, we would have difficulty establishing that, unless we knew the actual truth. If the truth was that they told her to suppress it, that would have been material.

[13296] **The Chairman:** Exactly. So, we're trying to determine what the truth is.

[13297] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.

[13298] **The Chairman:** But you've already stated that, actually, you trust the leadership and that it is irrelevant.

[13299] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** I stated that I trusted the leadership.

[13300] **The Chairman:** But what we're asking you is: is it reasonable to expect that this should be shared? Because, even at this stage, in hindsight, there are different versions of what would seem to be the truth.

[13301] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Yes.

[13302] **The Chairman:** And we're trying to determine this.

[13303] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** It is only reasonable, subject to the context, which is, if it was material, and I even gave you a very precise example of when it would be material.

[13304] **The Chairman:** I'm asking you for a straightforward answer to understand how a particular member of CEC views this, is whether the fact that this is something that should have been shared with the CEC and the rest of the members as they were asked for feedback.

[13305] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Mr Chairman, I'm not trying to be evasive. I'm trying to genuinely answer you, based on the way that I perceive the nature of your question. And the way I perceive the nature of your question is, you are asking me whether I think it was relevant for that information to have been shared. My honest heartfelt response is that it would only be relevant if it was and it should only have been shared if it was, indeed, material. And I even tried to concretise that.

[13306] **The Chairman:** So, who decides whether it is material?

[13307] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** In this particular case, the materiality of it would depend on what actually transpired.

[13308] **The Chairman:** So, who decides on what's material? I'm asking you for a decision, a perspective. You say it depends on this, it depends on that. So, I'm asking you, therefore, on whether it's material. So, I'm asking you who decides whether it is material? Should one not bear certain responsibility to make a certain decision?

[13309] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** If I were the leadership and I told her that she would ultimately need to share this information —

[13310] **The Chairman:** Share what information?

[13311] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** That she had spoken an untruth in Parliament. Again, it's hypothetical. But if I had told her that she had to come clean ultimately, but I was now giving her space, then I would – I, not Pritam – then I would think that it would not be material to share that information.

[13312] **The Chairman:** So, there's no need to share the information with the CEC; there's no need to share the information with the rest of the WP members as you seek feedback for that?

[13313] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Not in that particular narrative of events; not, if that were, in fact, true.

[13314] **The Chairman:** Noted. Thank you. Any other questions from Members? Dennis, any question? Okay, if there are no further questions for now, we would like to thank you for coming before the Committee.

[13315] A transcript of the proceedings will be shared with you for verification. So, do go through it and if you have any minor amendments, do make changes and send the transcript back to us. The transcripts and any evidence given to the Committee are not to be disclosed to anyone or published and must be kept strictly confidential until the Committee has presented the relevant Report to Parliament.

[13316] There being no other matters, our staff will accompany you out to the waiting room. Thank you very much.

[13317] **Assoc Prof Jamus Jerome Lim:** Thank you for your time.

[13318] **The Chairman:** Sergeant-at-arms, please accompany the witness out.

(The witness withdrew.)

(The hearing adjourned at 4.42 pm.)

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

WEDNESDAY, 15 DECEMBER 2021

1.15 pm

PRESENT:

Mr Tan Chuan-Jin, Speaker (*Chairman*)

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

[Mr Speaker in the Chair]

[13319] **The Chairman:** I call the meeting to order. Serjeant-at-arms, please invite Mr Pritam Singh, to the witness table. Good afternoon, Mr Pritam.

[13320] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Good afternoon, Chairman.

[13321] **The Chairman:** Please take your seat. Mr Pritam Singh, thank you very much for coming back again. I would like to remind you that you've made an affirmation to tell the truth. The proceedings today is a continuation of the last hearing and you are still bound to your solemn obligations. If you refuse to answer our questions directly, attempt to prevaricate or wilfully mislead the Committee by providing false evidence, such behaviour will be an offence, in contempt of the Committee.

[13322] Essentially, there are two things. The Clerk had further written to you to appear before the Committee today to produce any paper, book, record —

[13323] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13324] **The Chairman:** — or document, including any email, message in any messaging application in your possession or under your control relating to or with respect to any discussion, instruction, inquiry or communication to or with any persons relating to untruths spoken by Ms Raeesah Khan in Parliament on 3 August 2021 and 4 October 2021.

[13325] Secondly, any discussion, instruction and inquiry or your communication to, or with any other persons relating Ms Khan's personal explanation in Parliament on 1 November 2021, and also the formation, proceedings, deliberations and recommendations of the Disciplinary Panel set up by the Workers' Party to inquire into Ms Raeesah Khan. I understand that you've not brought any documents with you today?

[13326] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's correct.

[13327] **The Chairman:** Okay. We will follow up on this, subsequent to this interview. I think we also have some questions that Minister Edwin Tong would like to put to you.

[13328] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[13329] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you, Mr Chairman. Good afternoon, Mr Singh.

[13330] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Good afternoon, Mr Tong.

[13331] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, some evidence was received by the Committee after you gave evidence on Friday. So, we thought we'll put it to you and ask you for your response to it.

[13332] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[13333] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I will first give you the context and then show you the new evidence that has come in after you gave evidence; then ask you for your response on them. This is in relation to what you had expected Ms Khan to do after you met with her on 3 October. You remember we had a discussion on that on Friday?

[13334] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13335] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I think you confirmed to us that it is important for all Members of Parliament to tell the truth and to clarify an untruth on the record as soon as possible in the circumstances, correct?

[13336] **Mr Pritam Singh:** In the circumstances that – given the circumstances, yes.

[13337] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. You mentioned that in this case, the timing might be up to Ms Khan, but you were very clear to her that if she were to speak up thereafter, it would have to be the truth, correct?

[13338] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13339] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I'd just like to show you one portion of the evidence just to give you a context of where I'm coming from. If you can please pick up your bundle on 10 December.

[13340] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I have that bundle.

[13341] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This is the transcript of your evidence. Could you please turn to page 50, and go, please, to the bottom one-third of the page?

[13342] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13343] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'll start with my question. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 10 December 2021, from Para No 7894.*]

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: So, please focus on my questions. Your understanding on 3 October was that if the matter came up, she would stand up in Parliament and clarify the lie. Correct?

Mr Pritam Singh: Yes.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: And you said that, in your mind, there was no doubt that she understood you, right?

Mr Pritam Singh: That's right.

[13344] Mr Pritam Singh: Mr Tong, just give me a second. I'm trying to find where you are reading from.

[13345] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Oh. I'm so sorry. The bottom one-third of the page, page 50.

[13346] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes, I'm there. Please carry on.

[13347] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Okay. So, over the page, "So, at 12.30 pm when Minister Shanmugam stood up to make his Ministerial Statement" —

[13348] Mr Pritam Singh: That's page 51, right?

[13349] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Yes. I've just read page 50 so I'm now into page 51. Would you like me to start with page 50 again?

[13350] Mr Pritam Singh: Yes, please. I wasn't focused on the page when you started speaking.

[13351] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: No problem. I'll start again. So, two questions from the bottom.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: So, please focus on my questions. Your understanding on 3 October was that if the matter came up, she would stand up in Parliament and clarify the lie. Correct?

Mr Pritam Singh: Yes.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: And you said that, in your mind, there was no doubt that she understood you, right?

Mr Pritam Singh: That's right.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: And, so, at 12.30 pm, when Minister Shanmugam stood up to make his Ministerial Statement and seek the clarification, in your mind, there was only one outcome.

Mr Pritam Singh: Absolutely.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: And that she would stand up and tell the truth?

Mr Pritam Singh: That is correct.

[13352] So, that was your position? You stand by that, right?

[13353] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right.

[13354] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That's your position. Yes. And your position also was that this would be clear to Ms Khan after your meeting with her on 3 October?

[13355] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that is correct.

[13356] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Again, for context, I will show you what Ms Loh said about this same occasion. If you could leave your bundle open and pick up, please, the transcripts of 2 December?

[13357] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I have it in front of me.

[13358] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Could you please turn to page 44?

[13359] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I'm at page 44.

[13360] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You'll recall that you had given evidence that on 12 October, you met with Ms Loh and on that occasion, you recounted to Ms Loh what you had said to Ms Khan on 3 October?

[13361] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Are you reading from page 44?

[13362] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I'm just refreshing you of the context before I read it to you.

[13363] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I beg your pardon. Could you say that again? On 12 October —

[13364] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On 12 October, you had given evidence that you met with Ms Loh and Mr Nathan, and you told them what you told Ms Khan on 3 October.

[13365] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Generally, in those terms, in the same terms, yes.

[13366] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, in the same terms.

[13367] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13368] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This is my question to Ms Loh about that occasion. So, if you could please go to the middle of the page, where I said: "You mentioned". Do you see that?

[13369] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I see that.

[13370] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Starting with my question. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 774.*]

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: No, you mentioned that Mr Singh told you that he would not judge Ms Khan.

Ms Loh Pei Ying: Yes, that was on 12 October.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: So, that I think, we earlier agreed, you took as a sign that that was reassuring, right? He's prepared to let her do as she thinks appropriate?

Ms Loh Pei Ying: I mean, I would assume he's prepared. If he said that to her, I mean, you say that with the knowledge that it could go either way, right?

[13371] I recall that you had said it was not “either way”, but it was very clear in your mind that Ms Khan had understood you, that it was only one way.

[13372] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[13373] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. On Monday – that was two days ago – I'm losing track of my time myself. Ms Sylvia Lim came before the Committee of Privileges and she gave some evidence. And I would like show you what she tendered to the Committee of Privileges. If I could ask you to please pick up the document that was tendered by Ms Lim to the Committee of Privileges? Could the Clerk please assist Mr Singh? [*A document was referred to.*]

[13374] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13375] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You have it?

[13376] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I do. Which page am I to look at?

[13377] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you can look at the bottom of the page, you will see a pagination, binder, page 1 and so on.

[13378] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I do.

[13379] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Page 1 is not relevant for my purposes. I'll just orientate you to the document. Page 2 is a typewritten transcript of a meeting that took place between the DP, the Disciplinary Panel and Ms Khan on 8 November. You see that?

[13380] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that is correct.

[13381] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You were present, right?

[13382] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I was present.

[13383] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, these are Ms Lim's notes. And you will see, at binder page 5, these were the original handwritten notes which she then subsequently typed up.

[13384] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13385] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you will see the notes from page 5 through to page 11.

[13386] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I do.

[13387] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. At page 12, the same, for the meeting of 29 November.

[13388] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I see it.

[13389] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Again, she typed up the notes, the same notes that she took in handwriting from the binder page 18 onwards, all the way through to binder page 30.

[13390] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13391] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, 12 pages of handwritten notes transcribed and written up.

[13392] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13393] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She had confirmed to this Committee that these notes were taken contemporaneously, the handwritten notes, and also, to the best of her recollection, verbatim.

[13394] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13395] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can I ask you to just quickly look at page 17 of the note?

[13396] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Binder, page 17?

[13397] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, please.

[13398] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I'm there.

[13399] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At binder page 17, let me just read it to you: "PS," and I think she refers to you, is recorded as saying [*A note was referred to, with the following text.*]:

PS: Before October session, I met you and told you it was your call. Did need to tell the truth in Parliament occur to you?

RK: "Yes, but consumed with guilt and own experience, thought it wouldn't come up.

PS: Can't lie; right?

RK: Yes.

[13400] So, these are Ms Lim's notes of what happened at the meeting on 29 November. There are two portions to it: what you told her, meaning Ms Khan, and what she should do, "she" meaning Ms Khan, and these are distinct. What you told her when you said "your call", does it mean for Ms Khan to make a choice?

[13401] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I understand what you're asking. I think this was the way I phrased my question to Ms Khan at the Disciplinary Panel. But insofar as what I

said to her at the meeting at her house on 3 October, it was clear that: “You had to take ownership and responsibility for it”. And thereafter, as I already have given in evidence, I said: “I will not judge you”, but in the context of her appearing to look uncertain of herself.

[13402] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand. But on 29 November, based on these notes, you had said to Ms Khan that you put it to her as “your call” and you were referring in this line to the 3 October meeting?

[13403] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Before the October session, Mr Tong, I would have to read the document a bit more to give you an affirmative answer there.

[13404] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Sure, you can.

[13405] **Mr Pritam Singh:** But it would highly likely refer to the 3 October meeting.

[13406] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, because if I recall your evidence, in October or at least prior to the October Sitting, there were only two occasions you had pointed us to.

[13407] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right.

[13408] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The email on 1 October and the second was this meeting was at her home on 3 October.

[13409] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[13410] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, a conversation would refer to the 3 October conversation?

[13411] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13412] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so, the reference to your call must be a reference to the conversation that took place on 3 October.

[13413] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is right.

[13414] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, in that context, would it mean that it is for Ms Khan to make a choice?

[13415] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, Sir, it would not.

[13416] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That’s an ordinary meaning of the phrase “your call”. Would you agree?

[13417] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, but if you look thereafter, I said, “Did the need to tell the truth in Parliament occur to you?” It’s a confirmation in my mind for putting the term “your call” into context.

[13418] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right.

[13419] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, I did not specifically frame the question to say that “You were told to take ownership and responsibility”. The question wasn’t framed that way but it was quite clear in my communication to her when I asked “your call”, I mean, it follows from her evidence I’ve given earlier about the responsibility that a WP MP should take vis-à-vis his or her work in Parliament, the sort of politics that we want to practise and, I suppose, that one has to look at it in totality.

[13420] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Ms Lim, who was present at this meeting on 29 November and, indeed, these are her notes.

[13421] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[13422] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I’d like you to look at what she said about this portion of the notes.

[13423] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13424] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If I could invite you to please pick up the transcript of 13 December.

[13425] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I believe this would be the one. Yes. Oh, no, sorry, this is 10 December. Okay, I have 13 December in front of me.

[13426] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. If you could please turn to page 62.

[13427] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13428] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You have it?

[13429] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I do.

[13430] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Ms Lim, at page 62, you will see at page 62 and over the page at page 63, she spent some time giving us an account of the notes that she had taken on 8 November as well as on 29 November.

[13431] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13432] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And so you can see on the transcript her evidence was quite extensive, and at page 64, she then said this, and I would like to read it to you, from just before the middle of the page, “And last of all” – did you see that?

[13433] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, the fourth paragraph from the top.

[13434] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That’s right. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 13 December 2021, from Para No 12932.*]

Ms Sylvia Lim: And last of all, from these notes, I’d like to also highlight on the last page, page 6, that, and this concerns the 3 October meeting, which I wasn’t present at, between Mr Singh and her, and the question was put to her by Mr Singh as follows, it says: “Before the October session, I met you and I told you that it was your call. Did the need to tell the truth in Parliament occur to you?” And her response was: “Yes, but

I was consumed with guilt in my own experience and I thought that it wouldn't come up.” That's her response. She was consumed with guilt at her own experience and she thought that it wouldn't come up. And Mr Singh says to her: “You can't lie, right?” And then she says: “Yes.”

As far as the 3 October meeting, I was not there but that was her response to the Disciplinary Panel when asked why she didn't tell the truth at the October Sitting. She said she was consumed with guilt in her own experience, that was what she narrated.

The Chairman: If I may ask just a quick question since you raised this.

Ms Sylvia Lim: Yes.

The Chairman: In that last page, you mentioned regarding the conversation on 3 October. At the top of the page where Mr Pritam Singh said: “Before the October session, I met you and told you it was your call.” So, meaning that it was really up to her to decide what to do.

Ms Sylvia Lim: I don't know the context but he phrased it in this way.

The Chairman: From this, it would seem to be that it's really for her to decide, which is, I guess —

Ms Sylvia Lim: She has to decide, yes.

The Chairman: — I guess, if you follow from this, when he said that: “I will not judge you”, is that, “You decide what you want to do, I will not judge you for that”. Would that be a fair interpretation, as you see it? I know you were not there —

Ms Sylvia Lim: I wasn't there.

[13435] It goes on over the page but let me just stop for a moment and ask for your response to Ms Lim's evidence, where she says that this account took place and the way it's phrased, she doesn't know the context because she wasn't present at the 3 October meeting, but she says that it is for Ms Khan to decide. Would you agree with that?

[13436] Mr Pritam Singh: Well, I think when one informs an MP that he or she has to take ownership and responsibility, indeed, that MP has to take ownership and responsibility. And I can see why the word “your call” gives the suggestion that it's a choice for her to make.

[13437] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Yes, indeed.

[13438] Mr Pritam Singh: And I think that's a reasonable look at it. But in the context of how I put it to Ms Khan at the DP and, in particular, the question that I followed up with, I mean, “You really can't tell a lie, can you?” The whole entire context of the discussion on 3 October really comes back to Ms Khan having to take ownership and responsibility for this issue, which I believe I communicated to her quite clearly.

[13439] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: I understand. So, you would agree, and you said that earlier, at least on its own, the phrase “your call”, one reasonable interpretation of that would be that it is for Ms Khan to make a decision?

[13440] Mr Pritam Singh: If you discount the context of this word being used in a DP and the subsequent question put to her, I can understand.

[13441] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand. Okay. Ms Lim, who said she was – and again, to give you the context, and I don’t know if you had seen, at least, what is public about Ms Lim’s evidence, she had said that she was aware of the lie on 8 August.

[13442] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That’s right.

[13443] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And thereafter, she left it to you to deal with Ms Khan, liaise with her, work out the plan for Ms Khan to clarify the lie in Parliament. And up till 4 October, she had no idea what you had done or what you were doing and what you had said to Ms Khan. So, that was her evidence.

