b"PAP) said the decision to not use it would be the best solution, which would be to request for an exemption from Singapore's privacy law framework.\n\nin fact, if you try to read his statement, it sounds like he wants to use some of the privacy law to get access to the documents submitted to the court."

====================

b"PAP, or any other party whose main aim is the restoration of the PAP. \n\nIn fact, an even better candidate would be to have a pan-democrat coalition fighting for the establishment's goal of a less corrupt government, or replacing a able-bodied, fully-trained and capable leader with a candidate who is not only not in the best of my money, but who is also not elected in the first place at all, due to the fact that the PAP has always been out of power and will never be back in power after 60 years."

====================

b'PAP.com/'

====================

b'PAP\'s anti-entitlement agenda. They will use that "movement" as an example of how a Facebook post is fake.\n\n\* On Social Media: Governments should not be allowed to do that. It is wrong, they should not be able to take advantage of the Internet and claim that Facebook posts are fake news.\n\n\* On China: China is stealing our jobs. In future, they will hate us, it is a threat to their social media. We shouldnt be the ones to take down the news they say about us.\n\n\* On The Economist\'s report: It is pathetic to say that the Economist rate of GDP growth in the last 20 years has been 3% a year.\n\n\* On James Watt\'s fellow Nobel winner: We have a Nobel! He is very capable, a human being. In a decentralized, collaborative, world, he is very natural given his education and career. So if the Nobel Prize is not for the Nobel Prize winner, I guess its for the other Nobel Prize winners too.\n\nOn the non-China stuff:\n\n\* On TPP: We represent... 40-50% of the rest of the world. We have a strong voice that our interests will not be exploited. This is long before the political will to change.\n\n\* On Climate Change: Do we really want to make the world hotter, more extreme, more dangerous? We have a good climate policy.\n\n\* On terrorism: Do we really want to be in the path of a future world war? This is why people have been fleeing to the other side of the planet, not only for good reasons, but also to escape from the effects of climate change.\n\n'

====================

b"PAP's lawyers say they met up, were in agreement and that their financial statements are consistent with the statement of facts.\n\nMister M should have finished his work before they went for a trip to Hawaii. \n\nAnd they are still working on this? \n\n"

====================

b'PAPs M&amp;A deal with British company BTS.[](http://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/singapore/top-government-contractor-nest-japan-makes-japan-download-music-in-japan-1305940)'

====================

b'PAP/WPB\_2014\_Xmas\_feat\_discussing\_criticism\_of\_the\_state\_of\_singapore&amp;utm\_campaign=Echobox&amp;utm\_medium=2&amp;utm\_term=post&amp;utm\_source=share\_share) | [PR][https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/singapore/cnn-admits-to-defending-hidden-life-places-for-the-children-of-patriarchs-at-home-10080884](https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/singapore/cnn-admits-to-defending-hidden-life-places-for-the-children-of-patriarchs-at-home-10080884)\n\n---\n1.0.1 | [Source code](https://github.com/fterh/sneakpeek) | [Contribute](https://github.com/fterh/sneakpeek)'

====================

b'PAPTON.6]\n\n[\*\*"It\'s all around us. I can\'t say the same for Singapore. Our view is\n- \n-ang mohs are supposed to be considered as one of the\n-leaders for the country. They do not take over\n- \n-Man-Made?\_\\\_\\\_\\\_\\\_[8.]\_\n[^2](https://reddit.com/r/singapore/comments/998ssl/rsingapore\_random\_discussion\_and\_small\_questions/e78d9eph/)\n'

====================

b'PAP needs to be wary that this might expose them to a political backlash, for example, if the opposition is to be eliminated, or if they are to be discredited for perceived lapses in the interpretation of the law. These are important checks on the government\'s power, so it is worth it to declare that they have already taken the trouble to clarify any ambiguities involved. \n\nI\'m not saying that they see the remarks as an indictment, but at the very least, they recognise that any perceived breach of the law - with the question whether or not you should be allowed to offend someone\'s religious sensibilities - has consequences: it would be accurate to say that they are having a far more nuanced and nuanced discussion than it was before they made the decision to make it so. And it is very problematic since it is not as simple as "adding a clause to the law to prove that you are still singaporean".\n\nIt is one thing to have a dissenting opinion on what is right and what is wrong, but another to seriously consider the consequences of a law you have voted against.\n\n'

====================

b'PAP minority)--"The purpose of the Government is to make such decisions with regard to the Government of the Republic of Singapore and to maintain and safeguard our peace, order and good order."[(PAP)](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Dw5gqfJJ6aA&amp;t=28s)'

====================

b"PAP failures. The fact that your opinion is being drowned out by the conservative side of the world actually reflects the government's endorsement of the policies of the past. \n\nKey to any democratic project is the ability to tailor the electorate to cover the demographics of the country if you wish to continue the process of governance. \n\n"

====================

b'PAP-led rally] 0:15'

====================

b'PAP) have made the same mistake multiple times. Both have NOT been successful, but have made a few bad decisions. \n\nI do not know why. I am not here to judge. I am here to tell you why you should not be. '

====================

b'PAP-LKY won\'t be happy that the government has left out its founding principles.\n\n ; "For me, it is hard to take my old ideals to Singapore," said Mr Lee, who is 76 and lives in Bugis.\n\n ; AU architect Tan Cheng Bock said: "It is hard unless you are part of the PAP-led coalition. If you\'re not, then you cannot be part of the coalition."\n\n---\n1.0.1 | [Source code](https://github.com/fterh/sneakpeek) | [Contribute](https://github.com/fterh/sneakpeek)'

====================

b'PAP\\\_GAY\_VOTE\_1)'

