

Volume II
No. 49



Friday
10th February, 1961

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

**DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)**

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

MOTIONS:

Situation in the Congo [Col. 5335]

The Minor Offences (Amendment) Bill—

Report of the Select Committee [Col. 5412]

Nationality of the Persekutuan Tanah Melayu [Col. 5414]

DI-CHETAK DI-JABATAN CHETAK KERAJAAN
OLEH THOR BENG CHONG, PEMANGKU PENCHETAK KERAJAAN
PERSEKUTUAN TANAH MELAYU

1962

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

Official Report

Second Session of First Dewan Ra'ayat

Friday, 10th February, 1961

The House met at 9.30 a.m.

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr. Speaker, DATO' HAJI MOHAMED NOAH BIN OMAR, S.P.M.J., D.P.M.B., P.I.S., J.P.
- „ the Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- „ the Minister of Internal Security, 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 Health and Social Welfare, DATO' ONG YOKE LIN, P.M.N. (Ulu Selangor).
- „ the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- „ the Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB (Kuantan).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P. (Batang Padang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Rural Development, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry, ENCHE' CHEAH THEAM SWEE (Bukit Bintang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Labour, ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of the Interior, ENCHE' MOHAMED ISMAIL BIN MOHAMED YUSOF (Jerai).
- „ 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).

- The Honourable 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 Bharu Barat).
 „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID (Seberang Utara).
 „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN HAJI YUSOF, P.J.K. (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' CHAN YOON ONN (Kampar).
 „ ENCHE' CHIN SEB YIN (Seremban Timor).
 „ ENCHE' V. DAVID (Bungsar).
 „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).
 „ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N. (Kapar).
 „ ENCHE' HANAFTI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N. (Kulim Utara).
 „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
 „ 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).
 „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN (Kota Bharu Hulu).
 „ ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
 „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
 „ ENCHE' K. KARAM SINGH (Damansara).
 „ CHE' KHADIJAH BINTI MOHD. SIDEK (Dungun).
 „ ENCHE' KONG KOK YAT (Batu Gajah).
 „ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON (Kluang Utara).
 „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
 „ ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW (Sepang).
 „ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
 „ DR. LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
 „ ENCHE' LIU YOONG PENG (Rawang).
 „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
 „ ENCHE' MOHAMED BIN UJANG (Jelebu-Jempol).
 „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ABBAS BIN AHMAD (Hilir Perak).
 „ 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).

- The Honourable 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).
 „ 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, J.P. (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, J.M.N., 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, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
 „ ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
 „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Malacca).
 „ ENCHE' TAN PHOCK KIN (Tanjong).
 „ TENGKU INDRA PETRA IBNI AL-MARHUM 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 MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ALI (Kelantan Hilir).
 „ WAN SULAIMAN BIN WAN TAM, P.J.K. (Kota Star Selatan).
 „ WAN YAHYA BIN HAJI WAN MOHAMED (Kemaman).
 „ ENCHE' WOO SAIK HONG, P.J.K., J.P. (Telok Anson).
 „ ENCHE' YAHYA BIN HAJI AHMAD (Bagan Datoh).
 „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
 „ ENCHE' YONG WOO MING (Sitiawan).
 „ PUAN 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 Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence and Minister of Rural Development, TUN ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
 „ the Minister of the Interior, DATO' SULEIMAN BIN DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Muar Selatan).
 „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, ENCHE' ABDUL AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Kuala Langat).
 „ the Minister of Transport, ENCHE' SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR (Pontian Utara).

- The Honourable the Minister of Commerce and Industry, ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR BIN JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- " the Assistant Minister of Information and Broadcasting, TUAN SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, J.M.N., (Johore Tenggara).
- " ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT (Penang Utara).
- " ENCHE' HARUN BIN PILUS (Trengganu Tengah).
- " ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- " ENCHE' KANG KOCK SENG (Batu Pahat).
- " ENCHE' LIM JOO KONG (Alor Star).
- " ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA (Pasir Puteh).
- " ENCHE' NG ANN TECK (Batu).
- " ENCHE' TAN TYE CHEK (Kulim-Bandar Bahru).

IN ATTENDANCE:

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

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

MOTIONS

SITUATION IN THE CONGO

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam (Menglembu): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to move the motion which stands in my name,

This House views with grave concern the failure of the United Nations to take effective steps, after the arrival of Malayan troops in the Congo, to protect and preserve the democratic rights of the people of the Congo and calls upon the Government to withdraw Malayan troops from the Congo unless more effective steps are taken in the immediate future to restore democratic rights to the people of the Congo.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was on the 29th of September, 1960, that this House approved a motion for the despatch of a contingent of Malayan troops to the Congo. It was stated at that time when the approval of this House was sought that the purpose in sending the troops to the Congo was to discharge the obligations of this country towards the United Nations. Those obligations have always been vague, but Command Paper No. 43 of 1960 sets out the reasons why the despatch of troops was necessary, and in paragraph 3 of that Command Paper the force is described as follows. It says,

"In discharge of this country's obligations under this Charter, the Government

responded to an appeal by the Secretary-General and placed at the disposal of the United Nations Organisation a force for use in the Republic of the Congo for the maintenance of law and order."

That is what I wish to stress—our force which we sent to the Congo was placed at the disposal of the United Nations Organisation for use in the Republic of the Congo for the maintenance of law and order.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, four months have elapsed since that contingent was despatched and it is now the duty of this House to consider what use the United Nations has made of our troops during that period of four months. Has the United Nations succeeded in the purpose for which these troops were sent, that is to say, in maintaining peace and order in the Congo? What we find in the Congo today, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is the prevalence of might over right. We find at every turn that those who threaten the United Nations have their own way. But those who are prepared to abide by the directives of the United Nations are always on the defensive. Since our troops went to the Congo the position there has seriously deteriorated and it has now come to the stage when our troops there have no other duties to perform except to act in the capacity of bodyguards, bodyguards mainly for foreigners. We find that so and so is marooned there and troops are despatched to rescue them. Who are these

people marooned? Who are these people whose lives are threatened? Mainly foreigners—Europeans—who in any event should have had the sense to get out of the Congo by this time instead of imposing a burden on the United Nations troops to protect their lives in the Congo. It should be crystal clear to any European in the Congo, who is there for commercial purposes, that he is not welcome in the Congo and that at the first opportunity the people of the Congo get they are likely to show by violence their resentment to the presence of these foreigners in the Congo. Now, what has the United Nations done about it? Has the United Nations issued a directive to these foreigners "Don't expect us to defend you. Please get out, because the Congolese people do not want you here, and we are not going to use these troops from other countries to defend your lives if you do not take our advice." There is an absence of any such directive, and, as I have said, we have done nothing in the Congo except to protect this sort of people.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I proceed further in this debate, I would like to make it very clear that my purpose today is not to level any criticism at our troops in the Congo. It would be a grossly improper thing to do so. I am not for one moment suggesting that Malayan troops are not capable or are not willing to carry out any duties assigned to them. My contention is that our troops in the Congo are not permitted, are not allowed, to use their powers to achieve the purpose for which they were despatched there.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, let us look at a few examples, a few instances, and consider whether it is worthwhile maintaining our troops in the Congo. The House will recollect the case of Patrice Lumumba. He was arrested, he was subjected to ill-treatment, and the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjöld, issued a warning to these torturers that they must not do so in the future. Now, when a responsible official of a world organisation, with the might of the world

behind him, issues such a warning, one expects that it will be heeded. But what was the answer of these men like Col. M. and others? Their answer was given at the Airport in Katanga, when Lumumba was transferred to Katanga. The United Nations Secretary-General had warned them, "Don't ill-treat Lumumba." The answer they gave was, "Right in front of the whole world, we will put Lumumba at the Airport, we will kick him, we will slap him, we will throw him into the lorry like an animal, and our troops will sit on his body; and what are you going to do about it?" That was the answer which Col. M. gave to Mr. Hammarskjöld. What is the use of our troops, troops of all nations in the Congo, if a man is allowed to spit in your face? What is the result of all this humiliation? Our troops, Malayan troops are compelled by circumstances to stand by and witness these indignities and insults.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, Sir, this motion is framed in two parts. The first part expresses grave concern at the failure of the United Nations to take effective steps. I do not think it can be seriously argued by anybody in this House that the United Nations has taken effective steps, because, if effective steps were taken, they would be evidently out. I, therefore, feel that the first part of this motion should be accepted—we must express great concern at the failure of the United Nations to take effective steps. Whether they could take or whether they couldn't take, whether it is their fault or not, the fact remains that effective steps have not been taken, and I fail to see how anybody can quarrel with the first part of the motion.

