

FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT OF SINGAPORE

First Session

THIRD SPECIAL REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Parl. 7 of 2021

Presented to Parliament on

12 December 2021

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Members

Mr Speaker (Mr Tan Chuan-Jin)
Chairman

Ms Grace Fu Hai Yien
Minister for Sustainability and the Environment

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

Ms Rahayu Mahzam
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Communications and Information and Ministry of Health

Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Minister for Culture, Community and Youth and Second Minister for Law

Mr Don Wee

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

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
THIRD SPECIAL REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES	1
Annex A – Summary of Key Points from Evidence Given by Mr Pritam Singh on 10 Dec 2021	A1 – A10
(I) – Events in August 2021	A1 – A3
(II) – Events leading up to Mr Singh’s 3 Oct meeting with Ms Khan	A3
(III) – Events in October 2021	A3 – A7
(IV) – Events in November and December 2021	A7 – A10
Annex B – Minutes of Proceedings	B1 – B2

THIRD SPECIAL REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

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

1. On 10 December 2021, the Committee heard oral evidence from Mr Pritam Singh.
2. A summary of the oral evidence given by Mr Pritam Singh is set out at **Annex A**.
3. After hearing the above witness, the Committee resolved to make the entire video recording of the oral evidence, with sensitive information redacted, available to Parliament and thereby to the public through the Parliament website.

Next steps

4. The Committee will continue to investigate the Complaint and hear further evidence. It will make its findings and recommendations in due course.

Annex A

(A) Summary of Key Points from Evidence Given by Mr Pritam Singh on 10 Dec 2021

1. Mr Pritam Singh (“Mr Singh”) gave evidence to the Committee of Privileges (“COP”) on 10 Dec.
2. The key points from Mr Singh’s evidence are summarised below.
3. Mr Singh agreed that the issue that the COP was looking into, namely a Member of Parliament (“MP”) telling a lie in Parliament, was a very serious matter. He said that if a Workers’ Party (“WP”) MP told a lie, the minimum expected was that the MP would have to correct it, and come forward with the truth.
4. Mr Singh also agreed that if an MP is aware that a falsehood has been told to Parliament, the MP has an obligation to correct it, regardless of whether the lie came from that MP or not.
5. Mr Singh was asked about the untruth (that Ms Khan had spoken in Parliament on 3 Aug) in relation to the Police. He was told that the false allegation painted a picture of the Police. In response, Mr Singh denied that Police would be adversely impacted by such a lie. He was asked if it was “okay to have a lie in Parliament where the lie relates to the reaction of the Police, bad reaction... to a complaint by a sexual assault victim”. In response, Mr Singh said that the Police were not a ‘broken-back’ organisation. He questioned the amount of work put in by the Police to check on the allegation. Mr Singh also said that he didn’t feel that a wrong had been done to the Police by Ms Khan’s untruthful allegations against the Police.

I. Events in August 2021

6. On 3 Aug, Mr Singh met Ms Khan in the Leader of the Opposition’s (“LO”) office. This took place after Ms Khan had been questioned by Minister of State (MOS) Desmond Tan about the anecdote raised in her statement in Parliament (“the 3 Aug Parliament statement”), concerning a sexual assault victim whom she claimed to have accompanied to a police station.
 - a. Ms Khan told Mr Singh that she was unable to contact the victim in question. Mr Singh told Ms Khan she had to clarify on the record, in Parliament, that she could not contact this person, if that was indeed the position.
 - b. Mr Singh then drafted a short statement for Ms Khan, based on what she had told him. Ms Khan revised one sentence in the statement, and proceeded to deliver it in the House that same day.
7. Over the next few days, Mr Singh continued to ask Ms Khan for details concerning her anecdote.
8. On 7 Aug, Ms Khan called Mr Singh. During the call, Mr Singh asked Ms Khan directly, whether the anecdote in her 3 Aug Parliament statement had happened. Ms Khan confessed and told Mr Singh that this did not happen. Mr Singh was very angry and upset when Ms Khan told him this, and ended the call.
9. On 8 Aug, Mr Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim (“Ms Lim”), and Mr Faisal Manap (“Mr Faisal”) met with Ms Khan at Mr Singh’s home (“the 8 Aug meeting”).