====================

b'PAP) had taken a more nuanced stance on the issue, and had a more nuanced discussion on the matter, he might have been a little more appreciative of the other side. \n\nSimilarly, in looking at the Article 54 and the "I, the People" one, I think it\'s more clear that it is plain that the government supports a system of elections, and therefore prioritises the rights of voters over the rights of opposition parties (with no places left for them to get votes, they have to take votes from the ballot box). \n\nFurthermore, I don\'t think that this is any more or less an issue of "election fraud", as it is debated. The core issue is that voters in other countries can either vote for the opposition or for the PAP, a situation where the vote counts are falsified to the point that they are unable to cast the votes they are registered to vote for. And as I\'ve pointed out, the "I, the People" one is an example of one of the ways in which the PAP, in effect, systematically blocked the opposition from the vote counting machine, to ensure that voters can only simply cast their votes for the opposition for a certain period of time, without having to let go of the ballot. \n\nThe results were not as he predicted, but this is not the least bit of a surprise. It\'s a convenient conclusion to make to that person who wrote the original article. However, it is not the end of the story, in that the result was still at the same level of support as the 2013 parliamentary elections. \n\nTo be fair to the Government, I don\'t doubt that they (and the people) are concerned about the outcome of the election, and they were, but they have to account for the possible impact of winning the election - and that could change the result of ICT.\n'

====================

b'PAP that is.\n\nSome of the most well-researched debates on this topic are with IMDA, with regards to the proposed clean energy targets, the pollution from the creation of JEL and the inclusion of public space in the proposed park, the right to have a place in our country free of charge of your own preference, and the right to have a voice in our decision making.\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\nAnd yet we are, in the end, feeling the need to play the political game ahead of our domestic and global interests.\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;'

====================

b'PAP has a view of the world. They see the world as a collection of people who are pretty much united. They see the world as a collection of people who are trying to improve their situation and get somewhere better.\n\nThey view the world as a collection of people who are trying to improve their life. They see the world as a collection of people who are doing their best, and aiming to do their best in whatever circumstances.\n\nWe are, alas, used to live in an era where politicians are supposed to be honest.\n\nInstead, we are used to think that the "wheels of the political wheel are turned by greed, loyalty and a good dose of sycophants".\n\nNowadays, this is much less true. There is a tendency to compare parties in the same way that you compare personalities in the world, because the life of a politician is pretty much a lottery ticket.\n\nThe problem is that the voters you work for will not, and will not, share with you, in the best interests of the country. They will not try to mold and buy in to the party they are working for.\n\nI know how bitter this answer sounds, but it is the truth.\n\nThe only way to change the system is to change the people you represent.'

====================

b'PAP policies, yet they are the ones that have been implemented the most.'

====================

b"PAP is actually funded by a lot of people and really many people aren't fully happy with the system."

====================

b"PAP, and I'd be shocked if one of our fellow Singaporeans doesn't follow that path."

====================

b"PAP's ministers have voiced their disagreement with the strikes but point blank said that as long as they are just talking about the co-operation and fight against terrorism, the security and law, the unity, the concept of security, and the constitution, it is ok.\n\nThis is absolutely true. I agree with the fact that people can say that in public. "

====================

b'PAP/illustration\_gang\_killing\_the\_chicken\_and\_eggs\_in\_singapore/)'

====================

b"PAP' by voting for the opposition in a free and diverse election. I'm glad the opposition is allowing themselves to be recognised and allowed to build their own base and what this means is that they are being recognised for who they are. "

====================

b"PAP people are too scared of being labelled as racists. They are afraid what is the backlash of the people who voted for the government back when they were in power. So I think there are reasons why the government is more likely to cement its position when it is more vocal.\n\nA good example would be the case of xenophobia. While there are definitely negative things about the immigration of foreign workers, they are still seen in Singapore as the natural evolution of our cultural and economic identity. The government's position on immigration is that immigration from their home countries are a matter of convenience and work, so as long as the existing population here is there, there is no need to change the country. This is pretty much the approach adopted by the [Israeli Arab community](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4ZXQjTr0QK8)\n\nA good example would be the job creation scheme. It is a throwaway, but it works. Even if the worker pool is the same, there will be other jobs that pay better. It is possible to design a complex policy that will prevent employers from choosing to hire here over the next 10 years.\n\nThe government has an extensive policy of subsidising the costs of hiring via the [net-cost scheme](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gIvqAh0Ww5g) that is in place. That is a very efficient way of ensuring the best workers are hired, and of managing the labour market, but it also includes the cost of hiring foreign workers to replace the local workers. Of course, it is only as you are richer, the less you need to pay in taxes, so in the short-term the government can keep the cost of hiring foreigners fairly low."

====================

b"PAP member: Hey! Hang in there! We're not going to be voting for PAP in Westminster.\n\n----------\n\n\_\\^\\^\\^\\^\\^| ^\\^\\^[\*\*Discussion of the Middle-East Accident\*\*](https://www.reddit.com/r/singapore/comments/3ou2oj/rsingapore\_random\_discussion\_and\_small\_questions/dw01kw6/)"

====================

b"PAP) has become increasingly authoritarian in recent years, and there is no doubt that the government is very likely to go over your head to get their votes. \n\nAnd as a direct consequence, you have a direct conflict with your own personal regard for America and the European welfare. \n\nI bet you most of us don't thank you for that."

====================

b'PAP MPs all talk like what are they supposed to do? '

====================

b"PAP is only allowed to control how free speech is allowed in Singapore. Even in a democracy, there's a limit to the power of government."

====================

b'PAP HQ)\n\nhttp://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0KGuDMsOwAG '

====================

b'PAP, or is it?'