[13444] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[13445] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In the context of what Ms Khan then did on 4 October, which was in Ms Lim’s words, “double down on the lie.” This is what Ms Lim said, if I may refer you to the same bundle, and turn, please, to page 39.

[13446] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I’m there.

[13447] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. Just around the top one-third of the page, where “Ms Lim” first appears, and she starts with “You see”. Do you see that?

[13448] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I do.

[13449] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. She says, “You see, it never crossed my mind and I cannot fathom this possibility that Pritam would have given her the option to choose between telling the truth or continuing the lie. That never crossed my mind and I do not believe it to be true. So, when she comes and says, ‘I don’t think I want to tell the truth’, I think it’s just her. It’s nothing to do with Mr Singh at all.”

[13450] Ms Lim says that it’s not fathomable that you would have given Ms Khan a choice but, based on these notes on 29 November, it would appear that you gave her a choice, of course, in the context in which it is used. Would you agree?

[13451] **Mr Pritam Singh:** In the context in which it is used, yes.

[13452] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But would you agree that one reasonable construction or interpretation from Ms Khan on 3 October would be that she would be given a choice as to whether to tell the truth or to continue with the lie?

[13453] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I didn’t tell her on 3 October that “it is your call to make”. I didn’t say that to her. I told her she would have to take ownership and responsibility. On the notes written by Ms Lim, yes, indeed, I would have put the question to Ms Khan in that manner, but it’s not just that which is important. As I conceded, I can understand why that line of questioning is something that you’re pursuing. You also have to see what comes after that, which is “You can’t tell a lie, right?” So, I think it was a – I wouldn’t want to use the word “abridged” – but I had just put the matter across to Ms Khan at the DP in that manner.

[13454] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. So, you are saying that despite the way in which you had phrased the question on 29 November to Ms Khan, you didn't use those words?

[13455] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right, on 3 October.

[13456] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On 3 October. If you didn't use those words, how would you have conveyed to her that that "it was your call"? Why would you say to her on 29 November "that was your call"?

[13457] **Mr Pritam Singh:** It was in the context of how she was responding to us. I think that whole meeting on 29 November was a meeting where she was just continually crying and crying and crying. And in that context, I put a question which I felt could elicit a response which would be helpful to the DP. So, that's how I put the question.

[13458] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. And so you're not saying that you had phrased it in this way, but would you not accept that the way in which you had characterised how you left Ms Khan on 3 October, after the meeting, and your frame of mind about how sure she was that she would come and tell the truth, would be quite a different characterisation from the words "your call" taken in the context of the notes on 29 November?

[13459] **Mr Pritam Singh:** To the extent that you're making the comparison, I would agree. In the course of this hearing, I must have shared something like about 100 pages of documents to the Committee, of communication, I think one or two emails, one email, at least. There's also an exchange I have with Ms Khan's father that takes place sometime in the middle of October.

[13460] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Second half of October.

[13461] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that's the point when she actually tells her parents what's happening, and ownership and responsibility are quite a major part of my message to Mr Khan. And those words were really the central focus of what I expected Ms Khan to do, had the matter come up post 3 October.

[13462] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand. As you appreciate, what this Committee has to do is to work out the extent to which this conversation took place in the way in which you have described it or in the way that Ms Khan has described it.

[13463] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I fully understand.

[13464] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. In context, on 3 October, Ms Khan was a fresh new MP, rookie MP, one year in Parliament or barely one year, and she had admitted two months prior to that that she had told a lie in Parliament, coming to see her senior leaders of the Workers' Party. Would you not accept that in that context, really, the only thing that you ought to have said to her at that point in time should be, "Look, Ms Khan, there is a lie on the record. You must go and own up, tell the truth in Parliament if it comes up", make it very clear, in clear, simple, direct terms? Would you agree?

[13465] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I believe I gave my reply to this earlier, at the earlier session before the Committee of Privileges, and that was the nature of what – or the nature of why the lie was told in the first place. It was an episode where Ms Khan suffered a traumatic, or at least she communicated that she had suffered a very traumatic episode of sexual assault. And so, because of that particular fact or what I saw to be a fact at that point, and I have really no reason to believe that it wasn't true, I took a course of action where I wanted her to address that issue, and then, thereafter, I could pursue that with her.

[13466] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand what you've just said and I can understand the point that you are making, which I think Mr Faisal and Ms Lim also made to us, that because of the sexual assault, the experience and the trauma, one might understand that that has an impact on the timing at which this is going to be done.

[13467] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[13468] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I think you gave quite a lot of evidence as to how you saw that issue. But here we are on 3 October where you're contemplating the issue might arise, and, in fact, speaking to Ms Khan about it. In that context, when you're discussing it with her, with the expectation or contemplation that it might arise the next day, why not use direct terms, tell her, "Tell the truth, go to Parliament. You've told a lie. Own it and take responsibility, and tell the truth to Parliament"?

[13469] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Mr Tong, I believe I communicated that in my way when I suggested to her to take ownership and responsibility.

[13470] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.

[13471] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13472] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In fact, actually, to dial back one step, in fact not only if it comes up, but why not say whether it comes up or not —

[13473] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13474] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — "you should tell the truth". In fact, that ought to be your position.

[13475] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think this is where I don't think we disagree on the eventual outcome. And the outcome is the lie has to be corrected, the record in Parliament has to be corrected. But how we get there is obviously where there's a difference in terms of the proposition you are putting to me and what actually transpired.

[13476] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay.

[13477] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And in my case, the fact that she was a sexual assault survivor herself, I determined that I'm going to give her time to manage her affairs, and thereafter, I would pursue it. And, again, my email of 1 October is suggestive of the fact that I wasn't personally going to let this issue lie, but "lie" as in to remain on the record,

but it is to inform not just Ms Khan, but everybody, that these sort of things are just not on. You can't do this.

[13478] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Just to clean up one other point with you on this.

[13479] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[13480] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, we saw Ms Lim's evidence, both in terms of the contemporaneous notes as well as what she had said to this Committee in answer to Mr Chairman's questions. I'd like to show you what Ms Loh said as well again on this. If you have that same bundle opened up.

[13481] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I would. 2 December?

[13482] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, 2 December.

[13483] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I'm here.

[13484] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you please pick it up again and turn now to page 28.

[13485] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I'm here.

[13486] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. So, just around the bottom one-third of the page, I will just read you some extracts, okay? Starting with "But now". Do you have that?

[13487] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I'm there.

[13488] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** My question [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 500.*]:

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: But now that you know what you know, would it not be a fair assumption that the meeting prior to 4 October between Mr Singh and Ms Khan was to settle the terms of what she would say if she is pressed?

Ms Loh Pei Ying: Yes, I would imagine —

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: If she had expected what would happen?

Ms Loh Pei Ying: Yes, I would imagine that they should have discussed the best way to handle it.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: And so, were you taken aback or surprised that this was the agreed position with the Party Leader in Parliament?

Ms Loh Pei Ying: I mean, I knew it wasn't the agreed position to take because Mr Singh had left the choice up to her, with his words of "I will not judge you."

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: But, certainly, Mr Singh, by that time, knew what the true position was, and he was present in Parliament when those falsehoods continued to be perpetrated, correct?

Ms Loh Pei Ying: Correct.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: As a senior Party member and a cadre member, were you not surprised?

Ms Loh Pei Ying: I was not surprised, but I was disappointed.

[13489] Ms Loh is here saying that you had, as least from your narration to her of what happened on 3 October, you had given Ms Khan a choice and that she's disappointed by that. Would you say this is consistent with how Ms Lim had recorded your question to Ms Khan on 29 November, meaning "your call"?

[13490] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, I would not.

[13491] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you explain why, then, the narration that you gave to Ms Loh on 12 November as to what happened —

[13492] **Mr Pritam Singh:** 12 October.

[13493] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 12 October, I beg your pardon, as to what happened on 3 October, gave her the impression that it was her choice?

[13494] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think she makes her view quite clear. And we see this also in the communication, which I also had sight of when I was here last Friday. These words, "I will not judge you", seem to be seared in Ms Loh's and I think even Mr Nathan's mind. And I think they've placed a large amount of weight on it and they have not placed enough emphasis on the context in which that phrase was shared. And hence, I think it follows why Ms Loh would make the representations that she has done.

[13495] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And the context that you refer to would be the earlier words that you used concerning taking ownership and responsibility of the problem, right?

[13496] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct.

[13497] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Further down the same page where I left off at page 29, you see, five lines from the bottom.

[13498] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I do.

[13499] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** My question [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 518.*].

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: But I'm asking you from the perspective of you having heard from Ms Khan, who reported the conversation to you.

Ms Loh Pei Ying: Actually, it was Mr Singh who shared with me the conversation.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: What was your takeaway, since you heard directly from him?

Ms Loh Pei Ying: I suppose he was implying that he gave her the choice and that she had then acted independently thereafter.

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: That's what he's implying?

Ms Loh Pei Ying: Yes.

[13500] So, would your response be the same?

[13501] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, my response would be the same, Mr Tong.

[13502] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But you would agree that at least based on the evidence that Ms Loh had given us as to her takeaway from the conversation with you on 12 October, her impression is that a choice was given to Ms Khan?

[13503] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think it's a little far more nuanced than that, Mr Tong. When she prefaces her statement by saying "I suppose he was implying", so you have a supposition and you have, trying to read into what I'm implying. So, I think there's quite a lot of grey there. And I would suggest that it was quite clear that Ms Khan, whether she's a rookie MP or not, I don't think these things even need to be explained that, "If you tell a lie, you have to admit it". It's just not on, it's something you can't do.

[13504] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand that, and I think you made it very clear as far as Ms Khan is concerned. I'm asking from the perspective of Ms Loh, who was hearing it directly from you. You narrated it on 12 October.

[13505] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[13506] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I'm simply saying that based on, at least a portion of the evidence I've showed you, it would appear that Ms Loh's takeaway from that conversation was that Ms Khan had a choice whether to tell the truth or otherwise, and that she acted independently thereafter.

[13507] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, my answer would be as I've already put it on record.

[13508] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. If the words "your call" were used and taken in the context of the rest of the phrase that you told us about on Friday, which is "take ownership and responsibility" and "I won't judge you", would you agree that that would be something to take into account when trying to construe what "I won't judge you" means?

[13509] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Are you referring to the use of those words, "your call" on 29 November or 3 October?

[13510] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes, and whether you would agree that if you take it together, it would reasonably give rise to an interpretation that the choice was Ms Khan's whether to continue to lie or to tell the truth?

[13511] **Mr Pritam Singh:** The words weren't used together. "Your call" was clearly in the context of the Disciplinary Panel. And as far as Ms Khan, the meeting I had with Ms Khan on 3 October, it was to take ownership and responsibility.

[13512] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you are very clear those words were not used?

[13513] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That is correct. Absolutely correct.

[13514] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Even though you had put it that way directly to Ms Khan?

[13515] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, at the DP.

[13516] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At the DP, 29 November was an event that took place just about two weeks ago?

[13517] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13518] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And this was you talking to Ms Khan directly and referring to the prior conversation you had with her?

[13519] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Right.

[13520] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you had characterised it as “your call” at least on 29 November?

[13521] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And thereafter to ask her that, “You can’t lie, right?” I think it’s important. I think those two questions have to be read quite closely, rather than isolated.

[13522] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I understand, Mr Singh. Thank you very much. Mr Chairman, I’ve got no further questions.

[13523] **The Chairman:** Are there any other questions from any other Members? Mr Singh, just from my perspective, why this particular issue is important. As you realise, there are slightly different versions that have been shared.

[13524] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13525] **The Chairman:** You have made it quite clear to us that your intent was to make sure that, and your impression was that Ms Khan was under no illusions that on 4 October, should the issue arise, she was to tell the truth?

[13526] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, Sir.

[13527] **The Chairman:** And you have been very specific, as I flagged up before, that she needs to take ownership and responsibility, and you also did make mention of the words you “will not judge her”. But she had a different interpretation of this, obviously. So, we have to ascertain which seems to make sense, because obviously she repeated a lie on 4 October.

[13528] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I understand.

[13529] **The Chairman:** And for us, we need to determine the level of responsibility, culpability, especially when the lie was repeated —

[13530] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, Sir.

[13531] **The Chairman:** — on 4 October and then made other statements, of course, where the lies were reinforced. And we need to determine as to what your directions, as Leader of the Opposition was. You've shared with us your perspectives. What you've shared, obviously, is your intent and what you've said and this is what she interpreted from it. And we are trying to see all the series of events leading up to it, following it and trying to ascertain which seems to make sense, because we do need to determine, what is quite clear, she had lied and repeated that lie, we need to determine the level of responsibility.

[13532] So, I think where we're going with this really is that, if indeed, as you said, the intention was to make clear, we did point out that normally, it is an important statement to make, especially because a lie had been made to Parliament. We noted that in the months of August and October, no actions were taken since 8 August until 3 October, when you met her, when you conveyed those positions to her. We note that, a day before 4 October, where, purportedly, if the issue was raised, she would have come clean and she would, as you expected of her, tell the truth.

[13533] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13534] **The Chairman:** And that's an important step. But we do note that there were no preparatory efforts made. You have explained that you didn't know for sure whether it would arise, so should you put in all the effort to prepare, vet the statements, as you did for the 1 November statement.

[13535] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think, Chair, I don't disagree with you. And it didn't cross my mind that, "You've already lied, you've already made the admission to your Party leadership. Why would you lie again?"

[13536] **The Chairman:** I understand.

[13537] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, I expected her to —

[13538] **The Chairman:** Indeed, to make clear. But we all know, and I think it's been registered by all of you, that it is a grave matter. And I think how one admits, how one puts it across, I think for any political party, both as a party and an individual, it is important for us to make sure the statement is done right —

[13539] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, absolutely.

[13540] **The Chairman:** — and communicated. As you have correctly, I think, as any party that is worth their salt, ought to do in the lead-up to the 1 November statement, a whole series of activities was taking place.

[13541] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I just didn't expect her to continue with the lie.

[13542] **The Chairman:** So, these activities didn't take place leading up to 4 October. You met just the day before. In your mind, your communications were very clear. We do note that you recounted this incident to Ms Loh and Mr Nathan, both of whom interpreted it differently from how you intended it to be.

[13543] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I wouldn't say "differently", Chair. I'm just basing my comments on memory of what they said in their evidence to the Committee. I don't think they were equivocal about having a different understanding.

[13544] **The Chairman:** But it wasn't clear in their minds that you had told her to —

[13545] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Indeed, it was a nuanced reading of what happened.

[13546] **The Chairman:** That's right. So, they didn't get this from Ms Khan; they got this from you. And you recounted this and, importantly, it was recounted on 12 October.

[13547] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that's right.

[13548] **The Chairman:** When actually she had, I would imagine, disappointed you by not telling the truth on 4 October.

[13549] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, that's right.

[13550] **The Chairman:** And that aspect of being disappointed and I would imagine you would have been rather angry that she didn't follow your instructions and intent, that element of it didn't quite come up in the way they interpreted it. Because they still felt it wasn't so clear. So, I'm just recounting —

[13551] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I don't dispute your —

[13552] **The Chairman:** Of course, I think why we raised this issue, which I think you've given your evidence and we have noted it, as Ms Sylvia Lim has observed, a statement that you made about choice.

[13553] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13554] **The Chairman:** So, we're just trying to string it together to understand the circumstances on what exactly has happened —

[13555] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I fully understand.

[13556] **The Chairman:** — to determine, well, did Ms Khan really just ignore all advice and direction and repeated the lie again? Or did you convey differently, or did she interpret it differently? So, I just sort of wanted to just place on record why we are taking this approach.

[13557] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I understand.

[13558] **The Chairman:** We know that it might seem to be belabouring the point, but it is important for us.

[13559] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No, no. Sorry, Sir, I didn't mean to cut you off. Go on.

[13560] **The Chairman:** So, just to determine, from a whole series of events, of things done, things not done. And also, we had gone through — and which I don't propose

to go through again – the responses on 4 October from yourself, Ms Sylvia Lim, where the expectation was to come clean but yet why the responses were in particular ways; and we've noted that as part of the evidence.

[13561] So, that's really the context I wanted to explain that, in case you're wondering why we're going over the same ground again.

[13562] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Oh, no, no, no, I don't. I just wanted to add also the context, which I don't believe you've mentioned, Chair, of my response and attitude to her after she told the lie, which I didn't know was a lie after 3 August, just following up with her to make sure that what she said is even true.

[13563] **The Chairman:** Indeed, indeed. Whether it actually happened and this was taking place in the course of the few days after 3 August, leading up to 7 August, when she informed you, when you knew, when you slammed down the phone. And because you wanted to know, were you able to verify and back up that particular anecdote that she shared.

[13564] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I think the point is the state of mind of me as the Party's Secretary-General, the easier approach was just to ignore it.

[13565] **The Chairman:** That's right. That part, I don't think we're much in dispute. I think what is of pertinence to us is that as of 8 August – and we've gone through that – whether the directions given were clear. And I think we've determined that, and then on 3 October. Because this is where we need to determine the level of responsibility.

[13566] As I have said, there's no question whatsoever she lied and she lied repeatedly. We need to understand the context.

[13567] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I understand.

[13568] **The Chairman:** And that's really where it is. If there are no other further questions from Members, then it just leaves me to thank you once again for coming forward.