- a. During that meeting, Ms Khan explained that she had told the untruth because she was labouring under a traumatic episode after having been the victim of a serious sexual assault. She was upset, and cried as she shared her experience.

Mr Singh asked Ms Khan who else knew about her sexual assault. She replied that Ms Loh Pei Ying (“Ms Loh”), Mr Yudhishthra Nathan (“Mr Nathan”), her husband, and her therapist knew.

Mr Singh told Ms Khan that she would have to speak to her parents about this issue.

- b. There was no substantive discussion at the meeting on what to do about Ms Khan’s untruth. According to Mr Singh, everyone was shocked at the news. They were sympathetic to Ms Khan, and were more concerned about her well-being.

Mr Singh did not direct or instruct Ms Khan to clarify the untruth. He also did not recall Ms Lim or Mr Faisal discussing what to do with the untruth and how to clarify it

- c. After Ms Khan composed herself, Mr Singh, Ms Lim, Mr Faisal and Ms Khan discussed the issues relating to female genital cutting and polygamy, which Ms Khan had also brought up in her 3 Aug Parliament statement. They agreed that Ms Khan would put up a Facebook post clarifying her position on female genital cutting and polygamy that same evening.
- d. As Ms Khan was leaving Mr Singh’s house, Mr Singh told her, “We’ll have to deal with this issue, but speak to your parents first.”

10. Based on what Ms Khan said that day, Mr Singh had no doubt that Ms Khan had told a lie in Parliament.
11. In view of her sexual assault, Mr Singh said that he was prepared to give Ms Khan the time to speak to her parents and therapist. Mr Singh said that it was important for Ms Khan to speak to her parents because that would be a condition precedent to her coming clean in Parliament.
12. Apart from his statement that “we’ll have to deal with this, but speak to your parents first” (see above), Mr Singh agreed that it would be fair to say that Ms Khan would have left the 8 Aug meeting not being very clear in her mind about the Party leaders’ instructions on how to deal with her lie.
13. Thereafter, there were no other communications between Mr Singh and Ms Khan about the lie she had told to Parliament, until 3 Oct (see below).
14. Mr Singh disagreed with Ms Khan’s account of the 8 Aug meeting. He said that there was no discussion during the meeting about referring Ms Khan to the COP. He also denied asking Ms Khan to take her untruth “to the grave”. Ms Khan had given evidence that she was told this at the meeting and, a few minutes after the 8 Aug meeting, had sent a WhatsApp message to Ms Loh and Mr Nathan, saying the same. Other than the part of Ms Khan’s message about taking her untruth “to the grave”, Mr Singh agreed that the other parts of her message to Ms Loh and Mr Nathan were accurate.
15. On 10 Aug, Mr Singh met Ms Loh and Mr Nathan on an unrelated matter. Mr Singh recalls confirming that Ms Khan had lied in Parliament. They did not discuss what Ms Khan had told

Ms Loh and Mr Nathan – namely, that she had been asked by Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal to take the lie “to the grave”. There was also no discussion as to whether or when Ms Khan should come forward to clarify the lie.

II. Events leading up to Mr Singh’s 3 Oct meeting with Ms Khan

16. Mr Singh said that after the 8 Aug meeting, he did not check with Ms Khan in Aug, as to whether she had spoken with her parents about the sexual assault. Nor did he have any discussions with Ms Khan about coming clean on the matter. The next parliamentary sitting was on 13 Sep. Mr Singh said that he could have considered the Sep sitting as a possible window for the truth to be clarified. But he did not take any steps to speak with Ms Khan about the matter and get it clarified during the Sep sitting. There was no discussion with Ms Khan on setting out the truth during this session, and no preparations were made for her to come clean. Mr Singh said it was Ms Khan’s responsibility to speak to him about the matter, after she had settled things with her parents. He said that he was in no position to know when that would happen. A few days before the September sitting, Ms Khan had shingles, and did not attend the September sitting.
17. Mr Singh said that between the 8 Aug meeting and end Sep, no steps were taken by himself, Ms Lim or Mr Faisal to ensure that Ms Khan would come clean about her untruth. There were no attempts that could be construed as consistent with wanting Ms Khan to come forward and come clean. Mr Singh agreed that he did nothing at this point in time.
18. On 1 Oct, Mr Singh sent a general email, to all WP MPs. This general email was sent by Mr Singh after he came across the Hendrickson affair, which he wanted to share with his fellow MPs, in the course of preparing for the FICA debate in the Oct sitting of Parliament. Mr Singh told all the WP MPs that they had to be able to substantiate any statements made in Parliament, or risk facing the COP.