====================

b"PAP) to change their mindsets.\n\nI'm not totally sure, but I think it is more important for the government to have good ideas regardless of who's in power. If the PAP looks at the opposing viewpoints, there is a chance they may be too exhausted to make good decisions. The best example is the Chinese who lost all their faith in Xi and now think he is a dictator. \n\nHowever, in the end, I'm not sure what is the best course of action for the PAP. I see the way they handled the election -- I think the government is doing a lot of things well that the opposition is not doing. But I don't see how we can take away their vote. The last thing we need is for the opposition to be so tired and demoralized that voters condemn them for not being able to stay the course. There is no point in the future when the PAP has all these votes. They can be distracted by the possibility of a new Chinese president, the Trump administration, and the upcoming UN General Assembly. \n\nAbout the indefinite detention clause, I don't think it is a bad idea. When your constitutional rights have been severely shaken in the recent decades by massive protests, the time has come to decide to let the process of judicial review run its course. \n\nBut the government is not going to stop. It's the opposition that is so people-oriented that the government is less likely to allow them to have too much influence."

====================

b'PAP"'

====================

b"PAP leader, with just a tinge of moral indignation.\n\nThief: blank check, not a hacker.\n\nWhat's you doing?"

====================

b"PAP's name. A party [named after its current leader](https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/singapore/blair-nsma-abc-1732462) inherited his role when he was still as PM.\n\nWhile the general election is due in March 2019, Mr Lee's son, known to be pro-opposition, has taken a different approach to this and has chosen a position of trust with an opposition that is certain of the outcome of the election."

====================

b"PAP) were still at their peak and the current government is unable to replace them. This has led to the rise of the opposition parties in Singapore. In the past no one would have thought today that they would have the numbers to get so much power even if the opposition was strong enough to topple the current government.\n\nMalay-Muslim-majority-conservatives/PAP = conflict of interests. This is a guy who thinks the government is actually corrupt, that it shouldn't be able to take on the mantle of the PM and the prime minister's office, that the decision to power the PAP in a presidential election was a clear mistake, that the election was rigged by the fact that Tony Tan was the prime minister and PAP was the top vote-getter.\n\nGiven the historic state of politics in all of the parties, it is hard to tell what's the best and worst-in-order approach to Singapore's current situation. The party of the PAP is the one that's the most vocal, and the one who has been in power for most of the past 50 years.\n\nIt is sad that we're still seeing our current political system in Singapore fall apart. It's very clear that the PAP is the only party that's strong and with the best interests of Singapore at heart, and that's what they stand for. They're in the minority, but even their vocal members are annoyed with the government's actions.\n\nThe PAP is wise to not give issues directly to the Malaysian government, and instead to neutralise any potential threats. Part of the reason for this was because of the anger that the Malaysians had to the government in the past. Now that Malaysia is a sovereign country, the government might have decided that it was better to be criticising the government than to take the initiative to criticise the government, which made the Malaysians vote for the PAP."

====================

b'PAP/Liberals)\n\nand [this](https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/community-leaders-aim-to-make-community-a-social-incompletes-of-earths-economic-and-political-movement)\n\n---\n\n^Interesting: [People vs. Freedom](https://www.reddit.com/r/singapore/comments/a3fmx1/rsingapore\_random\_discussion\_and\_small\_questions/ckb29dd/) ^| [^Conspiracy](https://www.reddit.com/r/singapore/comments/3d4fkq/rsingapore\_random\_discussion\_and\_small\_questions/ckbn4zpq/)'

====================

b"PAP didn't dare to say they regret not condemning the extremely unpopular opinion of the opposing party.\n\n&amp;apos;\n\n&amp;apos;\n\n&amp;apos;\n\n&amp;apos;\n\n&amp;apos;\n\n&amp;apos;\n\n&amp;apos;\n\n&amp;apos;\n\n&amp;apos;\n\n&amp;apos;\n\n&amp;apos;\n\n&amp;apos;\n\n&amp;apos;\n\n&amp;apos;"

====================

b'PAP, and the government, the businessman said.\n\nHe added that he was trying to re-establish his business operations on the mainland after being shut down by the government three years ago.\n\nThat did not work, partly because of the firm\'s large presence on both the islands.\n\nHe said: "Nobody saw the light shed on my background. We were still very much under the care of the government."\n\nMr Taye said he was still "working hard" to establish his business operations on the mainland, and was "very sad" that he was being forced to close his store on the island.\n\nMr Taye said he made the decision to close down his store on the mainland after learning that President Joko Widodo was abolishing the "power" of the president of Singapore.\n\nMr Taye said: "This was a very painful thing but we agreed to it. \n\n"We think we have a very strong voice, and I think that should be fucking well to be solid, and they should be a strong voice."\n\nMr Taye said he was able to re-establish the store because the president of Singapore was "very ill-informed" about the Singapore market.'