The second part of the motion calls for the withdrawal of the Malayan troops from the Congo, but I would like to make it clear that there is a qualification—I have said "withdrawal of Malayan troops unless immediate steps are going to be taken". That, again, I fail to see how anybody can quarrel with that part of the motion.

I support, I agree, that it is our duty to remain in the Congo, send reinforcements if necessary, provided

we can achieve something. My argument is that the tendency and indications are that we are just going to be bogged down there for years without any result. As I pointed out, the purpose of our sending the troops was for use in the Republic of the Congo for the maintenance of law and order. Now, when we speak of law and order, we naturally mean law and order as known to civilised nations—not the law and order of savages. If today we are going to allow our troops to remain there to support what some people consider the lawful Government, that is the Government of Kasavubu, then we must also consider whether the law and order which Kasavubu is seeking to enforce in the Congo is the sort of law and order known to civilised nations. If it is not the law and order known to civilised nations, then we certainly must not and cannot allow our troops to act in aid of what some people believe to be the lawful Government of the Congo, because that was not the mandate. The mandate was to assist the lawful Government of the Congo in maintaining peace and order.

I referred a few minutes ago to the incident where Lumumba was assaulted and humiliated in public after due warning was given to Kasavubu's Government. With Lumumba there was also another man—one of his former Ministers—called—I do not know how to pronounce the name—M-P-O-L-O. He was a Minister of Lumumba's. He was also taken with Lumumba to the Airport. He was also assaulted in the presence of the public and the United Nations. They were both taken to a Camp. Mpolo died within a few days—that is according to the report of the newspapers. What has the United Nations done about it? If responsible people in a Government, which originally invited the United Nations to go into the Congo, can be beaten to death in the presence of the United Nations forces, I ask, "Is it not a disgrace, a humiliation, for us to remain there without taking further effective steps?"

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the whole trouble in this problem appears to be that the

United Nations in the Congo is dealing in a manner which may be effective with other nations which have been in existence for some time, but which will certainly not, and will never be effective, with the nations composed entirely of different tribes. You are trying to unify them by sending an expeditionary force. They have got their private armies, they have got their gangs roaming around all over the country-side. They do not understand the language of diplomacy. You are trying to deal with them with velvet gloves and they are just laughing at you. When the United Nations deals with the people of the type of Col. M, what they must show them is not the velvet gloves but the mailed fist. They must say, "This is our mandate, you listen to us or we beat you down the knees". That must be ultimatum to be given to Col. M. If Col. M says, "No, I am not going to listen to you", the next step is to initiate complete military operation against the army of Col. M. But far from doing any action, what we have heard so far is words condemning Col. M, condemning atrocities, condemning this, condemning that. All that we have done to serve the people of the Congo in any objective manner is to fight for the people of the Congo with words. More than words, we have done nothing. I ask, "Was it the mandate of the United Nations that we should try to secure democracy for the people of the Congo by the use of words?" It was a clear mandate to use troops, armed troops, to maintain law and order, and if our armed troops are going to stand by and do nothing unless somebody comes and attacks them, then I say it is a mockery.

Then, why do I say again that the United Nations has failed? I ask the House to recollect a statement made by the Secretary-General some time ago, when it became obvious that the authorities in the Katanga were recruiting foreigners for their army. A report came about that about 300 ex-Nazis and ex-Fascists were being recruited as a private army by the Katanga authorities. What was the United Nations' reaction to that? The

United Nations has said, "These are tough soldiers, tough foreign legion soldiers. United Nations may not be able to withstand them or sustain an attack on them in Katanga. Therefore, we consider that the United Nations be withdrawn from the Katanga Force". Is that the way to maintain the dignity and prestige of the United Nations? When a rebel is strong enough to fight the United Nations, the United Nations says, "They are too strong for us. We get out". When the other group is too weak to resist the United Nations, the United Nations says, "We stay here and you don't try to fight with Katanga. We could stop you, and the reason is that you are not so strong as Katanga". Is that not a ridiculous state of affairs—when somebody becomes too strong for the United Nations, they can have their way; when somebody becomes too weak, the United Nations have this way?

Then another instance, which will justify the first part of my motion, is the occasion when a United Nations Commission went to Katanga—a Commission of what is or should be the most powerful military organisation in the world. The members of the Commission went to Katanga; they say, "We want to see Lumumba, we want to talk to him." What did Colonel M say?—"Nothing doing, you cannot see him. You better turn back and go home before it is too late." What did the Commission do? They promptly turned back and went home. Is that the dignity which we are getting in the Congo—Colonel M can order the United Nations about? Therefore, what we face at every turn in the Congo is insult and humiliation at the hands of men who are little better than savages. When I say, "Men who are little better than savages", let me be not misunderstood—I do not refer to the people of the Congo as a whole; I refer to people of the Colonel M type. As we have said in this House before, the root cause of the attitude of the United Nations is to be found in the interference with its activities by capitalists, Belgian and American

organisations, who, it should be well known to this Government and, in fact, the whole world, have got enormous vested interests in places like Katanga. That is a fact which cannot be denied, and confirmation of this this Government will undoubtedly be able to secure from international sources. Vast areas of Katanga are under Belgian private ownership, and they cannot afford to allow men like Patrice Lumumba to be in control of the Congo, because they well know what is going to happen to the capitalists' interests in the Congo. That is at the back of all this hesitancy and unwillingness to show the mail fist to people like Colonel M.

Surely, this Government and the world have to consider very seriously the question as to why countries like Morocco, with 3,000 troops in the Congo, have withdrawn their contingents. The United Arab Republic and Indonesia, why have they all been unable to stomach these insults any more, unable to stand by and kicked around by men like Colonel M? Why have they said, "We are going out of the Congo; there is nothing we can usefully do in this country."? If it is one nation, we can say that may be it is influenced by another power, that Russia has got some influence in this country; but then we go on from country to country—United Arab Republic, Indonesia, Sweden, Morocco: are all these countries, or leaders of these countries, incapable of understanding the true position in the Congo and what their obligations are to the United Nations? As these countries withdraw, should we not pause to consider seriously their reasons, and consider whether it is proper that the lives of our soldiers should be risked in a cause which may prove to be utterly unworthy?

My submission, Sir, is that Morocco and the other countries have withdrawn because they have seen through the game, because they have seen through the game that the United Nations is being used by Western imperialists, and they—the people of Morocco and other countries, United Arab Republic—are not prepared to

allow themselves to be used as instruments in the achievement of the aims and objectives of Western capitalists.