III. Events in October 2021

3 Oct – Mr Singh visited Ms Khan

19. On the evening of 3 Oct 2021 (the day before the Parliament sitting on 4 Oct), Mr Singh visited Ms Khan’s home with his wife. Mr Singh confirmed that between the initial 8 Aug meeting (two months earlier), and this visit on 3 Oct, he had no discussions with Ms Khan about the untruth she had told in Parliament.
20. When they met on 3 Oct, Mr Singh told Ms Khan that it was entirely possible that someone might ask her about her 3 Aug anecdote, in Parliament the next day. He said that “if the issue came up”, Ms Khan had “to take responsibility and ownership of the issue”, and if she did so, he “will not judge” her.
 - a. Mr Singh was asked if he had told Ms Khan directly, to tell the truth in Parliament. He said that he did not specifically tell her to speak the truth, in those terms.
 - b. Mr Singh however said that was what he had meant, by the words that he had chosen to use.
21. Mr Singh agreed that none of the usual preparatory steps (which were taken in the lead up to the 1 Nov statement) were taken vis-à-vis the clarification that Ms Khan might have to deliver on 4

Oct. Prior to the 1 Nov statement by Ms Khan, to clarify her untruth, the following steps were taken:

- a. There were several meetings to discuss the draft personal statement.
- b. Mr Singh and Ms Lim gave comments to Ms Khan's draft statement.
- c. Ms Loh and Mr Nathan helped Ms Khan with her draft.
- d. Ms Khan's father gave input on the draft.
- e. The WP Central Executive Committee ("CEC") was told on 29 Oct, and they reviewed Ms Khan's draft.

None of the above steps were taken prior to 4 Oct. Mr Singh said that none of these steps were taken before the October sitting because he was not sure whether the matter will come up during that sitting, and if it did not come up, then Ms Khan may not have clarified.

22. Mr Singh was asked to clarify his evidence on what the position was, if the matter was not raised. At one point, Mr Singh said that he had told Ms Khan that she had to take "ownership and responsibility of the issue" and thus Ms Khan had to clarify the truth, even if the matter was not raised. At another point in his evidence, Mr Singh said that if the matter did not come up, then Ms Khan would not need to clarify the truth, during the October sitting. Mr Singh denied that he had changed his evidence. Mr Singh also said that if the matter did not get raised, then he (Mr Singh) had no plans to voluntarily get the issue clarified, because it was Ms Khan's responsibility. Mr Singh confirmed that he did not specifically tell Ms Khan to clarify the truth on 4 Oct, even if the issue was not raised.
23. Following the 3 Oct meeting:
 - a. Mr Singh did not inform the WP CEC that Ms Khan might make a clarification in Parliament on 4 Oct (the next day), admitting that she had lied in Parliament. Nor did he seek their approval or consensus.
 - b. There was also no draft of her statement prepared, or any discussions or comments sought on a possible draft. Mr Singh said that he did not know what Ms Khan was going to say.
 - c. Mr Singh did not check with Ms Khan whether her family was aware, and if she was therefore in a position to come clean and clarify the lie in Parliament.
 - d. Mr Singh agreed that, nothing was done in anticipation of the possibility that Ms Khan might come clean on 4 Oct.
24. Mr Singh was asked in detail about his conversation with Ms Khan on 3 Oct. Ms Khan had said, in her evidence to the COP that Mr Singh had told her that if she continued the narrative based on the untruth in her 3 Aug parliamentary statement, he (Mr Singh) would not judge her for doing so.
 - a. Mr Singh said that based on what he had told Ms Khan (that she had to take ownership and responsibility for the issue and that he will not judge her), he had an expectation (as opposed to an understanding) that Ms Khan will clarify the truth, if the matter was raised

on 4 Oct. Though not articulated to Ms Khan, what Mr Singh meant by this was that he will not judge Ms Khan if she took responsibility and ownership.