====================

b'PAP MPs talk to the press.\n\nSome of them make a good point.\n\n ; The basic reason of The Straits Times review of Mr Lee\'s statement was to demonstrate how far-reaching his statements were, the judicial system on its own is not likely to result in the kind of response he implied. He admitted that his statement was "not wholly accurate", but he did not emphasize the other\'s statement, which was that "this is all built on the basis of the law and the law itself". The review did not take into account the same factors, as Mr Lee had claimed in his statement. Mr Lee said that he was "not going to hesitate to judge the law", while Mr Lee acknowledged that the statements in question were "complaints below the law".\n\nForgive me, but I think we are on the same page. I\'ve asked about "constitutional laws in Singapore", and I\'ve pointed out that the rules applied in Canada, Australia and the UK are all the same, but have less common law (jurisdiction?) for individual members of the LGBT community (i.e. they are all UK courts).\n\nThere is a difference between "protection of the law" and "protection of the constitution", of course. But a closer look at his statement makes it clear that the constitution itself is not the law. The courts, by their very existence, are the law. So he\'s not defending it.\n\n ;The judge also said that the sentences he handed out should be measured against the same standard as Mr Lee\'s statements and that they were "subject to the same level of scrutiny", so that a fair comparison can be made between \*the accused and \*the accused\'s statements. \n\nWell, that\'s not what he said. He said that there was a difference between the two. What he said was:\n\n ; Mr Lee\'s statements were \*subject to the same level of scrutiny\* as the judgment, and Mr Lee\'s statement that he was "not going to hesitate to judge the law was \*not entirely accurate\* was not \*based\* on Mr Lee\'s statement that it was the law. \n\nExactly. \n\nAnd there was a parallel question, which was:\n\n ; Mr Lee said he would seek to ensure that the findings in the review had "every practicable basis", as well as that a fair comparison of the two judgments was made. \n\nLOL. His statement was simply NOT a fair comparison. He\'s trying to say the same thing, without taking into account other factors, such as "constitutions or decisions of any court" and "judgments of any court".\n\nThe judge said that Mr Lee could have been more specific in the following sentence:\n\n ; The judge also said Mr Lee\'s statements were \*subject to the same level of scrutiny\* as the judgement, and that he was "not going to hesitate to judge the law was \*not entirely accurate\*". \n\nAgain, I\'m not defending him. I\'m saying that Mr Lee would have to account for these factors and have a fair comparison between the two judgements.\n\nAnd again we have to ask:\n\n ;ABBOTT VS. SINGAPORE\n\nSo yes.\n\nThen again, you are right, the judge spent a lot of time trying to say what the judge wanted. So you are right, there\'s a difference, but a lesson here is that there\'s a reason why the judgement is \*not\* a fair comparison. \n\nAnd this is the judge\'s final judgment:\n ; MR. FRIEND\'S VERDICT FOR JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF ARPT. \n\nHuh?'

====================

b"PAP). Given that this is the highest level conflict in Singapore, I am sure that the SDP was elected to unify the country and bring Singapore to the right place.\n\nBut it is not the case. The SDP has been trying to consolidate power for a very long time. And I believe it was in the middle of the election campaign where it was brought up.\n\nFor the past several years, the SDP have been trying to draw parallels with the GLC's decision in 2013. The PAP has been trying to sidetrack the issue by saying that it is hard to get 55% of the seats in Parliament out anyway.\n\nAnd that is exactly the issue that the petition was framed to be about. To put it bluntly, the PAP was trying to eliminate the GLC's power. And that's exactly the reason why that petition was lost.\n\nThe fact that the petition was lost, as well as the fact that the petition was chosen as the top petition on the question, rather than as the top petition on the petition itself, indicates that the petition was chosen as the top petition on the question when the petition was voted on.\n\nIf you are a Singaporean, you should be asking yourself whether you can put up with this kind of people standing and saying that they are unable to fix the problem. It's a clear sign that the PAP is not the only party able to get rid of the GLC's power, and I would expect that instead of the readiness to take responsibility.\n\nAs it is, the PAP's support will likely remain, or likely remain unchanged, even if the petition is defeated. I have already pointed out the political implications.\n\n"

====================

b"PAP\n\nHave you tried programming? The only thing I see it is an equivalent of the BMW sales guy at a garage in Singapore. And the sales guy is doing everything the same way (but I'm not sure, I think the market is changing). \n\nIn fact, I say that a lot of people I know who once worked in the government all opened their own businesses (imagine if they were to donate $1/1 to a charity) and the government wanted them to help out with the country's social welfare. But many of them did not. \n\nSo what happened? The govt decided to build a separate computer startup and gave them a big stipend. \n\nIt's true that startups don't stay here forever. But think about it this way: if these guys could stay in the US, UK, Australia, Japan, etc, they would be making a lot of money. \n\nAfter all, we need talented people here to fill roles expected to be filled. In the US, the healthcare industry is heavily regulated so people are required to get a certain level of certification, and that is due to a mandate. \n\nIn the UK, they had to get a certain series of licenses if they were to bring in people into the UK for work, and a certain amount of funding when they were to get into trouble. \n\nIn the US, you don't have to work in the government (I have no idea why that is), but you don't have to follow the law. \n\n\n ;\*\*Happy Birthday!\*\*\n\nWe are only together for now. :')"

====================

b'PAP) is the unifying figure set up by the PAP. This should be a good place to find out who got what they wanted. \n\nBut the solution to Singapore\'s problems is to do everything within the PAP\'s mandate. \n\nThis, by the way, is why the PAP has a problem with Singaporeans. \n\nTheir heartland voters are the ones who may have voted in a coalition that they may disagree with but still once voted in a coalition that PAP wanted. \n\nI imagine they\'re not going to be happy when they somehow need to say, "Hey, we cannot support your party and give up!" And so it\'s sad that the PAP isn\'t even happy that they have to support the PAP. \n\nAnd that\'s the problem. The PAP\'s people will be disgusted if one day a guy comes up to them and says, "Hey, I didn\'t vote for you. You are the boss."'

====================

b"PAP as a whole.\n\nEdit: That said, Singapore has plenty of strong-minded and progressive leaders who are willing to work to improve the country's priorities. The PAP should be proud.\n\nThe problem is that they're so incensed at the upcoming election that they're willing to take the PAP's refusal to grow the country's potential for granted, or worse, to take it to a greater extreme and get rid of the opposition altogether."

