

Volume II
No. 6



Tuesday
26th April, 1960

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 599]

MOTION—

**The Shooting of Africans in Sharpeville by South African
Police [Col. 602]**

BILL—

The Local Government Elections Bill [Col. 672]

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 685]

FEDERATION OF MALAYA
DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

Second Session of the First Dewan Ra'ayat

Tuesday, 26th April, 1960

The House met at Ten o'clock a.m.

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr. Speaker, DATO' HAJI MOHAMED NOAH BIN OMAR, S.P.M.J., P.I.S., J.P.
- .. the Prime Minister, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- .. the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Defence, TUN ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- .. the Minister of External Affairs, DATO' DR. ISMAIL BIN DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johore Timor).
- .. the Minister of Finance, ENCHE' TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Malacca Tengah).
- .. the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, DATO' V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungei Siput).
- .. the Minister of the Interior, DATO' SULEIMAN BIN DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Muar Selatan).
- .. the Minister of Transport, ENCHE' SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR (Pontian Utara).
- .. the Minister of Health and Social Welfare, DATO' ONG YOKE LIN, P.M.N. (Ulu Selangor).
- .. the Minister of Commerce and Industry, ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR BIN JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- .. the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- .. the Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB (Kuantan).
- .. TUAN SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, J.M.N., Assistant Minister (Johore Tenggara).
- .. ENCHE' ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P., Assistant Minister (Batang Padang).
- .. TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN, Assistant Minister (Kota Star Utara).
- .. ENCHE' CHEAH THEAM SWEE, Assistant Minister (Bukit Bintang).
- .. ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K., Assistant Minister (Klang).

The Honourable ENCHE' MOHAMED ISMAIL BIN MOHAMED YUSOF, Assistant Minister (Jera).

- „ ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Malacca Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN (Krian Laut).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN OSMAN (Sungei Patani).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI ABDUL RAOF (Kuala Kangsar).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kota Bharu Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BOESTAMAM (Setapak).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN MOHAMED SHAH, S.M.J. (Johore Bahru Barat).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID (Seberang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN HAJI YUSOF (Krian Darat).
- „ TUAN HAJI AZAHARI BIN HAJI IBRAHIM (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ DR. BURHANUDDIN BIN MOHD. NOOR (Besut).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN (Kluang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SWEE HO (Ulu Kinta).
- „ ENCHE' CHIN SEE YIN (Seremban Timor).
- „ ENCHE' V. DAVID (Bungsar).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT (Penang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N. (Kapar).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N. (Kulim Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN PILUS (Trengganu Tengah).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASAN ADLI BIN HAJI ARSHAD (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASSAN BIN HAJI AHMAD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' HASSAN BIN MANSOR (Malacca Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN To' MUDA HASSAN (Raub).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN (Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
- „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' KANG KOCK SENG (Batu Pahat).
- „ ENCHE' K. KARAM SINGH (Damansara).
- „ CHE' KHADIJAH BINTI MOHD. SIDIK (Dungun).
- „ ENCHE' KHONG KOK YAT (Batu Gajah).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON (Kluang Utara).

The Honourable ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).

„ ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW (Sepang).

„ ENCHE' LIM JOO KONG (Alor Star).

„ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).

„ DR. LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).

„ ENCHE' LIU YOONG PENG (Rawang).

„ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH (Port Dickson).

„ ENCHE' MOHAMED BIN UJANG (Jelebu-Jempol).

„ ENCHE' MOHAMED ABBAS BIN AHMAD (Hilir Perak).

„ ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA (Pasir Puteh).

„ ENCHE' MOHAMED DAHARI BIN HAJI MOHD. ALI (Kuala Selangor).

„ ENCHE' MOHAMED NOR BIN MOHD. DAHAN (Ulu Perak).

„ DATO' MOHAMED HANIFAH BIN HAJI ABDUL GHANI, P.J.K. (Pasir Mas Hulu).

„ ENCHE' MOHAMED SULONG BIN MOHD. ALI, J.M.N. (Lipis).

„ ENCHE' MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).

„ TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).

„ NIK MAN BIN NIK MOHAMED (Pasir Mas Hilir).

„ ENCHE' NG ANN TECK (Batu).

„ DATO' ONN BIN JA'AFAR, D.K., D.P.M.J. (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).

„ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Tanah Merah).

„ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Perlis Utara).

„ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG (Seremban Barat).

„ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID (Rembau-Tampin).

„ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB (Muar Pantai).

„ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).

„ ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).

„ TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).

„ TUAN SYED HASHIM BIN SYED AJAM, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sabak Bernam).

„ ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI (Larut Utara).

„ ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).

„ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Malacca).

„ ENCHE' TAN PHOCK KIN (Tanjong).

„ ENCHE' TAN TYE CHEK (Kulim-Bandar Bahru).

„ TENGKU INDRA PETRA IBNI SULTAN IBRAHIM, J.M.N. (Ulu Kelantan).

„ DATO' TEOH CHZE CHONG, D.P.M.J., J.P. (Segamat Selatan).

„ ENCHE' V. VEERAPPEN (Seberang Selatan).

„ WAN SULAIMAN BIN WAN TAM (Kota Star Selatan).

„ WAN YAHYA BIN HAJI WAN MOHAMED (Kemaman).

„ ENCHE' WOO SAIK HONG (Telok Anson).

„ ENCHE' YAHYA BIN HAJI AHMAD (Bagan Datoh).

The Honourable ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).

„ ENCHE' YONG WOO MING (Sitiawan).

„ HAJJAH ZAIN BINTI SULAIMAN, J.M.N., P.I.S. (Pontian Selatan).

„ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB (Langat).

„ ENCHE' ZULKIFLEE BIN MUHAMMAD (Bachok).

ABSENT:

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, ENCHE' ABDUL AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Kuala Langat).

„ WAN MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ALI (Kelantan Hilir).

IN ATTENDANCE:

The Honourable the Minister of Justice, TUN LEONG YEW KOH, S.M.N.

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

ROYAL MALAYAN AIR FORCE

Use of Aircraft by Private Persons

1. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of Defence whether he sanctioned the use of Malayan Air Force aircraft to carry the former M.C.A. President from Malacca during the M.C.A. crisis, and if he did so, under what lawful authority did he sanction the use of the aircraft for use in connection with a private political party's crisis.

The Minister of Defence (Tun Abdul Razak): On 10th July, 1959, a Royal Malayan Air Force aircraft was booked to convey two Ministers to Malacca on Government business. When the time came, this flight was not required, and the then Minister of Commerce and Industry enquired whether, since the aircraft was available, it could be used to convey him to Malacca to bring Tun Tan Cheng Lock to Kuala Lumpur. He was advised that, in accordance with regulations, the aircraft could be hired for this purpose, but a charge would be raised. Under these terms, the flight was duly made, and the charge was paid.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr. Speaker, may we know how much the former President of the M.C.A. was charged for this trip?

Tun Abdul Razak: That is a separate question.

FEDERAL CITIZENS SERVING WITH BRITISH ARMED FORCES

Compensation on Termination of Service

2. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of Defence whether he will take up the case of compensation for Federal Citizens employed by the British War Office in the same manner in which the British Government took up the case of compensation for British Officers facing Malayanisation.

Tun Abdul Razak: Mr. Speaker, Sir, civilian personnel employed in unestablished posts with the British Service Authorities are temporary employees and, under their terms and conditions of service, are entitled in cases of redundancy to gratuities. The same applies to other ranks enlisted in the British Forces and to officers serving on short-service commissions. No compensation was paid by the Federation Government to British officers employed under similar terms and conditions of service. They received only the gratuities to which they were entitled on the termination of their employment.

With regard to civilian personnel employed in established posts with the British Service Authorities, they are permanent employees and enjoy pension rights in the normal way on their retirement. I understand that no redundancy in these posts has yet arisen, and there are, therefore, no

grounds for the Federal Government to take up the question of compensation for loss of employment as in the case of British officers on the permanent establishment who have been prematurely retired under the Malayani- sation programme.

THE HOME GUARD AND THE SPECIAL CONSTABULARY

Financial and Other Assistance to former Members

3. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of Defence the amount of money that has been given to Home Guards who have served the nation and what is the policy regarding giving assistance to former Special Constables.

Tun Abdul Razak: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the answer to these questions have been given many times in this House for the last three years, and I suggest the Honourable Member should him- self do some home work.

However, I am prepared to give the answer now to save time.

The Home Guard was an organisa- tion of members of the public who voluntarily undertook part-time and unpaid services, and, as such, there was no general scheme of gratuities for such services. With regard to the permanent staff, they were entitled to such benefits as were included in their contracts, and in a great many cases, they have now been absorbed into the permanent staff of the Territorial Army.

With regard to Special Constables, they received gratuities on discharge, and, in addition, long-service Special Constables are eligible either for agri- cultural land subsidy or for a loan to build a house or to start a business, or, in lieu, for an outright grant of \$750. For discharged Special Con- stables as for all ex-Servicemen, special arrangements have been made for entry into Land Development Schemes under a quota system, or for appointment in Government depart- ments, or for employment through employment exchanges in certain cate- gories of work.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Prevention and Cure of Pneumonia

4. Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad asks the Minister of Health and Social Welfare to state, with reference to the figures published in a recent Govern- ment Weekly Health Intelligence showing that pneumonia has caused more deaths than any other single disease, what steps the Government is taking to control it, and what action the Government proposes to take to educate the people as to its fatality, its causes, and the methods of over- coming it.

The Minister of Health and Social Welfare (Dato' Ong Yoke Lin): Mr. Speaker, pneumonia does not cause more deaths than any other single disease.

For diseases such as tuberculosis, typhoid, cholera, diphtheria, and small- pox, specific inoculations can be given for preventive purposes. Pneu- monia is unlike those diseases in that there is no specific inoculation for prevention. Pneumonia is a respiratory disease caused by a variety of germs and viruses, which can attack a person either singly or in a group in combination. As a rule, the elderly and the very young are very prone to this disease, and always it is secondary to an original factor, e.g., common cold, influenza, malnutrition, a debilitating disease, or some loss of resistance due to various causes. It is clear that this is not a disease that is completely avoidable or easily con- trollable.

MOTION

SHOOTING OF AFRICANS IN SHARPEVILLE BY SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

That this House, while fully recognising the responsibility of the South African Government for its own internal policies and administration, nevertheless, consistent with the Federation Government's attitude in respect of violations of fundamental principles of human rights as exemplified by its stand on Tibet, expresses abhorrence at the shooting of, and the violence used

against, the Africans by the South African police in pursuance of the apartheid policy, and fully supports whatever action the Government considers appropriate in the matter.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have not brought up this motion in order to stir up any trouble or ill-feeling against another Commonwealth country. Nor do I seek, in bringing this motion, publicity for myself. What I have done is that I have come here to speak against what happened in South Africa, to speak in the name of human decency, humanity and human justice. The last thing I would wish to do is to start any campaign of hatred or vilification against another country, particularly a member of the Commonwealth, because she regards what happens in her own country as purely her own domestic and internal affair. Normally, what a country does in her own country and in her own territory is her own affair, and not ours. Our policy has always been to leave such matters alone. We have always maintained a policy of non-interference, a policy of neutrality on matters which we regard as the domestic policy of the other countries, which we regard as internal matters which are the concern of those countries alone; and because of this, the stand of the Federation Government in all its foreign affairs has been one of strict independence. That is a good principle in itself, a principle which has won for us a good name abroad and respect and support at home. There comes a time, however, when the question arises as to whether an occurrence in another country can be strictly regarded as, or strictly construed as, an internal affair of that country alone. This is a case in point: Can it be said that such an event in one country is mainly domestic and internal, and strictly within the jurisdiction of that country, when the outcome of it has widespread repercussions outside the borders of that country? I am referring to what happened in Sharpeville on that fateful day of March 21st and to the atrocities which were committed on that fateful day. The first news that came from that ill-fated town was very scant and the full extent of the brutalities which occurred among the

helpless and unarmed people there did not begin to emerge until the 24th March.

The news, you might say, has become somewhat stale. Stale because we had not brought it up earlier; but that is because unlike any other Parliament in the Commonwealth we did not sit in session then, we sit when the period arises, and that is why I take this opportunity to bring this matter up at this session. News of this nature cannot by any stretch of imagination be regarded as stale, because it affects humanity and human rights.

I woke up that morning on the 24th of March; I scanned the news headlines, heard the news on the radio and listened to an account of the atrocities committed and what was disclosed was really disgusting and a great shock to me. All the news from the radio and the newspapers I read turned my stomach because according to the reports there was no justification whatsoever for the killing of those innocent people.

I tell this House what I did on that occasion; I immediately drafted a message to the British Prime Minister, Mr. Macmillan, expressing my sorrow and very strong feelings of abhorrence and disgust at what had happened in South Africa. At the same time, instructions were sent ahead to the leader of our delegation in the United Nations asking our delegation to take up the matter in the Security Council of the United Nations. I had before that, of course, called in my colleagues, the Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs and informed them what I proposed to do, showing them the message I had drafted ready to be sent to the British Prime Minister. Their support, as you can imagine, was spontaneous and they were in full agreement with me and the course of action I proposed to take. The Minister of External Affairs then arranged for my message to be dispatched at once.

In that message, I might tell the House, I deplored very deeply the action of the South African police in handling the situation at Sharpeville

in the manner they did. I said that the whole concept of democracy was absolutely in conflict with such brutality, and that it was completely foreign to the concept of the Commonwealth which is based on human rights and human justice. I stated that it was unthinkable and unbelievable that such a thing should have occurred in a country which is in the Commonwealth, which we as a new nation have been very proud to belong to.

I then informed my other colleagues in the Cabinet of what I had done and they gave me their full and unanimous support for the action I took.

A few days later, however, I was informed that the practice normally followed at Conferences of Commonwealth is that no item can be put on the agenda for discussion where such item concerned the internal or domestic affairs of another country and according to the practice such subject matter could not be discussed at the Commonwealth Prime Minister's Conference. It was also indicated that if this subject was brought up it was likely that the South African Prime Minister would not be present at the meeting.

In the United Nations, we know that member countries can and do discuss matters affecting internal policies or internal affairs of member countries and we also know that teams have been sent to investigate reports on what has happened in those countries. Moreover, the Security Council itself, in this instance at the request of the Asian-African group, has discussed this matter. In my view there is all the more reason for us to do so, and when events such as this take place in the Commonwealth we as members of that great family of nations cannot ignore it. Otherwise it may well be asked, why have a Commonwealth if there is to be any special consideration for its members and if the members of that great family of nations are not able to discuss affairs which are not only of common interest to member countries but which have also become of world interest as it is a policy where human rights and liberties are not respected.

The events at Sharpeville aroused worldwide indignation. They touched us all, not only as nations but as human beings also. When an unfortunate and deplorable event such as occurred at Sharpeville—an event which has brought world opinion down on a member nation of the Commonwealth—are we as Commonwealth Prime Ministers to sit round a table without taking some positive measure to discuss the event and also in the hope that we might prevent such an event occurring in the future. Are we going to smile at one another across the table ignoring what has happened in another member country when the people in our own country whom we represent demand that action should be taken at the Prime Minister's Conference? Are we going there just to talk platitudes with a country whose hands are stained with red blood of innocent human beings? (*Applause*). Can we do this when all the world has condemned the police action there as the cruellest and vilest massacre ever committed in a Commonwealth country, a massacre in which men, women and children, meeting peacefully and without arms, were shot down in cold blood, shot in the back as they ran helter-skelter for safety? Are we to stand by and say nothing, do nothing? I think not—and I intend to speak out, be it at formal meetings or informal meetings of Commonwealth Prime Ministers (*Applause*).

We in Malaya have already shown and expressed our disgust with what happened in Hungary in 1956 and what happened in Tibet last year. Only just recently delegates from Malaya joined with others from African States and Asian countries at a conference in New Delhi to express their disapproval of Communist China's actions in Tibet.

There is a parallel with Hungary in the events of Sharpeville, even though the ruthless crushing of the Hungarian revolt was due to foreign intervention. The parallel, however, lies in the brutality of both events. I grant you, however, that the rebels in Hungary, fighting for their freedom, their own self-determination, did possess arms. The Africans assembled in Sharpeville

to protest against the enforcement of the pass laws were not.

There is a more direct parallel in the events in Tibet, which Communist China has repeatedly declared was a domestic and internal matter. Did that prevent worldwide disapproval of what occurred in Tibet? We in Malaya were among the first to protest most vehemently against this so-called internal attempt to crush the will and spirit and aspirations of the Tibetan people to determine their own way of life.

The issues in Hungary and Tibet were struggles for national freedom. The issue in South Africa is not even that; it is something more elementary in terms of human rights. Has anyone ever read or heard of any desire on the part of the black Africans in South Africa for independence? No. What they have asked for and struggled for, what they were asking for at Sharpeville, was simply the right to be treated as human beings in the country which they call their home.

We in Malaya, and also those in other countries in Asia have won their freedom, know how difficult the struggle against colonialism can be. We in Malaya can be thankful that we achieved independence along the path of peace, that no blood was shed in our course of nationhood. But in some countries it was necessary to resort to civil war.

The history of colonialism in Asia shows many marks of brutal and extreme repression of those fighting for liberty, for their national rights, but I cannot think of any instance when such brutal repression has been applied to a struggle for civil rights. Yet in this day and age, in this Commonwealth to which we belong, and are proud to belong, blood has flowed in a struggle for human rights, liberty and human justice.

The Commonwealth—a free and voluntary association of independent nations—has till now been bound together by a common appreciation of law and justice, by a common concept of democracy, and by a common desire to foster the gradual growth or emergence from the colonial era into the

dignity of independence, and with it a free choice, whether or not to remain within the Commonwealth. Thinking of the Commonwealth idea in its highest and best sense, it is an association of nations bound together by common belief in comradeship and good fellowship, and with its members working together amicably for mutual benefit without derogating in any way from the sovereignty of each. Such an association has always implied mutual acceptance of standards of conduct, and I think it is fair to say that the record of the Commonwealth as a whole is an example to the world. Within this family of nations we have members of different races, different traditions, different colours and different types of government. This diversity within our broad unity is what has made the Commonwealth one of the most outstanding organisations in the world and, in fact, in human history. We in the Commonwealth were the first to recognise the right of subject races for self-determination, and from first to last until now—save for this one glaring exception—we have staunchly upheld principles of fundamental liberties, belief in dignity and respect for man as a human being and the rights of all everywhere to live in peace and security as free and equal men, or equal in the eyes of men.