- b. Subsequently, he said that he had the understanding that Ms Khan would clarify the issue, if the matter was raised.
 - c. On 3 Oct, Mr Singh didn't ask Ms Khan if she had told her parents about the sexual assault she had suffered. He didn't ask, though Ms Khan telling her parents was of "immediate concern" to him, and (in his mind) a precondition before she clarified the truth in public.
25. It was pointed out to Mr Singh that he didn't specifically take any steps for a possible disclosure by Ms Khan, and told her he will not judge her. He was asked if that suggested that he had (as of 3 Oct) wanted her to continue to lie (which is what Ms Khan had said was her understanding of what Mr Singh told her to do). Mr Singh denied that.

4 Oct – Ministerial Statement

26. On 4 Oct, the issue which Mr Singh thought might arise in Parliament did arise. Minister Shanmugam gave a short Ministerial Statement about Ms Khan's anecdote, and sought clarification from Ms Khan.
27. Whilst Minister Shanmugam was making his Ministerial Statement, Ms Khan sent Mr Singh a message, asking: "What should I do, Pritam?" Mr Singh agreed that Ms Khan's message was completely at odds with his evidence: that as of 3 Oct, he expected her to tell the truth if the matter came up. Mr Singh had said that he had this understanding, based on what he had said to her, on 3 Oct, that she had to take personal responsibility, and if she did, he will not judge her. He believed that this meant that she knew that she had to tell the truth, if the matter came up. It is at odds with his understanding, because the matter did come up on 4 October and yet she was asking him for instructions, on what she should do.
28. Mr Singh did not respond to Ms Khan before Ms Khan stood up to answer Minister Shanmugam's questions. Ms Khan then repeated the lie on 4 Oct, in response to Minister Shanmugam's questions.
29. Mr Singh agreed that this created a far more grave situation, because Ms Khan had continued the lie and repeated it. He agreed that as the Leader of the Opposition, he had a duty to correct Ms Khan's falsehood. Mr Singh said that Ms Khan repeating her lie on 4 Oct had made it a grave situation for Ms Khan, but not for the WP.
30. Mr Singh said that he read Ms Khan's WhatsApp message (to him) at 12.45pm (after the exchange between Ms Khan and Minister Shanmugam had ended). Mr Singh told Ms Khan, "Will speak after sitting. Keep Chair and I posted." There is nothing in writing in response from Mr Singh, on what Ms Khan should do.
31. Mr Singh met with Ms Khan on 4 Oct in the LO office, but could not remember if he had met Ms Khan once or twice that day. But he remembered that he, Ms Lim and Ms Khan had met late that night, some time past 11pm (just before the parliamentary sitting had ended), for a "very, very short" meeting. Mr Singh recalled that Ms Khan was in a daze and said, "Perhaps there is another way. That is, to tell the truth." Mr Singh said he was very upset and replied, "But look at the choice you made."

- a. Mr Singh was asked if he had told Ms Khan, when they met: “We had an understanding. Why didn’t you come clean?” Mr Singh said that he did not do so. Mr Singh was asked: if his evidence was correct and on 3 Oct, he believed that he had left Ms Khan with the impression that she should tell the truth, then on 4 Oct, by telling the untruth again, she would have gone directly contrary to what he had told her on 3 Oct. He should then have asked her why she did that, instead of just messaging her to ask to see her in his office. He disagreed that his conduct did not make sense.
 - b. Mr Singh was also asked if Ms Khan’s words, “Perhaps there is another way. That is, to tell the truth”, reasonably suggested that Ms Khan was under an impression, until that point, that she was not to tell the truth. Mr Singh disagreed.
 - c. Mr Singh said that his takeaway, based on what Ms Khan said at the meeting, was that she was now prepared to tell the truth. Mr Singh said that he was relieved because this is the first time he is hearing that she wants to own up to what she had said in Parliament. He said, “Good, we’ll talk about it.”
 - d. Mr Singh was asked if he had therefore told Ms Khan: “Let’s prepare to tell the truth” the next day (on 5 Oct), when Parliament would sit again. Mr Singh said that he had not done so, as he made what he described as a “reasonable supposition” that Ms Khan had not told her parents the truth yet. He confirmed that he did not know if Ms Khan had or had not told her parents, at that point. Mr Singh agreed that it would have been very easy to confirm that supposition with Ms Khan. But though he did not know whether she had told her parents, he did not ask her.
32. After the Parliament sitting on 4 Oct, there was no further communication between Mr Singh and Ms Khan on this issue apart from an email that Ms Khan forwarded from the police (see below). Thereafter, the next discussion they had was at a meeting on 12 Oct (see below).