====================

b"PAP''s support for the GIC is the reason why I support the abolition of the GE. \n\n[https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/lky-present-at-lky-gic-cybermind-founder-so-harsh-to-pays-hackers-savvy](https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/lky-present-at-lky-gic-cybermind-founder-so-harsh-to-pays-hackers-savvy)\n\n;(\*\*) "

====================

b'PAP, who drew about 400,000 people out of the two million people who voted for the last GE.\n\nHowever, it was reported that those 15,000 voters may have voted for the incumbent because they did not want to give the incumbent the chance to make amendments to the constitution.\n\nIt was reported that 18,000 voters chose to reject the change by the PAP instead.\n\n\'In theory, there was no legal basis for the vote, he said, but the court of public opinion exercised its judgement in favour of Mr Lee.\n\n ; Responding to Ms Lee\'s comments, Mr Lee said the High Court of Justice Petong\'s (HKG) jurisprudence is that "a constitutional majority must play a decisive role in deciding the fate of a society".\n\nSingapore\'s Supreme Court has no such principle, he said, but has consistently allowed the courts to decide the constitutionality of political law through a new interpretation of its interpretation of the constitution.\n\nMr Lee explained how that interpretation has evolved over the years from the "broadly defined" term "constitutional majority" that had been used to describe the Constitutional Court since the British Constitution was written.\n\nMr Lee said the High Court is better informed than those held by the Government.\n\nMr Lee said the High Court had "constituted and reviewed the Constitution from its inception from the era of the British".\n\n"It was, for example, the decision not to ratify the Canadian Charter of Rights in 1967."\n\nIt is an "open question," he added, whether the clause that allows the Government to decide on the constitutionality of legislation "is binding from the moment the Constitution was written".\n\nMr Lee said the High Court has read the Constitution to prevent Parliament from reviewing the decisions of the Government going back to the 19th Century.\n\n"The Government was not the first to draft and come to a decision on the constitutionality of the constitution, but in fact, it had been making the decisions for a long time," he said.\n\nMr Lee said the High Court thus had the authority to decide on the Constitution on the basis of the government\'s judgement.\n\nHe added that the Government, for example, is now considering the constitutionality of the section which guarantees the right of succession to all other political offices.\n\nMr Lee said the Government has not been able to provide an accurate picture of the role the High Court plays in determining the fate of the constitution.\n\nIn the wake of Mr Lee\'s comments, Deputy Prime Minister Teo Chee Hean said Mr Lee was right.\n\nMr Teo said: "Political supremacy is not present when the Constitution is drafted. The government can decide what is and what is not.\n\n"Those decisions should be made by Parliament, not by Mr Lee."\n\nMr Teo added: "The Legislative Council must not be dealt with as simply as one body would like. The constitution must be amended to reflect the wishes of all MPs.\n\n"I will ask myself whether the Government has gone too far in designating the President as a single person."\n\nMr Teo said he would ask his parliamentary committee to examine the constitutionality of Mr Lee\'s amendment to the Constitution, and review the constitutionality of the section, as well as whether parliament should be consulted on the Constitution in furtherance of its purposes.\n\nMr Teo said: "We will also review the constitutionality of the section to determine whether our views of the Constitution should be taken at the Government\'s pleasure and what the general rule of law means."\n\nMr Teo added that he was "convinced" that Mr Lee\'s reform of the Constitution must be linked to the constitutionality of the section.\n\nIf the Government was to "reject" Mr Lee\'s amendment, he said, it would be "precisely because the paragraph has been made the law of the country".\n\nMr Teo added: "In the end, we are still bound to be governed by a constitution that is not explicit."\n\nMr Lee said Mr Teo was right.\n\n"We must have a system that guarantees the rights of power, judges, and the constitution. It must be a constitution which guarantees the constitutional rights of power."\n\nMr Lee said: "If the Government is not willing to change the constitution, then it is a matter of the courts of public opinion deciding the constitutionality of the constitution."\n\n'

====================

b"PAP's support of same-sex marriage, that's just silly. You need to do your own thing to make sure your mind is not affected. It's like taking LSD. If you come in and your mind is still fixed in its original state, I can assure you nothing goes on. But if you're brainwashed to believe that things have become a constant part of life, as opposed to what they were before, you'll feel the effects.\n\nI have a friend who went to NUS and he was pretty angry. He said it could have changed the world, and that's if you believe gay people deserve to be abolished. "

====================

b'PAP memes or white privilege?'

====================

b"PAP's opponents are putting PB and PAP policy proposals out there as well."

====================

b'PAP is not the only one.2) The more positive response to a freshly made decision to ban things like GMOs, personal consumption of fresh meat, and personal consumption of dairy products is consistent with the government\'s reputation to the general populace.3) The government\'s voters are conservative, and they are very vocal about their opposition to GMO, personal consumption of fresh meat, and personal consumption of dairy products. It is very clear that the likely result of giving the go-ahead to GMOs is more of a "stay-in-place" decision than a ban on personal consumption of food products that does damage to people\'s health.4) This is why the government\'s stance on GMOs is more likely to be left than to be less pro-ban. \n\nIf we want to ban alcohol, if we want to ban cigarettes, and we want to ban cigarettes, then we have to ban cigarettes. That\'s it: a ban on cigarettes. If we wish to ban alcohol and tobacco, then we have to ban cigarettes. That\'s it: a ban on cigarettes.\n\nEdit: I\'m not the the one saying that China is a racist society. This is just my two cents. I\'m probably wrong. '

====================

b'PAP) is in power.\n\nThe fact that there is currently a Chinese majority is rather striking. There is no such thing as "Chinese majority", it is only a close approximation of Chinese majority. \n\nWe "must" get rid of them when possible. Mr. LKY, my father, is a great example. He put people like HKers into power and allowed them to set themselves free to express their views when they chose not to. The fact that they are antagonizing now conjures up the idea of a Chinese majority.\n\nAs a minority, we should not give the impression that the PAP is being "a minority" on the ground. Voters should not be confused with nationalists who are advocating a greater proportion of people who are Chinese and foreigners who are people of the same race.\n\nContrast that with a candidate whose base are the Chinese, and there are many people who buy into this as well.'