Those who rule South Africa to-day and control its destiny do not conform to our Commonwealth ideas and ideals of human rights and justice and I am beginning to think whether a country like South Africa has any right to be within this family of nations (*Applause*). If the treatment of the non-whites by the rulers of South Africa was carried out humanely within their own borders then perhaps it might be regarded as a purely domestic matter of that country and within the jurisdiction of that country. But when the treatment of the non-whites is so repulsive as to cause a great offence to our sense of justice and fair play then we must protest. If those who control the destinies of South Africa will not listen to our protest in the cause of humanity and justice as a member of the Commonwealth, then again we should ask ourselves what right has South Africa

to be a member of this Commonwealth of Nations?

The South African racialist policy of apartheid has expressed itself in most personal terms, even against visitors. A few years ago three of our own high Government officials, including one European officer in the party, had a very nasty experience there. They were going to England from Malaya by way of the Cape because of the trouble in the Suez. Their ship arrived in Cape Town on Christmas Eve. In that party of three there were two Christians and naturally they wanted to join in the festivities of the occasion and to join the festivities, as is the custom in this country, they wanted to indulge in a little drink. At several hotels the European member of the group was told that he could go in but not his two friends. They would have to stay outside. And I think quite rightly the European officer concerned said in each case: "I would rather not drink than leave my friends outside." Finally, a black African taxi driver told them of a dirty third-rate place where they could go and take part in the Christmas festivities there. They had no choice but go there. But their feeling inside must have been pretty bad against the South Africa of to-day. This may seem a minor incident to mention in the present context but it is typical of the feeling of the South African whites against people of colour, even if they are from an independent Commonwealth country. You can imagine what they think of and how they treat the black men who live in South Africa if this is the way they treat visitors from another Commonwealth country.

The police actions in Sharpeville against the unfortunate black men caused a storm of resentment in all countries. The recent troubles in South Africa have been brewing for a long time; now the sorry mess has boiled over—boiled over in the resentment of black Africans without any right of appeal against the repeated and continued indignities imposed, heaped and piled upon them, in a form of serfdom unknown and unheard of in this modern world.

This policy of apartheid not only creates a class a cast of human beings

despised in the eyes of those who rule them, but also creates a class without even the slightest elements of rights as citizens of a country in which they are born, in which they live and in which they are going to die. When they seek to obtain redress in the only possible way they can, by peaceful demonstrations, they are shot down. Bullets and not ballots were their unhappy lot. Therefore, let it not be said that what they have died for they have died in vain. We and the rest of the world, the democratic world, must take up their cause at whatever cost (*Applause*), and I am happy to say that a section of our community has already taken the initiative, for the Associated Chinese Chamber of Commerce have already called for a boycott of South African goods (*Applause*).

The events in South Africa were a mockery of the principles of Commonwealth comradeship. South Africa has time and again defied the United Nations, and their Minister of External Affairs has expressed the views of his Government on apartheid and his Government's stand on that question. If South Africa feels strongly against inclusion of this item in the agenda for the meeting of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers and chooses to keep out from the Commonwealth as a result, then I say "good riddance". (*Applause*).

My motion before this House is straightforward; it is neither emotional nor temperamental; my feelings at this moment are indeed very sad and very shocked. What I have said is not intended just to arouse a sense of pity for the blacks of South Africa who have suffered as a result of police action; it is an expression of the shock and abhorrence which have stirred all of us in Malaya, in this land above all other lands where we believe fundamentally in racial tolerance, harmony and goodwill. We want something to be done so that inhuman brutalities will not occur again.

Sir, I beg to move. (*Applause*).

The Minister of External Affairs (Dato' Dr. Ismail bin Dato' Abdul Rahman): Sir, I beg to second the motion, and I reserve my right to speak later.

Enche' V. David (Bungsar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have heard a long speech by the Honourable the Prime Minister on the question of South Africa. Sir, the African Continent has been ruled for centuries by the colonial rulers and the white men have control over the destiny of the Africans from thousands and thousands of miles away. The Whites were the oppressors who exploited and degraded the lives of the African people. Sir, in this motion I will have to make certain observations. For the unanimity of this House on this important motion, I would like the Members of the Government Bench to consider deletion of certain words in order to have a unanimous approval of this motion.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, our stand on certain matters in the past have been clearly stated in this House. We repeat that we still take the same stand. I would like to propose the following amendments to the motion. The amendments would be:

After the words "fundamental principles of human rights", delete the words "as exemplified by its stand on Tibet", and then add after the last word "matter", the words "including the boycotting of all South African goods."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the struggle between the Whites and the coloured people cannot be dealt with without referring to the historical events of the globe where the white men have dominated over the coloured race for decades. The Whites never thought or had time to think that the coloured race had the same natural instincts as the Whites. In the early part of 19th century Negro slaves were bought by American planters in cages and the slave trade in the United States was a profitable business then. At that time a Negro slave suffered long working hours but he did not feel the strain from the physical side. Since he had never known freedom, he looked upon slavery not as a degradation but as a routine. He had no thought of the future—in sickness and in health, in his childhood and in his old age, he was assured of an income proportioned to his necessities and not to his productiveness. The misconception in the minds of the Whites was that the Negro people were in any case fit only

to be slaves until Mr. Abraham Lincoln declared that if slavery is not a sin, then nothing could be sin in the world. This is where the struggle of the Negroes began.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, even though the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution was adopted somewhere in 1868, it was not interpreted until the early part of 1954. Sir, scientists have proved, basing on biological sense, that all human brains are equal. And therefore, the claim of one race to be superior to the other is a mockery to Science itself. Africans to-day prefer independence in poverty to riches in slavery. The race problem in South Africa remains an anachronism in the midst of all the advances having been made.

Africa has its own past, a past wilfully neglected by the western conqueror and imperfectly known and understood by the African himself. The Union of South Africa stubbornly resist African demands for treatment as a member of one of the variously shaded human races. The stringent racial separatism and perpetual White-rule, which has embodied in the South African formula of apartheid, are insults to the intelligence of human aspirations of all Africans and the human race itself.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in Africa the annual income of a native African averages about \$210 per year. At the same time the annual income of a White is somewhere about \$2,700 per year. The workers are denied the right to organise themselves into trade unions. The African worker has no legal right to negotiate and settle disputes with his employer through his own trade union. They are denied the right to choose their own delegates to negotiate on their behalf and their representatives are being appointed to speak on their behalf by the Minister of Labour. The coloured workers are completely denied all industrial democracy.

Mr. Speaker: I would like you to confine the speech to the amendment as to why these words are to be deleted and why those words are to be included. You will have the right again to speak on the main motion

itself after we have gone through the amendment. I think it will be better in that way.

Enche' V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, while moving the amendment, I thought I could speak generally on the motion itself.

Mr. Speaker: You can, but you have the right to speak again.

Enche' V. David: But I do not like to speak again. I thought I would finish it once and for all. Sir, the Minister of Labour, Mr. Sohen, in the Assembly in August, 1953, said,

"It is obvious that the stronger the native trade unions should become the more dangerous it would be to the Europeans in South Africa. We would probably be committing racial suicide if we give them that incentive."

Sir, the vital question posed in South Africa is to meet the challenge of many opportunities and to realise human potentials of its revolution, the continued existence of the hardcore areas behind the race curtain in South Africa is poisoning the political system of the country. All the apartheid and armed forces of the Union of South Africa, where Europeans are outnumbered nearly four to one, will be unable to prevent these tides of awakened aspirations. The question prevails that the liquidation of European domination will take place. The possibility of a civil war along racial lines hides the future of South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister, Dr. Verwoerd's barbarous act is deplorable and should be condemned as the most intolerable character of the 20th century. This action of Dr. Verwoerd will remain in the history of the world, together with that of the late Dr. Malan, for race hatred. African countries will, one day, pose as a threat to the world if the Whites, who have been the conquerors, do not change the present position. The prevailing position in South Africa to-day is that the minority Whites are driving the coloured into remote areas by occupying all fertile lands. Land hunger and poverty have shadowed the coloured population. Conditions are created for the Whites to live at the expense of the native

Africans. This is a tragedy to the democratic principles of society.

Sir, at the third meeting of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions held in December, 1959, it was decided unanimously to boycott all African goods. As a result of that the Malayan Trade Union Congress supported the decision of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. Sir, the boycott will be officially commenced by the workers from the 1st of May. I understand that the Malayan Trade Union Congress is holding a mass meeting on the 1st of May, 1960, to resolve the boycott of African goods. It is desirable and necessary for the Afro-Asian nations at this juncture to convey an Afro-Asian Conference similar to the Bandoeng Conference held in 1955. Such a Conference will bring effective pressure on the nations which are involved in this race hatred. Sir, the Africans and the Asian can only protect the present deteriorating situation in South Africa. The White Afrikaners of South Africa have all lost their sense of human feelings. They are a degraded race of perverts. They are gloating over the murder of poor defenceless Blacks in cold blood. They have defied world opinion, the United Nations and all powers which have expressed their opinion on this state of affairs in South Africa. The world must now unite to rescue the poor natives from White imposed horrors. The poor Blacks must be given protection against the violence imposed by the White Africans.

Malaya cannot standstill and watch the Black people being butchered by the White Africans. 68 helpless Blacks were butchered by the Whites on the first day early in April. Now the death toll is over 70, and wounded several hundreds. Malaya, I hope, will play its role in stopping the massacre of the Blacks by the Whites.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, while moving the amendment I feel that the amendment should be embodied with powers to boycott the African goods. The Prime Minister just stated that the Chinese Chamber of Commerce had made the move. We welcome the wise move taken by the Chinese Chamber of Commerce.

The workers of this country have also voiced their opinion and the formal boycott will commence after the 1st of May.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I call upon the Honourable Prime Minister not to have, in his mind, thoughts about party politics, but to think that the amendment is in the interest of the nation and in line with the voice of the workers of this country. We are not prepared here to debate on the question of Tibet which is quite irrelevant, but we feel, as we have taken a stand on it, we would like the same to be deleted so that the House can give a unanimous mandate to the Prime Minister to speak at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference and also to exert pressure through various means to bring a settlement of the deteriorating situation prevailing in South Africa.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew (Dato Kramat): Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the amendment.

Sir, we are not here to try in any way to lower or reduce the wonderful attempt of the Honourable the Prime Minister in deprecating the actions by a certain dominant immigrant minority group in South Africa. We wish to inform the House that as far as that part of his speech is concerned, we are with him wholeheartedly. But we are asking for this amendment because we believe that the Honourable the Prime Minister is perhaps being a bit mischievous in putting in a clause which is really irrelevant. This clause says:

"... consistent with the Federation Government's attitude in respect of violations of fundamental principles of human rights as exemplified by its stand on Tibet."

Why use an example—"as exemplified by its stand on Tibet"? If it is the purpose of the Honourable the Prime Minister to get the House to oppose this motion, it will only weaken Malaya's stand in the eyes of the world, because then it will show to the people that we are not united in this stand against this dominant immigrant minority group in South Africa; and it is because we want to show the world our united stand and because we want to let the whole civilised world know

that we cannot stand by quietly whilst such acts are being perpetrated, that we ask—in fact, we appeal to—the Prime Minister to himself delete this clause. This clause serves no real practical purpose though it may serve to disunite this House. I think that we can be equally as mischievous as the Honourable the Prime Minister. This clause says: "as exemplified by its stand on Tibet". We could move an amendment and say: "as exemplified by its stand on Tibet and not as exemplified by its stand on Algeria, on South Korea and, perhaps, on Israel." And what would then be the Government's attitude in such an instance? Surely the Government is not going to say for example: "Let us leave out Algeria, where the French are massacring the Moroccans." Because, after all, the UMNO the other day welcomed a representative of the Algerian Liberation Movement, and I believe certain officials of the UMNO agreed to support the representative's drive for funds; and yet the Government has been absolutely silent on this matter for the last few years.

Take the example of South Korea as another illustration. We have read two or three days ago that tanks were used against school students, and if the Honourable the Prime Minister woke up on the morning of 24th March with shock and surprise, disgust and horror, which apparently turned his stomach, I am sure that that news from South Korea would have equally turned his stomach, and yet not one word in this motion on South Korea. Why this distinction?

There is a motion on Israel that is coming up for debate. We do not want to prejudice the issue, but we would like to say this: there have been allegations that Israel has ghettos in Israel, where the Arabs are treated in as equally a sub-human fashion as the Africans have been treated in South Africa. We know of the expansion of the border of Israel into Arab territory, and the confiscation of Arab land because people had fled from the parts in the face of aggression and occupation. Those people have not been given back their land. We know of United

Nations resolutions—four of them, I believe—condemning Israel, and yet the Government has done nothing about Israel. Can we not then move an amendment that the Government has not amplified its stand with regard to Algeria, with regard to South Korea and with regard to Israel—and other instances, innumerable?

But the point is this: we must, in this instance, show a unanimity against this action by this aggressive minority group, and therefore for this purpose I appeal to the Tunku to remove this rather irrelevant clause, because the Tibetan issue is another issue by itself. We may have different views on this, but let us not throw a spanner in the works, by holding on to this irrelevant clause.

Now, the mover of this motion has talked of black and white supremacy. We want to make this clear: we do not stand against races, we do not distinguish people according to race. This racial theory, this idea of the super-race, this idea of the Aryan race, was a theory of Fascism. It was Hitler's theory which enabled him to kill six million Jews—and we fought against such racial persecution. What we are against is this: it is the abhorrence of a minority dominant group which is immigrant, in other words, a minority dominant immigrant group suppressing and ill-treating the very people whom they have come to exploit and who for years and years and countless years have been crying out for Anna and the Black Bible. Very often it is said in South Africa:

"You gave us the Bible, but you took away our land!"

I would like to say this: that the Bible was given to those people but their souls were taken away, because, according to Christian beliefs, it is only animals, dogs, that have no souls, only the human being has a soul and the African is to-day being treated as dogs. In other words, by taking away their souls, they have reduced these African people to the status of beasts.

Of course, we must hope that not only will this clause be deleted, but that the Honourable the Prime Minister himself would take active steps to

show our disgust and abhorrence at this act. We have asked for a boycott, but that was formally refused because it was stated by, I believe, the Prime Minister himself that a boycott of South African goods would cause us more misery than South Africa. Of course it is quite possible that my memory may be as faulty as the Honourable the Prime Minister's memory, which was displayed the other day when he said to the House that the Alliance Manifesto never said it would support the Afro-Asian Group, and the very next day the Minister of External Affairs stood up and said: "Of course, in our Manifesto we said quite clearly that we support the Afro-Asian Group. (*Interruption*) (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker, this is a very solemn occasion, and it is no use having mourners weeping, crying and making speeches over a raped carcass. If we want to help Africa, we must in some concrete way show that we certainly in Malaya abhor such violence.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Bungsar is to add a comma after the words "principles of human rights", delete the words "as exemplified by its stand on Tibet", and add the following words at the end of the motion: "including the boycotting of all South African goods".

That amendment is now open to debate.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I oppose the amendment for this simple reason: that it is not relevant to the motion which I have put before the House. The motion states quite clearly the stand which we took, as distinct from the stand which the Honourable Members supporting it took. The stand which we took on Tibet we propose doing the same with regard to South Africa, and for that reason we say "as exemplified by our stand on Tibet". I can't see any reason why the Opposition should take objection to this particular sentence, unless, perhaps, they have a reason peculiarly of their own. Are they suggesting that what the Communists in China did in the case of Tibet, they are justified in doing it, but what the white man did in Africa,

they must not? (*Applause*). Inequality and inhumanity, wherever it is practised, is bad from the humanitarian view, bad from all angles. Therefore, the innocent sentence which appeared in there—I can't see any particular objection. Therefore, I will refuse to accept the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member.

In the course of his speech, the Member for Dato Kramat suggested that the stand which we should have taken on these other countries like Algeria, Palestine and many others which he mentioned just now, have no bearing on this particular matter. It is not relevant, in fact. If the Honourable Member will remember, in the course of my speech I said that events in Tibet have a parallel in this, because Communist China insisted that what happened in Tibet was purely its own domestic and internal matter, and refused to allow any other country to concern itself with this matter. Yet the United Nations took a real stand on this, and so agreed, and outside the Government, individuals who stand for right and justice and liberty, as I had mentioned, called a meeting in New Delhi to discuss this matter and took a resolution on it.

The other objection which I have is that in mentioning Algeria and various Arab countries, it was purely done to discredit the Alliance Party. In one breath, the Honourable Member said we shouldn't think of party politics, and in another what he did was to discredit us by trying to tell the world that we did not concern ourselves with what was happening in these countries. In fact, we did. But what happened in these countries and what happened in this particular one has no parallel—they are different things. In one case they were fighting for independence, for the right to determine their own destinies. The other is fighting for the right to live as a human being. Therefore, there is no parallel at all.

The other is the suggestion that we should introduce, at the end of the motion, the boycotting of South African goods. This, as I said, boycotting of goods is a matter for one particular section of the community, particularly

the business people. Whatever they do is their affair, but if this Government can gauge from the expression of opinion in this House to-day, we can take steps to do more than boycotting South African goods. Therefore, just to suggest adding the words "boycotting South African goods" is to put us on the same parallel and footing as a business house. That we refuse to accept.

Dato' Dr. Ismail: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Members of the Socialist Front—because I have to distinguish the Opposition; they are so diverse in this House—say it is unfortunate that on this issue we cannot all be one. We all in this House want to be at one on this issue, but the Socialist Front will not allow us. Why? Because we differ on the fundamental principle. We on the Government bench—and I hope, too, members of the Opposition—hold the view that the violation of human rights should be above party politics. More than that. They should not be partial on the question of the violation of human rights (*Applause*). Violation of human rights is violation of human rights, be it perpetrated by the white, by the yellow, by the black or by the brown. The violation of human rights does not grow in intensity according to the degree of our pigments. We are all human beings whether our colour is black, brown, yellow or white. We must stand united wherever there is violation of human rights.

It is sad to hear that the phrase "as exemplified by its stand on Tibet" is irrelevant. Sir, is the violation of human rights in Tibet irrelevant when we are fighting for the dignity and the rights of the black in South Africa? Are the Tibetans because they are puppets, because the denial of human rights there is being done by the yellow communists, to be neglected? I am surprised to hear that it is irrelevant to this motion. I say it is very relevant because by exemplifying the example in Tibet we have aroused the sympathy and the anger of the world against the atrocities that are committed in South Africa. Sir, the Government has been loud on its stand on Tibet, but it is only to-day for the first time that I

have heard from members of the Socialist Front that the question of Tibet is irrelevant as far as human rights are concerned. The members from the Socialist Front say that they want to be co-operative. If they want to be co-operative why don't they add the words Algeria and South Korea in making the amendment? Why delete this question of Tibet?