7 Oct – Police’s request to Ms Khan

33. On 7 Oct, Ms Khan received an email from the Police requesting her assistance on the anecdote in her 3 Aug Parliament statement. Ms Khan forwarded the email to Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal, and asked for their advice on what to do. Mr Singh confirmed that he did not advise Ms Khan to respond to the Police.
34. Mr Singh agreed that the police request was reasonable. He said that he told Ms Khan (at some point) to tell the Police that she is going to answer in Parliament. Mr Singh said that he did not direct Ms Khan to meet the Police to answer their questions. He said that he also did not direct her not to do so.
35. When asked why he had not advised Ms Khan to explain her position to the Police, despite being invited by the Police three times, Mr Singh said that this was because it was clear to him that Ms Khan’s untruth had to be corrected in Parliament, where it was originally made.
36. Mr Singh agreed that as at 7 Oct, there were no objective steps taken (by him or the WP, or Ms Khan), which would be suggestive of Ms Khan preparing to go to Parliament to clarify her lie. In another part of his evidence, Mr Singh said that it had been clear to him from 4 Oct that Ms Khan would clarify the lie.

12 Oct – Meeting between Mr Singh, Ms Khan and Ms Lim

37. On 12 Oct, Mr Singh met with Ms Khan and Ms Lim. Mr Singh disagreed with Ms Khan's account of what transpired at this meeting.
- a. Mr Singh said that he initiated the meeting. Ms Khan had wanted to discuss the advice that she received from her lawyers about the Police's request, but Mr Singh wanted to discuss how she should correct her untruth in Parliament. This was the first discussion they had on this issue, after 4 Oct.
 - b. Mr Singh said that at the meeting, Ms Khan was initially still unwilling to make a speech in Parliament to correct her untruth. Ms Lim was very upset about this. Mr Singh impressed upon Ms Khan that there was no other way but to do so, and Ms Khan eventually agreed.
 - c. Mr Singh said that the advice that Ms Khan received from her lawyers on whether she should respond to the Police's requests was consistent with Mr Singh's view that Ms Khan should address the untruth in Parliament.
38. On 12 Oct, Mr Singh also met Ms Loh and Mr Nathan. He said that it was a reasonable conclusion that based on what he told them about his meeting with Ms Khan on 3 Oct, they got the impression that he, Mr Singh, had left it to Ms Khan to decide what she would do, and that he would not judge her. Mr Singh said that on 12 Oct, he may have left them with the impression that he had not given clear instructions to Ms Khan to come clean, even if asked. He agreed that he did not tell Ms Loh and Mr Nathan that Ms Khan had been expected to tell the truth when asked on 4 Oct, but that she had disobeyed and repeated the lie.

IV. Events in November and December 2021

39. Mr Singh read Ms Khan's 1 Nov draft statement before she delivered it, and was satisfied with what she planned to say. The CEC was also told about this on 29 Oct and reviewed the draft statement.

Statements issued by the WP - 1 Nov, 2 Nov, 2 Dec

40. After Ms Khan delivered her statement in Parliament on 1 Nov, Mr Singh put up a Facebook post later that day. Mr Singh did not disclose, in his post, that Ms Khan had confessed the untruth to Ms Lim, Mr Faisal and himself, on 8 Aug, which was 5 days after she told the untruth in Parliament on 3 Aug. Mr Singh was asked if it would have been open, transparent and honest for these facts to have been disclosed. Mr Singh said that it was not important for Parliament, and not relevant for the public to know this.
41. On 2 Nov, the WP put out a media statement, announcing the formation of a Disciplinary Panel ("the DP") concerning the statements that Ms Khan had made in Parliament. Again, Mr Singh said that he did not think that it was relevant that he, as the leader of WP and a member of the DP, had been aware of Ms Khan's falsehood much earlier.
42. Mr Singh was asked if the suppression of the fact that Ms Khan had told some of the WP leaders on 8 Aug, and that Mr Singh had spoken with her on 3 Oct, will give the impression that it was all Ms Khan's doing. He said that it was irrelevant to mention these facts in the two press statements.

