YOURSAY | Passing the buck on controversial law

Malaysiakini

07 November 2023

Yoursay

YOURSAY | 'Get ready for another major disappointment from Anwar.'

GanMu: Prime Minister Anwar Ibrahim can't find an easy way out by going to the Conference of Rulers first before discussing it at Parliament and seeking their endorsement.

He should also stop talking in general terms without being specific.

We want to know what constitutional amendments will affect the citizenship that he raised with the rulers, what is the limit on what he can do after discussions (with the rulers) and what is the "certain position taken that has to be honoured".

The point is, why did the prime minister go to the rulers first without seeking the views of all stakeholders? Is this the way to run the government?

When he made promises during the elections, he never raised the issue of rulers.

We all know that once finalised and discussed in Parliament, this will finally go to the rulers for approval.

Knowing our rulers, history has shown that they will always endorse what is good for the rakyat.

He is putting the cart before the horse by going to the rulers first before seeking approval at Parliament.

Now he is trying to find an easy way out by using the rulers' name. I hope the rulers throw it back to him to seek the mandate from the people before coming to them.

Another point, why is he flip-flopping on gender equality? Different rules for fathers and different rules for mothers.

This is the same man who strongly advocated for fairness and gender equality.

GrizzledWarrior: Malaysia is a constitutional monarchy.

The Agong, by convention, will always give his royal assent to a Bill that has been passed by the requisite majority in both the Dewan Rakyat and Dewan Negara. It is a formality.

Yes, the Agong can withhold his royal assent and send the Bill down to be re-tabled, thereby frustrating the legislative process, but in the modern-day context, this is rarely done, except upon ministerial advice.

The last time a European constitutional monarch vetoed a bill was in the 18th century!

Are we being dragged, screaming back to the Middle Ages? So much for Malaysia Madani.

GreenRusa4781: Common sense dictates that the proposed citizenship law changes ought to have been discussed in the cabinet and the leaders of the coalition making up the government before taking it to the rulers.

The need for change to the citizenship laws is long overdue and most NGOs have voiced their views and concerns, but sadly it looks like Home Minister Saifuddin Nasution Ismail and Anwar have screwed up big time.

All MPs within DAP should vote against it and force it into further discussions before retabling.

Sealthedeal: That statement is upside down. Who runs the country, and who are the lawmakers?

In a constitutional monarchy, the lawmakers pass laws for submission for royal assent. It is not the other way around.

This amendment is unfair to the stateless who have been illegally prevented from gaining citizenship.

As such, it's appalling that one group can break the law of the land and the Constitution and believe they can sneak in an amendment that covers up their shameful illegal policy on the stateless.

A class action lawsuit should be launched immediately.

RR: Our rulers have always been very conscious and compassionate of the welfare and unity of rakyat as a whole.

Surely they will take cognisance of the views expressed by some of the concerned parliamentarians and will review the proposed amendments to the citizenship provision in the Constitution before signing the approval of the amendments to be passed by Parliament.

Anwar should facilitate this important matter with the rulers as the prime minister to sustain harmony and unity for a progressive Malaysia.

Constitutional supremacy: Do the rulers have the final say? Ours is a constitutional monarchy.

Rulers act on the advice of the cabinet. Rulers are subject to the Constitution. Rulers have discretion on matters such as the appointment of the prime minister and declaration of emergency.

If what the prime minister says is true, then changing the Malaysia Agreement 1963 (MA63), enforcing Syariah Courts (Criminal Jurisdiction) Act 1965 (Act 355) and so on can be enforced without referring to the cabinet and just getting the rulers' consent.

We hope all parties who make up the government will wake up and meet the prime minister as well as seek constitutional experts for advice.

Bill Price: The specific amendments should be presented separately so that Malaysian mothers can pass on citizenship by operation of law. This will pass.

It’s possible that the other amendments, with their ridiculous new requirements, will not pass.

If all are presented in a single bill, the amendment everyone (well, almost everyone) wants will be defeated along with the rest and we will be back where

we started.

My bet is that if the bill is defeated, Anwar will simply move on and say he tried, but that the winds of change weren't blowing in his direction. I'm preparing for yet another major disappointment from Mr Madani.

PurpleKijang9104: Never heard of this. After a two-thirds majority passing the bill in Parliament, the bill has to be discussed by the rulers.

Ever since Anwar took over the government, he used the rulers to shield himself. The majority who voted for Pakatan Harapan now feel cheated.

Kilimanjaro: So, why do we need a prime minister? Why do we need elected MPs? Why do we even need a Parliament?

If rulers get to decide on such an important issue, then just dissolve Parliament and go your own way.

Let me guess - when PAS gets to Putrajaya it may want its Syura council to decide.

What is Anwar trying to do actually?

Call former prime minister Dr Mahathir Mohamad whatever you want, but at least he has a spine.

Copyright © 1999-2012 Mkini Dotcom Sdn. Bhd

Source: https://www.malaysiakini.com/news/685657