Now, it may be asked, what is the answer; it may be asked, are you suggesting to get out of the Congo and let the Congolese people kill each other and have civil war for an indefinite period? The answer is to be found in the suggestion put forward by the Indian Government and that should be the basis of our stand in the United Nations. The suggestion put forward by the Indian Government is this—and it will be noted that at the moment the Indian Government does not have any combat troops in the Congo, but they are prepared to send combat troops—and may I say that Malaya should send further combat troops, if the conditions set out are complied with:

- (1) Disarming of all conflicting elements in the Congo. Now it is obvious that if the United Nations is to exert its authority, there must be one unified Command for the whole of the Congo, and the only command that can be effectively established at this time is the Command of the United Nations. You cannot have two military commands where one says "Do this" and the other says "Do the other thing." So my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is that our representatives in the United Nations must at the earliest opportunity move for the disarming of all Congolese troops in the Congo—and when I say all, I include the forces of Patrice Lumumba supporters as well as Colonel M supporters, because I think the record of the Congo since independence has shown that both parties, both sides, are capable of the most horrible atrocities. We blame Colonel M, but at the same time we do not say that the soldiers of Lumumba are angels. They are capable of similar atrocities. Therefore,

I suggest, in order to carry out the mandate to preserve law and order, the disarming of the entire Congolese army is the first condition.

- (2) According to the Indian proposal, the next thing is the withdrawal of Belgians. It is obvious, and I think it is clear—and I am sure the confidential reports which may be sent to this Government will confirm the fact—that the Belgians are still in the Congo and are exerting a very serious influence, especially in the Katanga area. The United Nations has already ordered the Belgians to withdraw, but they have not done so—on the other hand, their evil hand still remains in the Congo. There must be another demand by the United Nations that if the Belgians do not get out voluntarily, they would be thrown out by force.
- (3) Release of all political prisoner. This, of course, must be a condition precedent. With Patrice Lumumba, the only lawfully elected Prime Minister of the Congo in jail, there can be no constitutional Government in the Congo. Today we have read in the papers that Kasavubu has set up a Government. Of course, it is very clear why he has done that. He is trying to forestall any move by the United Nations to convene Parliament, to put up a publicly elected member like Lumumba—in any event, I doubt if the United Nations could do that. But anyway, he has decided to forestall the United Nations by putting up a puppet of his by the name of Ileo, and very soon, I am sure, we will get the answer that if any further interference is contemplated Kasavubu will say, "I have

got my elected Prime Minister; why are you trying to interfere in the internal affairs of the Congo?"—not elected, I am told—"I have got my own Prime Minister; why do you want to interfere in the affairs of the Congo?" That, Sir, is the motive behind the formation of this Government, which is nothing more than a puppet Government of Colonel M. Now, Sir, I would go further to suggest that there is only one way in which we can bring peace and order to the Congo, and that is by a complete military occupation of the entire Congo by the United Nations. I believe that there is no other way in which we can bring peace to the Congo. So long as rival armies are allowed to exist, it cannot be done. So, I would commend to this Government to consider seriously urging the United Nations to effect a military occupation of the Congo, and under its occupation, Parliament could be reconvened, for which elections, if necessary, could be held in the Congo. A constitutional Government could be set up.

Now, I know the answer to that will be that that is not the mandate of the Security Council. But then I would ask this Government to remember that we are part of the United Nations. If the mandate given before is not enough, let us move for a new mandate. Why do we not move for a new mandate? Should we stick to a resolution which is found to be ineffective? And what steps have this Government taken to move such a resolution in the Security Council to give additional powers to the United Nations Command in the Congo? We do not have to stick to one resolution for ever. Once we find the former resolution ineffective, then it is our clear duty to move a fresh resolution which, I suggest, should be one for the military

occupation of the Congo in view of the fact that there is a complete breakdown of the civil administration, a complete absence of any regular army in the Congo, so that there would be no valid objection to such a course. Of course, the only objection would be that we are interfering in the internal affairs of the Congo. But that in a sense would be purely a technical argument. When a country is in chaos, when there is no constitutional Government, when there is no disciplined army, when there is no civil administration, it is the plain duty of the United Nations to go in and deal with the matter firmly, because if we do not do that and we fall back on the resolution of the Security Council, we are bound to lend aid to the Government of Kasavubu. Is that what we want to do? Because we must remember that the United Nations has recognised the Kasavubu regime, and the mandate of the Security Council was to give aid to the legally constituted Government of the Congo. If the United Nations has recognised Kasavubu, then if we are to act under the old resolution, then it is the duty of the Malayan troops to stand on the side of Kasavubu. I say we are not prepared to do that; and I say no decent person is prepared to do that and to lend aid to Kasavubu—a man who is prepared to torture the former Prime Minister in the presence of the whole world at a public airport. If that is the sort of law and order Kasavubu wants in the Congo, we certainly are not going to help him to enforce that kind of law and order. If, however, the United Nations rejects a proposal on similar lines by this country, then the answer which we have to give to the United Nations is very simple—"We sympathise with your professed aims, but since you are taking no practical steps, we do not think our troops should remain in the Congo." That is the effect of the second part of my resolution. Not that we must abandon the project in the Congo, but we must demand effective steps and methods, dynamic steps which will destroy once and for all elements like Colonel M.

I would also ask this Government to consider the position which is likely to arise in the very near future if the whole policy in the Congo is not changed. As we find other nations pulling out, one by one, they will be replaced by Malayan troops and there is bound to come a day when the Malayan force will be the major force in the Congo; and at that time we will find that the Malayan force may have to face not only the gangs of Colonel M but also the entire people of the Congo, who will feel so resentful against the United Nations, because they have got their force and they have got their arms in the Congo and yet they allow the people in the Congo to suffer this agony on the pretext that they cannot interfere in the internal affairs of the Congo. If we are not to take part in the preservation of law and order, which is in itself an internal affair of the Congo, then why should we be there? Once we are faced with the hostility of the people of the Congo as a whole then we will be faced with the alternative of either fighting the Congolese people or withdrawing.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the greatest danger now is that Malayan troops, if they remain in the Congo under the present mandate of the Security Council, will sooner or later—and I am sure of this—will sooner or later be faced with the alternative of a humiliating defeat at the hands of the people of the Congo, in the sense that they will be hunted down by the people of the Congo as people who are just standing by and doing nothing in their hour of agony. The people of the Congo will begin to look upon us as enemies of the people of the Congo in the sense that, because of their presence, the people, the common man in the street of Congo, is unable to rise in rebellion against the Government of Kasavubu. Surely that is the only effect of the presence of the United Nations in the Congo. The ordinary man, the unarmed man is unable to organise himself to rise in rebellion against the treachery and dictatorship of Colonel M—and that is the only thing the United Nations is doing in the Congo

today. If the United Nations were not in the Congo, I know there would be bloodshed. But that would be caused by a rebellion, a popular rebellion by the people of the Congo, against the dictators who are denying them their very rights; and, in the history of the world, such rebellions cannot be avoided. With people like Colonel M coming up and trying to destroy the whole nation, they in turn have to be destroyed. If they cannot be destroyed, if they cannot be removed by the United Nations, then the people will do it sooner or later, and let not the Malayan troops stand in their way when that hour comes.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, why are we then in this atmosphere? Is there any reason why we should not sympathise with Lumumba who recently sent a message to his children who are in Cairo, calling upon them to remember with hatred the acts of the white man in the Congo? Then today it is evident that it is the interference of the white man and his greed in the Congo that has brought about this situation in the Congo today. I therefore call upon this Government to take immediate and effective steps through the agency of the United Nations to remove from the Congo the curse that has fallen upon it in the person of Colonel M. If the Government is unable to do that, if the Government is unable to persuade the Security Council to do that, then I say we have no right to be in the Congo.