43. Mr Singh agreed that the 2 Dec Press Conference was the first time that the public got to know that the WP leadership was privy to Ms Khan's lie from a few days after it was first said in Parliament.

- a. Mr Singh was asked why had chosen to disclose the Party leaders' knowledge and involvement from 7/ 8 Aug, when he had, for a long time, held the view that it was irrelevant to the public.
- b. It was pointed out to Mr Singh that the WP Press Conference was held at around the same time on the first day that the COP held its first sitting.

Mr Singh denied that he had, at the Press Conference, disclosed for the first time the extent of the Party leaders' involvement, because he knew that these facts would also come out in the evidence given to the COP. He also said that the timing of the Press Conference (which was at the same time as the first day of the COP hearing) was coincidental.

- c. Mr Singh said that by that time, there had already been questions and 'chatter' in the online space as to when and how much the WP leaders knew about Ms Khan's untruths. Mr Singh therefore decided to address this issue, as he anticipated that the journalists would ask questions about it. It was pointed out to Mr Singh that this 'chatter' online had existed for some time, since at least 1 Nov, and was not new. Mr Singh agreed.

44. Mr Singh said that the DP had not disclosed to either the CEC, or to Party members, that Ms Lim, Mr Faisal and himself had known of Ms Khan's untruth since 7/ 8 Aug. He was asked why he had not disclosed these facts, in the spirit of full, frank, honest and open disclosure.

- a. Mr Singh disagreed that it was relevant whether Ms Khan had kept the untruth hidden for many months, or if she had confessed the lie to the Party's senior leadership at an early stage. He said that the level of Ms Khan's perceived culpability would not make a difference to members' submissions. Nor would the extent to which Ms Khan had cooperated with the Party.
- b. Mr Singh also said that he did not pay heed to the points made to the DP by Ms Loh and Mr Nathan because he similarly did not see their points as relevant. Ms Loh and Mr Nathan had asked Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal to be transparent and provide the full facts and their personal involvement to the Party members. Mr Singh said that it was not relevant for Party members, the CEC and the public to know these facts.
- c. Mr Singh said that the CEC could have asked the DP whether and when the DP knew about Ms Khan's 3 Aug untruth, if it wanted.

It was pointed out to Mr Singh that there was a conflict of evidence. Ms Khan was saying that she had been told by Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal to continue with her lie. The DP comprised the very persons whom Ms Khan says told her to continue with the lie. The DP had to decide on Ms Khan's lie. It was pointed out to Mr Singh that this could be seen as cover up by the 3 persons on the DP, if Ms Khan's version was true. Mr Singh said that it never crossed Ms Lim's, Mr Faisal's and his minds that there was any problem.

- d. According to Mr Singh, the involvement of himself, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal in the events that unfolded would only become relevant if they could be shown to have directed Ms Khan to lie.

- e. He said that no such direction to Ms Khan had been given, because “the truth of the matter is that she (Ms Khan) was told to take “responsibility and ownership” of the issue. (This is contrary to what Ms Khan had said, and contrary to the message from Ms Khan to Ms Loh and Mr Nathan on 8 Aug.)
45. Mr Singh said that at the DP’s formal meeting with Ms Khan, the DP asked Ms Khan questions about her anecdote – when and through which group she met the sexual assault survivor, etc.
 - a. There were also questions about Ms Khan’s self-discipline, such as why she did not meet many of the deadlines set for her by the Party.
 - b. Mr Singh had also asked Ms Khan to seek the views of her teammates in the Sengkang Group Representation Constituency (“GRC”). Mr Singh could not recall when the Sengkang GRC MPs found out that Mr Singh, Ms Lim and Mr Faisal had known about Ms Khan’s untruth since 7 or 8 Aug.
 46. Mr Singh said that the WP had shifted their CEC meeting earlier, to 30 Nov, because Ms Khan had asked to hold the CEC meeting before she attended the COP.
 47. When asked why Ms Khan might have lied in her 8 Aug WhatsApp message (about taking the information to the grave), Mr Singh said that Ms Khan told the DP that she may have Disassociation. Mr Singh asked the COP to consider asking Ms Khan to go for a psychological assessment.
 48. Nevertheless, when asked about Ms Khan’s general performance, Mr Singh agreed that there was nothing that came to his attention which suggested that there was anything unusual about her performance.
 49. Ms Loh had previously been Mr Singh’s Secretarial Assistant. Mr Singh had spoken of Ms Loh in glowing terms. She was a cadre member of the WP. He agreed that Ms Loh is a person who speaks her mind. Mr Singh was asked about the evidence given by Ms Loh and Mr Nathan, to the COP. He said that they were very protective of Ms Khan and were unhappy with what had happened. Thus, he said, they could have lied in their evidence to the COP.
 50. A series of propositions were put forth to Mr Singh. Mr Singh responded to each of them as follows:
 - a. On whether he had told Ms Khan to tell the truth, in those terms, Mr Singh confirmed that he had not told Ms Khan to tell the truth:
 - i. On 8 Aug.
 - ii. Between 8 Aug and 3 Oct when he next spoke with her.
 - iii. On 4 Oct.
 - iv. Between 4 Oct and 7 Oct.
 - b. On what Mr Singh would have done, if he expected Ms Khan to tell the truth in Parliament on 4 Oct:
 - i. Asked to see Ms Khan’s draft statement she would use – Mr Singh disagreed that he needed to see that.