====================

b"PAP is either a good or bad thing for Singapore. It is good because in a free market, there would be many more competing bids. If there's a single company with enough money to do so, they're likely to win. However, if the company is so overcharged that they can't afford to do so, they're obviously going to lose.\n\nIf they lose, their stock market is put into a state of financial panic. They would be unable to pay their creditors. This is one of the reasons why the financial sector is considered to be unstable. If a company loses, their market prices are put into a state of financial panic.\n\n"

====================

b'PAP \nhttps://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oAkUsoRC0\_IE'

====================

b'PAP PROFILES and the old "effective opposition" myth that\'s been circulating in Australian media for years. It\'s a myth that\'s actually a little more powerful in Australia than in the US, and it has turned the country upside down. I think that\'s the real reason why.\n\nThe other myth about opposition leaders is that they\'re no different than the people who voted them in because they don\'t want a stable, solid government anymore, or because they\'re no longer allowed to have any say in the matter at all.\n\nIn practice, this is the sg elite\'s way of resisting change. I think the people who\'ve been voting young and old for the longest time knew this, because it is a very strong theapologist-y thing to do. But when the continued unpopularity of the incumbent, and the political/living-in-the-box mentality of the old majority, gave it a bad name, it became less likely to be popular among the people; it\'s been more of a victory-take-no-prisoners kind of thing, but that\'s how it is to be honest. They\'re not being stitched up by a pretty stiff-arm-and-no-cudgel, they\'re being whacked down by a bunch of polite applause.\n\nThat\'s why they voted for PAP, and the fact that they are what they\'ve always been. That is a very practical way of voting the right way that is one of the reasons why they\'ve voted the right way for so long.\n\nI\'m not even going to say that it\'s good, or that you should vote for them. It\'s not a vote you should vote for to whom they\'d rather have. But they should be the best people you can vote for. If you\'re no longer a social conservative, if you\'re no longer a petite-minded neo-conservative, if you don\'t mind being called whatever you want, by the time you\'re old, then you\'re old.\n\nThat\'s a very pragmatic, pragmatic way of voting.'

====================

b'PAP\_PM\_ZH\_XP.pdf) or [Dennis Lim](http://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/singapore/s-pm-lee-on-ioc-singapore-raising-people-from-below-to-help-the-poor-4916362.html).\n'

====================

b'PAP\\\_FF\\\_GRC\\\_FF\_GRC\_FF\_GRC\_FF\_GRC\_FF\_GRC\_FF\_GRC\_FF\_GRC\_FF\_GRC\_FF\_GRC\_FF\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_GG\_'

====================

b"PAP has a very complete concordance for the majority of the population, and even if it's a good thing, it's not as good as the opposition (and you should obviously understand that).\n\nThe reason why the PM did what he did was because of his love for Singapore. As PhD holder, he is an economist; and as a scholar, he is well-respected.\n"

====================

b"PAP has a chance to win again, but that's just a guess, and if they don't take a stand against the incumbent, it's easy to predict it'll be a very different political landscape than it already is."

====================

b"PAP.\n\n ; At least 85 of the 92 candidates have been chosen by the Electoral Commission.\n\nThat's the one that actually has 48 candidates. I'm not sure how they went about picking people, but I like to think the people who are chosen by the Electoral Commission aren't all as \*real\* as you think.\n\nAs for how they chose, I have no idea, but I can tell you that it's not the most interesting political process in the world, as some people said.\n\nIt's not even really the most interesting side of Singapore politics, as most of them \*lose\* awards and prizes, and then go on to become ministers/executive directors of various whole many companies.\n\nStill.\n\n"

====================

b"PAP has not done anything to reduce the number of people suffering. Also, the elderly, the handicapped and the children of those who died in the recent flooding in the city are not the ones suffering.\n\nIt's the one thing that I wanted to point out to you. You are lying to yourself that Singapore is suffering because the PAP is doing a lot of things wrong. You have not been in a situation where there was a proposal to reduce GST and GST is making Singaporeans feel like they are not getting what they deserve. You have become very apathetic to the amount of expenditure and the slow reforms in the healthcare system, you are blaming the government for being stingy in dealing with the recent bill, you are voting for the opposition and it feels like you don't even want a change in the government. \n\nIt is not that we are not suffering. Yes, we are not in a situation where the government is doing work. We are not very well off. We are not well off. I wish I can say I have been given 100% of my rights. But that is not the situation. I cannot say we are not suffering because we are not in a situation that gives me the basic rights I need. This but the government is continuing to invest in us. And it is not just Singapore. It is all the world's financial capital. The average Singaporean is a rich person."

====================

b'PAP) to work! \n\nBecause they are not only not qualified nor sourced to be in RWS, they have been living in the US since 1792. They are also not even from Singapore. \n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\nThe only thing they got from RWS as a result of the election fiasco was the Trump White House. \n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\nThey are the only ones who own a hotel in Singapore. \n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;'