I ask this House to consider my motion seriously, as indeed the Government has considered it seriously; and I would like to express our great appreciation of the fact that the Government itself has considered this motion seriously, although perhaps they might or might not agree with the motion. Nevertheless, it shows that the Government is fully conscious of the grave burden that lies on its shoulders in sending our troops abroad, because in sending our troops abroad we are dealing with our own people, with our own soldiers, with their lives. When we send them to do a job outside, we must know, we must be satisfied that if any one Malayan

life is lost, that life is lost for a worthy cause; and I think with that feeling in mind the Government has given priority to this motion. I therefore ask Members of this House to consider seriously whether there is anything at all objectionable in my motion. I feel that my motion is one which should be accepted, as it will serve notice on the United Nations that we are not satisfied with the present campaign that is going on in the Congo and that, while we are quite prepared to send more troops if necessary to do something effective in the Congo, we are not going to send a single Malayan soldier more to the Congo if we are just going to stand by and to allow democracy to be murdered in the Congo.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move.

Enche' Chan Swee Ho (Ulu Kinta):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second the motion. Although Malaya is a small nation, our stand on the South African affair has gained the attention and respect of the whole world. As we are living in a peaceful and freedom loving country, we understand the vital importance of giving assistance to uphold liberty. In view of our desire to help the people who are facing the dangers of war and to preserve world justice and peace, we will support whatever positive steps that are taken to ease the tension. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the situation in the Congo is now becoming worse and it is time for us to review the position.

We support the United Nation's decision on the Congo affair, but we should not support it blindly. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the challenge to the United Nations by some member nations' decision to withdraw their troops from the Congo is not without reason. Therefore, Sir, I would ask the Honourable Prime Minister to review the United Nations stand on Congo and to take effective steps to solve the problem.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew (Dato Kramat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise in support of this motion. I rise in support of this motion because it is clear from newspaper reports, even though they

may have been biased reports, that all is not well in the State of Congo. We must, in order to review our stand in the Congo, go back into history and remember that Patrice Lumumba was a constitutionally elected Prime Minister of Congo, and as the constitutionally elected Prime Minister of Congo he appointed Kasavubu as President of the Congo State. Now, when Congo achieved its independence, Congo achieved its independence as a State, as one nation. And then we find all of a sudden the province of Katanga under the leadership of Tshombe breaking away from the Congo State and demanding self-rule and independence. Now let us think of a similar situation in Malaya. Supposing that the Government of Kelantan decides to break away from the Federation of Malaya and declares itself as an independent State and calls upon for its support Siamese troops and Siamese technicians, because it had formerly ties with Siam, how would the Prime Minister of this country view the Kelantan Government? Surely the Prime Minister would stand up and say, "This is a treasonous act; those who are responsible for this secession are traitors. They are unconstitutional; they are subversive; they are insurrectionists. Therefore, we shall declare another war of Emergency; for another 12 years we shall fight to bring about law and order in this country." (*Laughter*). We who proudly proclaim that we have fought an Emergency for something less than this find ourselves in a situation where we are compelled to fight for a traitor like Tshombe who has dared to challenge the will of the Congolese people as expressed within the Constitution of Congo. Now because Patrice Lumumba made a mistake in appointing a defeated rival—because Kasavubu was defeated by him in election—as the President, it does not give the President the executive power to control the State, against the wishes of his popularly elected Government. What is the Constitution of the Congo? I do not think the Government has told us, but it is obvious even from the reports of the papers that where there is a President and a Prime Minister, the Prime Minister is the executive Head

of State—as much as our Prime Minister is the executive Head of State—and the President, the titular Head, shall do as he is advised by his Ministers headed by the Prime Minister. In this case Kasavubu decided that he could usurp the functions of the executive Head of State as well. So, he appoints a new government and when he found that the Eisenhower regime was vacillating and would not come out in full support of himself he returns to Congo and appoints Colonel Mobutu as the Commander-in-Chief of the forces in order to repress the forces in firm support of the very man who, as the elected, constitutional Prime Minister of the Congo, had asked us to go into the Congo. The Honourable the Prime Minister has always made it very clear to this House that he is a man of peace, that he loves peace, that he loves law, and that he loves order. Well, what law are we going to support in the Congo? The law of the United Nations? That is the moral law? So the apologists claim. But even if that is true, where the moral law conflicts with the constitutional law of the country—what is our position? People who do not take a stand are often accused of having no stand at all—this is based on the principle of he who does not support is against. That often we hear. Similarly, if we do not support the Constitution in the Congo we must be against it. Who then are we supporting? We are supporting Tshombe. And who is Tshombe? An insurrectionist. And if we support insurrection, we are firmly and illegally against the Constitution of the country. Since this is so, can the Honourable Prime Minister say we are not interfering with the internal affairs of the Congo? Then let me ask this: was or was not Patrice Lumumba a constitutionally elected Prime Minister? Was or was not the Prime Minister of the Congo, Patrice Lumumba, a legally constituted Prime Minister? If not, then the Resolution of the United Nations to go into the Congo on—I wish to stress—on the call of Patrice Lumumba was an illegal act. But if we argue that we went into the Congo because a legally-constituted Government under Patrice Lumumba asked us to go in,

then we must continue to support the legally constituted Government of the Congo. I do not know, nor am I interested in the internal affairs of the Congo, I do not know, nor do I care, how Patrice Lumumba is going to move. But what is obvious is this: that this new Government set up—as it is reported in the papers today—under the premiership of Ileo is not, I wish to emphasise and stress again, is not an elected Government. It is an appointed Government by the self-appointed usurper of the popular will, President Kasavubu, self-appointed because he had been removed from office by Lumumba who, when he did so, did so as the legally elected Prime Minister of the Congo.

Now, Malaya has always said, “We stand for democracy, we stand for Constitution, we stand for human rights.” Let me ask the Honourable the Prime Minister what does he mean by “democracy”. “Democracy”, as one famous President of the United States of America said, is a Government of the people, for the people, by the people. “Democracy” does not mean Government of the people by a usurping power for, what it imagines to be, the sake of the people. We have now found out that there is also the danger of civil war breaking out in the Congo. But let us go into the context of the United Nations motion that resolved that the United Nations should send troops into the Congo. I think and the Honourable the Prime Minister must certainly remember—because at that time he did make it a point of telling us—that it was to restore law and order, to make sure that property is not want only destroyed, to make sure that human lives are protected. And, if you will remember, the reason given as to why Malaya went into the Congo was to protect Belgian lives and property, was to protect property of nationals foreign to the Congo—in other words, to protect Belgian property and Belgian lives—and, therefore, it went there to deal with an international situation. It was on that basis that Malaya sent troops. Now, the problem is entirely different. No longer is it the question of protection of Belgian

property and Belgian lives. It is now a question of whether we are going to allow Col. Mobutu, President Kasavubu and Tshombe, using Ileo as the Prime Minister, to continue the controlling of the State of the Congo against popular choice or not. If we are there to support Kasavubu then I say that our Government is supporting dictatorship, is supporting an insurrectionist party, is supporting—what you would call—subversive and evil influences within the State of the Congo.