- ii. Reviewed Ms Khan's draft and given comments and input, as he did prior to the 1 Nov sitting – Mr Singh disagreed that he needed to do that.
 - iii. Informed the CEC that Ms Khan would be admitting to the falsehood – Mr Singh disagreed that he needed to do that.
 - iv. Mr Singh agreed that from 8 Aug to 4 Oct, he had not seen any steps taken which would be suggestive of coming clean.
- c. On what Mr Singh would have done after the 4 Oct Parliament sitting (either immediately or thereafter), if he had expected that Ms Khan would have come clean in Parliament when she was asked by Minister Shanmugam:
- i. Asked to see Ms Khan immediately to ask her why she lied again, on 4 Oct in contravention of the understanding on 3 Oct, that she should come clean in Parliament on 4 Oct if she was asked – Mr Singh disagreed that he should have done that.
 - ii. Asked Ms Khan to immediately correct the record the next day in Parliament – Mr Singh disagreed that he should have done that.
 - iii. Even if none of the above was done, to have taken clear steps between 4 Oct and 12 Oct to make clear the direction for Ms Khan to come clean immediately – Mr Singh agreed that even at that stage, he had not told Ms Khan to tell the truth, in those words. The sum total of Mr Singh's words were: "Good, we will talk about it."
 - iv. Checked that her family was aware that therefore Ms Khan was in a position to come clean and clarify the lie – Mr Singh said he had not done that.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

8th Meeting

Sunday, 12 December 2021

10.00 am

PRESENT

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

1. The Committee deliberated.
2. Question put, “That the video recording of the oral evidence of Mr Pritam Singh, Leader of the Opposition and Member of Aljunied GRC, be made available to Parliament and published on the Parliament website.”.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 7

Tan Chuan-Jin
Grace Fu Hai Yien
Desmond Lee
Rahayu Mahzam
Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Don Wee
Zaqy Mohamad

Noes, 1

Dennis Tan Lip Fong

Resolved, “That the video recording of the oral evidence of Mr Pritam Singh, Leader of the Opposition and Member of Aljunied GRC, be made available to Parliament and published on the Parliament website.”.

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

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 7
Tan Chuan-Jin
Grace Fu Hai Yien
Desmond Lee
Rahayu Mahzam
Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Don Wee
Zaqy Mohamad

Noes, 1
Dennis Tan Lip Fong

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

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

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 7
Tan Chuan-Jin
Grace Fu Hai Yien
Desmond Lee
Rahayu Mahzam
Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Don Wee
Zaqy Mohamad

Noes, 1
Dennis Tan Lip Fong

Resolved, "That paragraphs 1 to 4 inclusive stand part of the Third Special Report."

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

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 7
Tan Chuan-Jin
Grace Fu Hai Yien
Desmond Lee
Rahayu Mahzam
Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Don Wee
Zaqy Mohamad

Noes, 1
Dennis Tan Lip Fong

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

6. *Agreed*, that the Chairman do present the Third Special Report to Parliament today.

Adjourned to Monday, 13 December 2021