[13569] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes. Can I just add a point? I was given the transcript of the proceedings after my session with the Committee on Friday and there's one part in the transcript where I say I received an email with regard to the legal advice that was given to Ms Khan. And I did mention on the record that I have an email of this. In the course of responding to the Committee and providing all the documentation that I have, I realised I don't have that email. It then occurred to me that I actually did see that advice. It would have happened on 12 October or at one of those meetings.

[13570] **The Chairman:** This is with regard to the Police?

[13571] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's right. The advice that Ms Khan received. So, I actually said on record that I have that email, but I don't have that email. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 10 December 2021, from Para No 9737.*] So, I just think that I ought to communicate this to the Committee, and if the Committee has any clarifications in that regard for me, please let me know. I will cooperate fully.

[13572] **The Chairman:** Okay, we note that. Subsequently, the Clerks will follow up with you, I think just again, summons on some of the details.

[13573] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I understand.

[13574] **The Chairman:** One of the things we do feel would be relevant for our consideration would be some of the correspondences. I mean, if you don't have, then you can declare accordingly.

[13575] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13576] **The Chairman:** So, correspondences that you may have, among the Party leadership and during the Disciplinary Panel, the inputs given. Because their responses to members might give us some insight as to how the issues are viewed. There's also the organisation of the judgements of the CEC, the press conference. That may be also relevant for us to understand the context. So, I think we will put that forward to you. And I'll leave it to you to decide if you would like to respond to us or not.

[13577] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure. I've given my view at the earlier session on this matter and that view stands.

[13578] **The Chairman:** I understand. Okay, if not, then a transcript of the proceedings will be shared with you for verification. Do go through it. And if you have any other minor amendments, do get back to us with the changes and send the transcript back to us. The transcripts and any evidence given to the Committee are not to be disclosed to anyone or published, and are to be kept strictly confidential until the Committee has presented its Report to Parliament. You may be free to withdraw now. Should there be a need to call you back, we will do so. But otherwise, our staff will accompany you out.

[13579] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you very much.

[13580] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Thank you, Mr Singh.

[13581] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Obligated, Chairman. Thank you.

[13582] **The Chairman:** Thank you, Pritam.

[13583] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you.

(The witness withdrew.)

(The hearing adjourned at 1.56 pm.)

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

MONDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2021

11.40 am

PRESENT:

Mr Tan Chuan-Jin, Speaker (*Chairman*)

Ms Grace Fu Hai Yien
Mr Desmond Lee
Ms Rahayu Mahzam

Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong
Mr Don Wee
Mr Zaqy Mohamad

[Mr Speaker in the Chair]

[13584] **The Chairman:** Serjeant-at-arms, please invite Mr Pritam Singh to the witness table.

[13585] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Good morning.

[13586] **The Chairman:** Mr Pritam Singh, do take a seat. Thank you for coming back again. I would like to remind you that you had made an affirmation to tell the truth. The proceedings today is a continuation of the last hearing and you're still bound to your solemn obligations. If you refuse to answer our questions directly, attempt to prevaricate or wilfully mislead the Committee by providing false evidence, such behaviour will be an offence and in contempt of the Committee.

[13587] The Committee of Privileges requires to you produce any paper, book, record, document, including any emails or messages in any messaging application in your possession or under your control relating or with respect to: (a) any discussion, instruction, inquire or communication to or with any persons relating to the untruths spoken by Ms Raeesah Khan in Parliament on 3 August 2021 and 4 October 2021; (b) any discussion, instruction, inquiry or communications to or with any persons relating to Ms Raeesah Khan's personal explanation in Parliament on 1 November 2021; and (c) the formation, proceedings, deliberations and recommendations of the Disciplinary Panel (DP) set up by the Workers' Party to inquire into Ms Raeesah Khan and collectively, these will be known as "the documents", to the extent that the documents have not already been produced to the said Committee.

[13588] You have been summoned to appear before the Committee today to produce the said documents or present to the said Committee a written and signed confirmation that you have already produced to the Committee the documents.

[13589] May I have your response, please? I believe you've brought some of the documents.

[13590] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes, I've submitted a whole stack of documents to the Committee, including a cover letter and also explaining the documents particularly requested for under 1(c) of the summons.

[13591] **The Chairman:** Okay.

[13592] **Mr Pritam Singh:** And all those have been provided in their entirety.

[13593] **The Chairman:** Alright. Clerk, would any copies be provided for us at the moment?

[13594] **Secretary to the Committee (Ms Ng Sheau Jiuan):** Yes, we are producing those copies and we were just about to return the originals to him.

[13595] **The Chairman:** Okay. Alright. So, I understand that there's quite a large volume of documents you'll be submitting, along with the others.

[13596] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13597] **The Chairman:** So, I think what we will do is that we will review the documents. Should there be a need, we can call you back and query further.

[13598] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Sure.

[13599] **The Chairman:** We appreciate your responding to that.

[13600] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Yes.

[13601] **The Chairman:** The Committee also requires you to sign – I think there's a written confirmation, that you have already reproduced all the documents to the Committee.

(The witness signed a written confirmation.)

[13602] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you. Mr Chairman, with your indulgence, let me just put it on request to the Committee on these documents. Because, as you know, I wasn't keen on producing them —

[13603] **The Chairman:** Understand.

[13604] **Mr Pritam Singh:** — because they cover confidential matters between the Party leadership, myself and obviously, by extension, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap, to our members. And they gave their feedback and we confirmed with them that that feedback would be kept confidentiality. So, in relation to the documents I have submitted, I have redacted the names of these members.

[13605] **The Chairman:** That's fine.

[13606] **Mr Pritam Singh:** That's the first cut. And there's another level of redactions that pertain to identifiable information. If the Committee wants to have a look at that

identifiable information, I'm prepared to share that privately but that won't be the submission I made.

[13607] **The Chairman:** Understand.

[13608] **Mr Pritam Singh:** So, if you want to see what's behind those redactions, I'm happy to share. But as far as the names of the members are concerned, I'm not sharing them with the Committee.

[13609] **The Chairman:** I fully understand. Unless it's pertinent and I don't foresee that to be so; if there's a need to have a sense about what was redacted, we'll discuss with you. And similarly, we'll take on board fully your sensitivities on some of this information.

[13610] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you.

[13611] **The Chairman:** I think we can find ways to manage this —

[13612] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I appreciate this.

[13613] **The Chairman:** — so that we can meet your needs, while at the same time, allowing the Committee to build up a better sense of what happened.

[13614] **Mr Pritam Singh:** I understand.

[13615] **The Chairman:** Okay. So, you've signed the document?

[13616] **Mr Pritam Singh:** No. I don't have the document with me. Thank you, Clerk. Do I need to stand and make the declaration?

[13617] **The Chairman:** No, it's alright.

[13618] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you.

[13619] **The Chairman:** We very much appreciate your submission. We will go through them. I understand it's quite voluminous but I fully understand the sensitivities you have expressed. As I have said, we will work with you and the other Members as well in how we would handle the information. Should there be any need for other further information, we'll contact you.

[13620] The transcript of the proceedings will be shared with you for verification. Today, it is quite straightforward, we won't be going through any specific queries. But I think we will still send to you the short proceedings – as short as it may be. Any minor amendments, do make changes and send the transcript back to us. And do know the transcripts evidence given to the Committee are not to be disclosed to anyone or published. It must be kept strictly confidential until the Committee has presented its Report to Parliament. So, with that, once again thank you very much for providing us the information and we'll contact you further if there's a need to.

[13621] **Mr Pritam Singh:** Thank you.

[13622] **The Chairman:** Thank you. Serjeant-at-arms, if you can accompany Mr Pritam Singh out? Thank you.

(The witness withdrew.)

[13623] **The Chairman:** Serjeant-at-arms, please invite Ms Sylvia Lim to the witness table.

[13624] Ms Sylvia Lim, just take your seat. Thank you for coming back again. I'd like to remind you that you had made an affirmation to tell the truth. The proceedings today is a continuation of the last hearing and you're still bound to your solemn obligations. If you refuse to answer our questions directly, attempt to prevaricate or wilfully mislead the Committee by providing false evidence, such behaviour will be an offence and in contempt of the Committee.

[13625] The Committee of Privileges requires to you produce any paper, book, record, document, including any emails or messages in any messaging application in your possession or under your control relating or with respect to: (a) any discussion, instruction, inquire or communication to or with any persons relating to the untruths spoken by Ms Raeesah Khan in Parliament on 3 August 2021 and 4 October 2021; (b) any discussion, instruction, inquiry or communications to or with any persons relating to Ms Raeesah Khan's personal explanation in Parliament on 1 November 2021; and (c) the formation, proceedings, deliberations and recommendations of the Disciplinary Panel (DP) set up by the Workers' Party to inquire into Ms Raeesah Khan and collectively, these will be known as "the documents", to the extent that the documents have not already been produced to the said Committee.

[13626] You have been summoned to appear before the Committee today to produce the documents or to present to the said Committee a written and signed confirmation that you have already produced to the Committee the documents.

[13627] May I have your response, please? I believe you have a number of documents that you've brought with you.

[13628] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Yes, Chairman. I handed them over to the Parliament staff, together with a cover letter, which I hope the Committee will take into account.

[13629] **The Chairman:** I understand. So, we will look through them. I understand it is quite voluminous, so, rather than go through them today, we will review the documents. Should there be any need to follow up, we'll contact you. And similarly, we will respect your concerns about sensitivities.

[13630] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Thank you.

[13631] **The Chairman:** If there's any need for us to follow up, we will discuss with you and work out the best possible arrangements so that we can meet our needs as well as to meet the needs that you have raised.

[13632] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Thank you, Chair. I understand.

[13633] **The Chairman:** So, if I may ask you to sign the confirmation. Do we have a confirmation for Ms Sylvia Lim to sign?

(The witness signed a written confirmation.)

[13634] **The Chairman:** We appreciate your cooperation in submitting to us the various documents. We will go through them. So, we do not need to query you today. We'll follow up with you if there's a need to. So, there will be a short transcript of today's proceedings. It will be shared with you for verification. It should be quite straightforward. Any minor amendments, do send them back to us and we will adjust accordingly. And similarly, please do note the transcripts and any evidence given to the Committee are not to be disclosed to anyone or published. It must be kept strictly confidential until the Committee has presented its Report to Parliament. So, once again, thank you very much, Ms Lim.

[13635] **Ms Sylvia Lim:** Thank you, Chairman and Members.

[13636] **The Chairman:** Serjeant-at-arms, please escort Ms Lim out. Thank you.

(The witness withdrew.)

[13637] **The Chairman:** Serjeant-at-arms, if you can escort Mr Faisal Manap in? Good morning, Mr Faisal. Come, please take your seat.

[13638] **Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap:** Good morning, everyone.

[13639] **The Chairman:** Good morning. Thank you, Mr Faisal Manap, for coming back again. I would like to remind you that you've made an affirmation to tell the truth. The proceedings today is a continuation of the last hearing and you're still bound to your solemn obligations. If you refuse to answer our questions directly, attempt to prevaricate or wilfully mislead the Committee by providing false evidence, such behavior will be an offence and in contempt of the Committee.

[13640] The Committee of Privileges requires to you produce any paper, book, record, document, including any emails or messages in any messaging application in your possession or under your control relating or with respect to: (a) any discussion, instruction, inquire or communication to or with any persons relating to the untruths spoken by Ms Raeesah Khan in Parliament on 3 August 2021 and 4 October 2021; (b) any discussion, instruction, inquiry or communications to or with any persons relating to Ms Raeesah Khan's personal explanation in Parliament on 1 November 2021; and (c) the formation, proceedings, deliberations and recommendations of the Disciplinary Panel (DP) set up by the Workers' Party to inquire into Ms Raeesah Khan and collectively, these will be known as "the documents", to the extent that the documents have not already been produced to the said Committee.

[13641] You've been summoned to appear to the Committee today to produce the documents or present to the said Committee a written and signed confirmation that you have already produced to the Committee the documents.

[13642] May I have your response, please? I understand you have a bunch of documents that you've brought to us.

[13643] **Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap:** Yes, I did. I brought along.

[13644] **The Chairman:** Do you also have any attached cover letter, note and so on, on the documents?

[13645] **Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap:** Yes, I do.

[13646] **The Chairman:** I think there's quite a large volume of documents. So, what we propose to do is we'll go through them. Should there be any need to clarify we will contact you again and to go through them, rather than hold you back for today.

[13647] **Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap:** Alright.

[13648] **The Chairman:** If I can request that you sign the written confirmation that you have already produced all the documents to the Committee. Clerk, can you provide the form to the witness?

(The witness signed a written confirmation.)

[13649] **The Chairman:** Thank you, Mr Faisal Manap. While the proceedings will be short but the transcript of today's short proceedings will be shared with you for verification. Do go through it, any minor amendments, make changes, send it back to us. Do note that the transcripts and any evidence given to the Committee are not to be disclosed to anyone or published and must be kept strictly confidential until the Committee has presented its Report to Parliament. Once again, thank you very much for submitting the documents. Should there be a need to clarify, we will contact you and follow up.

[13650] **Mr Muhamad Faisal Bin Abdul Manap:** Thank you, Mr Chairman. Thanks, everyone.

[13651] **The Chairman:** Thank you. Serjeant-at-arms, please accompany the witness out.

(The witness withdrew.)

(The hearing adjourned at 12.02 pm.)

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

WEDNESDAY, 22 DECEMBER 2021

9.45 am

PRESENT:

Mr Tan Chuan-Jin, Speaker (*Chairman*)

Mr Desmond Lee
Ms Rahayu Mahzam
Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Mr Don Wee
Mr Zaqy Mohamad

[Mr Speaker in the Chair]

[13652] **The Chairman:** I now call the meeting to order. Serjeant-at-arms, please invite Dr Christopher Cheok to the witness table.

Dr Christopher Cheok Cheng Soon was examined on oath.

[13653] **The Chairman:** Good morning, Dr Christopher Cheok. Take your seat. You may remove your mask, For the record, please state your name, your occupation and the positions you hold.

[13654] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Good morning, Chairman and members of the Committee of Privileges. My name is Dr Christopher Cheok Cheng Soon. I'm a psychiatrist by training. The positions I hold is that I'm the Acting Chief of the Department of Forensic Psychiatry and I'm a senior consultant at the Institute of Mental Health.

[13655] **The Chairman:** Thank you. The evidence you'll be giving today before the Committee will be taken on oath. If you so desire, you can also take an affirmation. Clerk, please administer the oath.

(The witness made an oath.)

[13656] **The Chairman:** Thank you. Please be seated. The Committee of Privileges is looking into the complaint made by the Leader of the House, Ms Indranee Rajah against former Member for Sengkang GRC, Ms Raeesah Khan, for breach of privilege.

[13657] Thank you very much for attending today's hearing and for your expert evidence before the Committee and to answer the questions which Members of the Committee would like to put to you. You have taken a solemn obligation to answer our questions truthfully. If you refuse to answer our questions directly or attempt to mislead the Committee, such behaviour will be an offence and in contempt of this Committee.

[13658] I also want to place it on record that this issue of review from the psychiatrist was raised by Mr Pritam Singh and Ms Sylvia Lim and they also have requested for such an examination be made on Ms Khan. But we appreciate you spending time to evaluate the situation. I will now perhaps hand over to Minister Desmond Lee for some questions. Or perhaps, before the questions, would you like to take us through some of your evaluations and then you'll take questions from that point on.

[13659] **Dr Christopher Cheok** Thank you, Mr Chairman. I have assessed Ms Khan on two occasions: on Friday, 17 December and Monday, 20 December. I received a formal letter of request from Parliament on the morning of Friday, 17 December, and I have also received a bundle of documents from the Parliament together with this request. I have also interviewed her husband as required by our standard procedures and this is to obtain corroborative history from the next-of-kin.

[13660] I have also watched the recordings of the parliamentary sessions where Ms Khan spoke on 3 August, 4 October as well as 1 November 2021. And I also watched the recordings of the Committee of Privileges when Ms Khan was testifying on 2 and 3 December 2021. And I also read the Reports from this Committee that is published on the Parliamentary website.

[13661] **The Chairman:** Would you like to take us through your assessment?

[13662] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** My assessment, based on the brief that has been provided to me, was that during the times that Ms Khan spoke in Parliament on 3 August, 4 October as well as 1 November 2021, as well as when she spoke at this Committee of Privileges on 2 and 3 December 2021, she did not suffer from any significant or material dissociation during these times.

[13663] I would also like to say that during this period from August to November 2021, she did not suffer from any significant psychiatric disorder that would have impaired her ability to testify or speak at such sessions as required for me to assess.

[13664] **The Chairman:** I see. I understand. Any other further observations you would like to share with us?

[13665] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I will be happy to answer any questions because there are many observations. If I may, I would also like to state that as far as possible, in your questioning, I will try my utmost best to protect the privacy of Ms Khan and unless really required by this Committee, I will endeavour to protect her privacy.

[13666] **The Chairman:** Yes, we appreciate that. Thank you. Minister Desmond Lee.

[13667] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Thank you very much, Dr Cheok, for your assessment that you've just provided. I thought it's important to set out the context. I think the Parliament Secretariat would have given you some background and hence, you went through all the material that was available in the public domain.

[13668] But as Mr Chairman had said at the start of this hearing, this Committee of Privileges has been set up to inquire into the conduct of the former Sengkang MP, Ms Raeesah

Khan when she said some things in Parliament on 3 August and 4 October which are allegedly untruthful. She has admitted to those untruths.