No doubt I admit that we are a small nation, but at least if we are going into the Congo, we must support and maintain law and order as is understood by us—in other words constitutional law and constitutional order against usurping powers not held by popular choice. The situation in the Congo is unlike the situation in Cuba. If there is a civil war as there has been in Cuba, then it would be an internal matter which is not our affair. In such cases when constitutional means fail, when law and order fails, and when might attempts to achieve right by its own power and then people rebel against such dictatorships, then there must be revolution—leading to internal strife and civil war, which has nothing to do with us as a foreign nation. We have newly emerged, and we must stand clearly as a strong force not subjected to emotionalism or subjected to pressures and to our own weaknesses. We must stand in the Congo as a symbol of a young, a clean, a new, (although small) nation. Therefore, before the Government continues further with the Congo, I think the Government should at least bring this matter up with the United Nations and again ask the United Nations to reconsider its stand on the argument that there has been a failure of the United Nations to take effective steps to protect and preserve the democratic rights of the people of the Congo, and that the Government feels that since that is the position, our duty is to withdraw our troops from the Congo. Thank you.

Dr. Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor (Besut): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong pada usul ini kerana kedudukan Congo sa-bagaimana yang

telah kita sama² dengar dalam surat² khabar cherita-nya nyata-lah kekacauan yang sa-benar-nya di-sana sekarang ini. Kedudukan Congo sa-sudah kita menghantar tentera kita ka-sana ada-lah di-dasarkan kepada kebenaran dan pengiktirafan kita di-atas Kerajaan yang muda ia-itu Kerajaan yang mula² memanggil Bangsa² Bersatu membantu Kerajaan Congo itu. Sekarang keadaannya sudah terbalek. Kerajaan Lumumba yang kita bantu yang meminta bantuan Bangsa² Bersatu dan sa-telah Bangsa² Bersatu menghantarkan bantuan²-nya maka kita dari Malaya telah menghantarkan bantuan dengan keputusan² yang telah kita bahatkan sama dalam Rumah ini. Sekarang Kerajaan Lumumba telah bertukar dengan Kerajaan Mobutu dengan pertukaran Kerajaan lain lagi—tidak payah saya sebutkan perkara itu kerana sama² kita ma'alum, dan nyata-lah usaha United Nations di-sana telah gagal kerana itulah kita dalam Rumah ini juga telah memandang dan membawa usul supaya kita kurangkan tentera kita yang dihantar ka-sana dengan jalan itu kita dapat mengkaji perkembangan di-Congo itu.

Sekarang apa yang sudah saya katakan dahulu itu pun sudah bertukar, terbalek dan pada masa itu pun dua Kerajaan telah mula menarek tenteranya dari Congo dan sekarang ini banyak lagi Kerajaan lain yang telah menarek tentera-nya. Dalam kegagalan Bangsa² Bersatu di-Congo di-atas dasar Kerajaan dan di-atas dasar keputusan United Nations kepada negeri itu sekarang ini, kita pula menghantar tentera tambahan lagi ka-sana. Saya sangat berasa dukachita mengenai perkara ini yang Kerajaan lain telah menarek tentera-nya. Sekarang sa-olah² dengan kekacauan itu kita menyertai pula dengan kekacauan yang melawan kepada Kerajaan yang sah yang dipimpin oleh Lumumba yang dia sekarang ini dalam tahanan penjara.

Mr. Speaker: Dalam usul yang dihadapan ini tidak ada menyebutkan fasal hendak menghantar tentera kita lagi ka-Congo. Dalam usul ini minta ditarek balek tentera yang ada di-sana. Itu tentera yang ada di-sana kalau tidak ada keamanan dan amanah-nya itu tidak ada dalam usul ini.

Dr. Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor: Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya buat ini sa-bagai satu mithal-nya yang menunjukkan bahawa sepatut-nya dalam perkara ini Kerajaan kita lebeh berchermat lagi dalam mengambil langkah bantuan² kita ka-Congo itu. Kita bertujuan hendak memberi keadaan bantuan kita itu maka sepatut-nyalah usaha ini kita putuskan bersama, kita setuju kan dan dapat-lah kita mengkaji kembali kedudukan bantuan kita di-Bangsa² Bersatu itu dengan adanya bertambah lagi pehak Kerajaan lain yang telah menarek tentera-nya, kechuali-lah Bangsa² Bersatu itu dengan tentera kita di-sana dapat menegakkan kembali demokrasi berparlimen yang penoh menjalankan dan menegakkan keamanan, ketenteraman dalam negeri itu.

The Minister of Justice (Tun Leong Yew Koh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am astounded that a lawyer of the standing and experience of the Honourable and learned Member for Menglembu should adopt the quite fantastic stand he does today. Has he never read Part VIII of the Criminal Procedure Code? Is he wholly unaware of the rule of law or

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order—I do not like to interrupt an august Member as the Honourable the Minister of Justice, but is he entitled to speak in this House? (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Boleh.) I am asking for a ruling. I am not denying him his right.

Mr. Speaker: Saya beri amaran kuat pada Ahli² Yang Berhormat, Jika sa-orang meminta "ruling" daripada Tuan Speaker, tidak-lah boleh orang lain beri "ruling", melainkan Speaker sendiri. Kalau ada orang lain hendak jadi Speaker—boleh-lah dudok sini (*Ketawa*).

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: I ask for your ruling as to whether he can speak on a matter not referring to his Department.

Mr. Speaker: The ruling is that he can take part in the debate, but he cannot vote. Please proceed.

Tun Leong Yew Koh: He tends to argue on quasi legal and spurious

quibble. Surely, the whole purpose of the United Nations Organisation is to prevent, or at least mitigate the effects of warfare under whatever name it is. We are trying to establish under the rule of law a family of nations, which have not only rights but also obligations.

Let us take our little community in Malaya. This may come as a surprise to the Honourable and learned gentleman that in this country it is the duty of male civilians to assist the custodians of public order, if called upon to do so, to prevent or surpress an affray. It is open to a Magistrate or Senior Police Officer, if he thinks that the public peace is likely to be jeopardised to call upon male citizens *ex circumstibus*, those standing around, to assist in the maintenance of law and order; in circumstances which are extreme Magistrates can call in military power to quell an affray.

Now, Sir, the Congolese authorities have lost control for reasons for which, perhaps, they are only very slightly responsible, and the United Nations has been asked to intervene to safe lives and property. So, is this not a perfectly ordinary common law practice? Are we not as Malaysians, as one of the family of nations, under a moral obligation to assist to the best of our ability? I suggest that we are. We are not taking sides in an internal dispute. All that we are doing is to prevent disorder, so that the Congolese may make out their own destiny in an atmosphere of sanity. We are not dictating a policy—we are completely impartial. I note that the Honourable and learned Member by implication at least has taken sides. His battle anthem is probably:

"Hark the herald Engel sing Patrice Lumumba is just the thing."

It is only right that we should support the United Nations Organisation. We rely on it for our own protection. It may not have escaped the notice of the Honourable and learned Member that various nations, which are now withdrawing their support, are just the ones who have in the past been loudest and most persistent pleaders for United Nations' help. If they wish to evade their responsibility, that is

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, the Honourable Member is reading his speech, and it is quite obvious that he wrote it out even before he heard my speech. (*Laughter*).

Tun Leong Yew Koh: If they wish to evade their responsibility (*Laughter*), it is up to their natural conscience—I mean no criticism. We have had a lot of help, one way or another, from the United Nations, and we are under obligations. In matters of this sort, one way traffic might commend itself to the Honourable and learned Member, but it certainly does not commend itself to me. By defeating this irresponsible motion, in which the Honourable and learned Member is in the position of Satan rebuking sin, this House will show its disgust.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not intend to speak on this debate, but having heard the last speaker, the Honourable the Minister of Justice, I feel that I have to speak. The Honourable Minister is supposed to be and, in fact, is the Minister of Justice, but from the speech made just now, this country will know what kind of Minister of Justice we have and what kind of justice this country can expect under his administration.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, reference has been made to the Criminal Procedure Code of this country—to Part VIII of the Criminal Code of this country, to police action, to Magistrates having the right to request private citizens to assist in the maintenance of law and order when an affray takes place. It is beyond my comprehension to know why and what Part VIII of the Criminal Procedure Code has got to do with Lumumba, Kasavubu and Colonel Mobutu in the Congo. If the Honourable the Minister of Justice can compare the situation in the Congo with Part VIII of the Criminal Procedure Code, which I assure you I know much better than he does, then I say justice in this country certainly is going to suffer a very very great deal. Confidence in the administration of justice has been shaken, and the speech delivered will shake it much more.