Sir, I would like to tell this House why is that we are very strong on this question of Tibet. This is a very good example of how the world is closing its eyes to the violation of human rights. When we in the United Nations, together with Ireland, tried to bring this question of Tibet to be inscribed on the item of the agenda we were advised by our friends and by our foes not to bring it up. Members of the Commonwealth, members of the Afro-Asian group and, of course, the Communists told us not to bring it up because, they said, it would intensify the cold war. Sir, if in fighting for the dignity of man, in defending the human rights, we are intensifying the cold war, I say let the cold war go on, because you can never have peace, you can never thaw this cold war if you are going to condone wherever there is violation of human rights. Members of the Socialist Front always say that their foreign policy when they come to power—if they ever come to power—will be neutral. To-day we know on which side their neutrality is. (*Applause*).

It is sad, Sir, that the strong, impassioned speech by the Prime Minister on the dignity of man and on the violation of human rights in South Africa should be spoilt by members of the Socialist Front. Why do they go for these things—one begins to wonder. We on the Government bench are always clear on our stand, and as the day is brighter when the sun rises so will we in this House and as the democratic institution grows we will see the evolution of the policy of the Socialist Front in this House. I say that we will oppose strongly the amendment moved by the members of the Socialist Front because we are proud of the stand that we had taken on Tibet. While others have other considerations in deciding on international issues, we,

because of our independent policy and because we are not tied to any block and not dictated by any power, and Ireland were the two powers, Sir, that stood up strongly on this question of Tibet. The others may by their abstention have helped us to get a two-third majority in the United Nations Assembly. But when historians write of those who defended the fundamental human rights, Malaya three years after its independence together with another small power in the West were the first to raise their voice against the big power which trampled on a small power to deny it of human rights (*Applause*). We never think in terms of colour on this question of violation of human rights. So, we strongly oppose this amendment, Sir. (*Applause*).

Amendment put, and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Now the debate will resume on the substantive motion.

Dr. Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor (Besut): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, usul yang di-bawa oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat tadi ia-lah masa'alah human issue ia-lah masa'alah peri kema'nusiaan. Maka saya dan Persatuan Islam sa-Malaya ada-lah menyokong dengan sekuat²-nya dan dengan sepenoh² perasaan ra'ayat negeri kita ini, dan bersetuju dengan keterangan yang di-kemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat itu. Masa'alah ini ada-lah masa'alah peri kema'nusiaan, jadi kerana itu bersangkutan dengan istilah ini dengan dasar² yang telah di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan Afrika Selatan menjalankan dasar apartheid ada-lah melanggar dengan dasar² perjuangan kita dan perjuangan peri kema'nusiaan itu. Kita menyokong kuat bagi usul ini.

Kita mengemukakan membantah apa² yang di-kemukakan berupa perkauman, kerana kita musuh kepada chara² yang menimbulkan perbalahan kaum, tetapi apa yang di-timbulkan oleh apartheid itu bukan sahaja menimbulkan perkauman, tetapi mengapi²kan perkauman ka-seluruh dunia ini. Jadi, langkah yang di-bawa oleh Perdana Menteri kita sokong dengan kuat-nya.

Berkenaan dengan perkara Tibet walau pun kita ada berlainan pendirian

sedikit, tetapi kita tidak sedikit meninggalkan perkara Tibet, kerana masa'alah itu hanya-lah menjadi contoh atas kejayaan yang telah di-chapai oleh Perikatan. Kita sepatut-nya menyokong ini dengan memberi kesedaran seluroh ra'ayat negeri ini atas kekejaman perbuatan² Police action in South Africa, dan kita harus memberi perasaan simpati dan timbang rasa terhadap perjuangan ra'ayat Afrika yang telah lama memperjuangkan kebebasan yang telah tertindas oleh apartheid itu dan kerana itu kita seluroh ra'ayat harus-lah manakala Perdana Menteri kita telah membawa nanti usul-nya di-persidangan Perdana² Menteri Commonwealth di-mana kita juga ra'ayat di-sini memberi sokongan moral dari seluroh ra'ayat negeri ini. (*Tepok*). Kalau Chinese Chamber of Commerce sudah mengambil sikap, maka kita harus mengikut sikap dan memberi kesedaran bahawa kita ra'ayat Malaya dengan penoh rasa timbang rasa terhadap ra'ayat Afrika memperjuangkan peri kema'nusiaan dan memperjuangkan terus peri kema'nusiaan itu.

Satu perkara yang kalau tak salah ingatan saya ia-itu mungkin tak dibawa ka-meshuarat Perdana² Menteri Commonwealth dalam agenda persidangan Perdana² Menteri itu. Saya berharap perkara ini perkara yang besar yang akan membawa satu sejarah supaya dapat-lah ikhtiar menjadikan satu agenda. Saya mengatakan ini, kerana apa yang telah saya baca beberapa masa yang lalu berkenaan dengan sikap Australia dan sikap New Zealand hendak mengasingkan daripada perbahathan Perdana² Menteri Commonwealth itu. Perkara ini adalah satu perkara perbahathan yang luas, dan dengan ini saya berharap supaya perkara ini dapat menjadi rekod yang betul² dalam agenda itu.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support this motion which has been proposed. In doing so, I would like to say this: that, as we have often said, from the P.P.P. group here, that violence or any other form of atrocity, whether it comes from the Communists, capitalists or socialists, will be condemned by

the People's Progressive Party of Malaya in any country. (*Applause*).

The motion as put before this House I fully support, but I regret that it would appear to be a bit apologetic in its form. It says, "That this House, while fully recognising the responsibility of the South African Government for its own internal policies and administration, nevertheless . . ." and then it goes on. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the question of South Africa and the apartheid policy is one which has gone on long enough; its history is known to all the world. My only regret is that this motion has not been more dynamic, more specific, in condemning the atrocities in South Africa.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is: what are we going to do about it? Express our abhorrence and keep quiet? What is the Government going to do? I suggest that this Government should take a positive stand, a positive stand by action—an embargo on South African goods. The trade and commerce circles of this country have expressed their desire to boycott South African goods; the Chinese Chambers have declared that they would do so. I think some political organisations have declared that they will ask their members to boycott South African goods. If I am not wrong, and subject to correction, I think the Malay Chamber of Commerce also declared their stand to boycott South African goods. Mr. Speaker, Sir, if there is such united expression of opinion that South African goods should be boycotted as a sign of protest, as a sign of sympathy with the African people, then I say it is the duty of this Government to consider placing an embargo on all South African goods to this country. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it may be said that we will lose some trade—I do not know how large or how small our trade and business with South Africa is—but even if it means a loss of dollars, I say, in the interests of the South African people, it is better to lose those dollars than let Malayan dollars go for bullets to kill South Africans in South Africa. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the question of

money in a matter of this nature is secondary. This is a country of Asians. We are Asians and whilst brutality whether to Asians or to non-Asians is to be condemned in a like manner, it is more painful to us to see that Asians of coloured races are being slaughtered, massacred and butchered by the white people of South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, with reference to the question of Tibet being included in this motion, there is one observation I would like to make. While we condemn, as I said, brutality from any quarter, the inclusion of the example of Tibet must not be taken as a vote of confidence or approval of this House on the stand of the Government on the Tibetan issue. If that matter comes before this House for debate and for a vote of confidence or a vote of support for this Government's stand, then that matter will be debated and a result will be obtained.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we strongly support this motion, and wish our Prime Minister all the best in bringing this matter up.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar (Kuala Trengganu Selatan): Sir, I beg to move an amendment to this motion which would read as follows:

"That this House, while fully recognising the responsibility of the South African Government for its own internal policies and administration, nevertheless, consistent with the Federation Government's attitude in respect of violations of fundamental principles of human rights, expresses abhorrence at the apartheid policy of the South African Government, and fully supports whatever positive action the Government considers appropriate in the matter."

This amendment of mine would delete the words "as exemplified by its stand on Tibet" and also the words "the shooting of, and the violence used against, the Africans by the South African police in pursuance of the apartheid policy" and would include the word "positive" before the word "action" in the last line of the motion.

In the motion introduced by the Honourable the Prime Minister, stress has been on "abhorrence at the shooting of, and the violence used against, the Africans by the South African police."

I submit, Sir, that that is merely incidental. Our abhorrence should not be merely at the incident that happened and which I believe is the source of an inquiry by the South African Government. We know in advance what the result of the inquiry will be. It would be a white-washing of that incident. What we deplore, and I think what the Prime Minister himself deplores, is the apartheid policy of the South African Government—that is the crux of the whole problem—and the support of this House should not be merely to fully support whatever action the Government considers appropriate in the matter; it should, in my view, be to fully support should, in my view, be to fully support whatever positive action the Government considers appropriate in the matter. In the course of this debate I feel sure you will hear from Honourable Members the kind of positive actions that can be taken—a boycotting of South African goods into this country, a ban on the export of goods from this country to South Africa, and possibly a prohibition of the entry of South Africans themselves. (*Applause*).

The motion as it stands to-day is, in my view, insipid. It is not positive enough. It merely opposes the incident of shooting at Sharpsville. But what actually is meant, and I am subject to correction by the Honourable Prime Minister, is abhorrence at the whole apartheid policy of South African Government.

Mr. Speaker: May I have your amendment, please? A copy must be submitted to me under the Standing Orders.

The Prime Minister: Before the Honourable Member hands in his amendment to you, Sir, I wonder if he would compromise. The only suggestion that I could make is that I agree with the word "positive". That is all I would agree to.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is not before the House yet. (*Laughter*).

(*Dato' Onn hands in his amendment*).

Enche' Chin See Yin (Seremban Timor): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to

second. I rise as I did yesterday in a move to condemn any act of atrocity, the killing and the murder of the innocent and helpless men, women and children. This we have all heard over the radio the other day, and much has already been said not only in this House but also in newspaper reports. Everywhere—in this and every town of this country—people are condemning these acts of atrocity.

Sir, for twelve years we have suffered and we know what it is to be undergoing such brutal acts. What has been done in South Africa against the Africans are similar to what we have seen for the last twelve years—acts of communist terrorism—in this country. What we want is positive action, not merely an act which is negative—going there and telling them, “Look here, we deplore this.” I think that is not enough. In the League of Nations, as we all remember, we condemned the acts in Africa done by the Italians. What happened? The Japanese took up arms and they came here and caused endless troubles. If we were to go to London and say that we deplore the action and do nothing more than that we will find a repetition in history. More atrocities will be done in other countries. We see from the newspapers that certain Prime Ministers of certain countries in this family of nations do not support the move by our Honourable the Prime Minister. But that should not deter us from moving forward and doing something first here before we go there. We have started with the boycotting of South African goods by the Chinese Chamber of Commerce—let everybody follow. Further, send back all African goods and say that we do not want them and, if necessary, send back the Africans too. That is positive action. We do not want something that is negative. We all agree that internal affairs are their own concern and we do not like to interfere, but to see innocent and helpless men, women and children being slaughtered and shot down as though they are animals, I think, that is something we must go forward and tell them, “Look here, if you go on like that and if any other country were to follow that, we will not agree and we will take positive action.” For that reason, Sir,

I say let us take a positive move, boycott all the South African goods, and send the Africans back—that is what I suggest and I support this motion.

Mr. Speaker: This is the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan. The amendment has already been seconded. Before I put it to debate, this is what the amendment says:

Delete

“as exemplified by its stand on Tibet,”
also delete

“the shooting of, and the violence used against, the Africans by the South African police in pursuance of the apartheid policy,”; and

substitute

“the apartheid policy of the South African Government and fully supports whatever positive action the Government considers appropriate in the matter.”

The question I have to decide now is in respect of those words to be deleted. First, the words “as exemplified by its stand on Tibet”; that amendment had been debated and rejected by this House. Once an amendment has been rejected by this House, it cannot be raised again.

The amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Bungsar also sought to add the following words: “including the boycotting of all South African goods”, at the end of the motion. That first amendment therefore, had two parts: the first part, to delete those words that I have said, and the second part to add certain words. We have another amendment here now, by the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan, which has got part of the amendment already rejected—part of the amendment now moved has already been rejected by the House; in addition, it seeks to delete certain words and, in substitution, to add other words to this motion. I can only accept that part of the amendment making the deletion in order to insert other words in substitution. I can accept that. I have to consider, however, whether I can accept the deletion of the words “as exemplified by its stand on Tibet” which has already been debated and rejected by this House. So I suspend the meeting for 15 minutes.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: Sir, before you suspend the meeting, I was not in the Chamber when the amendment was made and I am quite prepared to withdraw the deletion of the words "as exemplified by its stand on Tibet" and allow those words to remain.

Mr. Speaker: I think I am right, in my mind, to reject that because it has been debated and rejected. In any case I suspend the meeting for 15 minutes.

Sitting suspended at 11.45 a.m.

Sitting resumed at 12.05 o'clock p.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker: Now the amendment is before the House. This amendment has been moved, and I shall read it again for the information of Honourable Members. Delete the following—

"the shooting of, and the violence used against, the Africans by the South African police in pursuance of the apartheid policy," and substitute it with—

"the apartheid policy of the South African Government"

The word "positive" has been added in the last line, between the words "whatever" and "action". The amendment is open to debate.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the amendment on the ground that if there had been no shooting, in the first place this motion would not have been brought up. The apartheid policy of South Africa has been in existence for many years, but it was followed by the atrocities which happened in Sharpeville on the 21st of March and that caused the abhorrence, not only in this country but throughout the world, and if the reference to the shooting of those poor Africans is to be deleted from this motion it becomes meaningless. With regard to the apartheid policy as practised in South Africa, it is purely a domestic and internal affair of South Africa and it has all along been our stand not to interfere, but it was because it was followed by those atrocities that we have taken this stand and brought this motion to this House. Therefore, I strongly oppose the

amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam (Menglembu): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have been rather taken aback by what the Honourable Prime Minister has just said. I was under the impression right from the beginning that the policy of this Government was to condemn the apartheid policy. I am not sure I have not misunderstood the Honourable Prime Minister. As I understand it, he said just now that apartheid was purely the internal affair of South Africa and in which this Government does not intend to interfere—by that I mean not even to express an opinion. If that is so, then the whole complexion has changed.

The Prime Minister: I do not think it is quite correct. Perhaps I might not have expressed my views quite clearly just now. But the whole of this motion expresses what is in my mind, and I will read the whole of this motion again—

That this House, while fully recognising the responsibility of the South African Government for its own internal policies and administration, nevertheless, consistent with the Federation Government's attitude in respect of violations of fundamental principles of human rights as exemplified by its stand on Tibet, expresses abhorrence at the shooting of, and the violence used against, the Africans by the South African police in pursuance of the apartheid policy, and fully supports whatever action the Government considers appropriate in the matter.

"... in pursuance of the apartheid policy...". We are opposed to that policy. Therefore, we fully support whatever action the Government wish take in the matter.

I think if you read and try to understand the purpose of this motion, it is exactly what is in mind in bringing up this motion here.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: On a point of explanation. Does the rejection of my amendment by the Prime Minister also include the word "positive".

The Prime Minister: If the Honourable Member would just amend by inserting the word "positive" I am quite prepared to accept it. But that is a different matter.

Mr. Speaker: Well, in that case the Prime Minister can move an amendment to the amendment by saying "to add the word 'positive' in the last line". I can put that to the House if there is somebody to second it. Will you move that?

The Prime Minister: Sir, I beg to move that the word "positive" be inserted in the last line of the motion, so that it will read "... whatever positive action the Government considers appropriate in the matter."

Dato' Dr. Ismail: Sir, I beg to second the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Now, there is an amendment to the amendment before the House. The amendment is moved by the Honourable Prime Minister himself to the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan. The amendment moved by the Prime Minister is to insert the word "positive" in the last line between the words "whatever" and "action" so that it will read "whatever positive action the Government considers appropriate in the matter." Before I put the amendment to the House I would like to ask the Honourable mover of the original amendment whether he will accept the amendment to his amendment. If he will accept this amendment to his amendment, we will not go back to debate that amendment.

Dato Onn bin Ja'afar: No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: So you do not accept it.

Enche' Chin See Yin: Before you put the amendment to the amendment to the House, can I ask the Honourable Prime Minister to clarify what positive action he proposes to take?

The Prime Minister: Whatever positive action the Government may wish to take will have to come for approval before this House. It is not for me to say immediately what positive action we would like to introduce before I have heard the expression of opinion and views of Honourable Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker: Now the motion before the House is only to add the

word "positive" in the last line. After that has been disposed of, I will go back to the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan. If nobody wishes to speak I shall put the question to the House.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun menyokong pindaan yang dikemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri yang menambah perkataan "progressive". Yang sa-benarnya, saya berchadang hendak menyokong dengan tidak ada pindaan sakali pun. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam perkara yang saperti ini boleh juga kita umpama-nya, mengadakan pindaan² yang panjang² atau pendek tetapi yang saya risaukan kalau² adalah pengintip daripada South Africa di-sini maka nampak-lah kapada dia alang-kah payah-nya hendak meluluskan satu chadangan saperti ini. Dan dalam persidangan Perdana² Menteri Commonwealth boleh-lah di-kata orang sunggoh pun chadangan-nya begitu tetapi bukan-lah ra'ayat berbuat demikian. Saya perchaya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak sa-orang pun sahinggakan daripada mana² pehak didalam Majlis ini ta' bersetuju bahawa apa yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan Africa Selatan mengikut dasar apartheid itu ada-lah berlawanan dengan peri kemanusiaan dan berlawanan dengan chara² hidup yang telah di-pakai di-zaman ini.