[13669] And then, the second thing we have been asked to do, of course, is to then assess her level of culpability. In that regard, the factual circumstances as well as any potential medical circumstances surrounding what she said in Parliament would be relevant for our determination to then weigh how serious her actions were.

[13670] And in that regard, through the course of the Committee of Privileges, we have heard conflicting evidence. Following the media reports, you would probably be familiar with what the conflicting evidence pertains to. And they, in gist, pertain to different accounts of what happened provided by Ms Khan and some witnesses, as opposed to Mr Pritam Singh and some other witnesses.

[13671] These turned upon, if and whether she was told to tell the truth in Parliament or told to, quoting her WhatsApp message, “to take the lie to the grave.” So, whether she was told by her superiors to confess and tell the truth in Parliament and make a clean confession of it. Or to maintain the narrative which is false and continue the lie.

[13672] In the context of that, there was a request by one of the witnesses, which is Mr Pritam Singh, Leader of the Opposition, to ask the Committee to assess her mental health or mental wellness, and in that context, some terms were brought to our attention, such as dissociation or disassociation, and post-traumatic stress disorder because these pertain to what she said about a sexual assault victim.

[13673] So, that is just the broad background, to give you a sense of what this hearing is about. I thought you could help us by giving us a sense of the brief that you were asked to carry out in terms of examination. You have just told us your assessment. And then, maybe give us a sense of the basis for your assessment, so that as laypersons of this panel, we have a better understanding. Thank you.

[13674] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I received this formal request from Parliament on the morning of Friday, 17 December. And, in this letter, they have actually given me the background as to why they have requested this assessment. And they’ve also provided some information. I do not know whether you have a copy of this brief that was given to me. If not, I’ll give it to the Clerk after this.

[13675] What they’ve said here was that Ms Khan had disclosed that a report dated 3 November was provided by her psychotherapist Ms Joanna Tan and she worked at Adelphi Psych Medicine Clinic. And that Ms Khan had also disclosed some information during the Workers’ Party Disciplinary Panel on 4 November.

[13676] They also stated here that Dr John Bosco Lee had referred Ms Khan to Ms Joanna Tan for therapeutic support and these sessions commenced on 12 October. They provided a memo from Ms Joanna Tan that stated that Ms Khan suffered from symptoms, and I stress again the word “symptoms” of post-traumatic stress disorder. And, from my interpretation of what’s on the memo, Ms Joanna Tan did not state that Ms Khan had post-traumatic stress disorder, only “symptoms of”.

[13677] In the email between, I presume, Parliament and Ms Khan, who had requested a memo from Dr John Bosco Lee, Ms Khan had replied that when she approached Dr Lee for a memo, he had mentioned that as Ms Joanna Tan was the primary therapist, it was more appropriate for Ms Joanna Tan to provide this report.

[13678] So, in this whole assessment, I have not had any sight of any reports by Dr John Bosco Lee. And in Singapore context, any psychiatric diagnosis is typically made by a psychiatrist.

[13679] So, in the brief that was given to me, it was required for me to assess whether Ms Khan was currently suffering from any significant or material dissociation, whether she was of sound mind and rational mind to provide evidence to the Committee, and whether she was able to recount rationally and understand the events that transpired in Parliament on 3 August, 4 October, as well as before the Committee of Privileges on 2 and 3 December, and whether Ms Khan had, at any stage, between August and November 2021, suffered from any significant or material dissociation that would have had an impact on her actions during this period. That was what was asked of me.

[13680] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, maybe, just to tally that with what you've just told us at the start of this hearing, you were asked whether she was suffering from any significant or material dissociation. Perhaps, you share with us what dissociation is for the benefit of all of us as laymen. And then, if could then repeat your assessment and tell us the basis for that. Thank you.

[13681] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Dissociation is the loss of the integrative function of the human mind. So, in a normal setting, the human mind is able to integrate many sensations, thoughts, processes, ideas, memory, muscle movement, so that the person can function in a coordinated way.

[13682] However, when a person dissociates, the person may lose one or more of these functions. And in the state of dissociation, this phenomenon is not caused by a medically diagnosed problem. That is to say, if someone dissociates and loses half the power in his body, it is not due to a stroke that has caused this impairment. It's actually a psychological reaction that impairs the person's brain function in a particular area of functioning.

[13683] There are many types of dissociation. Some forms of dissociation can be a person who may feel that he doesn't have a sense of himself. He feels like he's outside his body. Sometimes, they may feel that when they are looking at something, it looks as if that they are in a movie, like watching something like in a movie, two dimensional and not like three dimensional. Other forms of dissociation include a temporary loss of memory or a temporary loss of a particular power in their body and typically, after minutes or hours, these functions return to that person.

[13684] Dissociation can be caused by many reasons. In normal people without any illness, any pathology, a dissociation can happen when a person is in deep prayer, when they're meditating or when they're in a state of hypnosis. When a person consumes illegal drugs or when they are taking legal anaesthetic agents, they also can go into a state of dissociation. When there's a psychiatric illness, such as post-traumatic stress disorder or what we call dissociative disorders, the phenomenon of dissociation can also occur.

[13685] So, what I'm trying to emphasise here is that dissociation is just a symptom. It is not a medical diagnosis. It can occur in normal people. It can be induced by drugs or it can occur in the context of a psychiatric disorder.

[13686] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Thank you. So, what you're telling us is that dissociation is not a medical diagnosis, it is a symptom that can result from a range of causes, both clinical as well as external, due to drug use and other forms of action.

[13687] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Yes.

[13688] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, we're trying to focus on what happened on – maybe, say, let's start with 3 August, when she told the first untruth in Parliament about having accompanied a sexual assault survivor. Based on your assessment of Ms Khan and looking at all the relevant material that you've looked at, what is your assessment again and what's the basis for that assessment?

[13689] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I had viewed the recordings of her speech in Parliament that day and I've also asked her about it. During my interview with her, she said that she was present, fully present mentally when she was giving that speech in Parliament. And when I viewed the videos, there was no sign that she dissociated while she delivered that speech in Parliament.

[13690] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Okay. You mentioned that you looked also at 4 October, which is the second time she came to Parliament. She was asked some questions by the Home Affairs Minister about her 3 August anecdote, about the sexual assault survivor and she responded to his questions and in essence, repeated the untruth. What is your assessment of Ms Khan's state of mind or physiology at that point in time?

[13691] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I opined that she actually was really of sound mind. She did not dissociate and whatever she said, she was fit, mentally fit to say what she has said and it was out of her own will and she knew what she was doing.

[13692] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Thank you. Then we come to 1 November, which is her third Parliamentary speech in respect of this matter, which is the false anecdote about the sexual assault survivor. On that occasion, she made a personal statement explaining or saying that she had told untruths on 3 August and 4 October, and she then explained from her perspective why she had told those untruths. Again, could you share your assessment of her mental health state at that point in time?

[13693] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** When she delivered that speech on 1 November in Parliament, she did not dissociate during the time that she was giving that speech. I think that during that period of time, from after 4 October to the time she gave that speech, I believe there was some anxiety and some concerns that certain actions that she take would lead to certain consequences and she had sought treatment with Dr John Bosco Lee and also with Ms Joanna Tan.

[13694] But on the day, specifically on 1 November, while delivering the speech, she was of sound mind. She did not dissociate and it was very clear from the video recordings that she was present mentally during the time of the speech.

[13695] **Mr Desmond Lee:** So, based on your assessment, from the period of 3 August all the way to 1 November – that is your period of assessment, is it? Or more than that?

[13696] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Yes, that was the period of assessment — No, all the way to 3 December actually.

[13697] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Okay, when she appeared before the Committee of Privileges.

[13698] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Yes.

[13699] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Let's go to the two days in which she was giving evidence before us here and we want to have a sense of whether her evidence before the Committee of Privileges has, in any way been impacted by dissociation or any other possible mental disorder or clinical condition. When she appeared on 2 and 3 December, in your assessment, was she suffering from any impairment from mental health conditions?

[13700] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** No, she wasn't. Maybe at this point, I would just like to emphasise the standard to which we use. So, competency to testify to a Committee of Privileges or in Court, typically, from our standard, we say that the person must be able to understand the question, able to recollect the information and able to communicate to the Committee or to the Court. And in the Singapore Mental Capacity Act, it is said that a person has mental capacity when he is able to understand the information relevant to the decision, to retain that information, to use or weigh that information in the decision making process and to communicate that decision. This is our Singapore Mental Capacity Act. By using this standard, I opine that she was fit to testify before this Committee on 2 and 3 December.

[13701] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Yes, thank you. So, in your view, from August all the way to December, which is the period of your assessment, your view is that she's not suffering from any significant or material mental health condition, am I right? That's what I hear from you.

[13702] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Yes, I agree that from the period of August all the way to 3 December, she did not suffer from a psychiatric disorder so significant that it would have impaired her ability to give evidence or to make her speeches.

[13703] **Mr Desmond Lee:** When asked by this panel as to – because one of the witnesses, Mr Singh, said that Ms Khan was lying before the Committee of Privileges – and when asked why he thought she could have been lying, based on his assertion, he raised the possibility of dissociation or other mental health conditions that may cause her to lie or predispose her to lie. As a clinician, having examined the subject, Ms Khan, and looked at the material, is it possible? I mean, would she be suffering from any mental disorder that predisposes her to telling untruths?

[13704] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** She did not suffer from any psychiatric disorder that would predispose her to saying untruths. In fact, I have been in practice for more than 25 years and I've found that actually many people with psychiatric disorders do not tell untruths more than any normal human being. The only time that perhaps that they have to say untruths is during finding a job or in social settings. They may have to hide their mental illness because of social stigma. But other than that, they do not say untruths more frequently than any other human being.

[13705] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Okay. So, when she was giving evidence before the Committee of Privileges on 2 and 3 December, what you're saying is that her testimony was – she was of sound mind, she was able to decide for herself what she wanted to say or did not want to say, and not labouring under any mental disorder that would render her testimony untruthful or not of her own free will?

[13706] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I agree with what you said.

[13707] **Mr Desmond Lee:** Okay. Is there anything else you would like to share with this panel or to inform us?

[13708] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I'm happy to take questions.

[13709] **The Chairman:** Questions? Don.

[13710] **Mr Don Wee:** Hi, morning, Dr Cheok.

[13711] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Good morning.

[13712] **Mr Don Wee:** So, I understand that suspects who commit serious crimes would be put under surveillance while they're undergoing investigation so that they can't feign their mental illness and use it as a mitigating factor. I would like to seek your guidance as to how do you ensure that your interview with Ms Khan is robust enough and able to conclude that she's not suffering from disassociation, in case she calibrated the replies in front of you so as to suit a particular agenda?

[13713] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** In our assessment, we follow best practice in our profession and so, the best practice is to interview the person on multiple occasions. And in this case, I have seen her two times on 17 and 20 December. And we also independently interviewed the next-of-kin and usually we get someone who knows her well or has lived with her so that we can ask the person about her behaviour outside the clinical setting. In this particular case, it was fortunate that we had video recordings of how she behaved in Parliament, the things that she said, and also the Committee of Privileges interviews were also available for me to view. And because all these recordings are contemporaneous, they're live, it can easily corroborate my opinion that she did not dissociate at the times that I was required to assess her.

[13714] **Mr Don Wee:** Thank you.

[13715] **The Chairman:** Any other questions?

[13716] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Yes, I have. Good morning, Dr Cheok, in your interview with Ms Khan, did you ask her directly for her medical history of any symptoms of dissociation or post-traumatic stress syndrome?

[13717] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Yes, I did.

[13718] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** What was her answer?

[13719] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Can I give my summary opinion?

[13720] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Actually, I'm asking you what was her answer when you asked her directly, for example, her medical history or what she suffered, when she suffered from dissociation or PTSD, what was her direct answer to you.

[13721] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** She had some symptoms of psychological trauma. She had many – there were many times when she felt that she had been traumatised psychologically. The first time was after the sexual assault and there were times after the election, as well as, of course, after the election because there were certain Police investigations at that time. She felt psychologically traumatised. But being psychologically traumatised doesn't equate to having post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). So, she does have symptoms but it didn't reach the severity that a psychiatrist would diagnose PTSD.

[13722] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Did you find out from – I think you had read from the notes from the proceedings, the transcripts and all that which you were provided, I think you confirmed that you read through the evidence that had been given, and you are aware that she had a sexual assault experience, I think it is in 2008. Did you ask her what were the, did she share with you what were the traumatic effects that episode had on her over the past 10 over years?

[13723] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Yes, she did.

[13724] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Could you share with the Committee how would these, what were these traumatic experiences?

[13725] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** With due respect, Mr Tan, I think I would like to protect the privacy of Ms Khan. I would be happy to share with you my opinion about my findings, but I respectfully ask that I don't have to disclose what she has told me.

[13726] **The Chairman:** You can just provide your assessment and opinion. That will do, thank you.

[13727] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** My overall opinion is that whilst she did have transient symptoms of some symptoms of PTSD, it was not enduring, it was not persistent. And over the course of 10 years, as you have asked, she did not have symptoms that persisted and it did not impair her ability to function as a wife, as a mother and as a Member of Parliament.

[13728] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** So, are you saying that she would have recovered from the trauma of being sexually assaulted?

[13729] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** It depends on what degree you're asking for. I think when any normal human being has undergone a trauma, the memories would never be erased. Certainly, some of these memories can trigger some feelings of anxiety or disappointment or sadness when we recall it, but it doesn't reach that degree or that severity that impairs the person.

[13730] So, when you ask about recovery, what I'd like to specifically say is that she was psychologically traumatised by the incident. However, she did not reach the threshold that one would diagnose post-traumatic stress disorder and as a survivor, she continues to be able to function in her daily life, in multiple dimensions. When we assess, we would assess her ability to function at home as a parent, as a wife and also in her occupation.

[13731] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** In your assessment, do you think this trauma that she went through as a result of the sexual assault would still have some effect on her whenever the incident is being raised, when she thinks about the incident, such that it would affect her decision making on the incident? For example, when she decided to lie to Parliament on 3 August that she accompanied a sexual assault survivor to the Police station when she did not in fact do so?

[13732] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I think that when a person undergoes a traumatic experience, it would be naive to think that it has left absolutely no mark on the person.

[13733] However, on the speech on 3 August, I have been made to believe that this was a prepared speech, it wasn't something, the anecdote that she has mentioned was not said impulsively in Parliament, the speech had been prepared already, and she had known that that was an untruth. So, in my opinion, she did not dissociate or there was no psychiatric disorder that would have influenced her ability and her soundness of mind to write that speech and to deliver that speech.

[13734] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Are you able to then offer any reason as to why she would suddenly make up a lie like this?

[13735] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I don't think it is within my remit to make such an opinion and I do not think that this is the role of a psychiatrist.

[13736] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Thank you.

[13737] **The Chairman:** Mr Zaqy Mohamad?

[13738] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** I am not finished yet, Chairman.

[13739] **The Chairman:** Oh, sorry.

[13740] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Did you even ask her why she decided to share in Parliament on 3 August about her anecdote of accompanying a sexual assault victim to the Police station?

[13741] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Yes, I did.

[13742] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** What was her answer?

[13743] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** She said she was trying to advance the cause of what she believed passionately about, which was women's issues.

[13744] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** So, you think her own experience had no part to play in the lie?

[13745] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** What I can say is that she did not dissociate, she was of sound mind, she wrote the speech, she delivered the speech as she had written. As to her motivations and as to why she decided to lie, I don't think it is within my remit.

[13746] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** And you may recall from the evidence that she actually put in the relevant paragraphs on this lie at a very late stage in her speech. She has already prepared a speech and she put it at a very late stage. Do you think that there's any reason why she who do so and has this to do with the fact of her experience?

[13747] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Please correct me if I'm wrong. I have tried to, as much as possible, to watch all the proceedings and all that. I would like to qualify first that statements I make in the next few minutes may not necessarily come from a psychiatric opinion. It is what I have seen.

[13748] What I'm made to believe through the videos was that she had prepared the speech and Mr Singh had asked her to substantiate it, and perhaps, she had written that anecdote in to try to substantiate her speech.

[13749] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Yes, you're right. She was asked by Mr Singh to substantiate, to be prepared to substantiate. But my question relates to just before, that means, the fact that she had only squeezed in the anecdote very late in time right, do you think that has anything to do with the trauma that she went through as a victim herself?

[13750] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I think she feels passionately about this cause because of her experience. The passion probably is communicated in the speech and the topic she chose to speak on. I do not think that her experience of trauma would have directly caused her to want to write that particular anecdote, as it was written.

[13751] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Bear with me, let me organise my questions. I have a few more questions to go. What tests are typically performed to diagnose dissociation or dissociative identity disorder?

[13752] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Mr Tan, I would like to clarify that you are asking two separate questions —

[13753] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Yes, part A and B.

[13754] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** — Yes. What tests are for dissociation and the other one is dissociative identity disorder. For dissociation, typically there are no tests, such as brain imaging, that is required. It is about the observations of the witnesses, as well as the description by witnesses as well as the patient themselves. This is sufficient if it fits the description of dissociation for us to diagnose the symptom of dissociation.

[13755] Dissociative identity disorder is an extremely rare disorder. The common name for dissociative identity disorder is multiple personality. And in my career, I can't recall seeing any patient that fits dissociative identity disorder. It is that rare. They may exist in Singapore but certainly, I've not come across one in my own practice.