Sir, let us now see what are the facts in the Congo. We are told that the very people who are withdrawing troops from the Congo are the very people who had been asking for United Nations assistance from time to time, or intervention from time to time. Does it mean, therefore, that these persons are going to be slaves to the United Nations? These nations which have withdrawn their troops from the Congo are nations with a backbone, are nations with a mind of their own; when they say that something is wrong with the United Nations Command, when they say that something is improper in the Congo, they have the self-respect and decency, and the courage to say, "We are not going to be tools of the United Nations, or the Rockefellers of America, or the Belgians." And I say that Malaya should have that backbone, because no matter what anybody tries to say, no matter what camouflage you try to apply over the situation in the Congo, one thing is clear—that the presence of United Nations troops in the Congo is serving only one purpose and that is to oppress and suppress the civilians of the Congo, the people of the Congo, and to prop up a regime, a dictatorship under Kasavubu and Colonel Mobutu. However, the Honourable the Minister of Justice says that the United Nations is right. The Minister of Justice says to this House, to this nation, that Malaya should go on keeping her force in the Congo under those circumstances. Can anybody in his senses agree with such a proposal? We would have expected a Minister, sitting on the Ministerial Bench, at least to say whether there are any steps that can be taken, whether there is any situation in the Congo which is not right. But this Minister did not say that. He says that everything is nice; everything is very good; there is nothing wrong in the Congo; the United Arab Republic is wrong, Indonesia is wrong, all other countries are wrong, India is wrong—they are all communist sympathisers or communist-inspired and are getting their instructions from Soviet Russia.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, let us not lose the sense of balance. As has been said by

the Honourable Mover of the motion and by the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat, there is only one constitutionally constituted Government in the Congo, that is the Government of Patrice Lumumba. If Malaya is going to intervene in the Congo under the United Nations Command, it must be to see that the Government of Patrice Lumumba is re-established in the Congo and with no other purpose. If Malaya sends her troops or lets her troops remain in the Congo for any other purpose, then Malaya is doing the greatest disservice to democracy, to the principles of freedom which this Government so often preaches but which this Government so often violates in this country itself.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No!

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: You say "No"—and I am not surprised you say "No" because the Minister of Justice sits there and has given us an example as to his indication of justice—we are not surprised that, to the Alliance Government, what they are doing is justice, what they are doing is democracy, what they are doing is in the cause of freedom, and no wonder they support the stand of the United Nations in the Congo. I am not surprised, and I do not think this nation will be surprised. It may be very nice to say "Our boys are in the Congo, our boys are in the front line doing service for the world in the Congo", but they are not doing a service—they are doing a disservice. They are not to be blamed. The Government of this country is to be blamed. The Government should have, long before this motion came up to this House, examined the situation itself, and the Government should have introduced such a motion to sound the views of this Parliament. That was not done. And I say that we of the Opposition here are in full support of this motion. We say in the interests of world peace, in the interests of the dignity of this nation and in the interests of the dignity of all freedom-loving nations of the world, this House must give full support to this motion.

The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Dato' V. T.

Sambanthan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have had this morning a resolution, which seeks to say many things at the same time, and which ultimately turns out to be negative quite puerile in intention. The Mover, in moving this resolution, ultimately said that the right things for the United Nations to do, would be to chase out Colonel Mobutu, militarily occupy the country, and do what we want. Now, when he said that, I do not know if he knew the principle and the intent of the United Nations. If the United Nations should take sides, if it had to chase out one and put in another, then I believe its rule 2 (7) has got to be radically altered.

The United Nations clearly does not want to interfere in the internal affairs of a country, but yet, let us look and see what happens in the case of Congo. In the case of the Congo, there was a breakdown; there was a danger that it might be dragged into the cold war, and ultimately into a hot war—all that could be prevented by the United Nations sending its forces there—forces from various countries, and in particular the smaller nations. If Malaya has sent its troops, and if those troops have—as they indeed have—behaved in an exemplary manner in doing what they have been asked to do, then they have brought glory to this nation in that we have played, so soon after Independence, a primary and important role in the United Nations in its task of establishing peace within the Congo.

Now, they say that nothing has been done; that the United Nations just sits by; Hammarskjöld does not do anything; and in fact Congo is getting from bad to worse. Possibly, the Honourable Mover has not heard of the 18-nation Advisory Committee on the Congo; nor has he heard of the 11-member United Nations Conciliation Commission on which this country has a member; that they have been in that country and they are, in fact, studying it carefully; that they are there to advise us if anything goes wrong. Now, these are basic facts which they have got to remember.

Sir, you and I—all of us—have known, how soon after the Japanese left this country in 1945, and before the British could take over, there was

an outbreak of lawlessness all over the country, and we do know that in some places, in some towns, the existence of the Indian National Army prevented the mass murder of the people. This outbreak was there, just for three weeks. The existence of an army, the mere presence of an army, prevented wholesale murder, and that is an example we have had in this country. The existence of the military and in other places—Japanese forces,—all these, prevented mass murder being continued and being increased in various parts of the country.

Now, in the case of the Congo, the Honourable Mover said that we sent our troops on the 29th September—according to the resolution of the 29th September—and that for the past four months nothing much has really happened. The Congo, as the Honourable Member should think and contemplate, is a country of 13 million people—a very large territory. We have sent about 600 soldiers, and unless he thinks that the sending by us of 600 soldiers will completely police a country, will bring peace to that country, then I fail to understand how he can really take up the stand to expect quick results. A nation in turmoil is really a nation in turmoil. Congo, as you know, has had many, many years of bad Belgian rule. Let us face that fact of very many years of bad Belgian rule. Nearly 40 or 50 years ago, we know, that the people there were shot indiscriminately with private arms; and we know later that even in their colleges that they would prevent Congolese becoming doctors or becoming lawyers or taking up certain other professions. These things, in a big way, prevented the Congolese having professional men at the top and there are no civil servants to take over the government. Then all of a sudden, more in a fit of spite than anything else, we have this freedom granted to the Congo in a manner meant to tell: "Look, we know what a mess you will make." The Belgians themselves have, I am afraid, to take a large part of the blame for the difficult circumstances prevailing in the Congo now. It was at this particular moment that the United Nations called for soldiers, and we sent

our own soldiers. If we had not sent them, what would have happened? As I said earlier, certain big powers may have moved in and there would have been a very bad situation. Now, the Honourable Mover said that, if there had been no United Nations, if we were to withdraw all our troops, there would have been bloodshed, and he would rather prefer that the people should decide for themselves what sort of rule they want; and then he further said that history has a record of these things—history has a record of civil wars. I am afraid that he has not studied history—he does not know contemporary history. Contemporary history has a clear record that if the Congo were to be left in its present situation, a situation far worse than the Spanish war would take place—ininitely worse. The whole African continent will be embroiled in the cold war hotting up. You would have Tshombe getting his supply of guns; you would have Mobutu getting his supply of guns; and all the weak groups getting their supplies of guns; and with the volunteers coming in, the situation in the whole African continent would ultimately be turned into turmoil and bloodshed.