Boleh jadi 3,000 tahun dahulu jiwa manusia itu tidak begitu besar harganya tetapi pada hari ini perkara itu sangat besar. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, didalam usaha mengemukakan chadangan ini, Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri telah membuat satu pengakuan-nya kalau saya ta' salah ada menyebutkan bahawa kita akan mengemukakan hal ini ia-itu soal "at whatever cost". Ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sangat-lah saya hormati dan oleh kerana Perdana Menteri telah menyebutkan bahawa didalam menentukan apa-kah langkah "positive" yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan maka Perdana Menteri hendak melihat bayangan lain dari pehak Ahli² Dewan ini. Pada fikiran saya, pada tempat-nya-lah saya membuat beberapa perhatian dalam perkara ini sebab nampak-nya,

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidakkan berbalek kapada soal yang asal. Jadi, soal ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soal mengemukakan hal ini di-dalam persidangan Perdana² Menteri Commonwealth telah pun kita nampak beberapa halangan² dan dengan sebab kita akan menentang kapada Kerajaan yang bersangkutan walau pun kita mengatakan itu ada-lah perkara yang bukan kita sama mengambil bahagian di-dalam-nya dan perkara ini ada-lah perkara negeri dia. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Perdana Menteri Australia, Tuan Menzies telah menyebui dengan terang²-nya soal sa-umpama ini maka tidak-lah patut di-bahathkan. Saya berharap, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahawa Dewan ini akan memberikan semangat yang kuat walau pun Perdana Menteri kita sudah kuat semangat-nya tetapi beri-lah semangat yang kuat sa-hingga sampai kira² bertegang² di-dalam persidangan Perdana² Menteri Commonwealth itu.

Sebab apa, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, walau pun seperti yang di-katakan oleh Perdana Menteri tadi, soal dasar Africa ini soal Kerajaan Africa ini soal Kerajaan Africa sendiri dan soal "colour-bar" di-Australia soal Australia sendiri. Kalau Australia orang-nya memikirkan dia hendak membuat macham mana dalam negeri dia itu suka dia-lah. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, penembakan dan pembunohan sa-hingga mengalirkan darah dan apa sahaja yang telah berlaku pada 21 March dan pada 24 March dan apa yang akan berlaku ka-hadapan ini tidak-lah berlaku semata² kerana kegemaran anggota² polis di-Africa untuk menembak orang tetapi kerana ada-nya dasar itu. Walau apa pun yang akan dikemukakan oleh orang² tetapi saya berharap bahawa Perdana Menteri kita jangan-lah lemah bahkan terangkan-lah kapada Kerajaan-nya bahawa hasil dalam dasar-nya yang tidak sehat itu-lah jadi-nya perkara ini. Dan kami di-dalam menentang perbuatan itu, juga berma'ana menentang dasar-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berasa gerun, sebab South Africa telah menentang perkara ini hendak di-bawa ka-dalam Pertubohan Bangsa² Bersatu. Yang menyebabkan saya berasa gerun kalau-lah Rumah ini tidak betul umpama-nya merupakan satu blok

yang ketat yang berpadu benar² dalam perkataan-nya melahirkan perasaan-nya maka saolah² Perdana Menteri kita pergi dengan barang² yang longgar yang akan di-lemparkan ka-Afrika Selatan dia akan tidak terasa sangat. Oleh sebab yang demikian, terutama dari kawan² kita dari Socialist Front berharap supaya soal² yang mungkin umpama-nya menimbulkan beberapa khilap dalam perkara ini chuba pada kali ini kita ketepikan dan kita pandangan pada kali ini di-mana kita hendak menunjokkan kapada dunia bahawa Perdana Menteri kita pernah pergi keluar negeri dengan suara yang penoh dalam soal ini daripada Dewan Ra'ayat. Sebab apa, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya telah merasa dalam pengalaman saya. Sa-buah negeri yang telah saya tinggal dahulu ia-itu saya tak usah sebutkan sekarang, ada sa-orang Perdana Menteri keluar dan berchakap di-United Nations, bukan main sedap-nya menghentam satu dasar yang dia tak suka. Kemudian sa-orang ketua party politik daripada negeri-nya telah menghantar telegram mengatakan kami tak bersetuju dengan apa yang di-chakapkan itu. Maka diketahuilah oleh wakil² negeri² lain atas perbuatan yang semacham itu. Sekarang ini perkara ini tidak timbul, tetapi yang kita harapkan ia-lah mari-lah kita bersama² dalam Majlis ini dengan sabulat suara mengutok Kerajaan Afrika Selatan dan mengutok dasar yang di-timbulkan-nya supaya ia mengubah dasar-nya itu. Itu bukan soal kita, tetapi soal Dewan Ra'ayat sendiri. Demikian juga yang mengubah dasar orang² yang ada dalam Commonwealth itu soal mereka, tetapi selagi perkara ini, umpama-nya tidak dipertunjukkan dengan penoh semangat, maka tidak-lah dapat kita mengubah keadaan-nya yang telah ada dalam negeri itu. Kalau tidak, kalau pun dapat kita kachau dan kita lakukan sa-suatu sekarang ini pada masa hadapan dia akan timbulkan lagi sekali.

Saya suka dalam hal ini menarek perhatian daripada langkah² yang telah di-sebutkan oleh beberapa Ahli di-sini. Oleh yang demikian saya bagi pehak Persatuan Islam sa-Malaya merasa hendak-lah kita chermat. Saya bersetuju dalam perchakapan-nya bahawa kita

ambil langkah semua-nya yang munasabah, tetapi dalam memutuskan munasabah ini, saya berharap, kita terutama Kerajaan supaya chermat, sebab umpama-nya sa-orang Ahli Yang Berhormat mengatakan jangan beri orang² South African datang ka-negeri ini. Saya suka menegaskan bahawa South African itu ada yang hitam dan ada yang putih, tetapi yang kita marah itu ia-lah orang² Afrika kulit putih yang hendak menentang hak orang² kulit hitam. Oleh itu, jika kita rasa orang South Africa tak boleh datang di-sini—kasehan orang yang semacam itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dan saya harap appropriate action yang akan difikirkan oleh Kerajaan itu hendaklah di-fikirkan bahawa South African itu ada dua golongan-nya dan janganlah di-anayakan kepada orang² kulit hitam kerana perbuatan orang² kulit putih itu.

Dalam menyokong usul ini saya berharap supaya Kerajaan memikirkan langkah² itu sa-sudah sahaja persidangan ini di-jalankan. Sebab apa, kalau perkara ini di-bawa dalam persidangan Perdana² Menteri Commonwealth di-London nanti, dan sudah nyata-lah bahawa Kerajaan South Africa tidak mahu bertolak ansor dalam perkara ini maka janganlah lambat sangat sampai kami hendak bersidang dahulu, dan masa persidangan akhir nanti perkara itu sudah sejok. Ketika itu baharu-lah Kerajaan dapat berjumpa dengan appropriate action ya'ani yang positive yang datang di-buat dalam perkara ini.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam (Setapak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua

Mr. Speaker: Kita ini dalam pindaan.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Ya.

Mr. Speaker: Dalam "positive".

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Saya tahu. (Ketawa). Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam satu hal apa yang di-katakan oleh wakil dari Besut tadi

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Bachok!

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Bachok, saya terima dengan rasa penoh hati. Mengutok apartheid di-Korea Selatan (Ketawa)—tidak, di-Afrika Selatan ini

harus-lah merupakan kebulatan pendapat ra'ayat negeri ini. Kalau tadi waktu saya tidak ada di-sini barangkali timbul beberapa kekeliruan, kerana pindaan² dan lain² sahingga merupakan soal ini soal yang harus kita debatkan panjang², soal yang harus kita gunakan kutok-mengutok, chachi-menchachi di-antara kita sama kita. Mithal-nya, soal pindaan yang kami timbulkan dalam soal consistent dan lain² tadi. Kami suka mengingatkan dan sudah menimbangkan bahawa objective clause ini tidak masok asas atau prinsip itu, maka apa yang kami kemukakan hanya mengemukakan fikiran. Kami sungguh tertarik hati dengan kesanggupan Perdana Menteri menerima perkataan positive atau tindakan tegas dan kami bergembira mendengar-nya bahawa Perdana Menteri mengatakan bahawa positive action itu terserah kepada Dewan ini, bukan dia sa-orang, erti-nya Perdana Menteri terang² mahu mengikut apa kehendak ra'ayat negeri ini—apa positive action kehendak ra'ayat negeri ini. Maka kami rasa gembira pindaan atas positive action, dan kerana itu saya juga turut bersama² dengan wakil dari Bachok meminta supaya kita di-sini sekarang melupakan chachi-menchachi di-antara kita sama kita dan menentukan kebulatan suara. Dan positive action ini bukan Perdana Menteri kita yang menentukan, tetapi kita—ra'ayat yang menentukan-nya, dan Perdana Menteri kita harus tunduk kepada ketentuan ra'ayat negeri ini berhubung dengan positive action itu. Maka kita bergembira sekali kerana Perdana Menteri kita sanggup menerima perkataan positive itu.

Enche' Tan Cheng Bee (Bagan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the amendment made by the Honourable the Prime Minister. As the people of a country who cherish democracy and who believe in the preservation of the fundamental principles of human rights, we must condemn—and condemn loudly and strongly in no uncertain terms—the apartheid policy of the Government of the Union of South Africa. The voice of our nation must be heard above all others in expressing our abhorrence at the shooting of and the violence used against the Africans by the South African police in pursuance of the

apartheid policy. It is really unbelievable that South Africa, a member nation of the United Nations, which subscribes to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—"a common standard of achievement of all people and all nations to that end and that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for the rights of freedom and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure . . ."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member is reading.

Enche' Tan Cheng Bee: Sir, I am quoting from the Declaration of Human Rights.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed!

Enche' Tan Cheng Bee: "to secure universal and effective recognition by observance both among the peoples of member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction"—should practise this violence in their own country.

Sir, I also would like to quote from this book written by a British missionary, who has been in South Africa for 13 years. He is Mr. Trevor Huddleson and he has written a book giving full details of the apartheid policy as practised by the South African Government—the whites—for the last twelve years. If you would allow me I would quote certain passages.

Mr. Speaker: Not too long!

Enche' Tan Cheng Bee: He says—

"The Government of South Africa believes that it can so plan society in the Union that white supremacy will be maintained within its borders for all time. This at least is what again and again its leaders have told the world as their conviction and aim. Every aspect of the policy, is therefore, directed to this end. What happens between this moment and the moment of achievement of the apartheid policy is of secondary importance. If it involves the uprooting of thousands of families: if it means the separation of members of the same family"

Enche' V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, are we debating the general motion or the amendment?

Mr. Speaker: We are now on the amendment. He can touch on the main motion as well.

Enche' Tan Cheng Bee: "If it means the creation of inferior educational amenities; if it means a rigid and almost absolute curtailment of freedom to move or to speak publicly, or to gather socially—these are incidental sufferings. For the kind of planned future which the doctrine of white supremacy means, the person, as a person, cannot count for much. He is subordinated always to the plan. He will be happy if he accepts it; he will suffer if he does not."

Mr. Speaker: You are not quoting the whole book—are you?

Enche' Tan Cheng Bee: That appertains to the motion—sufferings caused to the people in pursuance of the apartheid policy.

"His suffering is his own fault for refusing to understand the wisdom of the master race. Now we are 'Interruption' in the rush of this transition. 'Apartheid'—the forcing of division and separation upon our mixed society—is the reality of our day."

This is what this British missionary has stated about South Africa. Further I would like to quote—this is as to why I say that we must take positive action:

"It is inconceivable to me that two and a half million whites divided among themselves and with no justifiable claim to moral leadership can hope to mould the continent of Africa to their pattern. White South Africa will be fortunate if, fifty years from now, it is still a tolerated minority group, allowed to remain where it has been for centuries. I cannot see how a world which is so predominantly non-white, and which is progressively diminishing in size can look patiently upon a handful of citizens so determined to live in the past, so defiant of the trend of world opinion."

So, you will find that any action we take against the apartheid policy or against the Union of South Africa will not be effective, if we do not take positive action. The positive action which I suggest should be the severance of trade relationship with South Africa.

Enche' K. Karam Singh (Daman-sara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in regard to the amendment to the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan, this amendment is something more than just an

amendment to include the word "positive" because, this amendment changes the amendment of the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan. So what I am going to say would be more, will be something more than, can be confined expressly to the word "positive".

Mr. Speaker, Sir, just now we heard a Member from the Government Bench condemning the apartheid policy of the South African Government. And I think he has contradicted his own leader, the Honourable Prime Minister, who just now only said that the apartheid policy is an internal matter for the Government of South Africa. Are we to understand from the Prime Minister that the Alliance Government condones the apartheid as practised in South Africa, but only condemns the violence that flows from apartheid? That is a very fundamental issue. Does the Alliance Government's stand, as exemplified by the statement of the Honourable Prime Minister mean that the South African Government can, in South Africa, oppress the people, the black people of South Africa; trample upon their rights and destroy the Charter of Human Rights in that land of South Africa? Is that what we are to understand from the statement by the Prime Minister? If that is so, then I think it is a sad day for all of us, because the world will come to the conclusion that the Malayan Government, while opposing the flow of violence from the policy of apartheid, supports apartheid as practised in the Union of South Africa.

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin: No!

Enche' K. Karam Singh: If "no", we want a stand to be taken that the Malayan Government condemns apartheid as practised in South Africa. If you refuse to do it, according to your own version of who is not for us is against us, and if you do not condemn apartheid, the impression which will be given is that you support it. (*Laughter*). Sir, I am proud to say that I have . . .

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: On a point of order, is the Honourable Member speaking on the amendment or on the general debate?

Enche' K. Karam Singh: I am speaking on the amendment because the amendment deletes . . .

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is that the word "positive" should be added. Of course you can touch on the substantive motion, but I think you might be repeating again and again. And as we are going back to it, you will have the opportunity to speak later on. So I think it is better for you to confine to the amendment only in order to save time.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have got my speech, but I am not speaking on it now. I am only speaking on this amendment and I think, if any Honourable Member from the Government Bench thinks that the amendment moved by the Honourable Member is just to add the word "positive", he is mistaken, because the amendment not only accepts the word "positive" but rejects the previous amendment.

Mr. Speaker: As regards the rejection of that amendment, we are coming to that. This is only the addition of the word "positive". It is an amendment to the amendment.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: So we can speak as far as it affects that amendment?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: So, Mr. Speaker, Sir, we would like to know where the Malayan Government stands on the issue of apartheid. We want to stand against it and let that be one of the positive stands, let that be one of the positive actions of the Government—it is condemnation of apartheid as practised in South Africa. That is all, Sir.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment by the Honourable Prime Minister has two elements. One is the rejection of the words in my own amendment about the apartheid policy of the South African Government. The other element is the acceptance of the word "positive". Therefore, I submit that it is quite in order to speak on these amendments as a whole, not

merely on the acceptance of the word "positive".

Mr. Speaker: It is quite in order.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: I thank you for saying so because my impression is that if anybody speaks on the omission in the Prime Minister's amendment of the words "at the apartheid policy of the South African Government", he is out of order and that he should confine himself to the acceptance of the word "positive".

Now, the Prime Minister has said that his original motion was brought before this House because of "abhorrence of Government at the shooting of, and the violence used against, the Africans by the South African police in pursuance of the apartheid policy". Now I submit, as I have already said, that the shooting incident was merely an incident arising from the policy of apartheid adopted by the South African Government. Therefore, in dealing with this motion, we should not lay stress upon that incident at Sharpeville, but we should emphasise what is far more important—the apartheid policy of the South African Government. I fully realise that that policy is a matter of internal administration, but we should look at it from the far greater and wider point of view, in that the existence of such a policy will, in due course, produce an explosion in the whole Continent of Africa out of all proportion to what the South African Government believes to be its true cause. The apartheid policy is a permissive policy, and the motion before this House should, in my view, concentrate on that policy rather than on an incident arising from that policy.

I thank the Honourable the Prime Minister for accepting the word "positive", but I do oppose his motion in deleting the words "at the apartheid policy of the South African Government".

Dato' Dr. Ismail: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not think we disagree at all. We all condemn this apartheid policy in South Africa. I think if the Honourable Member for Damansara cares to read the Report of the Federation of Malaya delegation to the 14th Session of the

General Assembly of the United Nations, he will read the following. Of course, it is couched in the diplomatic language and it may not be the language of the Socialist Front, but it is the language that is recognised on international plane, and it is still very effective. It says here:

"It was with much regret that the Federation of Malaya had once again co-sponsored the request for the inscription, in the agenda of this session of the General Assembly, of the question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Union of South Africa. My delegation sincerely hopes that the government of the Union of South Africa will not continue to ignore the appeal made year after year since 1952 by the General Assembly of the United Nations, calling upon it to do away with its policy of apartheid."

Well, I don't think the Honourable Member will disagree that it is a condemnation although, as I have said before, it is not in the language couched by the Honourable Member.

Sir, why did the Government put the motion as it stands?

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: On a point of explanation, Sir. The Honourable the Minister of External Affairs has mentioned that the Government has in no uncertain terms condemned the apartheid policy in the United Nations. That being so, why is there reluctance on the part of the Government to reiterate that condemnation in this very resolution?

Dato' Dr. Ismail: Well, Sir, there is no point reiterating the policy in this particular resolution. We made the declaration once and we stand by it so long as we are in power.

The Assistant Minister of Labour (Enche' V. Manickavasagam): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Damansara just now said that the Government had not made its stand clear on the apartheid policy. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish that he would read the Alliance Manifesto, where it is clearly stated:

"Apartheid. The Alliance is determined to uphold the United Nations Charter, which calls for respect for human rights and contains freedom for all without distinction of race. The policy of the South African Government in this respect must be condemned", Apartheid condemned.

Sir, I also wish to refer to a passage in the speech by my Honourable Colleague, Enche' Cheah Theam Swee in the Political Committee of the United Nations. I quote:

"Instead, apartheid has increased. Has it increased because of the ability to scorn at world opinion, or because of the Union Government's fear of accumulated moral force of the United Nations, or is it in order to escape the inevitable result of the inflamed national feeling of the oppressed people."

Che' Khadijah binti Mohamed Sidik (Dungun): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong pindaan yang di-bawa oleh Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri tentang hal positive ini, kerana kalau pindaan yang tegas daripada Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu yang akan di-bawa oleh Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri kita nanti semuga perbuatan yang sangat kejam dan keganasan² yang di-lakukan oleh Pemerintah South Africa berhubung dengan apartheid yang membunuh anak², kaum² ibu yang tidak mengerti mengangkat senjata, atau harus barangkali tidak tahu dalam soal selok belok politik, yang mana mereka membunuh dengan sewenang²-nya atas kekejaman daripada pemerintah itu. Semuga dengan ada-nya tindakan yang tegas daripada Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu yang akan di-kemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri kita nanti, maka dapat di-beri kesedaran dan keinsafan kepada Pemerintah South Africa itu; walau pun mereka terdiri daripada manusia yang berwarna puteh supaya mereka mengetahui walau pun mereka itu daripada South Africa yang berkulit hitam, kulit biru atau hijau atau apa sekali pun dalam dunia ini Tohan menjadikan ada-lah sama dan mereka itu ada-lah sama mempunyai kebebasan kepada sa-suatu tindakan.