[13756] Dissociative identity disorder, or the layman term "multiple personalities", comes from, or typically is seen in a person who has gone through repeated childhood trauma. And the person will switch from one identity to another identity and even speaking in different voices, depending on the identity that the person assumes. So, this is a very rare condition and certainly, Ms Khan does not fit this description.

[13757] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Would you say that, can dissociation be triggered by any traumatic event?

[13758] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** If you ask me this in general, yes. A traumatic event can precipitate dissociation. Many times, during a sexual assault – and I say this in general. Many times during a sexual assault, the victim, the survivor may dissociate because the stress is so great that this is a coping mechanism for the survivor to go through that experience. So, yes, traumatic experiences can precipitate dissociation.

[13759] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** So, for someone with a trauma-induced dissociation or dissociative disorder, is it possible for a person to exhibit symptoms whenever the subject of the trauma is brought up?

[13760] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Certainly, in general, yes.

[13761] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** What would these symptoms be?

[13762] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** It depends on the person to person. As I mentioned earlier to this Committee, there are many forms of dissociation. Some people lose their memory, some people lose their muscle power, some people feel as if they are viewing their world like a movie, others have out-of-body, they feel they're not within their bodies, but they're slightly outside their bodies. So, it really depends on the individual.

[13763] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Would something like false memory creation be a symptom?

[13764] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** False memory creation can possibly be one form of dissociation, yes.

[13765] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** False identity creation?

[13766] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Alternate identity. It is possible.

[13767] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Memory lapses?

[13768] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Certainly.

[13769] **The Chairman:** These are general —

[13770] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Said in general.

[13771] **The Chairman:** — in general, right?

[13772] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Yes.

[13773] **The Chairman:** So, I think it is important to note that.

[13774] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** But otherwise, this person can still be high functioning in general, even when the traumatic event is not mentioned?

[13775] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Certainly. And even when the traumatic event is mentioned, not everyone dissociates. In the literature, following a traumatic event, roughly about one-third of people go on to have PTSD. It is not that everyone will go on to have post-traumatic stress disorder. We, as human beings, have our own protective mechanisms through the support of family, friends and the people around us, many people can recover from their psychiatric disorders. So, it is not to say that trauma equates to having dissociation, equates to having PTSD.

[13776] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** So, let me put it another way. Can a person with trauma-induced dissociation or even PTSD, be high functioning in general, but fall prone to memory lapses or false memory creation, when the subject of the trauma kicks in? Is that possible?

[13777] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** First, I would like to refer you – and I can provide this to the Committee after my testimony – to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Psychiatric Illness, fifth version. Basically, this manual is the criteria that we use to diagnose mental illness and it is published by the American Psychiatric Association. One of the diagnostic criteria that we are very concerned about is what we called Criterion G.

[13778] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Sorry? Criterion?

[13779] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Criterion G. And it states here: “The disturbance causes clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational and other areas of functioning”.

[13780] So, if a person is high functioning, then they would not have satisfied Criterion G, such that they would not be diagnosed with PTSD. I acknowledge that persons undergoing trauma can persist to have some symptoms of psychological trauma but they wouldn’t reach the threshold that it would become a psychiatric disorder.

[13781] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** So, you are saying, in other words, that in your view – Okay, let me put it another way. Do you agree or disagree that when I ask: can a person with trauma-induced dissociation or PTSD be high-functioning in general, but may still fall prone to memory lapses or false memory creation when the subject of their trauma is brought up or kicks in?

[13782] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I say in general, there is a possibility but we must always contextualise to the person that we are speaking about.

[13783] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** I don’t know whether you recall in the evidence, I can refer it to you if you need to, there was a message that Ms Khan sent to her two assistants after the outcome of her first meeting on 8 August with Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal, where she relates – let me go to that document. Please bear with me.

[13784] **The Chairman:** Perhaps while Mr Dennis Tan is looking for the particular points that were raised, perhaps I could build on it.

[13785] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Sir, Chairman, I can —

[13786] **The Chairman:** Yes, I'll just build on this; it's related to some of the points made earlier. Mr Dennis Tan was asking questions in general about some possible responses. But clearly from what you shared, there's really a range of responses from individuals who may suffer from these conditions or symptoms of these conditions. Would it be fair to say that one would actually really need to look at the specific subject and the specific context, to be able to provide a more accurate description of how an individual might or might not respond?

[13787] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Yes. We really need to contextualise to that individual and how the person responded. Because really, there is a range of responses following trauma, there's a range of dissociative experiences and we cannot generalise this whole topic and just speak in general. We really need to come down to the details for a particular patient.

[13788] **The Chairman:** I understand. Thank you. Dennis.

[13789] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Thank you, Chairman. Let me rephrase my question. Just now, I asked you and I think you agree generally, that a person with trauma-induced dissociation can be high functioning but fall prone to memory lapses or false memory creation.

[13790] So, let me go into a bit of detail about this false memory creation. Would it be possible that when the trauma kicks in, a person can be prone to making, in the course of a conversation, be prone to having a false memory creation? That means basically somehow a certain part of her speech contains certain falsehood and this is caused by this trauma? So, not the entire part of the speech is entirely untruth but in a conversation, she may relate a particular untruth amidst other facts which are not in dispute.

[13791] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** It is one of the many possibilities for why a person will make such a statement. There are many other reasons why the statement could have been made in that way.

[13792] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Okay. Can I refer you to the document tab, in Tab L, page 2. The documents are under Ms Loh Pei Ying but it's actually a WhatsApp message from Ms Khan to Ms Loh and Mr Nathan. It is at page 2, towards the bottom and is dated 8 August. Are we on the same page? And it says: "Hey guys. I just meet 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 agreed that the best thing to do is to take the information to the grave. They also suggest that I write a statement to send out this evening."

[13793] I think the issue at hand is that, it is not in dispute that Ms Khan met with Pritam, Sylvia and Faisal; that's the first sentence. The second sentence, they discussed about the Muslim issues and the Police accusation; this is not in dispute. And then, she goes on to say, "I told them what I told you guys and they have agreed that the best thing to do is to take the information to the grave." So, this statement, as you may be aware, is in dispute. Mr Pritam, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal do not agree that they had agreed with her that she should take the information to the grave.

[13794] And then, she finished the message by saying: "They also suggested that I write a statement to send out this evening." And you may recall this is a statement when she put on the Facebook about the Muslim-related issues of her speech, which is not related to the sexual

assault anecdote, that is, accompanying the victim of a sexual assault to the Police station anecdote.

[13795] Would you agree that this could be an example whereby a person suffering from a certain trauma, whilst still generally high functioning, could send out a message but would selectively put in a lie in her statement in her message?

[13796] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** So, now, we are speaking specifics, not in general. In this specific instance, in the context of Ms Khan and what I've assessed, I disagree with your statement.

[13797] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** But you agree that, in general, a person who suffers trauma would be able to speak, would be high functioning. So, when he's putting out a statement, talking to someone, giving a message, that conversation or that particular message can contain some falsity amidst other truths within the statement. Generally, it is possible?

[13798] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** In general, it is possible but there are also many other explanations why the person may want to give a falsehood.

[13799] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Thank you. Can I also move on to ask you about other aspects of when the trauma is mentioned? Is it the case that when a trauma is mentioned and a person suffering from PTSD or dissociation, it can create a certain distress to this person? Symptoms, right? This could be a symptom.

[13800] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Okay. So, in specific, Ms Khan does not suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder. But in general, what you have said is that, if you're talking about causing distress when talking about the trauma, I think it is quite understandable in our human experience that once we have undergone a traumatic experience, we cannot erase that memory. Because it's such a traumatic memory, it is not strange that a person would be distressed if someone brought up this bad experience. If someone mentions a bad experience, people would certainly feel negative about that traumatic experience. That's only normal in human beings.

[13801] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** In the evidence that has been given so far, I believe Ms Lim, Mr Faisal and Mr Singh have mentioned that in the various meetings they had with her, she had always been emotional whenever the issue of the sexual assault comes up. So, for example, I can just relate some of these incidents to you. "So, she burst into tears or she gets emotional every time the sexual assault incident was mentioned", at the meeting 8 August, all three of them mentioned it. I think the meeting on 12 October with Sylvia and Pritam, and during the two Disciplinary Panel interviews, and I believe in the CEC meeting on 29 October and 30 November.

[13802] How would you reconcile the fact that she's constantly emotional whenever this incident is mentioned during those occasions? How would you reconcile this with your earlier findings that she's not affected by any post-traumatic trauma or dissociation?

[13803] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I would like to clarify that my testimony is that she does not have post-traumatic stress disorder. I did not say that she did not have some symptoms of being psychologically traumatised. What I'm saying is that, it has not reached the threshold of a psychiatric disorder.

[13804] Based on the way you have framed your question, my opinion is that if she were to be emotional whenever the topic of her sexual assault was mentioned, this is a very understandable, very normal reaction from a survivor of a sexual assault.

[13805] A sexual assault is one of the most traumatic experiences that someone has gone through. It is a violation of their person. I would be very surprised if anyone can speak about their sexual assault plainly, callously without emotion. I think that's even more abnormal than being emotional when talking about their sexual assault.

[13806] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** So, would you say that she — Well, I note that you say that she is not suffering from PTSD, perhaps any more, but that you agree that there are still symptoms rather than the condition. Is that your distinction?

[13807] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Some symptoms.

[13808] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Some symptoms. So, she continues to suffer from some of these post-traumatic symptoms, whichever way we call it. So, you agree with that?

[13809] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** If I may just give an analogy. When a person goes for a major exam, a person may have anxiety. So, they have the symptom of anxiety, you know. It doesn't mean they have a generalised anxiety disorder or panic disorder which is a psychiatric illness. And each time they go for a high-stakes exam, they may still continue to have anxiety.

[13810] So, in the psychiatric profession, we always put in this criterion that the symptoms, when present, must be able to reach that intensity and that persistence that impairs the person's functioning.

[13811] So, many people who have gone through traumatic experience, be it a sexual assault, a road traffic accident, a physical assault, domestic violence, they would continue to have some anxiety when they speak about the topic or even if they watch a news story about another person's trauma. These are all normal reactions. But it doesn't mean that they are mentally incapacitated by their symptoms.

[13812] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Thank you. So, you're saying that some of these survivors of big traumatic events like sexual assaults or serious accidents, they may always suffer symptoms whenever the memory of the trauma is evoked and it can go on for many years, and they may not be exactly suffering from PTSD, so to speak? That is your evidence?

[13813] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** My evidence is that they may suffer the symptoms but these may not impair them. I would say that it will be very unusual for a person to undergo a traumatic experience and just erase it. If a person told me that they went through a traumatic experience and then went on to say, "I forgot it all totally", I would say that is highly abnormal. It's just a defence mechanism trying to perhaps compartmentalise or suppress that memory.

[13814] But if a person talks about their traumatic experience, they're able to talk about it rationally, in a measured way, displaying some emotion about it — but, of course, not too emotional — I think these are all very normal. I mean, it's normal human behaviour to act in this way.

[13815] So, specifically, I think, for Ms Khan, even though, some of these upsetting memories, she may feel upset by some of these things, it doesn't reach that threshold that would have impaired her judgement, impaired her decision-making capacity or her reality testing, even. She was of sound mind.

[13816] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Would it still be possible that when the trauma is brought up, it would have affected her judgement in such a way that she is capable of false memory creation, telling a lie?

[13817] **The Chairman:** Is this a specific question?

[13818] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** It is a specific question, applying to Ms Khan.

[13819] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** First of all, she doesn't suffer from dissociation. She may have said so but I think she used the term in a layperson's capacity, not from a professional definition of what dissociation is.

[13820] So, my testimony is that she does not suffer from dissociation or traumatic dissociation, for that matter. I do not think that, even when she speaks or the topic of her sexual assault was mentioned, it affected her so severely that she lost her mental capacity.

[13821] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Perhaps not losing mental capacity but lapses of judgement? Telling a lie, for example? Could you exclude that, definitively?

[13822] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** So, in the handbook of the Mental Capacity Act, it is said that people can make bad judgements and making bad judgements doesn't mean it is due to mental illness. Any normal human being can make bad judgements.

[13823] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** But it could be due to the trauma? The bad judgement could be due to the trauma?

[13824] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** In specific, for this particular instance, I do not think so.

[13825] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Did you ask her how did she arrive at her own admission that she suffers from dissociation?

[13826] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** If I recall correctly, she said that her psychotherapist told her that she had dissociation. I had asked her what did she mean by dissociation and her reply made me believe that she didn't fully understand what dissociation was. And when she used that term, she did not have a deep understanding of what that term meant.

[13827] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Can I just ask you a few more questions about dissociation? How many categories of dissociation are there?

[13828] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I think there are no real, how would I say this, internationally agreed way of categorising the different types of dissociation. But certainly, broadly speaking, there could be psychological manifestations of dissociation, for example, a loss of memory, a change of identity, a feeling that things are not real, a feeling that a person is not within their physical body. So, these are the psychological manifestations of dissociation.

[13829] **There are physical manifestations as well. Technically, we call them a conversion. But this is a technicality. And this is when people lose, sometimes, half their body sensation, half their body power. So, these are the physical manifestations.**

[13830] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Would you be able to share your understanding about dissociation being possibly conscious or unconscious?

[13831] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I don't understand that question.

[13832] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Are you aware that — No, let me rephrase this. Sorry about it. Is there a difference between a conscious or unconscious dissociation? Are you aware of this?

[13833] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Okay. I don't understand the context in which you're coming from. Let me answer you what I understand from your question. Some people can voluntarily try to put themselves into a dissociative state. This can be done through deep prayer, meditation, hypnosis even through trance in religious ceremonies. When people undergo a trance state, as we see from some of our Chinese temples, sometimes, what they call, "tiao dang" (in Hokkien). These trance states are all dissociative states as well.

[13834] **So, if you talk about consciousness, yes, they consciously enter into that state. Yes, some people can also unconsciously go into a dissociative state when there's extreme stress and they need to protect their mind from the stress. I don't really understand the context of your question.**

[13835] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Thank you for your explanation. Let me put in a certain context. Let me go back to how dissociation will manifest in the form of lying, telling an untruth. How would you apply the terms of unconscious and conscious dissociation to the fact that a person who suffers from it is lying?

[13836] **The Chairman:** Again, this is a general question or is it specific to Ms Khan?

[13837] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Yes, it is general question for now.

[13838] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** This is a very broad question because there are so many manifestations. Say, for example, a person has, dissociative identity disorder and the person assumes another identity. So, identity A, the person may call himself Peter; and identity B, he may call himself James. So, who is lying? Because he's assumed a different identity. Peter may say that he has gone to this particular school X and James may say he has gone to this particular school Y. These are the illustrative examples that I can provide but I don't think —

[13839] **The Chairman:** I think we are here and we've been going general questions —

[13840] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Chairman, can I continue.

[13841] **The Chairman:** Let me finish. I think the point here is that we're trying to evaluate and the doctor is here to evaluate Ms Khan's condition. I understand where you're going with the general questions but as explained, I think there are many, many variables and many circumstances. If it leads to where you would like to go, then that would be useful. But I

thought perhaps if we could be a bit more specific, that would be useful for us to assess her level of responsibility, which is what is the issue at hand today.

[13842] Because when you go into the realms of general questioning, there are so many possibilities and it really depends on context. So, perhaps if you could narrow it down, then that would be useful. Thank you.

[13843] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Thank you, Chairman for that. I'm sorry if I didn't make myself clearer. Let me try to make it a bit more helpful to you to understand. You were raising a certain example of a person having an identity, right? Let's say whether he's assuming a false identity consciously or unconsciously, there is an a difference, right? Is there a difference?

[13844] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** It really depends on —

[13845] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** He knows that he's assuming a false identity or telling a lie or he's not even aware? Is there a distinction as such?

[13846] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** In the case when a person dissociates, in the case of dissociative identity disorder, they truly believe they are that alternate personality.

[13847] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Could it also be possible that when they're suffering from some symptom of dissociation, they knew about dissociation and they make use of this knowledge as an excuse?

[13848] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Can I clarify, whether if a person knows that this phenomenon —

[13849] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** He's suffering from dissociation.

[13850] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** — of dissociation exists, then he uses it to the person's advantage?

[13851] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Yes.

[13852] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** That would be malingering, isn't it?

[13853] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** But that is possible, right? Is that possible for a dissociation sufferer or someone who thinks that he's suffering from dissociation to make use of that fact to his or her advantage?

[13854] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I mean, if you say in general, then, of course it is possible but that would be malingering.

[13855] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** But these cases do exist.

[13856] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Of course.

[13857] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** People do take advantage of that.

- [13858] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Certainly.
- [13859] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Thank you. But you do not agree that Ms Khan suffers from a conscious or unconscious form of dissociation at all?
- [13860] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I disagree, yes. She does not suffer from significant dissociation during the periods from August to 3 December.
- [13861] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** The fact that she has been telling people that she suffers from dissociation, including yourself, could it be possible that she has made use of this fact as an excuse for herself when she makes a lie?
- [13862] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I think that's beyond my remit. What I can say is that when I asked her what she understood by the meaning of the word "dissociation", it did not fit the medical definition of what dissociation is.
- [13863] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Did you ask her about the EMDR therapy that she has undergone?
- [13864] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** No, I did not.
- [13865] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Did you ask her about any treatment or therapy she has undergone recently?
- [13866] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I asked her why she had seen her therapist, yes.
- [13867] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Did you ask her about her treatments that she has undergone?
- [13868] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** She told me she was taking some medications and undergoing psychotherapy.
- [13869] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Have you analysed the treatments or prescription that she has been given?
- [13870] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** She informed me she didn't know the name of the tablets that she had been prescribed.
- [13871] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Have you sought to make contact with her, the medical practitioners that have been assisting her?
- [13872] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** No, I have not.
- [13873] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** So, you have not seen her medical records from the past?
- [13874] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I think under the Personal Data Protection Act, I have no access to her medical records. She has stated in the email to Parliament, the email to the Parliament representative, that she has attempted to get a memo from Dr John Bosco Lee and

he, from her interpretation, had said that it is better for Ms Joanna Tan to provide that memo. So, I have not had any sight of any medical report from her psychiatrist.