Sir, the Honourable Member, possibly feels that it would be infinitely better for the whole African continent to be burnt, to be pillaged and to be engulfed in this fire than anything else. I am afraid that as a young nation, as a nation which has got its freedom, as a responsible nation, whatever the opposition may say—e.g. our Government being dictatorial—as a responsible nation, we have been fortunate enough that in our Prime Minister we have one who had that foresight to think right; when we felt that this was an opportunity, a challenge, a duty this country had to perform—a challenge to this country in that, if the situation in the Congo is to be resolved, if it is to be improved—then, only the smaller nations can do it. The militarily powerful nations cannot and should not do it, simply because, the entry of one would bring in the entry of another and that would mean pandemonium and confusion worse confounded. Therefore, Sir, I feel that rather than pursue the

suggestion made by the Honourable Mover of this resolution, this House should throw it out. You read in the papers yesterday of further troops being sent to the Congo. The House should support this move. We have got to support the United Nations at this very, very important juncture. If we do not send troops, what then is Hammarskjöld to work with? Is he to recite Mantras. Is he to go down on his knees himself to Colonel Mobutu? Will that help? It will only mean that the U.N. would be absolutely puerile, ineffective and negative. This is the first big challenge that the United Nations has had in restoring peace and progress in a country. If more and more nations were to send their troops, the position could be resolved. But if each nation sending troops places its own dictates to the U.N. "you accept my dictates, or I won't send troops" it is going to be very, very difficult. I am sure that each nation would have its own outlook on the problem. If one says "do this, I will send my troops", the other will say "do that, I will send our troops." The proper solution would be for all of us to send troops, in particular for the smaller nations, and in view of the fact that you have the United Nations Conciliation Commission right on the spot, always looking into the Congo, you are not in fact giving them a blank cheque. You send your soldiers, you have a man in the Commission; you investigate the whole thing day after day, week after week and you know there is some progress, you know that slowly out of this tangle, out of this cauldron you find something good coming up.

In the ultimate analysis, Sir, I would like to say that history would record years later how this small nation of our's to its glory sent its troops at a moment when the world was uncertain of itself and sent its troops in leadership of the others, and in that leadership that we were able to save a nation called Congo, that the U.N. fulfilled itself and justified its functions. (*Applause*).

Enche' Yong Woo Ming (Sitiawan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the motion before us presents a challenge; indeed, it is a great one.

In the course of this debate we have heard much about the trouble in the Congo. The United Nations troops have come up for a lot of criticisms in the daily news. To say that the United Nations troops did not carry out their duties, in the words of the Honourable Mover, to protect and preserve the democratic rights of the people of Congo, is unfair and uncalled for. Sir, let us admit that in the beginning the trouble in Congo was started by internal elements and by the interference of foreign powers, directly or indirectly. This brought in the United Nations troops, and they have in fact done a wonderful job, in view of the conditions they are subjected to. It might be that the Honourable Member from Menglembu has in mind that because a few nations have given notice to withdraw their troops, Malaya should follow suit. Mr. Speaker, Sir, in view of the chaos in the Congo, to shirk from our duty and to withdraw our troops from the Congo would be doing the Congolese, and even the human race as a whole, a great wrong. It is just like abandoning your friend when he is between the devil and the deep blue sea. Our resourceful the Honourable the Prime Minister a few days back had expressed the intentions of our Government—his expression of our goodwill to all the needy people shows his wisdom and generosity—that even in their trouble, the Malayan people will always remember them.

Sir, in conclusion I would like to say that as our Government is one of the members of the United Nations, we should carry out our duty unselfishly and impartially. The motion moved by the Honourable Member from Menglembu is selfish and childish (*Laughter*). Thank you.

Enche' Abdul Rauf bin Abdul Rahman (Krian Laut): Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya suka hendak berchakap sedikit berkenaan dengan satu usul yang di-kemukakan oleh wakil dari Menglembu ia-itu meminta Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu supaya menarek balek Pasokan² Khas Persekutuan Tanah Melayu yang berada di-Congo pada masa ini kerana kata Ahli Yang Berhormat itu ada-lah Bangsa² Bersatu telah gagal dalam menjalankan

tugas-nya untuk keselamatan di-Congo. Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu menghantar Pasokan Khas-nya daripada Tanah Melayu ka-Congo itu pertama-nya ia-lah kerana Persekutuan Tanah Melayu telah menjadi satu daripada negeri yang menjadi ahli dalam Pertubuhan Bangsa² Bersatu dan dengan menjadi ahli dalam pertubuhan itu sudah tetap-lah ahli²-nya itu patoh kepada undang² Pertubuhan Bangsa² Bersatu dan juga mempertahankan Piagam Bangsa² Bersatu.

Sa-bagaimana yang di-katakan oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat dari pehak pembangkang yang menyokong chadangan atau pun usul ini ia-itu mengatakan Bangsa² Bersatu sudah gagal dalam menjalankan tugas²-nya di-Congo sana. Di-sini saya suka menyatakan jikalau sa-benar²-nya tugas² Bangsa² Bersatu yang bersangkutan dengan Congo itu telah gagal maka tidak dapat tidak pada fikiran saya bukan satu ratus, bukan satu ribu bahkan berpuluh² ribu ra'ayat Congo yang telah mati pada masa ini, tetapi dengan sebab bijak pandai-nya Bangsa² Bersatu menghantar Setia-Usaha Agong-nya ka-Congo dan menjalankan tugas-nya di-Congo maka beberapa banyak nyawa daripada bangsa² Congo itu telah terselamat sa-hingga pada hari ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi ia-itu pasokan askar Persekutuan Tanah Melayu yang di-hantar ka-Congo itu, bukan sahaja menunaikan kewajipan-nya sa-bagai ahli Bangsa² Bersatu tetapi juga hendak menunjukkan kepada dunia di-atas kemegahan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dan juga hendak menunjukkan kepada dunia keberanian perajurit² negeri ini yang bukan sahaja untuk mempertahankan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu daripada serangan musuh tetapi berani juga menyembarang laut untuk mempertahankan atau menjaga keamanan satu² negeri supaya jangan menjadi purak-puranda.

Saya suka, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menarek perhatian Dewan ini ia-itu sa-tahu saya hanya dua orang sahaja dalam Dewan ini yang ada mempunyai anak yang berkhidmat dalam pasokan

askar kita di-Congo pada masa ini. Sa-orang

Mr. Speaker: Itu tidak ada kena-mengena dengan usul ini. Jangan di-panjangkan.

Enche' Abdul Rauf bin Abdul Rahman: Saya hendak memberi pandangan

Mr. Speaker: Siapa yang ada anak di-sana tidak ada kena-mengena dengan usul ini.

Enche' Abdul Rauf bin Abdul Rahman: Pada pendapat saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, usul yang di-bawa oleh sahabat saya Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Menglembu tidak patut di-terima oleh Dewan ini, dan bagi diri saya sendiri sa-bagaimana yang saya telah katakan untuk kebaikan nama Persekutuan Tanah Melayu, saya membangkang usul sahabat saya Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Menglembu ini.