Dari itu, usul yang akan di-beri atau yang akan di-kemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri kita daripada Persekutuan Tanah Melayu itu nanti, saya berharap semuga akan dapat sokongan daripada seluruh negeri² dalam dunia ini.

Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam masa manusia hendak hidup bersaudara dan beramah tamah dan saling mengerti di-antara satu dengan lain, maka terjadilah satu peristiwa yang amat mengejut

dunia ini di-Afrika Selatan dengan pembunuhan yang di-lakukan oleh Kerajaan Afrika Selatan terhadap manusia dan ra'ayat-nya yang tidak berdosa itu. Gema pemecahan hak² asasi manusia ini telah pun sampai keseluruh dunia dan kita sekarang ini sedang membahathkan masa'alah ini dengan ditambah oleh Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri kita kalimat positive dalam ayat yang kemudian, maka nyata-lah kepada kita bahawa tindakan yang akan di-ambil oleh Perdana Menteri kita dan Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dalam menghadapi masa'alah pembunuhan beramai² terhadap ra'ayat di-Afrika Selatan itu tidak-lah boleh dipandang kecil arti-nya dalam soal yang besar ini.

Sa-telah kita berunding berhari² di-sini, maka pada sa'at dan waktu ini terdapat-lah persefahaman yang sama di-antara kita yang dudok dalam Dewan ini sama ada pihak pemerintah, atau pun pihak pembangkang dalam menghadapi soal ini. Kita di-benua Asia ini, oleh kerana kita tahu bahawa ra'ayat Afrika ada-lah orang² Asia dan Afrika yang kita tahu bahawa mereka harus hidup dengan aman dan damai di-negara-nya sendiri, tanah ayer-nya sendiri dengan tidak di-ganggu oleh satu² dasar, atau satu² polisi terhadap perbedzaan hidup di-negara-nya. Maka satu tempat yang layak dan sangat penting bagi Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu, terutama-nya pada waktu Perdana Menteri kita yang akan hadir dalam persidangan Perdana² Menteri Commonwealth untuk menyatakan kekesalan dan akan mengemukakan hasrat ra'ayat negeri ini dan kechewaan ra'ayat negeri ini dalam menghadapi dan mendengar berita² yang telah di-siarkan-nya melalui radio atau surat² khabar.

Bagi pihak Persatuan Islam sa-Tanah Melayu telah pun mengemukakan pandangan dan pendapat kami di-mana kami berdiri tegoh di-belakang Perdana Menteri dalam masa'alah menghadapi membedzakan kulit di-Afrika Selatan itu, dan kami bersama² dengan Perdana Menteri bertindak dengan chara yang positive terhadap pembunuhan² yang sewenang²-nya daripada mata² atau

Polis di-Afrika Selatan itu. Pada sa'at yang kita ingin hidup sa-bagai satu bangsa yang merdeka dan kita pun adalah satu bangsa yang telah merdeka yang mana kita tahu bagaimana pahitnya hidup di-bawah sa-suatu tekanan penjajah yang menuntut persamaan di-dalam 'alam demokrasi. Di-South Africa sa-bagaimana yang kita telah dengar bahawa penindasan yang telah di-lakukan ka-atas diri mereka itu tidak ada sama sekali mengikut peri kemanusiaan, maka Perdana Menteri kita akan mengemukakan usul yang telah dipinda-nya dengan menambah satu kalimat positive di-dalam persidangan Perdana² Menteri Commonwealth yang penting itu. Maka kita baik bagi pehak pemerintah mahu pun pehak pembangkang di-sini mempunyai kata sebulat suara bagi menyokong dengan kuat-nya dengan memberi satu semangat kepada Perdana Menteri kita bahawa tidak-lah akan ada satu apa pun yang membimbangkan Perdana Menteri manakala beliau mengemukakan usul ini dalam persidangan Perdana Menteri Commonwealth di-London kelak. (*Tepok*).

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 2.30 p.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

SHOOTING OF AFRICANS IN SHARPEVILLE BY SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE

Debate resumed.

Question again proposed.

The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Dato' V. T. Sambanthan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, if the tail of a dog were white and the rest of the body were of a different colour—it may be brown, it may be black—the contention of this Afrikaner group in South Africa is that the white tail should wag the rest of the dog. You know that this runs counter to all rules of nature. But that is the basis on which the philosophy of apartheid is built upon, and it is in running after this mad philosophy, this mad policy, that the present killings have resulted.

For many years now, in South Africa, we have seen how the policy of segregation has continued, how colour bar has been at its vilest form, and how in 1948 under the Malan Government, they decided on what they called apartheid; that is, they decided that people of different races should also live separately. That, of course, has in no way prevented the increase in the coloured population of that area. However, be that as it may, it is interesting to note that throughout that period, these African fascists—for they are really fascists—have decided very much in the manner of those who conducted the affairs at Buchenwald in those days, in a cold-blooded manner, in trying to pursue their policy. I have here a quotation from the *New Statesman*, which is a magazine of high reputation in England and which is noted for its very clear views on matters African and Asian. We all heard of the massacre at Langa and Sharpeville. Now, these territories are part of the new settlement areas which have been brought about by the Afrikaner and this is what the *New Statesman* says about these settlements, and I quote it to give an insight as to the cold-blooded manner in which these African fascists are doing things. It says:

"Even the design of the new African townships, of which Sharpeville is a typical example, has been planned with an eye to security, for each township has a semi-circle space just wide enough to enable a Saracen to deploy its full arc of fire."

They are in no doubt as to how they can keep South Africa in their control and that is through the Saracen armoured tanks, their planes and other weapons of destruction. So, in the ultimate, they realise that they will have to use brute force and brute force of the worst kind. We had the shooting at Sharpeville and then we thought it was all over. Some of us think that there is a lull in the country until news slowly comes in that all things are not well in that country after the shooting. After the shooting, we heard that the African Congress and the Pan-Africanist organisation had both decided to call a boycott in that country. And what happens then? I quote again, this time from the *Time*

and I quote because it is not very well-known in this country. It says here:

"Their soldiers and sailors surrounded 100,000 beleaguered Africans in Nyanga and Langa townships and the Police launched lightning raids from dawn to dusk. The corps broke into the squalid homes at random, flogging the helpless inhabitants with whips and shouting 'Go to work'".

In one forage, more than 1,500 were herded away to police stations for questioning. That is the type of rule that goes on in Africa. In Africa to-day, we have a rule wherein if a person were arrested, it is wrong for him to mention it even to his neighbour. Nobody can be told that he has been arrested, and that is why the figures coming in to-day are still not the correct figures. A number of persons have been arrested and subjected to various forms of de-humanised treatment; they are countless. So we come to a stage where, for instance, the Archbishop of Johannesburg says (speaking of the Sharpeville massacre)—

"I would go into a court of law and say, if it were the last thing I ever did, that it was not necessary for the Police to open fire. One woman was in a shop buying groceries; another was hanging out washing in the backyard. Even if there were provocations, it is difficult to believe that it could have been sufficiently serious to warrant what can only be described as a massacre of unarmed people."

Having massacred them, they found that the people are needed for doing their work in their factories and in their townships. So they sent the Police into these settlements and pulled them out; and when they pulled them out and if they slowed down they beat them up. And so the *London Times* says—and I quote again:

"At Philippe police station, groups of arrested Africans were hustled out of Police vehicles. Some who were slow to obey orders to get out were slapped by a policeman with a length of rubber hose."

That is a mild statement as to what happened. That is why men of all groups—men who were liberal, men who were worried and men who normally would have kept out of all this—to-day are fleeing for their lives in Africa; and that is why in Capetown on the 7th of April—I will read the names as these names will symbolise the type of persons who are against the fascist authority in South Africa—five

people were arrested. They are Miss Hannah Stanton, Warden of the Anglican Mission in Ladysmith, an African township near Pretoria; Reverend Mark Nye, who is in charge of the Pretoria Anglican Native Mission; Dr. Colin Lang of the South African Liberal Party; Mr. John Brigg, chairman of the Pretoria Branch of the Liberal Party; and Philip Masik, a 19-year-old African youth. So you see, this is the type of people who were against the South African Government. To the South African Government these men—men of God, I would call them—are not wanted; the only place they can find is inside prisons. And that is why even the Archbishop of Canterbury has asked the churches in England to offer prayers so that the people in South Africa, so that the fascists in South Africa, will have some sense and that the others who have suffered would have the word of God to guide them, to help them in their sufferings.

So, Sir, we are to-day at this stage when humanity is face to face with something that is most despicable. I said that the theory behind it was that if the tail of a dog were white, then it should have the right to wag the rest of the dog. That mad theory is driving these people into even madder reasoning.

The latest news we hear in South Africa is that the people in power are trying to bring in more whites in an effort to stop this, so that they can somehow or other counter the numbers of non-whites in South Africa. That is a useless venture, for it is well-known not only in South Africa but throughout Africa that if you look at the population of the whites and the non-whites it will be roughly 2½ per cent to 3 per cent and yet it will be wrong for us in this House to brand all the whites in South Africa as being against the blacks there—it is hardly true to say that, because in Africa we have a considerable opinion of good, progressive Europeans who hate the theory of apartheid, who think that the others in Africa should be given a decent chance. It is also a happy moment for us to think that the Malays in South Africa, the Indians and the other immigrant races are now whole-

heartedly co-operating with the African natives of that area, to use that expression, by which I mean the Bantus and the other original inhabitants living in South Africa, are wholly co-operating with them in their struggle for human rights. Therefore, Sir, I am happy that we in this House are resolved to give our fullest support to the Prime Minister in whatever he may seek to do when he goes to the Prime Ministers' Conference—not only that this House is pledged to give its fullest support to the Government but also to boycott as there has been talk earlier, that boycott is the only issue. Boycott is not the only issue that we can think of. In 1918, after the end of the last war, South-West Africa was handed over to South Africa as a territory under mandate, and then for many years these people misused that territory to such an extent that it is being said that the only territory which was given out on a mandate which has had no progress at all is South-West Africa. The International Court of Justice also decided that that territory clearly belongs to the United Nations, and it is under trusteeship, and so it is quite likely that we, the Government, for instance, may want to push this further with greater strength, so that South-West Africa need not for long be under the rule of these fascists.

Sir, I would now like to read just another quotation. It is said, "We realise there is a common basis of humanity, we intend to do what is just and right as a Christian nation in dealing with the people and fellowmen of this country of ours." Now, you and I would normally not quarrel with that statement, but unfortunately it is a statement made by a man who is trying to do everything against Christ. It is a statement made by Dr. Verwoerd, who has said that he realises there is a common basis of humanity and having said that it is he and his government who are chasing out Christ from South Africa. Let it be remembered that in South Africa to-day, if Christ were to come back alive, he would find no welcome at the home of either Dr. Verwoerd or his apartheid people, because his colour is not the colour that Verwoerd and the others relish.

And that is why I think the Good Friday that passed off a few days ago was the day when Christ was again being crucified by the followers of apartheid those who follow this inhumane and insane policy of apartheid.

And so, Sir, I would wish to complete the speech with a quotation from someone who is an immortal poet. It relates to Africa, to the deserts of Africa, which could well have been said about those fascists who still rule that land:

"I met a traveller from an antique land
Who said: Two vast and trunkless legs
of stone
Stand in the desert Near
them, on the sand,
Half sunk, a shattered visage lies, whose
frown,
And wrinkled lip, and sneer of cold
command,
Tell that its sculptor well those passions
read
Which yet survive, stamped on these life-
less things,
The hand that mocked them, and the
heart that fed:
And on the pedestal these words appear:
'My name is Ozymandias, king of kings:
Look on my works, ye Mighty, and
despair!'
Nothing beside remains. Round the decay
Of that colossal wreck, boundless and
bare
The lone and level sands stretch far
away."

Let us hope for apartheid the same sort of fate. (*Applause*).

Enche' Tan Kee Gak (Bandar Malacca): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in upholding the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, for which the Malayan Party stands, I rise to support the motion. We are against the apartheid policy because it is a policy which has displayed utmost contempt for human rights.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Alliance Government's action in condemning the inhuman brutality in South Africa shows that we wish to see that justice should prevail in South Africa. In the eyes of God and law, all men are created equal.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the violence in South Africa serves as a stern reminder to those who do not believe that all races should be accorded equal rights

and status. In order to create a new Malayan nation in which peace, happiness and prosperity shall be the dominant aim, it is our conviction that all races should be accorded equal rights and status.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we wish to clarify our stand on this. We fully support this condemnation of South Africa, but we regret that the question of Tibet was introduced.

As regards the question of positive action, we hope that one of the things that the Honourable the Prime Minister will do in England would be to call for funds to support that white man who shot Mr. Verwoerd and woke up the world from its sleep.

Enche' Lee Seck Fun (Tanjong Malim): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to give my wholehearted support to the motion moved by the Honourable the Prime Minister expressing abhorrence at the shooting of and the violence used against the Africans, or blacks as they are known to the western world, by the South African police in pursuance of the apartheid policy, and I fully support whatever action the Government considers appropriate in the matter.

In the Manifesto, which was drawn up by the Alliance—the Chief Architect of which is our Honourable Prime Minister—the Alliance Party's view on the problem of apartheid was clearly stated and it was also mentioned this morning by the Honourable the Assistant Minister of Labour. In the Manifesto which was drawn up long before the present South African troubles, the Alliance Party has stated clearly that it is determined to uphold the United Nations Charter which calls for respect of human rights and fundamental freedom for all without any distinction of race, creed, or religion, and the condemnation of the South African Government's policy in this respect.

The Honourable the Prime Minister's motion is a clear indication that the Alliance Government, the Government in power in the Federation to-day, is bent on fulfilling its election promises during its tenure of office. At the crucial moment in world history, when almost all African nations from the Atlantic

Ocean to the Indian Ocean are marching towards the attainment of independence and the freedom of individual Africans, we have this so-called kingdom of South Africa, which is a member of the British Commonwealth, and where we have 2,000,000 whites dominating and suppressing the freedom of nearly 11,000,000 native Africans (coloured) and Indians.

The creator and chief apostle of apartheid is its Prime Minister, who, in eight years in this decade as the Minister of Native Affairs, has constructed a pack of laws by which native Africans are subjected to one of the most shameful treatments at the hands of a small minority whom they outnumber by four to one. I wonder if there is any nation, colony, or kingdom in this Universe where these native people, who are in the majority, suffer such shame, degradation and inhumanities as the native Africans of South Africa. We have heard of how the Africans are being made to pay for the very fact that they were born black—they have to pay an annual tax called head tax; of how they are being forced to carry bulky passes without which they cannot get work to earn a livelihood, of how they have been herded into "Bantustans" or call it black new villages if you like; of how they are not allowed to be found in white municipalities after 9.00 p.m. and many other things which any civilised nation will be ashamed of itself. In South Africa Prime Minister Verwoerd would find the most eminent base which crowded the South African stage. During the war he was a staunch Nazi sympathiser. When he was the editor of his paper he riled against British journalism. When he was accused as a Nazi sympathiser he took action to sue for libel, and the judge who heard the case pronounced that Verwoerd's paper was a tool of the Nazis in South Africa. It was a Nazi Hitler who thought of the idea of Germany as the masterpiece and the extermination of millions of Jews and the people of other racial origin during the war. But within a short space of 15 years the world has seen the crushing of Nazism by the forces of democracy.

It is now proved that the supporter of Nazism is supporting the idea of the whites as the master race in South Africa and the subjugation by the most venial method of enslavement of the blacks forever in South Africa. We should express the strongest possible condemnation of the South African racial policy, and every Member in this House should fully support whatever action the Government considers taking which is appropriate in the matter.

I am told that most of the Members of the Boer Afrikaner National Party, the Party which has been in power in Africa for the past 11½ years, are staunch members of the Dutch Reformed Church and are orthodox Christians who practise Christianity to the very law and letter of the Bible. In his first speech after having been elected as Prime Minister to succeed the late Mr. J. Stridjom, Mr. Verwoerd was reported to have said that he was elected Prime Minister by the specific will of God and with this same Verwoerd's famous quotation he was reported to have told the African Chiefs "We should live apart as the lion and the elephant live apart."

Sir, it is time that we remind this small white minority in South Africa that the black elephant is growing sturdier and sturdier everyday, that the time will soon draw near when the ferocious white lion will have to leave the elephant's preserve and look for other places to dominate before it is crushed to death by the black elephant. I would suggest that we subscribe to send a million Bibles as a gift to the white community in South Africa, so that the Reformed Christians can search for the truth that lies hidden in the leaves of the Bible and find out for themselves that God is no respecter of persons and that the Prophet Jesus Christ had himself said in the Epistle of St. James, Chapter II, when he was telling the people that there was no distinction in God's eyes of the colour of one's skin, and I quote:

"But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all."

Certain Opposition Members have advocated that we boycott all South African goods as a sign of showing our disgust at the South African apartheid policy. However, I would suggest to this House to think very carefully before venturing to embark on such a harsh measure. Let us not forget that there are white forces within Africa which oppose the South African Government's apartheid policy. The novelist Allan Paton, the founder of the South African Liberal Party who wrote the book "Cry the Beloved Country", has long opposed apartheid, and this is the prime reason why his Party has lost in the vote again and again, but this has not lost Paton's confidence that apartheid is no good for South Africa. Then, again, we have one of the most eminent jurists in South Africa who has sat as Chief Justice on the South African Bench—Henry A. Fagan. He together with the novelist is responsible for saying that the South African policy is hopelessly impracticable, and he has won a large white following when he voiced, "We have to accept the fact of interdependence of the races in South Africa."

When our Opposition Leaders talk of boycotting South African goods, engaging in an economic war, let us not forget that we are not only waging an economic war against a stubborn, a small and rich white minority in South Africa, but at the same time we are also waging an economic war against a black majority who out-number the whites four to one. And what little force this so-called boycotting has will not only affect the white people but also it will affect the blacks—in the latter case to a very much greater degree, because it will be the blacks who will suffer most on account of their economic position. An economic war to be effective must have the full support of every country in this world, and at this very moment I do not think that even 25 per cent of the independent countries in the world are contemplating the action propagated by our so-called Opposition.