[13875] Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong: Did you ask her whether she had undergone any previous psychiatric or psychological treatment prior to August 2021?

[13876] Dr Christopher Cheok: Yes, I did.

[13877] Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong: Are you able to share with the Committee whether she has been undergoing treatment?

[13878] Dr Christopher Cheok: I respectfully decline to answer that question, to respect her privacy.

[13879] Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong: I understand. In your professional opinion, does Ms Khan harbour feelings of resentment towards Mr Singh or Ms Lim as a result of the events, sorry, not Ms Lim, Mr Singh – as a result of the events of 3 August to 1 November?

[13880] Dr Christopher Cheok: That's beyond my remit.

[13881] Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong: I'm only just asking whether, in your opinion, does she harbour any feelings of resentment from your interview and could these feelings have had a bearing on her testimony in the Committee of Privileges hearings?

[13882] Dr Christopher Cheok: That's beyond my remit.

[13883] Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong: Thank you. In the evidence that has been given, I would just try to summarise as best as I can, from the perspective of Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal certainly, she first — Let me just set out some facts and the context, then I'm going to ask you the questions, so the facts are a little bit long. But basically just to remind you that she first admitted to the lie to Mr Singh on, I think, 7 August, when Mr Singh pressed her about it.

[13884] There is a dispute in the version of events. Basically, Mr Singh's position to her is that she has got to deal with it, she's got to take ownership. Basically, Mr Singh's position is she has got to be prepared to go to Parliament to admit to the lie, okay?

[13885] Ms Khan has a different view of this. But assuming Mr Singh's position is correct, okay? So, we go down to 4 October in the second Sitting she then added another lie, she continued the lie. And after that she then, when she met Mr Singh and Ms Lim that evening, I don't know whether you remember this, she said to him: "But that's another path, honesty."

[13886] Yet, on 12 October, according to the evidence of Mr Singh and Ms Lim, when they were meeting at Mr Singh's request to prepare to make an admission in Parliament, she initially refused to admit, she tried to wriggle out of it. But she was then told that she had to do it and she agreed to deal with it.

[13887] Do you agree that her conduct has been confusing? That is, her conduct in not wanting to even come up to admit her lie for these number of months from August to October?

Do you find it confusing, why would she want to delay this coming to terms with this issue and making a decision what to do about it? Do you find it confusing?

[13888] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Because I don't really know what's the established facts. But I would find it difficult to comment on your question. All I can say is that she was not labouring under a significant dissociation and not labouring under a significant psychiatric disorder.

[13889] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Can I just ask you, after you have assessed her, you have shared with the Committee about your findings, bearing in mind what you've said she is not suffering from PTSD or dissociation, but I think it is not in dispute that – I mean, from what you have shared, that she may still be suffering from symptoms, especially when the incident of the trauma of her sexual assault is raised each time. What would you advise to her as possible treatments or possible measures that she can adopt to minimise any risk, to minimise such incidents?

[13890] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I can speak in general about some strategies to cope with some of these things. But I'm not her treating doctor, so, it is not my place to answer in specific for her. Because I think this is best suited to be advised from her treating doctor. I'm just the assessor.

[13891] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Okay. Chairman, I have no more questions.

[13892] **Mr Chairman:** Mr Zaqy Mohamad.

[13893] **Mr Zaqy Mohamad:** Doctor, thank you so much for sharing some of your insights and assessments. In your opinion, I'm just going to move to the period where she delayed her decision to come clean or didn't come clean. So, in your opinion, would trauma, mental state or her symptoms have affected her decision making process to hold back for three months, between August and October? Whether any of these would have been a challenge or barrier to her to come clean?

[13894] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I don't think specifically trauma in itself would have played such a big role in her decision making to delay or not to delay. I think there may have been other priorities or other reasons why she chose to take the actions that she has taken.

[13895] **Mr Zaqy Mohamad:** So, Doctor, what you are saying is that actually she has perfectly sound judgement, sound mind to make that call?

[13896] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** So, to be clear, I think she had the capacity to make decisions. Whether she made a good decision, bad decision, whether she chose to say a truth or untruth, but she was aware that she was taking such a course of action.

[13897] **Mr Zaqy Mohamad:** Okay, good. I was just trying to see whether something clouded her judgement in that sense. So, in your opinion, if it was made clear to her that she had to come clean early, say in August or September period, early on, she would have been of sound mind and she could have made perfect judgement to make that call if needed, if it was made clear to her.

[13898] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** She had the capacity to make the decision as to what she wanted to do. Whether the decision was right, wrong, good, not so ideal, that's a separate issue altogether.

[13899] **Mr Zaqy Mohamad:** I understand. Basically, I think, if you suggested to her that is "your call", she had perfect judgement, in that sense, to decide what she wanted to do. So, it is not impaired by – just to confirm – not impaired by any of these?

[13900] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** I wouldn't use the word "perfect". I mean, she had adequate capacity to make those decisions.

[13901] **Mr Zaqy Mohamad:** Whether she was asked to lie, to delay or to make a call, just to confirm again, that she would not have been confused? She would not be in a confused state?

[13902] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Medical definition of "confused", she would not have been in a medically defined confused state that would have impaired her so significantly that she didn't have the capacity to make the decisions.

[13903] **Mr Zaqy Mohamad:** Thank you, Doctor. No further questions.

[13904] **The Chairman:** Any other questions? Perhaps if I can make some observations. Maybe to build on what Mr Dennis Tan was asking. He presented a set of facts. Actually, what we are really trying here to do is to determine what the facts are. Essentially, there are two versions, you could broadly boil it down to that and that's really at dispute and that's what the Committee of Privileges is trying to determine, whether she had in fact been telling the truth, her recount of the instructions and directions given to her. That's one version. The other version is, as Mr Dennis Tan alluded to, was suggested by Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap, who disagreed with her version. So, that's another version.

[13905] We are in the process of trying to determine which is accurate, which is true. And I guess that's where the question has arisen as to her judgement, her medical condition, mental state and whether she has been able to make rational decisions. As you've shared, general questions, general responses really vary and there are many reasons why people do different things. All of us do many things as well, but that doesn't necessarily mean that there is a mental impairment of any sorts.

[13906] But in your judgement and what you've shared and if I were to understand correctly, is that in your assessment talking to her, talking to her husband and also going through the footages that have been available during the said period, looking at the transcripts, what has been discussed in your opinion, medically, she doesn't suffer from some of the conditions that have been put forward to you.

[13907] Basically, she is of sound mind, she's conscious, she's able to make the decisions, whether they're right or wrong decisions, that's a different matter. All of us make right or wrong decisions all the time. But in your professional opinion, she was aware and conscious of what she was doing, would that be correct?

[13908] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Yes.

[13909] The Chairman: So, I think that really behoves the Committee of Privileges to determine, I guess, in our effort to determine which version seems to make sense and that's within our remit. But I think we do thank you for your assessment. And I do understand the sensitivity and I think you've done that to refrain from going into the details where it may not be necessary.

[13910] I just want to place it on record – as someone who, for me, personally, who supports a lot of the work in the mental health front – concerns about mental health stigmatisation, about how perhaps we could sometimes over-medicalise things, which doesn't help those who actually do have the conditions. Would there be any general observations and comments that you would like to share with us for our own understanding and perhaps, also for the public understanding, as to how we should approach issues like this? Because there is always the temptation to, I guess, attribute mental health conditions to individuals for various reasons, but would there be any general sort of comment you would like to share with us, given the context of what we've been trying to address today?

[13911] Dr Christopher Cheok: I think that many people living in our urban society would undergo different stresses from work, family life and society in general, but just because you have certain stress and emotional symptoms doesn't mean you have a psychiatric disorder.

[13912] However, a good proportion of Singaporeans do suffer from some form of psychiatric disorder and I think if anyone does have a psychiatric disorder, I think it would be very useful for them to seek help. Seeking help doesn't mean going to a psychiatrist. You can also go to a mental health professional in the community. There are agencies out there that have counselling services in the neighbourhood available to them. So, I think most important is seeking help. And I think there is no shame to admit that one is suffering from a psychiatric disorder or even stress from the normal stresses of life. But most important is that we are able to support each other. And a good number, in fact, the vast majority of people with mental health conditions do recover, and it is important that we give them support so that they can make a full recovery and get on with their lives.

[13913] The Chairman: Would it be also correct to say that we should be careful not to over-medicalise and over-analyse and attribute conditions to folks because we all do feel stress and concerns? Would that be something that we should bear in mind because it does also stigmatise those who may actually suffer from such conditions?

[13914] Dr Christopher Cheok: Yes, I think we shouldn't use these psychiatric terms loosely. And if you were to use the terms, I think we should have a reasonable understanding of what they mean and not to just use it casually. Because I think a person who truly suffers from a significant psychiatric disorder would feel that the other person doesn't truly understand their experience.

[13915] Many people have told me that when they suffer from a major mental illness, the number one thing that they feel sad about is that they feel lonely, because they feel that no one else can understand their experience and they find it difficult to find someone to relate to.

[13916] The Chairman: I understand. Okay. So, with that, there being no other questions, thank you very much for the assessment and sharing with us your evaluation on Ms Khan and the terms which we have put forward to you through IMH. A transcript of the proceedings will be shared with you for verification. Do go through it. If you have any

amendments, do make changes and send the transcript back to us. If you've written up any short report, do make it available to us as well, if there are any.

[13917] Do note that the transcripts and any evidence given to the Committee are not to be disclosed to anyone or published and must be kept strictly confidential until the Committee has presented its Report to Parliament. There being no other questions, once again, thank you very much for your assistance. You may withdraw. I would like to ask the Sergeant-at-arms to accompany the witness out. Thank you very much.

[13918] **Dr Christopher Cheok:** Thank you.

[13919] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Thank you, Dr Cheok.

(The witness withdrew.)

(The hearing adjourned at 11.17 am and resumed at 11.34 am.)

[13920] **The Chairman:** Serjeant-at-arms, please invite Ms Raeesah Khan to the witness table. Thank you.

[13921] Ms Khan, please take your seat. Thank you once again for coming back. I would like to remind you that you have made an affirmation to tell the truth. The proceedings today is a continuing of the last hearing. You're still bound to your solemn obligation and if you refuse to answer our questions directly, attempt to prevaricate or wilfully mislead the Committee by providing false evidence, such behaviour will be an offence and in contempt of the Committee. I'll now call on Minister Edwin Tong, who has a few questions for you.

[13922] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Good morning, Ms Khan.

[13923] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Good morning.

[13924] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Since you gave evidence to this Committee several weeks ago, we've received some additional evidence on the areas that we touched on when you were giving evidence. That's in the form of oral statements – evidence before this Committee – as well as some documentary evidence. I would like this morning to show them to you and give you an opportunity to respond to them and ask for your views on this evidence that came to us after you had given evidence.

[13925] And I'll try to refresh your memory as to what you said as well, so if you remember, you let me know and then we can move quickly, but if not, I'll be very happy to show you the context behind the question that I'd be asking.

[13926] You remember we spoke about what happened on 8 August. In context, that was the day on which you met with Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal at Mr Singh's home. Do you recall that?

[13927] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[13928] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And on this occasion, you had admitted the falsehood, the false anecdote, to the three of them, and I recall asking you if it was put in very clear terms and whether they understood you, and I think you said yes. Do you recall?

[13929] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[13930] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. I would like to just ask you to read certain passages of your testimony to yourself. If you can please look at the right-hand side, there are several bundles. If you can pick up 2 December and turn please, to page 87. On the top second line, you're recorded as saying Mr Pritam's Singh's house. Do you see that? [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 1495.*]

[13931] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[13932] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Just quickly read this to yourself and let me know when you're done. This part of the page as well as half of the following page, page 88.

[13933] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[13934] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. In summary, your evidence was that you went to Mr Singh's house, you admitted to them that what you said on 3 August as far as the anecdote was concerned was false. You said that there was some disappointment, anger but also a lot of compassion. And at page 87, you said "The reaction was that if I were not to be pressed, then the best thing to do would be to retain the narrative that I began in August". And you said, in response to my question, "It means, 'If you can get away with it, we don't need to clarify the lie', correct?" You said, "I think in the simplest terms, yes, you are correct." And so on.

[13935] After that meeting ended, you recall that you then sent a message to Ms Loh and Mr Nathan. The evidence that we've heard so far from Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal is that the meeting ended around shortly after 12.00 pm. The meeting was about an hour, an hour plus. Was that also your recollection?

[13936] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[13937] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the message that you sent to Mr Nathan, and which I'd like to show it to you again if you can't remember, was sent at 12.41 pm on that day. And if you can leave the page open and just pick up a submission to the Committee of Privileges by Ms Loh on 2 December? This is the WhatsApp messages, yes. On the second page at the bottom, you'll see the message that was extracted as a screenshot and you will see the timing stamped at 12.41 pm. [*A message was referred to.*] Do you recall that?

[13938] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[13939] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, leaving that for a moment, subsequent to you giving this evidence, we heard from all three of the persons who were present at the meeting. I'd like to just show you the evidence that they gave to us. If you can start with the 9 December transcript, again, on your right-hand side. Do you have that, Ms Khan?

[13940] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[13941] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Please turn to page 109. You can cast your eye over the next few pages, beginning from 109, which is Mr Faisal’s evidence on what happened on 8 August at which he was present. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 9 December 2021, from Para No 3741.*] Do you have that?

[13942] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[13943] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Just cast your eye over the next few pages and let me know when you’re ready. Right through to page 115.

[13944] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Okay.

[13945] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay? Thank you, Ms Khan. Mr Faisal makes two broad points. He says that after you recounted your experience of the sexual assault, he felt very overwhelmed. He used that word many times in the course of his testimony. And he said that as a result of that, there were no further discussions relating to or queries on the admission that you made that you told a lie in Parliament. Was that your recollection?

[13946] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, that’s not my recollection.

[13947] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** He also says that, in his words, there was zero discussion thereafter on the question of the lie and what to do thereafter. Is that your recollection?

[13948] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, that’s not my recollection.

[13949] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, Mr Faisal, in your views, on that basis, you would disagree with him.

[13950] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I think he’s downplaying what the discussion was.

[13951] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. As far as you can recall, can you give us an account of what happened in relation to the admission that you made about the lie?

[13952] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** After I made the admission, there was of course discussion about my well-being, which I think rightly so because I had just shared a very deeply personal experience that I’ve had. And the discussion that followed was that we would not pursue the matter further and like in my message, Mr Singh used the words “take it to the grave”.

[13953] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the words “take it to the grave” came from Mr Singh?

[13954] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[13955] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Are you very clear about that? Is that your recollection?

[13956] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, I’m very clear.

[13957] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. And that's the language that you used in the message that you sent to Mr Nathan and Ms Loh at 12.41 pm.

[13958] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes. It is not a phrase that I would usually use, so it did not come from me.

[13959] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. Did he say this in the presence of Ms Lim and Mr Faisal?

[13960] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, he did.

[13961] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** He did. Understand. Thank you. Let me show you what Mr Singh says. If you can please pick up the bundle dated 10 December and turn, please, to page 175. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 10 December 2021, from Para No 10166.*]

[13962] If you can please look at the bottom of the page, I had referred Mr Singh to the same transcripts of your evidence that I've just showed you a moment ago. And if you can see, I made a reference to 2 December, page 87. Those were the same pages I showed you earlier.

[13963] And if you can go over the page to 176, you will see, around the first one-third of the page, I had read to Mr Singh your evidence. Do you see that? And I ended by asking him: "Would you agree with that?", Mr Singh says: "Completely disagree." And I put to him your next few lines, I said: "Let me understand the last statement." Do you see that? Do you see that, Ms Khan?

[13964] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[13965] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. Just read it to yourself until the portion where Mr Singh says, "I'm saying it's completely untrue and it's a lie."

[13966] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Okay.

[13967] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, Mr Singh completely disagrees with your account of what happened at the meeting. Can you give us your response to that? Would you agree with Mr Singh? He says you're lying.

[13968] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I mean, of course, I disagree completely. I have come here to tell the truth and I've made an oath to do so as well, and I've never strayed from that.

[13969] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, if Mr Singh is saying that he completely disagrees with your account and that your account is a lie, then you would disagree with that, and as far as you're concerned, Mr Singh would be lying when he says that he disagrees that it ever happened?

[13970] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I'm saying that I'm telling the truth.

[13971] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. Can you carry on reading over to page 177? Do you recall, Ms Khan, that you also told us that Mr Singh's initial reaction was that this would be something that would be taken to the Committee of Privileges? You remember that?

[13972] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[13973] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that you said subsequently, the position changed and you then said it was changed in favour of not raising it if you're not pressed and to leave it alone.

[13974] Can you look at the next few lines of page 177? The first half of the page, Mr Singh says that "That's not correct. There was no discussion that I recall on the Committee of Privileges at that point." So, I then asked him: "So, you did not tell her, even initially, that she should go to the Committee of Privileges?" Mr Singh says: "Not at that point." And he goes on to say: "Certainly not. The Committee of Privileges, I don't know how she recollects this on 8 August, but that discussion did not take place, because her condition was – she was not in a condition."