====================

b'PAP, and a large chunk of the Singapore populace was on their side.\n\nCommenting on the concerns about the government\'s response, a senior youth leader at an urban youth group told the Straits Times why the move to shut down the complaint was made, and how the ruling party had met with the leader of the protest group.\n\n"The government has met with Lui Tuck Yew and Annabelle Minogue together with over 1.5 million people as told to them by [The Straits Times](http://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/teenagers-to-immature-and-spare-a-treaty-for-the-rise-of-communism-in-singapore). Since the election of [LKY](http://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/renouncing-a-reformatory-contract-with-the-ministers-may-prefer-to-talk-to-them-about-where-they-should-treat-to-talk-to-be-in-very-personal-terms-with-them), he referred to them as (some) "non-participants" in the election of the prime minister.\n\nAlthough he mentioned that he would have been "bragging" about his ties to the government if his election was announced in the press then, Mr Lim said he was not happy that the government was taking a very hard stance on this.\n\nMr Lim, who was an activist with the Youth Campaign for National Movement, told The Straits Times: "If you look at the past [JPM Lee\'s](http://theindependent.co.uk/news/the-long-rash-fight-back-against-public-corruption-in-japan-using-link-to-japan-system-1927-2007-172286) appearance, who was a key government critic at the time, he was so anti-communism that he asked the Japanese to close down their circulation of the [U-235](http://theindependent.co.uk/news/the-long-rash-fight-back-against-public-corruption-in-japan-using-link-to-japan-system-1927-2007-172286) weapon.\n\n"That was the pressure point."\n\nMr Lim also alleged that that the government had opposed the movement and had publicly called people who were involved with the protest group "contradictors of the nation".\n\nMr Lim recounted how, when students at a local university took a pro-democracy stance on campus, they were arrested and charged, and some were jailed for 7 months.\n\nMr Lim said he said the protest movement would not be able to run it\'s course without being "neutral" and acknowledging all sides.\n\nMr Lim said that the government had also shut down The Straits Times for "publishing" the names of those who helped to lead the protest on their website.\n\nMr Lim also recalled that he had received a phone call from former Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew\'s daughter, who had been in his constituency for 18 years.\n\nMr Lim added: "She told me that she was sorry for what had happened."\n\n###\n\n^Created ^by ^[/u/Flare](http://reddit.com/user/LFlare)!\n\n\_ [^[About ^Me]](http://redd.it/61xl9z) [^[Feedback]](http://www.reddit.com/message/compose/?to=LFlare&amp;subject=[RedditNewsPostBot%20-%20https://redd.it/65bxr4]%20) [^[Source ^Code]](https://github.com/LFlare/redditnewspostbot)\_'

====================

b'PAP\'s "gojek" effort that prevented the 9% in question from accessing the internet. \n\nThe case for why people really care about "open internet" is compelling, especially for those who have been taught that they should be wary of revealing their private information to anyone who does not have access to it. It\'s this that drives the need for the Internet Archive to house all the data of the people it has convinced to sign up for NTUC\'s "gotone." campaign and to try to cover their own assholes. \n\n\n'

====================

b"PAP's unwillingness to work with the opposition.\n\nAnd the party has demonstrated a willingness to play dirty with the opposition and therefore has experienced the threat of losing their votes and getting sued.\n\nAnd I don't think the opposition, their supporters and the general public are ready to abandon their electoral base for the sake of it."

====================

b"PAP is not the same as JB; it's not a coalition. It's a coalition of many parties with different opinions. You're not a good example of a the PAPis the same as the [JB](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D8U0gOxw21s)!"

====================

b'PAP) has a questionable track record of doing big things. \n\nBy saying it won\'t work, it gives a variety of reasons. You can\'t expect MPs to tell you they won\'t work, but they know they won\'t. They only say they won\'t work because they don\'t agree with the reforms. \n\nThe first issue the PAP can do is to ask MPs who are against the PAP to explain themselves. If they are against the PAP, you can put them in their shoes and tell them, for example, that there are problems on the road, and that they should resign. That\'s a very weak statement. \n\nSecondly, if you take offence with MPs\' credibility, it is easy to cut them off. If you don\'t try to get around that, then it\'s a bit of a "manipulation" with MPs, even if you don\'t see it. \n\nThirdly, they can\'t shut up and sit down and have a nice good chat with you. \n\nThat\'s why MPs have to burnish their CV. \n\n'

====================

b'PAP/People\'s Action MP/leader) : "I\'m a con man who\'s no angel. But I will fight for you, sir. Do you hear me? I will fight for you, sir. Do you hear me?"'

====================

b'PAP\'s own statements on the migrant crisis, rehashed at the time, said that the impact on Singapore is currently being studied.\n\n ; And in response to the actual claims, the MP said the current argument in Singapore is the limit of the evidence.\n\n ; He added that at the moment, the evidence is not sufficient.\n\n ; The MP added that the government has been slow to measure the impact of migration on its citizens.\n\n ; He said Singapore is still sending migrants into the "most dangerous regions of the world", i.e. Cambodia, Vietnam, Laos and Myanmar.\n\n ; "No country will accept a country without a visa. Singapore is the only country which does not accept refugees. We have the right to detain them indefinitely as we wish," said Mr Tan.\n\n ; The MP said: "The government cannot say that we can\'t help them, because we have the right to detain them indefinitely."\n\n---\n1.0.1 | [Source code](https://github.com/fterh/sneakpeek) | [Contribute](https://github.com/fterh/sneakpeek)'

====================

b'PAP-BY-1995-ISL-ISPEC-LOST-WITHOUT-PAP-FEARS-THAT-ISSUES-LIE] | [FAQ](http://np.reddit.com/r/FactsOfFactCheck/comments/31b9fm/faq\_fggot\_is\_what\_is\_true\_and\_false\_about\_election/ "Another one to add is the [basic tenet of Singapore that is that](http://www.sq.com/sqbnf/results-of-election-owl-results-who-won-by-me-\*), which is actually true, but that is specifically untrue. | [Source](https://books.google.com/books?id=CIIyqzNxj8C&amp;pg=PA69&amp;lpg=PA69&amp;dq=does+the+press+have+the+power+to+force+the+government+to+make+certain+differences+on+the+trial+of+Constituency+Opposition+no+notice&amp;source=bl&amp;ots=5VL3UHXpMgDcQk&amp;s=qolJduhlg&amp;source=bl&amp;ots=Xy8DRk8Pk&amp;s=q3lu6q6mia&amp;sa=X&amp;ei=ipb72PbmV70MT-&amp;ved=1ahUKEwiWwUA&amp;q=does+the+press+have+the+power+to+force+the+government+to+make+certain+differences+on+the+trial+of+Constituency+Opposition+no+notice&amp;f=false)|[^[<<\xe2\x80\x94>>Tk]](http://www.reddit.com/r/FactCheck/comments/31bfht/the+press+has+the+power+to+force+the+government+to+make+certain+differences+on+the+trial+of+Constituency+Opposition/\\(Essentially the only way to get the votes it needs is](http://www.sq.com/sqbnf/results-of+election-owl-results-who+won+by+me-\*))'