I think that the United Nations is the best place which can think of action which will prove very effective and

will make the white rulers realise their folly. I, once again, do hope that every one of our Members here will give their wholehearted support to this vital motion moved by the Honourable the Prime Minister. I also hope that the white South African Government will realise its folly in the pursuance of its racial policy and will amend its ways before it is too late for one country to save the whites from drowning in the sea of blacks.

Enche' T. Mahima Singh (Port Dickson): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the motion brought forward by the Honourable the Prime Minister. I do not think that I need dwell on this too long, because all sections of the House have condemned the shooting of and the cruel treatment meted out to the coloured people by the South African Government. But I would like to make one point clear and that is, in condemning the Government of South Africa, we do not mean and do not intend to condemn all the whites, or white men, of South Africa, as several Honourable Members of this House have given their opinion that in South Africa there are hundreds of whites behind prison walls—their only offence is that they are in sympathy and have goodwill towards their coloured brethren.

All leaders of religions and all shades of the Christian religion have condemned the action of the South African Government and one of my learned friends has quoted Dr. Fisher, the Archbishop of Canterbury, condemning the action of the South African Government in no uncertain terms. Further, according to a press report, Members of the South African Parliament have condemned the action of their Government. If I may be allowed, Sir, I would like to quote one statement of a Member of Parliament, Mr. S. Watson, who was reported on the 19th May as saying:

"The whites are a minority in South Africa and the Government represents a minority of whites. Therefore, if we have a minority trying to defy the world we are facing a hostile world abroad and we are facing a civil war which is simmering at home. I want to tell the world that the majority of the white South Africans reject and repudiate the racial policy of the Government and I

deny that they represent the voice of the civilised whites of South Africa."

That I feel is the opinion of many, because several whites have fled the country for fear of persecution. The South African Government stands condemned at the bar of public opinion for the treatment that they have meted out to people whom they are supposed to rule with justice and fairness.

In my humble opinion, Sir, history will condemn not only the tyranny, but will record that the actions of the South African Government in the long run will do more harm to the whites, whom they pretend to protect, than to the victims of their aggression. In my opinion, Sir, the atrocities that are now being committed on the coloured people in their own land have not only had the effect of uniting good men, men of goodwill, in all countries together, but have helped or have resulted in bringing a type of unity that was unknown to the coloured man in Africa. The immediate result of this will be to shorten by more than one-tenth the period of the so-called supremacy of the white man in South Africa. It will hasten the time, Sir, when the Africans will be able to sit down and have the same type of freedom that we in this country have the pleasure to enjoy. In my opinion, Sir, it becomes an insult to any law-abiding, civilised person when he is punished for no other reason than the colour of his skin, for in South Africa we are told, Sir, more than 1,000 persons are fined every day for offences which would not be offences if they were committed by a white man.

The sufferings of the coloured people of Africa must have a limit, and we fear, Sir, that the tolerant African might reach a point where he would not be able to suffer any more, and he might not be able to control himself any more, and then, Sir, in the flood of their fury, their rage and temper, the coloured people may not be able to distinguish between the individuals and the groups from which these individuals come, and should that happen, we fear that thousands of innocent men, women and children would suffer for no fault of their own.

For these reasons, Sir, I am happy that this matter is being brought up at the Prime Ministers' Conference, and we are glad of the assurance given by our Prime Minister that he will not allow mere technicalities to stand in the way, but will persist in seeing that this matter is discussed at the Prime Ministers' Conference. Sir, I beg to support the motion. (*Applause*).

Datin Fatimah binti Haji Hashim (Jitra-Padang Terap): Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun menyokong atas usul yang di-kemukakan oleh Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri yang mana usul ini akan di-kemukakan dalam Majlis Persidangan Perdana² Menteri di-London. Saya tidak hendak berchakap panjang atas kenyataan sokongan saya ini, kerana kita telah banyak mendengar perchakapan² orang yang menyokong-nya yang terlebih dahulu daripada saya dan juga kenyataan yang panjang lebar daripada Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri sendiri ia-itu bagaimana kejam-nya dasar Kerajaan Afrika Selatan itu, bukan sahaja sa-takat menjalankan dasar membezakan kulit bahkan keganasan, keaniayaan terhadap manusia. Sa-bagai kaum ibu, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, yang bersifat lemah lebih daripada lelaki lagi terasa insaf tentang perbuatan atas kaum yang sa-jenis dengan saya ia-itu kaum ibu dan kanak² yang telah diketahui banyak mati di-tembak bergelempangan baharu² ini. Kerana perasaan ini bukan di-hadkan kepada warna kulit sahaja bahkan kepada perasaan kemanusiaan, bertambah pula buatan-nya yang berdasarkan perbezaan kulit, lagi-lah menyedeh dan menginsafkan.

Saya sa-bagai kaum ibu dan juga sa-bagai Ketua Kaum Ibu U.M.N.O. mengambil peluang ini berseru seluruh pertubuhan kaum ibu di-mana² negeri juga bukan sahaja bersempati terhadap orang kulit hitam bahkan mengambil tindakan yang sewajar-nya untuk mengemukakan bantahan terhadap keganasan Kerajaan Afrika Selatan ini dan dasar yang di-kutok itu. Saya juga berharap kepada Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri kita yang akan menghadziri Persidangan Perdana² Menteri di-London mengemukakan

perasaan kami kaum ibu di-sini dan juga di-mana² tempat yang akan di-singgahi sa-masa beliau itu menuju ka-London, demikian-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

The Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry (Enche' Cheah Theam Swee): To begin with, for the benefit of those who wish to take part in this debate and wish to pronounce the name of the South African Prime Minister, his name should be pronounced thus, Mr. Speaker—I would not attempt it myself, I just spell it out—F-A-I-R-V-O-O-R-T.

Mr. Speaker: We are not interested in that. Please proceed!

Enche' Cheah Theam Swee: Mr. Speaker, as far as the technicalities of international relationships are concerned, it is of some importance here because if the question is brought up in the United Nations, we have the rules and procedure of the United Nations to guide us. But here, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the question is to be brought up by the Honourable Prime Minister at the Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers, and it might be of some criticism to this nation that we are trying to interfere with the domestic affairs of another country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, to start off, may I quote from a passage of a speech which was delivered in the United Nations in the 13th General Assembly in 1958 by you, Sir, when the country had the honour of having you as the delegate of the Federation.

Mr. Speaker: Don't read the whole thing! (*Laughter*).

Enche' Cheah Theam Swee: No, Sir, I will not try to present your whole speech to this House, just merely a passage, Sir. I quote:

"The policy of apartheid of the Union Government was not only at variance with the civilised concept of freedom and morality, it also constitutes a threat to relations between peoples. When the internal affairs of any State reach the point where the internal peace and security might be endangered and where 80 per cent of the people were denied the enjoyment of fundamental human rights and subjected to discriminatory and suppressive legislation, it was the duty of the United Nations to intervene."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has intervened since 1952. Resolution after resolution, speeches after speeches, but nothing has become of them. Then we came to the General Assembly last year, in which another resolution was adopted. Mr. Speaker, that resolution has some bearing in this debate, and if I may just point out to one of the operative clauses which will be very useful to support this resolution when the Honourable the Prime Minister brings it up at the Conference in London. Mr. Speaker, the last but ultimate paragraph of the resolution adopted last year reads as follows:

"...appeals to all Member States to use their best endeavours as appropriate to achieve the purpose of this resolution

and that is exactly what we are trying to do. This operative clause is thus explained, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to quote from the remarks of the distinguished Defence Minister of India, Mr. Krishna Menon, and this is what he says:

"The last operative paragraph of the draft resolution was not, as some had feared, a request for sanctions. It was merely an appeal to Member States to do what they could in the matter, and to use their influence to get the Union of South Africa to abandon the fatal course which it was following. There was thus nothing to prevent the draft resolution from being adopted by a very large majority."

Mr. Speaker, we condemned, and we let loose many words of condemnation, but what has been the result of all this condemnation? In fact, since the first condemnation started in 1952, the apartheid policy as exercised by the Union Government has grown from strength to strength, and as a result of all this we had the recent developments, in which atrocities and brutalities took place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is very enlightening to see that from this House we will gather almost unanimous support for this resolution in our service to mankind. But it is also regretted to see that a small portion of this House is not in agreement to a little bit of the resolution. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to try our very best to get unanimous support for this resolution. In trying to get unanimous support for this resolution, we must of course, even

if we fail, try to explain to Members in the Opposition why it is necessary to include a phrase in relation to Tibet. Mr. Speaker, when we compare the resolutions adopted in the United Nations in relation to apartheid, when we compare the resolutions adopted on the question of Tibet, and when we compare the most recent resolutions adopted by the Security Council of the United Nations we find that they are all similar, all based on one principle—the question of the fundamental principles of human rights. Mr. Speaker, we want the Honourable the Prime Minister to go armed with that resolution and armed with that clause in relation to Tibet because he will be able to say to his colleagues at the Conference: "I am not only raising this matter because it is a question of white and black, because it is a question of a legacy of colonialism, because it is a question of East and West, because it is a question of South Africa and Africans, but because it is a question of human rights. We raised it in connection with Tibet, and this is what we are doing."

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I don't remember any question having been raised on Tibet?

Mr. Speaker: He is quite in order—he is merely explaining the phrase "as exemplified by its stand on Tibet".

Proceed!

Enche' Cheah Theam Swee: Now, the question is therefore this, that the Honourable Prime Minister will go armed with this, so that this Government will not be accused of purely trying to meddle with an affair in which the white man is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, to support this, may I refer to a passage of a speech of the Cuban delegation in a debate on the question of Tibet—not of our own delegation, Mr. Speaker, but the Cuban delegation—and we all know the affairs in Cuba and the state of government in Cuba at that time, and this is what they said:

"It matters not to us where the essential rights and freedoms of men are trampled upon, nor do we care whether the deed is

committed by an imperialist power, by Latin-American tyranny, or by a Communist country."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, so we can see even in countries where the state of affairs are not similar to ours, and where they uphold the principles of human rights, they too make a stand which is quite independent of, perhaps, ideology or race or philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, so I will appeal even to Members of the Opposition, who have attempted to delete this clause, to support the resolution not only in the condemnation but also in the drawing of a parallel where we have in no uncertain terms call for respect of human rights. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you will see, therefore, that in adopting this resolution we will be able to play our part in the calling for respect of human rights; and at least we can hope that the world will see that this House—whatever Party we belong to, or whatever inclinations we have—has a representation which is unanimous on the question of human rights.

Enche' Chan Swee Ho (Ulu Kinta): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am in support of the Honourable the Prime Minister's motion. The action of the South African Government has shocked the world. Such inhuman action must be condemned by all civilised countries so that the world may know. We condemn even the internal policy of a government if it is of a kind that restricts the fundamental rights of human beings. For the above reasons, Sir, I urge the Government to withdraw diplomatic relationship with the South African Government as a protest.

Dato' Dr. Ismail: On a point of information, Sir, we have not got diplomatic relationship with South Africa.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the *Sunday Mail* of last Sunday there was an article on South Africa and that article discussed a number of things. But before I really go on to them, I would say that just as the folly of the South African Government comes from its attitude of anti-black, we in our condemnation of that action and of the foolish policy of the South African Government, should

not in any sense be directed upon lines of colour. We shall not be against the South African Government's policy because we are anti-white but because the policy and actions of the South African Government imposed slavery on 11 million people, and whatever be their colour—in this case they are black—the imposition of slavery on 11 million people is to be condemned.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Union of South Africa has resisted world opinion for so long and it has resisted resolution after resolution of the United Nations. One of the Assistant Ministers has said just now that the effect of the United Nations comments and resolutions on the South African policy of apartheid has only been to increase that policy from strength to strength. But there is one very fundamental factor in the constitution of the Union of South Africa which the United Nations can enforce, and over which the United Nations have power over the Union of South Africa—I refer to South-West Africa. As one of the Honourable Members has said, South-West Africa was given as trust territory to the Union of South Africa in 1918. The *Sunday Mail* that I have referred to says, "In Government circles"—that is, South African Government circles—"it is realised that South Africa's Achilles' Heel is South-West Africa, which is held as a trusteeship territory." Mr. Speaker, Sir, for the United Nations to continue the trusteeship of the Union of South Africa over South-West Africa is not to continue any trusteeship at all but to abandon the people of South-West Africa to oppression, to humiliation, to slavery and to every other known evil that exists in this world. So if our Malayan Government is sincere, if our Minister of External Affairs would like to do something that would benefit the people of Africa, and especially the black people of the Union of South Africa, I would urge him to instruct the Malayan delegation at the United Nations to raise this matter, so that the trusteeship of South Africa over South-West Africa ceases and South-West Africa becomes independent of the clutches and tyranny of the Union of South Africa.

Dato' Dr. Ismail: If the Honourable Member will yield, Sir, I will give him some information. This question which he has suggested has been taken year in and year out. In fact this question of trusteeship has formed one of the major items in one of the Standing Committees of the United Nations and we have been second to none over this question. I do wish the Honourable Member would read our reports from the United Nations.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is good to hear from the Minister of External Affairs that this question has been taken year in and year out. We do not want this question to be taken year in and year out. We want South-West Africa to be free from the Union of South Africa; otherwise it all remains empty talk.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if the Afrikaners, if the Nationalist Government of the Union of South Africa, if the people who compose it in the racial group, at one time could rebel against the British Government of the Union of South Africa, why cannot the indigenous Africans rebel in the same way against the far worse slavery the white Government of South Africa is imposing upon them. And they can't do so, just as it is as ridiculous for France to try and impose its rule on Algeria and at the same time refuse to be dominated by Germany.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, those who died in Sharpeville and Langa have not died in vain, just as the students of South Korea have not died in vain. This sacrifice that these people made of their lives will stir up and organise the black people of South Africa to resist this tyranny. And we hope that our Prime Minister, when he goes to the Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers, would urge upon the other Prime Ministers to seek ways and means of alleviating the sufferings of the black people of South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have mentioned as a positive action the seizing back of South-West Africa as a trusteeship territory under the Union of South Africa. We hope that from the Government side, during the course of this debate, we will hear more of the

positive measures that the Government will take so that in this House and during this debate our country will know what steps our Government are going to take, and whatever steps they may take we will give our full support.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: Sir, I beg to move an amendment (*Laughter*). You will remember, Sir, in my first amendment I sought to delete certain words and substitute them with certain other words. Well, that amendment is defeated. I, therefore, now propose to amend the resolution before this House not by the deletion of any words but by the addition of certain words after the words "apartheid policy", and those words would be to include "and of the apartheid policy as a whole.". The effect of that would be that the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Prime Minister is unimpaired, it is left as it is, except with the inclusion of the word "positive" before the word "action" which he himself has agreed. The effect of my amendment would be to add after the words "in pursuance of the apartheid policy" the words "and of the apartheid policy as a whole.". This amendment, I hope, will avoid the objection raised by the Honourable the Prime Minister that the basis of this motion is based on the incident in Sharpeville. I maintain that the crux of this motion is the apartheid policy. Well, this is a compromise solution in that the Prime Minister has had his way and I hope I will have my way too! (*Laughter*).

Enche' Chin See Yin: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

The Prime Minister: Sir, I do not quite get the intention of the Honourable mover. When we put in "apartheid policy", Sir, our idea was not that the apartheid policy should be intended to be half (*Laughter*). It was intended to be the whole. I cannot see any necessity to include the words "as a whole".

Mr. Speaker (To Dato' Onn): Would you like to explain a little bit? I can't quite understand it myself. (*Laughter*).

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: As the motion stands, Sir, this House expresses its abhorrence at the shooting of and the

violence used against the Africans by the South African Police in pursuance of the apartheid policy. It does not abhor the apartheid policy as a whole; it merely quotes the incident arising from that apartheid policy.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is to add after the words "apartheid policy" in the second line before the last, the words "and of the apartheid policy as a whole.". It means that this motion expresses abhorrence at the shooting and at the apartheid policy as a whole. It is an addition. At first I wanted not to allow this amendment under Standing Order 33 (c), because we have already debated the first amendment made by the Honourable Member from Kuala Trengganu Selatan, but on looking carefully into this and as the words "at the shooting and the violence used against" are not to be deleted, I am afraid I have to approve this amendment to it. It depends on the Government whether to accept this amendment or not. The amendment has been seconded and it is now open for debate.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: Sir, may I be permitted to explain a little bit further?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, you can.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: Sir, it is my belief that the addition of the words "and of the apartheid policy as a whole" would add substance to the motive and intention of this resolution. It should strengthen the hands of the Prime Minister and it would indicate the actual feeling of this House, which is not merely abhorrence of an incident but abhorrence of the policy of apartheid as a whole.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan is bent on bringing amendments to this motion. What I am afraid of is that if this motion is passed by this House, it will be taken by me and put before the other Commonwealth Prime Ministers and I do not want words that are redundant or unnecessary to appear. We want to present our case at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference with a certain amount of dignity. Between us, we know what we want; but between

ourselves and others, we want to convey to them our feeling in this matter. Apartheid in itself—and our abhorrence of it—has become a standing question more or less in the United Nations. We all know that it has been brought up year in and year out—our objection and our condemnation of apartheid. Therefore, to my mind, it is superfluous to stress further the word "apartheid". It is what flows from apartheid that we abhor—something which follows as a result of that, something that causes our repercussion or reaction in this country to a certain extent, so that we find that we cannot just sit back and do nothing about it. That is why I want to go to the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference with a mandate from this House that because of what has happened as a result of apartheid in South Africa, the House has authorised me to bring this matter to the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. Therefore, I should like the House to consider it sincerely and truthfully if there is anything wrong in the motion before it which would appear ridiculous, or which would appear unnecessary in the light of what I have said: but do not add any more to it than is absolutely necessary.

To Honourable Members of the Opposition, I would like to say here that they have always been opposed to us which is nothing funny or strange. It is not funny or strange for a dog to bite a postman's leg, but for a postman to bite the dog's leg is something different. So we want the whole House to be with us, and we will give the Opposition the credit that for once they have agreed with us—this can be mentioned in the newspapers, and over the radio or anything they like. Don't for the sake of adding add anything to this motion, which is before the House, to make it ridiculous.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of explanation—it would certainly strengthen the hands of the Honourable the Prime Minister if these words were added to his motion. He has, I believe, the support, the full support, of the Opposition on this resolution; and it would be a pity if that resolution were to go to the

Commonwealth Prime Minister' Conference, or wherever it is going, as it stands. I understand that it may not be discussed there and it might be discussed in the Lobby or in a coffee shop, but certainly not in the Conference itself. They would, I say, strengthen the hands of the Prime Minister if he would agree to the inclusion of those words.