[13975] Did Mr Singh raise the question of the Committee of Privileges on that occasion on 8 August?

[13976] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes. His exact words that I can recollect were that: "My initial reaction or my initial instinct is to put you through the Committee of Privileges."

[13977] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** As far as you recollect, were those Mr Singh's words?

[13978] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[13979] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. And you then told us when you were last here that subsequently, that position changed. Can you recollect what words were used as far as you can remember?

[13980] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Once the discussion developed, it was that it would be best that it not be brought up further. I cannot remember the exact words.

[13981] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The exact words. Do you remember if either Ms Lim or Mr Faisal said anything in this context?

[13982] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, I cannot remember.

[13983] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Mr Singh goes on, if you keep to the same page. I then asked him, near the bottom of this page at 177, and I again read to him your testimony, beginning with the words: "8 August, thank you. So, I said, 'the upshot of the meeting...'" Do you see that?

[13984] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[13985] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And I asked him, "You would disagree with that?", given his earlier statement, he says "Absolutely." So, on this account, you would also disagree with Mr Singh?

[13986] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

- [13987] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Am I right?
- [13988] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.
- [13989] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** We were told by Mr Singh, Mr Faisal and Ms Lim that you left the meeting first. Is that also your recollection?
- [13990] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, that is my recollection.
- [13991] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** As Mr Singh was walking you out from his home, he mentioned that he had a conversation with you. Do you recollect that?
- [13992] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Very briefly.
- [13993] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you recall what was said?
- [13994] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, not at all.
- [13995] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** He informed us that he told you, as he was walking out, that you should tell your father about this and that “we will deal with this matter.” I’m paraphrasing but to that effect.
- [13996] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Okay.
- [13997] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you recollect that?
- [13998] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, not in the slightest.
- [13999] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Was there any discussion at that point about whether you should disclose this to your father, to your family?
- [14000] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, there was no discussion.
- [14001] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At the 8 August meeting?
- [14002] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, not at all.
- [14003] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** There was no such discussion?
- [14004] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.
- [14005] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. The impression that I got, at least, from the testimonies of both, in fact, all three – Mr Faisal, Ms Lim and Mr Singh – was that you were very emotionally affected and unable to have a conversation on this issue. Again, can you give us your account on that?
- [14006] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** If I was not able to have a discussion on this issue, then why would I have been left on my own to make a decision as they have claimed, which is not what happened? They —

[14007] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Alright.

[14008] Ms Raeesah Khan: Yes – and to use mental illness as a way to discredit someone, I think, is extremely out of line.

[14009] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: At the meeting, Mr Faisal said that after you had calmed down – again, I’m paraphrasing his words – he then proceeded to have a discussion with you on a statement that he had been discussing with you concerning clarification or editions to your speech that you had made just a few days prior to that. Do you remember that?

[14010] Ms Raeesah Khan: Yes, exactly. So, I was of enough, of sound mind to have a discussion about that.

[14011] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Was there a long break between your admission and the discussion on the statement?

[14012] Ms Raeesah Khan: No, it was right after.

[14013] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Was it at the same location?

[14014] Ms Raeesah Khan: Yes, same location, same time.

[14015] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Can you give us a brief account of what was discussed about your statement?

[14016] Ms Raeesah Khan: What was discussed was that: what were my views on what the statement should look like, how I felt as a Muslim woman in the community and what the statement could look like, and that I would be drafting the statement with assistance from Party leaders.

[14017] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: So, some views were exchanged and Mr Faisal had told us that he had been communicating those views with you by messages prior to 8 August. And from what I heard from you, some views were exchanged at that meeting and then you were to take it back and draft the statement. Is that right?

[14018] Ms Raeesah Khan: Yes.

[14019] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Did you have occasion to clear the draft with any of the other Party leaders who were present at the meeting?

[14020] Ms Raeesah Khan: I cleared the draft, yes, I think so.

[14021] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Did you discuss the draft on the same day? I assume so because you posted it later that day.

[14022] Ms Raeesah Khan: Yes, we discussed what the content would be.

[14023] Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai: Did you share your draft with either Mr Faisal, Ms Lim or Mr Singh at some point in time after the meeting and before you posted it?

- [14024] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.
- [14025] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did they give you comments to it?
- [14026] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, they gave some edits here and there.
- [14027] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You were shown earlier the message that you sent to Mr Nathan, Ms Loh, at 12.41 pm.
- [14028] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.
- [14029] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you recall from where you sent this message?
- [14030] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I sent it from the car.
- [14031] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You drove?
- [14032] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, I can't drive.
- [14033] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you sent it whilst you were making your way away from Mr Singh's home?
- [14034] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.
- [14035] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I would like to show you Ms – or perhaps I'll just ask you if you recall. A few days prior to 8 August, I think, on 6 August or 7 August, probably the 7 August, you had come to be aware from Ms Loh and Mr Nathan that they were meeting Mr Singh on 10 August. Do you recall that?
- [14036] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.
- [14037] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You had discussed that earlier and I think we heard from Ms Loh as well. You would have known, by 8 August, that Ms Loh and Mr Nathan were going to be meeting Mr Singh shortly after 8 August, at a meeting at which you would not be present. Correct?
- [14038] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Correct.
- [14039] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And there was an expectation amongst the three of you that this issue concerning the lie in Parliament, about the anecdote, would probably come up. Correct?
- [14040] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.
- [14041] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** It eventually transpired that there was some other issue that Mr Singh wanted to discuss with them. But the evidence we heard from Ms Loh is that the issue did arise albeit briefly and it was quite clear to Ms Loh that Mr Singh was aware of the lie. Was that also your impression after discussing it with Ms Loh, after 10 August?
- [14042] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14043] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What else did you discuss with Ms Loh after she and Mr Nathan had met with Mr Singh on 10 August?

[14044] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I do not recall that we discussed much about it, just that we would not pursue the matter further.

[14045] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Just to be complete, Ms Lim was shown Mr Faisal's testimony, the same portions I showed you earlier, and she says that she agreed with Mr Faisal that there was hardly any discussion, if at all, on the question of the lie. Would you agree with that characterisation?

[14046] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I think hardly at all, no.

[14047] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. I would like to refer you now to 3 October. You remember that was a visit that Mr Singh paid to you at your home. Just before that, between 8 August and 3 October, did you have any discussion with any of the Party leaders about the lie in Parliament and what to do about it?

[14048] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, we did not.

[14049] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you tell us why?

[14050] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I think because we assumed that it would not be brought up again.

[14051] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, on 3 October, Mr Singh says, and again, I'll paraphrase, that he went to your home because there was a Parliamentary Sitting the next day. You had been absent for the September Sittings because of shingles. So, this is now an occasion where you'll be in Parliament. And he said that he had contemplated that this issue might arise and he went to discuss it with you. So, that's the context of this meeting.

[14052] I would like to just remind you of what you said to this Committee. If you can turn to 2 December again, your transcripts, and turn, please, to page 83. Do you have it, Ms Khan? Page 83, if you just look at the bottom half of the page. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 1435.*]

[14053] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14054] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You said, "Before the October Sitting, I had a conversation with Leader." Do you see that?

[14055] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14056] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Just read it to yourself, this page, all the way through to the first half of the next page.

[14057] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Okay.

[14058] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This conversation that you had with Mr Singh, was it just the two of you?

- [14059] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, just the two of us.
- [14060] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At your home.
- [14061] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.
- [14062] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At that time, were there other people present in your home?
- [14063] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, I mean, I would like to clarify that, I think when you asked the question, I assumed that it meant who was present in the conversation.
- [14064] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes.
- [14065] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** But he came with his wife and, like I mentioned, they came because they wanted to drop off some stuff.
- [14066] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** From your own household, were there other people present at home?
- [14067] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, my mother and I think my father and my husband and my brother were there as well.
- [14068] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. It is just that they were not present at the occasion of the meeting where you had the dialogue and the conversation with Mr Singh.
- [14069] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, because we were seated in a corner.
- [14070] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Can you give us again the gist of the conversation you had with Mr Singh? To the best of your recollection.
- [14071] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Sure. He brought it up because he had a feeling that it would be brought up in Parliament again, and that if I were to stick to the narrative, if I was to stick to my position, there would be no judgement from him.
- [14072] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. I will ask you some questions from Mr Singh's testimony but I would like to show you what Ms Loh said about this meeting. Again, to give you the context, Ms Loh was not present at this meeting on 3 October, but she gave testimony that on 12 October, when she and Mr Nathan met with Mr Singh, Mr Singh had recounted what he said to you on 3 October to both of them. And I'm showing you her statements as she recollects it directly from Mr Singh. Okay?
- [14073] The same bundle, 2 December, and if you could please turn to page 74. No, sorry, I'm mistaken. I think it is page 23. Sorry. Again, bottom one third of the page beginning from Ms Loh saying, "This is information that I have that was shared with me after 4 October". Do you see that? [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 2 December 2021, from Para No 405.*]
- [14074] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14075] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Are you there? Okay. Just read that to yourself right through to half of the following page.

[14076] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, okay.

[14077] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At page 24, just to round up the point, Ms Loh said, “I don’t know if they discussed what response she should give. As I said, it was relayed to me that they had a conversation, and that conversation was that he had a feeling that she would be pressed about this issue again. And his response to that was that he would not judge Ms Raeesah Khan.” So, that was Ms Loh’s impression from her own conversation with Mr Singh. Can you give us your comments on that? Would that be consistent with how you saw it? Would this account go against what you’ve said? Give us a response.

[14078] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I think it is consistent with what I’ve said, but I would add that he did not give any directive to clarify the lie in Parliament.

[14079] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Ms Lim came before this Committee, again, after you had given evidence. And she also gave evidence both orally as well as with reference to some documents, which I would like to show you. If you can just leave the bundle there where it is and please pick up from the transcripts of 13 December. Again, let me give you some orientation, Ms Khan. On 29 November, you asked for a meeting before the Disciplinary Panel (DP). Do you remember? You gave us some evidence of that as well.

[14080] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14081] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you had asked for a meeting because the first meeting had raised questions of your general work and performance as an MP, and you wanted an opportunity to address that. You recall?

[14082] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14083] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, so, this was, I think, a meeting on 29 November in the morning. Ms Lim had taken notes of that meeting and she told this Committee that she wrote it in the first person. So, whoever was speaking, she would try as verbatim as possible to record those words and she also told us that she took notes contemporaneously in her handwriting. So, I would like to show that to you.

[14084] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Sure.

[14085] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you can pick up the submission made by Ms Lim. Do you have a copy? Sorry, Ms Khan, the Clerk will assist you with one more copy, okay? *[A document was referred to.]*

[14086] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Thank you.

[14087] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Ms Khan, before you are the documents submitted by Ms Lim when she came before this Committee of Privileges. That was on 13 December, after you gave evidence. So, if you can just quickly cast your eye over the next few pages, you will see some handwritten notes and they are then accompanied by a typed up transcript of the

handwritten notes. You will see the first meeting was on 8 November. That's the first occasion you had with the DP, correct?

[14088] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14089] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And then down the page, you will see that there's another transcript of a meeting on 29 November, starting at 10.30 am. Do you have that?

[14090] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14091] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And that's accompanied by Ms Lim's contemporaneous handwritten notes of the same meeting, which was then typed up. So, I would like to refer you to the second last page of the handwritten notes. At the bottom, you'll see a 12, page 12. Do you have it? It should be towards the end of that bundle that the Clerk had handed you earlier.

[14092] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Okay.

[14093] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Thank you. So, let me just show you the portion that appears at the bottom half of this page through to the next page. And then, I'll show you the parts which are typed up, which makes for easier reading. I wanted to show you that this is how it appears in the handwritten notes submitted by Ms Lim. And if you can then go to the typed up notes of the same meeting and go to the last page. The last page has a reference called "binder page 17" at the bottom of the page.

[14094] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Okay.

[14095] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, this is from Ms Lim's handwritten notes. "PS", which is Mr Singh. *[A note was referred to, with the following text.]*

PS: Before October session, I met you and told you it was your call. Did the need to tell the truth in Parliament occur to you?

RK: Yes, but consumed with guilt plus own experience. Thought it wouldn't come up.

PS: Can't lie, right?

RK: Yes.

PS: Where do you place Party in decision making?

[14096] **Mr Singh** confirmed that Ms Lim's notes accurately reflected what he told you at the DP on 29 November. Is that also your recollection?

[14097] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, sorry, I was reading this. Can you repeat your question?

[14098] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Sure, take your time.

[14099] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Thank you.

[14100] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Would you like to read the preceding page as well so that you have the context?

[14101] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Okay.

[14102] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay? Mr Singh has confirmed that Ms Lim's notes accurately capture what was said by him to you at this meeting on 29 November at the DP. Was that also your recollection that he said these words?

[14103] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No.

[14104] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you give us an account of what was said to you?

[14105] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** That if I were to continue the narrative, I would not be judged. That's what he said to me.

[14106] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** That's what you told us he said to you on 3 October, right?

[14107] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14108] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On 29 November, it is a different occasion.

[14109] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14110] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You're now before the DP, and these notes record what was said by each of the parties present at the DP. And Ms Lim's notes record Mr Singh as saying, "Before October session, I met you and told you it was your call. Did the need to tell the truth in Parliament occur to you?" And so on. I'm asking you about 29 November now.

[14111] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Okay.

[14112] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you recall if these words were said to you on that occasion?

[14113] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, I recall this.

[14114] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You recall this exchange.

[14115] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14116] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Mr Singh, when asked about this exchange, says that you got to see the words in the context of the entire discussion and he pointed us to several other parts of the conversation. But he also agreed that the phrase "It's your call" on its own would mean that Ms Khan, yourself, could make a choice as to whether to tell the truth or to lie, if she was asked on 4 October. In this context, can you let us know if those words were used in the same way on 3 October, at your meeting? If so, can you try to recollect the gist? If not, can you recollect what was said by Mr Singh on 3 October when he met with you at your home?

[14117] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** It was not — This was not said the way it is here in the transcript.

[14118] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Based on this recording.

[14119] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14120] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you explain then what was said and how it was put across to you?

[14121] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** It has been the same that I've — I don't have anything else to add.

[14122] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. So, would I be correct to say that the words in this transcript on 29 November suggest that it's your choice to make?

[14123] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14124] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But the impression and the words conveyed by Mr Singh on 3 October, did not give you a choice. Was that, am I accurately summarising your evidence?

[14125] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** He did not put forth that it was my choice to make.

[14126] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What did he say to you?

[14127] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** If he said that if I were to continue the narrative, he would not judge me. He did not put it forth as saying, you can either tell the truth or you can continue with the lie.

[14128] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. And did he on that occasion tell you that you should tell the truth in Parliament?

[14129] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No.

[14130] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Let me put to you what Mr Singh told us. Again, subsequent to you giving evidence. If I can ask you to pick up Mr Singh's transcripts. That is dated 10 December. Please go to page 29. Or you can start at the bottom of 28 for the context. Start with my question, "With your wife, can you tell me what happened on this occasion?" So, read that into the next page, 29. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 10 December 2021, from Para No 7468.*]

[14131] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14132] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay? Mr Singh says, and I'm paraphrasing his evidence, that he says he sat with you and told her, meaning yourself, "I'm not sure what's going to happen with the anecdote but it is possible that a clarification will come up. Somebody may ask you something about it, and he says that it is important that you take responsibility and take ownership of the issue." Did he say these words to you?

- [14133] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, this is the first time I've heard him say these words.
- [14134] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And then he goes on to say, "and I did say and she started getting a bit uncomfortable when I said that, and then I told her, I will not judge you." Did he say that in this way?
- [14135] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Not in this way, no. And I was never uncomfortable.
- [14136] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You were not uncomfortable about the conversation.
- [14137] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, I was not. I was in my own home.
- [14138] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. He then goes on to explain that "I will not judge you", and I'm reading from page 29, "meant I will not judge" – meaning yourself, Ms Khan – "if you take responsibility and ownership. That was the gist of the conversation. I didn't get the sense that she was going to be uncomfortable with telling the truth."
- [14139] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Why would I be uncomfortable with him asking me to tell the truth?
- [14140] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did he ask you to tell the truth on this occasion?
- [14141] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, he did not.
- [14142] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you go further down the page and into pages 30 and 31, just quickly cast your eye over the next few pages and I will ask you some questions.
- [14143] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Okay.
- [14144] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, at page 30, "Was there anyone in your home?"; "No, there was not.", and he says "I think she has told a lie. That's not true." I think you covered that earlier.
- [14145] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.
- [14146] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What you meant was there were people present at home but the conversation you had with Mr Singh was a private one, no one else was present in that conversation. Is that right?
- [14147] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.
- [14148] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Then, at the bottom of page 30, I showed him what you had said and he says: "I saw the transcripts. I was shocked about it and I want to relay to you that this is not true."
- [14149] Then, I went further into what you had said. Do you see that at the bottom of page 30?
- [14150] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14151] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And then, at the top of page 31, “Not at that point in time, no.” “Not on 3 October?” “No.”; “So, you disagree with this?” “Absolutely.” “If this is what Ms Khan said, you would say she’s lying?”, answer by Mr Singh, “Absolutely.” Can you give us your response to that?

[14152] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** That I would not lie on oath.

[14153] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you would disagree with Mr Singh’s evidence on this?