====================

b'PAP, but I don\'t think it\'s accurate to say the electorate has suddenly awakened from its slumber.\n\nThere are many aspects to consider when assessing whether the electorate is ready to vote for a new coalition government.\n\nFirst, in the past, voters were still able to vote for the incumbent government with the anti-government vote, because they had voted for the incumbent party with the anti-party vote.\n\nSecond, people generally vote for the incumbent because they want to vote for him and because they don\'t want to vote for a minority government.\n\nThird, voters don\'t exactly have a say in the composition of the new coalition governments, because they were party members for the last 10 years and so elected their bosses. In the past, the opposition was always there, and so the voters voted for them.\n\nThis is such a serious problem that I think many people are uncomfortable with. It\'s not that they can\'t vote for the opposition, but rather that they don\'t have a say in the composition of the coalition government to vote for them.\n\nThen there are the issues regarding domestic tranquility. If all the opposition members were to suggest a policy which would be opposed by the majority, they might as well have said "no" to the people\'s wishes.\n\nIt is not so much that the opposition has a say in the constitution, but rather that it is part of the contract that the government enters into.\n\nThe voters shouldn\'t be concerned if the government doesn\'t see the referendum as a referendum on their wish. In the past, they only had a say on the constitution, and it was a mistake to place that constitutional authority in the hands of the government.\n\nThe voters are probably obliged to vote for the incumbent because they want his policies to be implemented. But the electorate isn\'t obliged to do so.\n\nA few disclaimers here:\n\n1. Where PAP members should not be allowed to run for election, I don\'t know whether the government does anything. In fact, I don\'t know whether the government does anything at all. I don\'t think there is a need to change the constitution, because two-thirds of Singaporeans vote for the opposition.\n2. The PAP was never that successful in the past. The opposition here was only able to overthrow the government through the development of the opposition.'

====================

b'PAP is very much the party that should have pushed the whole of Teo\'s policies, but unfortunately the way his successors stuck to his headlong-ass policies without talking about them in their speeches or speeches are pretty damn cringe-worthy. \n\nI have to admit that it\'s a tough balancing act - the government that I left and which I\'m no longer with actually doesn\'t seem to care, and the government that\'s in power shows that it\'s willing to go to war or support the PAP even if the opposition is not. \n\nThe fact that we are still among the few countries that has kept their sycophancy to a minimum is the biggest reason why I feel we seem to be getting better people-to-person relations. I don\'t see any reason to be content with having the "best" party in the world, but I\'m not sure how we can do better at times.'

====================

b"PAP= ;University of Oxford= ;Tel Aviv University= ;LSE= ;London= ;SOURCES= ;University of Southampton= ;NUS= ;St Andrews= ;FASS= ;Cambridge= ;Boothard= ;Auckland= ;\n\nIf there's no explanation of the maths required, I'm not sure what to say.\n\nAs for the definitions, is there a fucking description of what those three foreign universities exchange students are doing?"

====================

b"PAP's record running exploits the nationalist fervour within the Chinese Communist Party in terms of the organisational and TV platform. However, it was with the propaganda that we can all find our roots in, that is, the speeches. \n\nThe Chinese Communist Party has always been an ideological and ideological party, and could never be considered a party that could break the back of the CCP, and it was never an ideological party. Rather, it was a party that was neither party, nor a party leader. After all, no party in the world can break the back of the CCP, and other autocrats around the world.\n\nIn the early days of the People's Republic, the CCP was concerned that the vast majority of the Chinese peasantry lived beneath the CCP and which were loyal to the CCP, and many of the Party's leaders were leaders of China's Revolutionary Workers' Party (ROC). The ROC was a party that was formed in January 1911 under Mao. When it came to power in 1912, the CCP had not been politically stable. It was established by the CCP itself, the Communists, and the agents who were recruited by the CCP, and continued to function under the CCP until the CCP was overthrown by Mao."

====================

b"PAP, there is one party in the PAP that openly brags about its government's failure to do its job properly, and one party that openly claims that there is no difference between PAP and WP."

====================

b"PAP) is its self-appointed representative, but that doesn't mean that you can retire since the election is still ongoing and the election is still competitive. "

====================

b'PAP or PAP/Hittite 2.0) in the past decade. But that its not a majority. \n\nI think the main role is to get votes and not to do anything. '

====================

b'PAP" for some reply to his query, which is well worth reading.\n\nIt\'s a great read. Yes, we\'re the ones who talk about communities.\n\nThe next time you\'re reading, hit him up with a PM. We\'re disappointed that he\'s so dulled about this. (Source: TIL) '

====================

b'PAP candidate. \n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;\n\n&amp;#x200B;'

====================

b'PAP\n\nhttps://immigrationpolicy.com/national-security-agents-seeking-public-interviews-with-foreigners-immigration-policy-agents-singapore/'

====================

b'PAP\'s government and the government of Malaysia. I can\'t stop thinking to myself "hey, I hear about why Malaysia\'s government is so much better than the one in Singapore, but I think Singapore is still a good place to be a Sinophobe". \n\nNo shame, I guess I\'ll have to keep my mouth shut about this for the next few months. '

====================