Enche' Chin See Yin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in fact, the original motion as it stands as has been pointed out refers to an incident, and it is not the case of a dog biting a postman, or a postman biting a dog. In this case we are building a house with four walls without a roof. Therefore, the amendment which I support provides the roof, and for that reason it will give the Honourable the Prime Minister a sort of support from this House with which he can go there and say, "Look here! We want this to be done whether you like it or not. It is our feeling that it is about time you get rid of this police." That is actually what we propose here and I hope that the Honourable the Prime Minister will eventually agree to this proposed amendment.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think no greater disservice can be done to the South African coloured people than to create the impression that there is some sort of division of opinion in this House. So far as I can see, we are unanimous in the condemnation of the South African crimes committed against the coloured South African people. I think that it must be borne in mind that we are not drafting a legal document which is going to be construed by lawyers in the court of law. I think that the original motion as proposed by the Honourable the Prime Minister should be accepted in the spirit in which it is moved. After all it is only a motion and it is intended to confer upon our Prime Minister the authority which he asks for. If he is satisfied with the original motion, if he thinks that it is strong enough for him, then I think it is our duty to support his motion, to support the authority which he asks for. I think we should go on with the question of passing the motion and dropping this amendment. (*Applause*).

Mr. Speaker: I cannot drop the amendment, but if the Mover of the amendment is prepared to withdraw it there is provision in the Standing Orders for him to do so. If he does not, I have to put the question to the House.

I see that he does not wish to withdraw it. I shall put the question to the House. The question before the House is an amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan to add, after the word "policy" in the motion, the words "and of the apartheid policy as a whole".

Amendment put, and negatived.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin (Tanjong): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have heard the Honourable the Prime Minister and others who spoke on this subject. The Honourable the Prime Minister has put forward his motion very vigorously and is was supported with even greater vigour by Members on the Government Bench as well as others in the Opposition. Apparently the Honourable Prime Minister is very confident of being able to do something at the Conference of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers. We, on this side of the House, sincerely hope that he will succeed in his mission. (*Applause*). We will be watching the proceedings with the greatest of interest and I hope the Honourable the Prime Minister will furnish this House with a full report of what transpires at the Conference. The feeling of this House on this particular issue on South Africa is very clear-cut and should the Honourable the Prime Minister fail in his deliberations, I think that Government should also consider taking appropriate action, positive action in this regard. I wonder whether the Honourable Prime Minister can tell this House that, should his mission fail in this Conference, he will consider leaving this useless Commonwealth Club. This is very important because if we feel so strongly about this matter, so strongly that the Honourable the Prime Minister comes to this House for a clear-cut mandate, and after getting this mandate he finds that he cannot do a thing about it, then I submit it is only right that we should

consider doing something in that respect to show to the world that we are not prepared to associate ourselves with a body that is not prepared to go along this righteous path.

Enche' V. Manickavasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the motion by the Honourable the Prime Minister. The action of the Union of South Africa cannot be considered as an internal affair, because it is an absolute disregard of the fundamental principle of human rights. The cruel policy of the Union Government cannot be tolerated. The apartheid policy of the South African Government and the oppression that is being carried out on the innocent people is deplorable. Sir, I just want to quote one or two passages delivered by the Honourable the Minister of External Affairs at the last session of the United Nations General Assembly—I quote:

“That the moral force of the United Nations will bring about a change of heart towards a more enlightened policy consistent with the fundamental human rights and human dignity on the part of the South African Government. Such a change will remove the only blot in an otherwise happy relationship now existing between the Federation of Malaya and the Union of South Africa in the family of Commonwealth Nations.”

Sir, the Honourable the Prime Minister by introducing this motion is asking the House to give him full support to take this issue up at the meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers.

Further, I wish to quote a passage from the speech made by His Excellency, our Ambassador in the United States:

“We have always taken a view that while the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of any State must be upheld, any problem which involves a violation of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights and which might have exclusively an internal problem. It is on this count, for instance, that we have once again together with other Asian and African Members proposed the inscription of the question of Algeria and the question of race conflict in South Africa on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly. In taking up the question of Tibet, we have been guided by the same principle.”

Sir, as already has been expressed by our Prime Minister and the

Minister of External Affairs, we condemn the violation of human rights whether it is in Tibet, or in Hungary, or in South Africa. I am also glad to inform this House that as a positive measure or action, I have just been told by the President of the Associated Indian Chambers of Commerce that they too are considering the boycotting of South African goods. (*Applause*). Sir, this shows that the whole country is with the Prime Minister when he goes to London. Thank you.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, from the expression of views in the course of the debate in this House to-day, we are all agreed that the apartheid policy is inhuman and cruel and therefore it stands condemned in our eyes and in the eyes of the world. As has been explained by Members on this side of the Bench, it is on record first in the Alliance Manifesto that we are definitely against apartheid and secondly it also stands on record in the United Nations that the whole of the United Nations are against apartheid. Therefore, the question that apartheid has not been made more off, or more stress has not been made on the question of apartheid is not correct. I may have slipped in trying to explain the motion. And in slipping I know that—either for a fun of it or in all seriousness which I do not know—certain Members of the Opposition want to make a big thing of that. In fact, they are waiting for me to put my foot in the wrong place and then they will jump up forgetting at the same time the main issue before the House.

However, in the course of time, everybody in here who has spoken is agreed that what we are here to-day is to condemn what happened in Sharpeville on that fateful day of March 21st, and we are agreed that I should go to the Commonwealth Prime Minister's meeting to try by all possible means to bring this to the attention of all the Commonwealth Prime Ministers. There have been attempts to amend the motion before the House. I had occasion to explain that we don't worry about little amendments here and there, but what should be uppermost in our

minds is to get the motion passed unanimously and to get the motion worded in such a way that when it appeared before the other Prime Ministers of the Commonwealth it would look dignified and prim and proper. That is the main intention.

It is the intention too that whatever action we take as a result of our objection to this apartheid and to the cruelty that has been meted out to the poor Africans, we must take some positive action. That positive action, as I said earlier, we will take as a result of discussion in this House, and whatever the action the House agreed that we should take, we will certainly take, as, otherwise, all our protests, all our objections will fail, we are sure, we know, will fall on empty ears. Therefore, it is up to us to take some positive action so that the country responsible will feel the sting of our action.

There was also a suggestion by an Honourable Member that when I go to England, I should collect funds to save the man who had shot the Prime Minister. With that I don't agree: I don't agree to doing away with Prime Ministers by shooting at them. Who knows—somebody might think that because I encourage it, they might take potshots at me themselves. *(Laughter)*.

There was another suggestion that one million Holy Bibles—which cost money—should be sent to the South Africans. After what they had done, I don't believe in spending any money on them.

There was also a suggestion that if my attempt to appeal on behalf of the Africans and doing away with apartheid were to fail that we should leave the Commonwealth. That is a very big question, a question which we should consider well. I don't believe in cutting our nose to spite our face. This is a very big matter, and I think it would be better for the South Africans to leave the Commonwealth than us to leave the Commonwealth.

Then, as to what I propose to do—all I know is that we will be there as guests of the British Government, and it is our duty and good manners demanded of us that we should'n't do anything to embarrass our hosts. On the other hand, there are ways and

means of putting it across. For one thing, I won't put it across as suggested by the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan—who is not here, however, he is somewhere where he can hear—I will not be putting it across at coffee shops, as suggested, that is not my way of putting things across, in coffee shops.

However, I am happy and pleased with the outcome of this debate to-day, and I feel encouraged and confident that when I go there, knowing the full support behind me, I shall go with full confidence and intention of bringing this matter before the Commonwealth Prime Ministers. *(Applause)*.

Original Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House, while fully recognising the responsibility of the South African Government for its own internal policies and administration, nevertheless, consistent with the Federation Government's attitude in respect of violations of fundamental principles of human rights as exemplified by its stand on Tibet, expresses abhorrence at the shooting of, and the violence used against the Africans by the South African police in pursuance of the apartheid policy, and fully supports whatever positive action the Government considers appropriate in the matter.

BILL

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS BILL

Second Reading

Dato' Suleiman: Tuan Speaker, dengan kebenaran, Tuan, saya hendak berchakap bahasa Melayu pada petang ini dan sa-lepas itu dalam bahasa Inggeris menerangkan tujuan² Rang Undang² ini.

Tuan Speaker, saya bangun men-chadangkan supaya Rang Undang² yang di-namakan "Satu Undang² bagi menyatukan undang² dasar berkenaan dengan Pilihan Raya Kerajaan Tempatan di-seluruh Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dan bagi perkara² yang bersangkutan dengan-nya" di-bacha bagi kali yang kedua.

Ahli² Yang Berhormat harus ingat bahawa di-dalam masa Meshuarat Belanjawan yang telah di-adakan pada akhir tahun dahulu saya telah menyatak-an bahawa Kerajaan Persekutuan

sa-telah mengadakan perundingan dengan Kerajaan² Negeri, telah memutuskan ada-lah Pilehan Raya Tahunan Kerajaan Tempatan di-seluruh Persekutuan yang sa-patut-nya di-adakan di-hujung tahun 1959 ada-lah di-tanggohkan sa-lama sa-tahun, dan saya telah menyatakan juga bahawa Kerajaan Persekutuan bersama² dengan Kerajaan² Negeri berchadang hendak menyiasat kemungkinan meminda kerana memudahkan syarat² pengundi di-dalam Pilehan Raya Kerajaan Tempatan dan dengan itu boleh-lah daftar² pengundi itu di-sediakan dengan betul-nya dan tidak akan memakan belanja yang banyak apabila daftar² itu di-semak pada tiap² tahun, dan juga menyiasat kemungkinan bagi menukar peraturan Pilehan Raya Kerajaan Tempatan. Berkenaan dengan tanggohkan ini saya menyatakan di-sini bahawa sa-lepas daripada kenyataan yang saya perbuat di-dalam Meshuarat Belanjawan itu, maka telah di-dapati mustahak pula di-tanggohkan lagi Pilehan Raya Kerajaan Tempatan itu hingga ka-bulan April tahun 1961. Maka keputusan ini telah di-perolehi oleh sebab permintaan daripada Surohanjaya Pilehan Raya yang telah mengaku memikul tanggungan menjalankan Pilehan Raya Kerajaan Tempatan di-seluruh Persekutuan Tanah Melayu.

Surohanjaya Pilehan Raya memerlukan masa di-antara bulan June tahun 1960 hingga bulan March tahun 1961 bagi menjalankan pendaftaran sa-mula pengundi² mengikut syarat² pengundi yang di-sebutkan di-dalam Rang Undang² yang ada di-hadapan Dewan ini pada hari ini.

Oleh kerana Surohanjaya Pilehan Raya telah mengaku memikul satu bebanan yang berat itu dan oleh kerana alasan² yang di-beri-nya itu di-fikirkan menasabah, maka Kerajaan telah mempersetujui permintaan itu; itu-lah sebab-nya maka di-lanjutkan lagi tarikh penanggohkan Pilehan Raya itu. Rang Undang² yang ada di-hadapan Dewan ini pada hari ini ada-lah mengandongi dasar yang telah mendapat persetujuan 'am di-antara Kerajaan Persekutuan dan Kerajaan² Negeri, chuma Kelantan belum lagi bersetuju dengan chadangan supaya

Surohanjaya Pilehan Raya menjalankan Pilehan Raya Kerajaan Tempatan dalam Negeri Kelantan. Dan ada-lah ia membatalkan undang² yang ada pada masa ini berkenaan dengan Pilehan Raya Kerajaan Tempatan yang pada 'am-nya terkandung di-dalam Undang² Pilehan Raya Kerajaan Tempatan tahun 1950, dan berkenaan dengan Negeri Pulau Pinang terkandung di-dalam undang² kuasa menjalankan Pilehan Raya tahun 1958 (Penang Conduct of Elections Authorisation Enactment, 1958) dan berkenaan dengan Negeri Johor terkandung di-dalam undang² menjalankan Pilehan Raya Town Council, Johor, tahun 1959 (Johore Conduct of Town Council Elections Enactment, 1959).

Dasar yang pertama yang ada terkandung di-dalam Rang Undang² ini ia-lah Pilehan Raya Kerajaan Tempatan itu hendak-lah di-jalankan oleh Surohanjaya Pilehan Raya. Bahagian V dan VI Rang Undang² ini ia-lah membolehkan Surohanjaya Pilehan Raya membuat lantekan pegawai-nya dan membuat Peraturan² berkenaan dengan Pilehan Raya itu. Ahli² Yang Berhormat tentu sedia ma'alum bahawa Bab 113 Fasal 1 Undang² Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ada-lah menyatakan bahawa Surohanjaya Pilehan Raya hendak-lah menjalankan Pilehan Raya bagi Dewan Ra'ayat dan Majlis Undangan tiap² negeri, tetapi mengikut Fasal 4 bahawa mustahak-lah undang² negeri di-adakan terlebih dahulu sa-belum Pilehan Raya kepada lain² Majlis di-jalankan oleh Surohanjaya Pilehan Raya dan ini termasuk-lah Pilehan Raya Kerajaan Tempatan. Maka ada-lah dasar Kerajaan, dan saya perchaya Dewan ini pun bersetuju dengan-nya, bahawa mustahak-lah kewajipan menjalankan Pilehan Raya Kerajaan Tempatan itu di-pulangkan kepada Surohanjaya Pilehan Raya dengan sa-beberapa chepat yang boleh.

Surohanjaya itu telah di-tubuhkan mengikut Perlembagaan sa-bagai satu badan yang bebas daripada pengaruh siasah (politik) dan lain² juga untuk menjalankan dengan sempurna-nya Pilehan Raya di-semua peringkat Kerajaan. Fa'edah-nya Surohanjaya Pilehan Raya menjalankan Pilehan Raya

Kerajaan Tempatan itu ia-lah banyak dan nyata; Surohanjaya itu boleh mengadakan satu susunan peraturan bagi Pilehan Raya Kerajaan Tempatan seluruh Persekutuan; dia boleh menjalankan aturan Pilehan Raya Kerajaan Tempatan itu bersesuaian dengan kewajipan-nya berkenaan dengan Pilehan Raya Dewan Ra'ayat dan Majlis Undangan Negeri², dan bersama² dengan chadangan hendak memudahkan syarat² pengundi bagi Kerajaan Tempatan itu, maka belanja menjalankan Pilehan Raya itu tentu-lah akan kurang. Oleh kerana Rang Undang² ini di-kemukakan kepada Dewan ini mengikut kuasa yang terkandung di-dalam Bab 76 Fasal 4 Undang² Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu yang membolehkan Parlimen membuat undang² berkenaan dengan Kerajaan Tempatan untuk menyamakan undang² dan dasar, dan termasuk Pilehan Raya Kerajaan Tempatan, maka jika Rang Undang² ini di-luluskan tidak payah lagi Kerajaan tiap² negeri mengadakan undang² memberi kuasa kepada Surohanjaya Pilehan Raya menjalankan Pilehan Raya itu. Rang Undang² ini sahaja telah memadai.

Dasar yang kedua yang terkandung di-dalam Rang Undang² ini ia-lah chadangan kerana meminda syarat² pengundi Kerajaan Tempatan mengikut syarat² pengundi kepada Dewan Ra'ayat dan Majlis Undangan Negeri seperti yang tersebut di-dalam Bab 119 Undang² Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. Syarat² pengundi Kerajaan Tempatan yang ada pada masa ini ada-lah terkandung di-dalam Perlembagaan Kerajaan Tempatan itu masing². Di-dalam-nya ada-lah banyak syarat² yang di-sebutkan boleh menjadi pengundi dan termasuk-lah Ra'ayat British, Ra'ayat United Kingdom dan Jajahan ta'alok-nya yang di-peranakkan di-Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dan Singapura, Ra'ayat Raja² Melayu dan juga Ra'ayat Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. Pada masa ini kita telah memperolehi pertukaran Perlembagaan yang penting tetapi syarat² pengundi yang terkandung di-dalam Perlembagaan Kerajaan Tempatan itu belum lagi di-tukar mengikut pertukaran Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu, dan lagi banyak di-antara

syarat² yang lain pula telah di-fikirkan tidak patut di-adakan lagi. Di-chadangkan di-sini bahawa Ra'ayat Persekutuan Tanah Melayu yang mempunyai kelayakan seperti tersebut di-dalam Schedule No. 2 di-dalam Bill ini dan tidak pula masuk di-dalam larangan yang di-sharatkan di-dalam-nya sahaja yang boleh menjadi pengundi. Mereka yang mempunyai syarat² ini yang ada mempunyai harta di-dalam kawasan Kerajaan Tempatan tetapi dudok di-luar kawasan Kerajaan Tempatan itu dengan mengikut syarat yang di-tentukan boleh juga menjadi pengundi, maka dengan jalan ini boleh-lah daftar pengundi² bagi Kerajaan Tempatan itu di-satukan dengan daftar pengundi bagi Dewan Ra'ayat dan Majlis Undangan Negeri, dan pula boleh-lah daftar² ini di-semak pada tiap² tahun dengan sa-kali gus. Maka perkara itu akan memudahkan pekerjaan memeriksa syarat² pengundi dan mengurangkan belanja menyemak daftar pengundi itu pada tiap² tahun. Sungguh pun mereka yang mempunyai harta di-dalam kawasan Kerajaan Tempatan tetapi tinggal di-luar kawasan itu dan mempunyai kelayakan yang lain di-beri hak menjadi pengundi akan berma'ana ia-itu syarat² bagi pengundi di-dalam 3 perengkat Kerajaan itu tidak betul² sama, tetapi di-chadangkan di-dalam Schedule No. 2 bahawa mereka itu di-sharatkan meminta pada tiap² tahun supaya nama mereka di-simpan di-dalam daftar pengundi² itu. Nama² mereka itu boleh-lah di-muatkan di-dalam satu daftar kecil yang lain yang tidak akan memberi pekerjaan yang banyak. Mereka yang hilang hak mengundi rangka baharu ini ia-lah :

- (i) Ra'ayat British, Ra'ayat United Kingdom dan ta'alok-nya yang di-peranakkan di-Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dan Singapura yang tidak menjadi ra'ayat Persekutuan Tanah Melayu.
- (ii) Sa-bilangan yang kecil mereka yang telah menjadi ra'ayat Raja² Melayu selepas Merdeka yang tidak meminta menjadi ra'ayat Persekutuan Tanah Melayu.