[14154] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes. Yes.

[14155] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And you stand by what you said to this Committee previously on 2 December as well as what you’ve just said to us here about what happened on 3 October?

[14156] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14157] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. When Mr Singh left your home on 3 October, was there any discussion about what you might be saying on 4 October? Was there a draft of what you might say? Was there a discussion on how you might approach the issue if it came up?

[14158] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No.

[14159] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I would like to now move to 4 October. On this day, Parliament did sit. Let me just recap it again. Parliament sat at 11.00 am that day. By 12.30 pm, Parliamentary Questions were over and Minister Shanmugam stood up to make a short Ministerial Statement. You were present in the Chamber at that point in time.

[14160] After you gave evidence, we received a document. I think it was from yourself, if I’m not mistaken, on 7 December and that it contained a WhatsApp message. I would like to show it to you. Or if you do recall it, then I won’t have to trouble you.

[14161] On 4 October at 12.34 pm, a few minutes after Minister Shanmugam stood up to speak, you sent Mr Singh a message, “What should I do, Pritam?”

[14162] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14163] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do you recall that?

[14164] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I recall that.

[14165] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Why did you ask this of Mr Singh at that point in time?

[14166] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Because I was unsure of what to do.

[14167] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What were you thinking he might say to you?

[14168] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Who are you referring to?

[14169] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh, sorry.

[14170] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Mr Singh. I thought that he would say just continue because that was the conversation that we had the night before.

[14171] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But he didn't reply to you?

[14172] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, he didn't.

[14173] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I would like to show you an excerpt from the video, the footage. Can the Clerk assist me, please? I will just put up a short excerpt of what happened on 4 October. *[A video clip of the 4 October 2021 Parliament Sitting was shown. The text can be found in Singapore Parl Debates; Vol 95, Issue No 39, Sitting of 4 October 2021, Ministerial Statement section.]*

Ms Raeesah Khan (Sengkang): I thank the Minister for the clarifications. Like I said, it did happen three years ago, and I have not been successful getting in touch with the person that I accompanied and with regards to confidentiality, I would prefer for it to remain that way.

Mr K Shanmugam: Sir, I asked which Police station, which month and the identities of the officers, to the extent Ms Khan knows them.

Mr Speaker: Ms Khan, to facilitate the investigation by the Police, to check.

Ms Raeesah Khan: Thank you. I do not know the identity of the Police officers.

Mr Speaker: And the questions on Police station, date and so on.

Ms Raeesah Khan: With regards to confidentiality, with the survivor, I will not like to reveal any of this information. Thank you.

Mr K Shanmugam: Sir, we are talking about the Police station. That has got nothing to do the confidentiality.

Mr Speaker: Understand. Ms Raeesah Khan. The Minister is not asking about the identity of the individual.

Ms Raeesah Khan: I understand but, with regards to confidentiality, I will not be revealing any other information. Thank you.

Mr Speaker: Minister.

Mr K Shanmugam: Sir, I have to say that, perhaps, Mr Speaker has the power to direct answers since the matter has been raised and through you, Sir, I ask for the direction to be given that we be told which Police station and the month; if not the date, at least the month and which Police station.

Mr Speaker: Ms Khan, I think that is a fair question. Would you like to respond or are you holding to the same position? The reason is that certain allegations have been made which I think are fair and serious. The Police, I understand, would like to follow up to check to make sure that they can rectify the situation. So, any leads would be useful without divulging the name of the lady concerned.

Ms Raeesah Khan: Thank you. I would still like for it to remain confidential. Thank you.

[14174] **Okay**, let me stop it there. Ms Khan, I could see that you brought your phone with you to the podium to speak and that you had looked at it from time to time. Can you tell us what you were looking for?

[14175] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I was looking for an answer from Mr Singh.

[14176] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And when there was no answer forthcoming, you gave those answers. Can you tell us why?

[14177] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Because this was a discussion that we had on 3 October, the evening before.

[14178] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh then replied to you shortly after this exchange was over. Again, do you recall that, or if not, I can show it to you?

[14179] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I recall it.

[14180] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In gist, again to paraphrase, he said “We’ll speak about it later”, and to keep Chairman and himself informed. Did you have any occasion to meet with Mr Singh? I know you did at about 11.00 pm that evening, but prior to that, did you have occasion to meet with him or speak to him?

[14181] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I don’t recall.

[14182] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did he call you?

[14183] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I don’t recall but I recall that we met that evening.

[14184] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Ms Lim said that she met with you earlier that day in the afternoon. Do you recall that?

[14185] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14186] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She says that it was around 2.00 pm.

[14187] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14188] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you tell us where you met?

[14189] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** We met in the LO (Leader of the Opposition) office.

[14190] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Was Mr Singh present?

[14191] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No.

[14192] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** She said she wanted to meet with you for broadly two reasons. One, to ascertain your emotional state and, secondly, to give you her view that you should seek legal advice.

[14193] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14194] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Again, do you broadly recall those as being the topics of discussion?

[14195] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14196] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** How long was this meeting?

[14197] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I think it was very short, maybe about 10, 15 minutes.

[14198] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** I would like to show you what Ms Lim said about that meeting. If I may ask you to pick up Ms Lim's transcripts again?

[14199] So, if you go to page 26, at the bottom, she says: "I had two purposes", what I have just summarised to you earlier. And then she proceeds to give an account of it over the next page or two. [*Minutes of Evidence; Hearing of 13 December 2021, from Para No 12360.*] Can you just quickly cast your eye over it?

[14200] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes. Yes.

[14201] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** At the middle of page 27, Ms Lim says that she suggested to you to get legal advice. You did get legal advice thereafter, did you not?

[14202] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, I did.

[14203] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Yes. She then goes on to say that when I asked her, "Did you ask her", meaning yourself, "why did you repeat the untruth?", Ms Lim said: "I didn't ask her that." That's also your recollection?

[14204] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14205] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did Ms Lim ask you why did you lie?

[14206] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, she didn't.

[14207] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did Ms Lim ask you why not tell the truth?

[14208] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, she didn't.

[14209] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did Ms Lim say that there was a Sitting the next day, on 5 October, and you could clarify the lie on the next day, to you?

[14210] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, she didn't.

[14211] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did Ms Lim ask you what you discussed with Mr Singh?

[14212] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No she didn't. I don't think she was aware that we met.

[14213] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** One of the reasons which Mr Singh and Ms Lim. and to a lesser extent, Mr Faisal, offered as to why there was no timeline for you to come to

Parliament to clarify the lie was that you had needed to square the position with your family first, to tell them about it, to give you an opportunity to break the news to them first. That was what they had told us.

[14214] **On this occasion, on 4 October, did Ms Lim ask you if you had told your family about the sexual assault and whether they were aware that that was the reason why, or at least one of the reasons why, you had then made up the anecdote in Parliament?**

[14215] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, they didn't.

[14216] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** On any occasion did Ms Lim, Mr Faisal or Mr Singh ask you if your family was aware, any occasion prior to 4 October?

[14217] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, they didn't. Only at 8 August meeting.

[14218] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** 8 August when you first recounted the experience?

[14219] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes. Because they asked me who else knew.

[14220] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay, I understand that. Ms Lim, when she was asked why it was not feasible to clarify the lie at the very next Sitting, which is on 5 October, she gave this reason. If I can refer you to page 29 of the transcripts, just read from the bottom question which I had framed through to the following page.

[14221] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Okay.

[14222] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Ms Lim, in summary, when I asked her why it was not possible to clarify the lie on the next day, said that it's possible but it would be a rush to do the clarification on 5 October because they would need time to go and ascertain from you exactly what you want to say and whether it can withstand scrutiny.

[14223] Eventually, you did clarify the lie on 1 November and there was a process by which you looked at the draft and revised the draft. So, in that context, would you agree with the statement?

[14224] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I think if I was told to clarify on 5 October, I would have.

[14225] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, the haste that she talks about could be done if you were told to clarify the lie on the next day.

[14226] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14227] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did you think there was any impediment in terms of whether your family was aware or otherwise?

[14228] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** It would have been one conversation with my parents. I think the issue would have been if I were to include the personal anecdote in my clarification or not.

[14229] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** But from your recollection, this issue of asking you to clarify the lie on 4 October itself, or the next day, on 5 October, did not come up in this conversation?

[14230] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No.

[14231] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Later that evening, you did meet with Mr Singh and Ms Lim again at about 11.15 pm. We had from you and also from – I think from yourself a series of messages exchanged at around 11.15 pm. Do you recall that meeting?

[14232] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14233] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** This meeting was also at the LO's office?

[14234] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14235] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** With Ms Lim and Mr Singh present?

[14236] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14237] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh told us it was a very short meeting. Would that also be your recollection?

[14238] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14239] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh told us that when you arrived at the meeting, you had a dazed look and that you said these words and I quote: "Perhaps there's another way, that is, to tell the truth." Do you recall making this statement?

[14240] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, I did.

[14241] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** He says that you were dazed and somewhat disoriented. Would you agree with that?

[14242] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, I would not agree with that.

[14243] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you explain what you meant by those words when you said it to Mr Singh?

[14244] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I meant that, perhaps, it is – I should take the opportunity to clarify and tell the truth.

[14245] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** When you say there's another way, what do you mean by that because when someone says there's another way, it contemplates that there is a path or two choices? So, can you explain to us in that context what did you mean?

[14246] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** As opposed to continuing the narrative.

[14247] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Which was your impression from the conversation the day before?

[14248] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14249] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, you approached Mr Singh with these words. What was his response?

[14250] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** That if that was what I wanted to do, I should have done it on 4 October.

[14251] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** What did you intend or hope to get from Mr Singh by making this statement to him?

[14252] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I was hoping for a clear directive to either tell the truth or —

[14253] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** In the context of what had happened on 4 October?

[14254] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, in the context of what he said on 3 October as well.

[14255] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Of course, by this time on 4 October, you had just seen an exchange —

[14256] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14257] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** — that you had and it was left off as there will be further investigations with the Police, right? And it was in that context that Ms Lim then says get legal advice, presumably because the Police were going to be asking questions of you.

[14258] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14259] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** So, was this statement made in that context, having taken one path from what you had said on 3 October and now, with what has just happened on 4 October, you are asking Mr Singh for his view on whether there should be another way?

[14260] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14261] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Do I summarise it correctly?

[14262] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14263] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Is there anything else you want to add to this?

[14264] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, there isn't. I mean, I would like to add that again, he's trying to paint this picture of me as being emotionally or mentally unstable, which again, I think is completely out of line and hopefully, there's a testimony that would say, you know, that I'm of sound mind.

[14265] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Okay. Your recollection of that meeting on the night of 4 October, you were not upset or emotionally – upset is perhaps the wrong word, but to characterise it as you not being in control of your mental emotions – your emotions and your mental state being unstable and being emotional. I think he said that you were also crying.

- [14266] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I was stressed, but I was not crying.
- [14267] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. He told us that his reaction, or at least one of his reactions, to what you said was to say the words, “But look at the choice you’ve made”. Do you recall that?
- [14268] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** No, I do not recall that.
- [14269] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** You don’t. Okay. Ms Lim’s account of this is similar. She says that she remembers you talking about “another path, which is honesty”, and that she said that Mr Singh responded by asking you “if you hadn’t already chosen that path”, by what you had done in Parliament that day. Do you recall that?
- [14270] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.
- [14271] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And what was your response to that?
- [14272] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I didn’t have a response to that.
- [14273] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Can you tell us why?
- [14274] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I think because I was shocked. Because I had that conversation with Mr Singh on 3 October and there was no intention or a directive from his part to tell the truth. I think I would have expected that someone would say that to me if there was a conversation around telling the truth.
- [14275] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Mr Singh’s evidence before this Committee on 3 October was that he said to you “to take ownership and responsibility” and that he won’t judge you. He also said that he didn’t use the words, “go and tell the truth or clarify the lie in Parliament”, but that’s what he meant and he was in no doubt that when he left the meeting at your home, that was what he had conveyed to you.
- [14276] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I mean, he never said the words “take ownership or responsibility” to me on that night.
- [14277] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** The words were as you said earlier, “continue the narrative and I won’t judge you.”
- [14278] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.
- [14279] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Are you very clear about that?
- [14280] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I’m very clear about that.
- [14281] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** If you were going to clarify the lie in Parliament, which is something you eventually did on 1 November and you had come around to that view by around 12 October, based on the evidence that we heard earlier, there would have been steps necessary to have been taken in preparation of that, correct?
- [14282] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, correct.

[14283] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** And would you have involved Ms Loh and Mr Nathan in those steps?

[14284] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, I would have.

[14285] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Why?

[14286] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Because they've helped me from the beginning with some of the speeches I've had to draft and they understand the complexities of the issue, especially about me bringing up my own experience.

[14287] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Would you also have appreciated that clarification of a lie that was said in Parliament and by this time, it was two and a half, three months ago, that would have a significant adverse impact?

[14288] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14289] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Were Ms Loh and Mr Nathan discussing this with you?

[14290] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, they were discussing about what the negative impact might be after I make the speech and they were very concerned over my welfare and they asked permission from Mr Singh to take over a lot of my social media accounts and some of my emails.

[14291] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Was this in contemplation of the adverse publicity that would arise after 1 November?

[14292] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14293] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Right. Can you give us an account of what steps were taken and how many meetings you had from 12 October, all the way through until 1 November when you actually made the clarification in Parliament?

[14294] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** We had two meetings. One was with the leaders of the Party, one was with Ms Lim, Mr Singh and Mr Manap; and one was just the three of us.

[14295] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** How many drafts did you look at and exchange? Do you recall offhand?

[14296] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I can't recall but I think there were three or four drafts.

[14297] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Did Mr Singh and Ms Lim give their views to you on the drafts?

[14298] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, they did. I think we had one more meeting as well at – I think for the final draft, we had another meeting at Mr Singh's house.

[14299] **Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai:** Alright. Thank you, Ms Khan. Mr Chairman, I've got no further questions now.

- [14300] **The Chairman:** Any other Members have questions? Mr Dennis Tan.
- [14301] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Hi, Ms Khan.
- [14302] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Hi.
- [14303] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Just a very few questions, more to clarify. Can you remember the speech you made in Parliament on 3 August? Did anybody help you to prepare the draft? Can you remember?
- [14304] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I worked it primarily on my own but because there was a lot of research to do with the work but some volunteers contributed here and there.
- [14305] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Do these volunteers include Ms Loh Pei Ying or Mr Yudhish Nathan?
- [14306] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** For this particular speech, both of them did not assist.
- [14307] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Did you check with them the draft before you posted it on the portal?
- [14308] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Not this particular draft, no.
- [14309] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Thank you. You told the Disciplinary Panel that you had post-traumatic stress syndrome and dissociation. Can I ask you —
- [14310] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Can I clarify that point?
- [14311] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Sure.
- [14312] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I mentioned that I might — I mentioned that the therapist said that I might have symptoms of PTSD. And when I was asked what symptoms they were, I said one of the symptoms was dissociation, but I never said that this was something that I was going through.
- [14313] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Okay. Who is this therapist that you're referring to?
- [14314] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** The one that sent in the, I don't know if it is a recommendation or the one that sent in the letter to say that I'm physically fit to continue work.
- [14315] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** So, this was in the recent months, right?
- [14316] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.
- [14317] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Prior to — Actually, since the sexual assault incident in, I think, 2008, and until August this year, have you ever sought treatment for any counselling, any help from any doctor regarding any trauma that you might have gone through?
- [14318] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I did see a therapist here and there, and I also went to this women's group that I mentioned.

[14319] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** This therapist that you mentioned. Is it in Singapore?

[14320] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes, it is in Singapore but we did not particularly explore this issue, as I thought that I would have recovered from it.

[14321] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Do you remember how long ago this was?

[14322] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I saw someone on and off, I think, throughout the few years, throughout the two years, two and a half, three years.

[14323] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Last three years?

[14324] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes.

[14325] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Did you ever share this with Dr Cheok, whom I believe you met in the last few days, from IMH?

[14326] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Yes. Yes, I did.

[14327] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Are you able to share with the Committee what did your lawyers advise you on the issue of whether or not to respond to the Police request for information or interview?

[14328] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Sure. They shared with me that if any clarification were to be made, they should be made in Parliament, but that I should still respond to the Police to tell them that this was my view.

[14329] **Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong:** Thank you. Chairman, no more questions.

[14330] **The Chairman:** Any more questions, anyone? No? Okay. We have no further questions for now. We would like to thank you, Ms Khan, for coming before the Committee again. The transcript of the proceedings will be shared with you for verification. Do go through it. If you have any other minor amendments, do make the changes and send the transcript back to us.

[14331] Please do note that the transcripts and any evidence given to the Committee are not to be disclosed to anyone or published and must be kept strictly confidential until the Committee has presented its Report to Parliament. Once again, thank you very much. You may withdraw.

[14332] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** Thank you. Chairman, can I say something, please?

[14333] **The Chairman:** Yes, you may.

[14334] **Ms Raeesah Khan:** I think talking about mental health, especially in this day and age, is very sensitive, and to use it to discredit someone sets back our movement to work on mental health and to further things like even that we were doing called Beyond the Label to encourage people to seek help when they need. That's all I wanted to say.

[14335] **The Chairman:** I fully understand. Thank you very much. Thank you very much for sharing on some of these fairly personal matters as well. You may withdraw. Serjeant-at-arms, do accompany Ms Khan out. Thank you very much.

(The witness withdrew.)

(The hearing adjourned at 12.45 pm.)