Akan di-ingat bahawa gulongan mereka ini tidak berhak menjadi pengundi di-pilehan raya Dewan Ra'ayat atau Majlis Undangan Negeri dan di-fikirkan tidak ada alasan yang مناسب supaya mereka ini di-beri hak pengundi di-dalam pilehan raya Kerajaan Tempatan.

Dasar yang ketiga yang terkandung di-dalam Rang Undang² ini ia-lah chadangan menukar chara pilehan raya itu. Pada masa sekarang ini sa-jumlah 1/3 daripada bilangan Ahli² itu hendak-lah berhenti pada tiap² tahun dan di-adakan pilehan raya pada tiap² tahun bagi memenuhi tempat yang di-kosongkan oleh mereka. Chadangan yang baharu ini ia-lah bagi semua Ahli² Majlis Meshuarat itu berhenti pada tiap² 3 tahun dan di-adakan pilehan raya pada tiap² 3 tahun. Kedua² chara ini ada fa'edah dan ada rugi-nya. Pilehan raya tiap² tahun boleh menentukan dengan lebih chepat akan pertukaran fikiran di-dalam kawasan Kerajaan Tempatan itu, dan juga sudah barang tentu ada ahli² Majlis yang berpengalaman yang tinggal menjalankan tugas-nya tiap² tahun, tetapi jika di-tilek daripada segi pentadbiran ada-lah pilehan raya tiap² tahun itu ta' boleh tidak akan melengahkan pekerjaan Majlis itu. Di-fikirkan chara yang di-chadangkan ini ia-itu semua ahli² berhenti pada tiap² 3 tahun ada-lah akan berfa'edah lebih lagi sebab-nya—

- (i) Majlis Meshuarat itu akan berjalan lagi tetap dan memudahkan perlaksanaan dasar yang besar yang dibena oleh Parti yang berkuasa;
- (ii) Chara itu membolehkan pilehan satu ahli bagi satu kawasan (ward);
- (iii) Chara ini boleh mengelakkan pembongkaran yang tetap ada jika di-adakan pilehan raya tiap² tahun dan sudah barang tentu mengurangkan perbelanjaan di-atas pilehan raya.
- (iv) Chara ini tidak akan berma'ana ia-itu satu² Majlis itu akan hilang Ahli² yang berpengalaman dengan sa-kali

gus sebab mereka yang berhenti itu boleh masuk di-dalam pilehan lagi.

Sharat mengadakan pilehan raya itu ada-lah terkandung di-dalam fasal 13 dan bagi pilehan raya yang pertama ia-lah di-dalam fasal 23. Akan di-ingat bahawa Ahli² yang di-pilih di-dalam pilehan raya yang mula² akan di-adakan itu ia-lah chuma berkhidmat 2 tahun sahaja dan bukan-nya 3 tahun. Ini ia-lah kerana hendak mengelakkan daripada mengadakan pilehan raya di-dalam satu tahun dengan pilehan raya Dewan Ra'ayat dan pilehan raya Majlis Undangan Negeri di-dalam tahun 1964.

Saya telah menyebutkan dengan sa-berapa rengkas-nya di-atas dasar² yang terkandung di-dalam Rang Undang² ini, dan alasan² bagi-nya. Saya per-chaya ada-lah Rang Undang² ini ada-lah satu chara untuk memperbaiki perjalanan Kerajaan Tempatan di-dalam Negeri ini.

Ada satu sahaja perkara yang saya suka hendak menyebut di-sini ia-itu berkenaan dengan taraf Majlis Bandaran Kuala Lumpur. Fasal 24 di-dalam Rang Undang² ini ada menyebutkan bahawa sharat² yang terkandung di-dalam Rang Undang² ini tidak menyentoh perlembagaan Majlis Perbandaran Kuala Lumpur. Ahli² Yang Berhormat tentu telah memperhatikan bahawa di-dalam fasal 32 Rang Undang² pindaan perlembagaan itu Bab 154 itu ada-lah di-pinda supaya kuasa bagi membuat Undang² bagi Kepala Persekutuan Tanah Melayu itu terpulang kepada Parlimen dengan serta merta. Dewan ini akan berpeluang kelak akan membahathkan Undang² yang akan di-kemukakan oleh Kerajaan berkenaan dengan Bandar ini.

Tuan Speaker, demikian saya menchadangkan supaya Undang² ini di-bachakan kali yang kedua.

Sir, may I speak in English now?

(*Mr. Speaker indicates assent.*)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an act for the purpose of ensuring uniformity of law and policy in respect of Local Government Elections throughout the Federation and

for matters incidental thereto" be read a second time.

Honourable Members will recall that at the last Budget Meeting I stated that the Federal Government in consultation with the State Governments has decided to suspend for a period of one year wherever possible local authority elections which were due to take place at the end of 1959, and that it was the intention of the Federal Government to investigate along with State Governments the desirability of simplifying the qualifications for local authority elections with a view to preparing electoral rolls which can be maintained at a high level of accuracy without excessive annual expenditure on revision, and the desirability of altering the arrangements for local authority elections. I would like in this connexion to state that since this announcement was made it has been found necessary to extend the period of suspension for a further period until April, 1961. This decision was arrived at the request of the Election Commission which has undertaken the responsibility for conducting local authority elections throughout the Federation. The Election Commission would require the whole period June, 1960-March, 1961, for the re-registration of electors in accordance with the qualifications mentioned in the Bill which is before this House to-day. In view of the tremendous responsibility that the Election Commission has agreed to undertake and in view of the reasons given Government has found it necessary to agree with the request; hence the further extension.

The Bill which is before the House to-day embodies the basic principles which have been generally agreed between the Federal and State Governments (only Kelantan has not agreed with the proposal to hand over the conduct of elections to the Election Commission) and it repeals the existing law relating to Local Government elections which in general is contained in the Local Authorities Elections Ordinance, 1950, and in the case of Penang, the Penang Conduct of Elections Authorisation Enactment, 1958, and in the case of Johore, the Johore Conduct of Town Council Elections Enactment, 1959.

The first principle which this Bill seeks to provide is that the conduct of Local Authority Elections should be undertaken by the Election Commission. Parts V and VI enable the Election Commission to make the necessary appointments and regulations to enable it to do so. Honourable Members will appreciate that Article 113 Clause I of the Constitution already made it mandatory for the Election Commission to conduct elections to the House of Representatives and the Legislative Assemblies of the States, but that under Clause (4) State Law would be necessary to authorise the Commission to conduct any other election and under this heading comes local authority elections. It is the Government's policy and I am sure the House agrees with this that it is necessary that the Election Commission should assume responsibility for the conduct of all local authority elections as soon as possible. The Commission is established under the Constitution to provide an independent organization free from political and other influences for the proper conduct of elections at all levels. The advantages of the Election Commission conducting local authority elections are obvious. It would be possible for the Commission to frame one set of local authority election regulations for the whole Federation; it can execute the whole local authority election procedure in harmony with its other duties connected with Federal and State elections; and in conjunction with the proposal for the simplification of qualifications for local authority electors the costs of running the election machinery are bound to be reduced. Since this Bill is introduced into Parliament in exercise of the powers conferred by Article 76 (4) of the Constitution, under which Parliament may, for the purpose only of ensuring uniformity of law and policy, make laws with respect to local government, a subject including local government election, if this Bill is passed, it will no longer be necessary for States to enact laws to authorise the Election Commission to conduct local authority elections. This Bill covers it.

The second basic principle which this Bill provides is the simplification

of qualifications for electors to local authority elections to accord with the qualifications for electors to Parliamentary and State Elections in accordance with Article 119 of the Constitution. The existing qualifications for local authority electors are contained in the various Constitutions of the local authorities concerned. Various categories of persons are mentioned as being qualified to be electors and these include British subjects, Citizens of the United Kingdom and the Colonies born in the Federation and in Singapore and subjects of the Rulers of Malay States as well as Citizens of the Federation of Malaya. There have been important constitutional changes since then which have not been reflected in these qualifications, and furthermore it is considered that the qualifications contain some elements of redundancy. It is proposed that only Federal Citizens subject to the qualifications stated in the 2nd Schedule and not subject to the disqualifications stated therein may exercise their rights of voting. Non-resident property owners who are otherwise qualified are, subject to certain conditions, also given the right to vote. It would thus be possible for electoral rolls for local authority elections to be combined with electoral rolls for Parliamentary and State Elections and for annual revision to be carried out in one single operation. It would greatly simplify checking of qualifications and greatly reduce the cost of electoral revision. The retention of the property qualifications for non-resident but otherwise qualified property owners would mean that the qualifications for electors would not be absolutely identical, but since it is proposed in the 2nd Schedule that they should apply annually for retention on the local authority electoral rolls, a relatively small supplementary list can accommodate their right to vote without undue work or difficulty.

The only categories of persons who would lose their present right to vote in local authority elections would be:

- (i) British subjects, some citizens of the United Kingdom and colonies born in the Federation and those born in the Colony

of Singapore who are not Federal Citizens.

- (ii) A very limited number of persons who have become State subjects since Merdeka but have not become Federal Citizens. It should be noted that these categories of persons are not eligible to vote in the Parliamentary or State elections, and there appears to be no good reasons why they should be allowed to vote in local authority elections.

The third basic principle embodied in this Bill is the replacement of the present system of the annual retirement of 1/3 of the number of councillors by a system of the total retirement of all members after a period of 3 years. There are advantages and disadvantages in both systems. Annual elections ensure a quicker response on the part of the local authority to changing currents of opinion and new needs, while at the same time ensuring a nucleus of experienced councillors from year to year continuously; but from a purely administrative point of view the annual upheaval of an election involving a third of the number of councillors sometimes proves a drawback since it is bound in some measure to disturb or delay the Council's business. It is however considered that the triennial total retirement will have the greater advantage because—

- (i) It will give greater Stability to local authorities and this facilitates the introduction and implementation of major policies by the party in power in the local authorities.
- (ii) It will make possible the introduction of single member wards.
- (iii) It will avoid the upheaval of annual elections, and certainly reduce expenditure on elections.
- (iv) It will not necessarily mean the periodic loss of experienced councillors, as outgoing councillors will be eligible to stand for re-election.

Provision for general election is contained in Section 13 and for the first

general election on resumption in section 23. It will be noted that the term of office of councillors after the 1st general election on resumption will only be for a period of 2 years and not 3 years. This is so done in order to avoid local authority elections being held in the same year as Parliamentary and State elections in 1964.

I have touched briefly on each of the basic principles which this Bill provides and the reasons therefor. I am confident that the Bill provides for a major improvement in arrangements for local authority elections and a great step forward in the development of local authorities in the country.

There is one final point which I wish to touch on and that is with regard to the status of Kuala Lumpur Municipality. Section 24 specifically mentions the fact that the provision of the Act shall not affect the Constitution of the Municipality of Kuala Lumpur. Honourable Members will note that

under para. 32 of the Constitutional Amendment Bill portions of Article 154 are being amended in order that Parliament shall have exclusive power to make laws with respect to the Federal Capital forthwith. This House will have the opportunity to debate at a later meeting of this House measures which will be introduced by the Government in connection with legislation in respect of the Federal Capital.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Enche' Mohamed Khir bin Johari): Sir, I beg to second the motion, and I reserve the right to speak later on.

Mr. Speaker: The question is that the Bill be read a second time. But now the time is 4.30 p.m. and I must adjourn the House to 10 o'clock tomorrow.

Adjourned at 4.30 p.m.

**WRITTEN ANSWERS TO
QUESTIONS**

**MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND
INDUSTRY**

PIONEER INDUSTRIES

**Endorsement of labour clauses on "Pioneer"
Certificates**

1. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of Commerce and Industry to state the labour clauses, if any, included in certificates of Pioneer Status issued to approved industries.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari): If by "labour clauses" the Hon'ble Member for Bungsar means clauses which regulate the conditions under which labour in pioneer industries works then the answer is that no such clauses are endorsed on pioneer certificates. Pioneer firms have to obey the legislation regulating conditions of employment in the same way as do non-pioneer firms.

If on the other hand "labour clauses" refer to conditions which govern the numbers of Malaysians and foreigners employed in pioneer firms, the answer is that such conditions are imposed. The nature of these conditions varies from pioneer firm to pioneer firm and is dependent on agreement being reached between my Ministry and the firm concerned on the need for technical and managerial skills being provided by persons from outside this country. Conditions are further imposed to ensure that training programmes are instituted to enable Malaysians to take over from foreign experts within a reasonable period of time.

**Grant of Pioneer Status to the Dunlop
Rubber Company**

2. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of Commerce and Industry whether the Government still insists on granting pioneer status to the Dunlop to manufacture tyres even though there is a public resentment against the intention.

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: The Dunlop Rubber Co.'s application for pioneer status to make tyres has been approved in principle, subject to the

Government being satisfied as to the degree of tariff protection required. The Dunlop Co.'s application for tariff protection has been considered by the Tariff Advisory Committee and that Committee's report is now under consideration. I am unaware that there is any "public resentment" against the Company's application being approved in principle, if by that term the Hon'ble Member means that "resentment" is widely felt by Malaysians.

3. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of Commerce and Industry which firm, Dunlop or the local concern, made the first formal application for pioneer status to make tyres.

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: The Dunlop Rubber Co. submitted the first formal application to make tyres and tubes. Their application under Section 3 of the Pioneer Industries Ordinance was received on May 8th, 1959.

Investment of Local Capital

4. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of Commerce and Industry what steps he has taken to encourage strictly local investment, local manufacturers and local business firms.

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: No special steps to encourage local investment, local manufacturers and local business firms have been taken which are not also applicable to others. That local investors, manufacturers and businessmen have taken advantage of the steps taken to encourage industry in general is evidenced by the fact that 15 wholly owned local firms, 4 in which local participation is greater than 50 per cent and 5 in which local participation is less than 50 per cent have been set up since the Pioneer Industries legislation was introduced.

Preference for Local Products

5. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of Commerce and Industry whether it is the policy of the Government to encourage the buying of local products in preference to foreign products.

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: Yes, it is the policy of the Government to encourage the buying of local products in preference to foreign ones.

The London Advisory Committee for Rubber Research (Ceylon and Malaya)

6. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of Commerce and Industry the names and qualifications of the members of the Malayan Rubber Fund Board's London Advisory Board, what are its function, why the London Advisory Board has the right to confirm appointments when there is a Minister of Commerce and Industry.

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: The London Advisory Board, or, to give it its full name, the London Advisory Committee for Rubber Research (Ceylon and Malaya) was set up in 1932 to advise the Rubber Research Institutes of Malaya and Ceylon on their general programmes of research in the botanical and agricultural fields. Membership of the Committee was:

- 1 member nominated by the Malayan Government;
 - 1 member nominated by the Ceylon Government;
 - 1 member nominated by the Colonial Advisory Council of Agriculture and Animal Health;
 - 6 members nominated by the Rubber Growers' Association to represent rubber planting interests in Malaya and Ceylon;
 - 2 members representing rubber manufacturers' interests, and
- the following ex-officio members, viz.:
- The Director of the Imperial Institute;
 - The Director of the Botanical Laboratories of the Imperial College of Science and Technology;
 - The Director of the Imperial Bureau of Mycology;
 - The Director of the Rothamsted Experimental Station.

The Committee had no written constitution or mandate. Until very recently, the Committee, besides commenting on the research programmes of the Rubber Research Institute of Malaya, also examines its budget and is also concerned with interviewing candidates and, after appointment, making arrangements for their travel to Malaya. Its functions are given statutory recognition

in the Rubber Research Institute Enactment, 1934.

It has long been realised that the London Advisory Committee for Rubber Research (Ceylon and Malaya) was no longer suited to present-day conditions in the Federation and as a result of the recent re-organisation of control of the research and development organisations financed from the Malayan Rubber Fund, the services of the London Advisory Committee are to be dispensed with, and its functions will be taken over by a newly constituted body to be called the Co-ordinating Advisory Committee with the Malayan Controller of Rubber Research as Chairman and the other members, with the exception of the two nominees of the Rubber Producers Council, to be appointed by me on the recommendation of the Malayan Rubber Fund Board.

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Mr. Tan Chuan Sin—Admission into Hospital

7. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of Defence to state why a political detainee Mr. Tan Chuan Sin is admitted in the Third Class, at the General Hospital, Johore Bharu, and why he is not admitted in the 2nd Class.

The Minister of Defence (Tun Abdul Razak): On his admission to hospital he did not request admission to a higher class. Subject to availability of accommodation all in-patients, including detainees, are accommodated in the class of ward of their choice and for which they are able to make the necessary deposit and payment.

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

PIONEER INDUSTRIES

Loss of Revenue from Tax Exemption and Tariff Protection

8. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of Finance the total loss in revenue in the form of tax exemption and tariff protection granted to foreign firms in the Federation.

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): On the assumption that the

term "tax exemption" refers to relief from income tax in the case of concerns which have been granted a pioneer certificate under the Pioneer Industries (Relief from Income Tax) Ordinance, 1958, the answer is that no figures are available for the reason that no claim for relief under that Ordinance has yet been made to the Comptroller.

No measure of tariff protection has been accorded to foreign firms in particular. It is not practicable therefore to state what reduction in revenue can be attributed to protection afforded to foreign firms operating in Malaya by virtue of the duty imposed on imported goods competing with the local products of such foreign firms.

Dunlop Rubber Company Limited

9. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of Finance the approximate revenue which would be lost in the form of tax exemption and tariff protection if Dunlop is given pioneer status to manufacture tyres.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: If the proposed subsidiary of Dunlop Rubber Company Limited obtained a pioneer certificate under the provisions of the Pioneer Industries (Relief from Income Tax) Ordinance, 1958, it would be entitled to relief from income tax on the profits

earned during the period covered by the pioneer certificate. As the factory has not even been built it is not possible to determine the level of profits and hence the amount of income tax relief.

As no tariff protection has been granted to the Company that question does not arise.

PRIME MINISTER'S DEPARTMENT

Mr. H. A. L. Stoneham

10. Enche' V. David asks the Prime Minister the circumstances which led the former Controller of the Industrial Development Division, Mr. Stoneham, to leave the Federation Government service after he had accompanied the Malayan Delegation to the ECAFE Conference in Australia.

The Prime Minister: I do not know the reasons for Mr. Stoneham's leaving the Government service, which were private. He accompanied the Malayan delegation to the ECAFE Conference on his way to the United Kingdom on leave. While on leave he decided unexpectedly not to return. He had completed a contract and was under no obligation to state his reasons for not wishing to be considered for a further contract.