Enche' Mohamed Yusof bin Mahmud (Temerloh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, usul yang di-hadapan kita ia-lah untuk Majlis ini memaksa Kerajaan kita menarek askar²-nya yang di-Congo itu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, marilah kita balek sa-mula, ia-itu apa-kah sebab-nya Kerajaan kita menghantar askar² ini ka-sana, ia-lah oleh sebab Kerajaan kita menjadi ahli Bangsa² Bersatu, dan keputusan daripada Bangsa² Bersatu meminta bantuan untuk menyelamatkan negeri Congo daripada huru-hara baik dalam negeri mahu pun di-luar negeri. Dalam negeri Congo itu ada bertelingkah di-antara beberapa puak dari dalam negeri dan jua luar negeri. Yang di-takutkan ia-lah kuasa besar yang menyembelah di-sa-belah pehak dalam negeri itu, sebab negeri Congo itu ia-lah satu negeri yang kaya dengan galian. Maka dengan dua sebab ini-lah dengan permintaan daripada negeri² Afro-Asian menghantar askar²-nya ka-Congo supaya kedua² perkara ini dapat di-hindarkan di-negeri itu. Sa-lepas beberapa bulan kemudian kita mendengar negeri² Afro-Asian yang menganjorkan menghantar askar² itu menyuarakan tidak puas hati-nya, dan hendak menarek balek atau sudah menarek balek askar²-nya. Negeri² Afro-Asian telah menyuarakan di-luar

untuk hendak menarek balek askarnya, sa-patut-nya-lah perkara itu dipulangkan kepada Pertubohan Bangsa² Bersatu supaya mengambil satu keputusan atas fikiran yang telah disuarakan itu.

Kita ada-lah satu bangsa dan negeri yang ada mempunyai maruah, oleh sebab kita hendak menjaga maruah kita dan tanggung jawab kita kepada Bangsa² Bersatu, maka tidak-lah 'adil yang kita mesti menarek diri dengan tidak mendapat satu keputusan yang di-buat oleh Pertubohan Bangsa² Bersatu atau Majlis Keselamatan Bangsa² Bersatu.

Yang sa-benar-nya apa² perkara yang terjadi di-dalam negeri Congo itu bukan-lah kita hendak mengambil tahu atau kita hendak menyembelah kamana² pehak, chuma sa-lagi Bangsa² Bersatu berkehendakkan ahli²-nya memikul keputusan yang di-buat-nya, maka sa-lagi itu-lah saya rasa Kerajaan kita tegas ia-itu askar kita mesti berada di-Congo untuk menjalankan tugas-nya. Sungguh pun penchadang ada mengatakkan di-hujung di-usul ini.

“ . . . effective steps are taken . . . ”

saya perchaya kerana saya mendapat berita daripada surat khabar ia-itu Majlis Keselamatan Bangsa² Bersatu akan membincangkan perkara ini pada bulan hadapan, dan sa-harus-nya-lah pehak yang tidak puas hati atas askar-nya di-Congo itu dapat menyuarakan di-dalam majlis itu, dan sa-lepas itu saya rasa apa² keputusan yang di-buat oleh Majlis Keselamatan itu, saya perchaya negeri kita akan bersama mengikutinya.

The Minister of Internal Security (Dato' Dr. Ismail): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in rising to intervene in this debate, I would, first of all, like to say that the success of the Alliance Party and the Government is, of course, due to our own work and partly due to the inconsistency of our Opposition. Now, the Honourable the Mover of the Motion paid a tribute to the Government in giving priority to the motion, but, on the other hand, the Member for Ipoh accused the Government for not having the courage to move such a motion in this House.

Sir, I would like to inform the House that originally it was the intention of the Government to put in a motion in regard to the question of Congo. However, when we considered the Orders of the Day and found that a Member of the Opposition had tabled a motion, which we thought would form the basis of a debate on this question of Congo, like a democratic Government we felt that we should not steal the thunder from the Opposition, and far be it from us of the Alliance Government to shirk our responsibility to the country and even to the Opposition.

Now, Sir, before I go on to criticise the speech of the Honourable Member, I would like just in passing to make a remark on the speech made by the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat. I do not think that I need dwell too much on his speech other than to correct one legal mistake and also to draw the attention of the House to the fact that his speech is a good example of the attitudes held by some people as to the cause of the chaos in the Congo.

Sir, the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat has mentioned that a Prime Minister is the Chief Executive of a State. Now, for his own edification, I would like to inform him—although he is not here, but no doubt Members of his Party would convey it to him—the fact that a Prime Minister is not elected. He is constitutionally appointed by the Head of State. A Prime Minister is not the appointed Head of State. I would like to draw his attention to Articles 39 and 40 of our Constitution. Article 39 says, “The executive authority of the Federation shall be vested in the Yang di-Pertuan Agong, but Parliament may by law confer executive functions on other persons.” And Article 40 (2) says, “The Yang di-Pertuan Agong may act in his discretion in the performance of the following functions, that is to say—(a) the appointment of a Prime Minister.” So, Sir, having disposed of that rather very involved speech by the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat, I would like now to turn my attention to the speech of the Honourable Mover of the motion.

Sir, I would like in dealing with the speech of the Honourable Mover of the

motion to take it in three parts. In the first part he dealt with the question of the causes of the present chaos in the Congo. I am not going to dwell too long on this problem as to the reasons or the causes of the present state of chaos in the Congo, but would like to criticise some of the remarks made by him.

Firstly, he said that Europeans are the cause of the trouble—one of the causes if not the chief cause of the trouble in the Congo and, therefore they should get out. Now, Sir, this is a very general statement to make, and if we carry it to the extreme, I think, it will go against the principle that we have been trying to defend and for which we have condemned South Africa. After all, an European although he may not have the colour, being white—white is a colour too, I presume—we should not discriminate against him in an independent country. It is a different matter if those Europeans are indulging in subversion in trying to make the country becoming once again a colony. But to say that all Europeans in the Congo should come out, because they are the cause of the trouble is, I think, a bit too far-fetched.

Then, again, he mentioned that one of the reasons why the Congo had deteriorated to such a state as it is at present is that it is a nation of tribes and ruled according to the law of savagery. These are very unkind words to use to a very newly independent country. After all, we say that self-government is better than good government, i.e., if we want to adhere to the principle that it is better to have self-government however bad than to have a good government under a colonial power. I think that is our stand. We think that we should fight against colonialism. We think that however bad self-government is, it is preferable to good government under colonialism. Therefore, I think it is unkind for the Honourable Member for Menglembu to refer to the Congo as a nation of tribes and ruled by the law of savagery. To be generous, even if what the Honourable Member says were true, would it not be a good thing for us to extend a kindly hand to this nation of savages under the law of savagery to become

civilised taking its place among the community of nations? After all, the Congo is independent. We, who have by the Grace of God after our independence enjoyed all the good things of an independent nation, should not we extend a helping hand to this poor war torn country. Congo, inhabited by a nation of tribes and ruled by the law of savagery?

Further, he goes on to say that one of the other causes of the present chaos in the Congo is the interference of United Nations activities by capitalists, such as those from America and Belgium. Sir, is it by implication that the communists are not involved in this question of the Congo? Are the communists acting like angels in the Congo? I am not going to defend these capitalists. Probably, they interfered in the affairs of the Congo. But I think that wherever there is capitalism there is communism too, because without these two there will be no cold war in this world. Probably, this interference may be—and I suspect it very strongly—initiated by the communists and thereby encouraging the capitalists to join in.

Then he goes on to say of the various causes of the chaotic condition in Congo, and he goes on to condemn the United Nations. This is where I would like to cross swords with him very strongly. Now, the first thing he says is that in Congo now force is gaining the upper hand. I have no doubt, Sir, that force is being used there, but to say that force is gaining the upper hand is an exaggeration, because if force is really gaining the upper hand there, then I think that force will be only of one kind—one that we know so well. But the fact that the United Nations is there that kind of force—and I do not think I need be very modest in describing this force as the Communist force—is frustrated by the presence of the United Nations there.

Now, he considers the work of the United Nations as a failure—and in fact he used that phrase in moving his motion. I think, Sir, here again he is exaggerating things too much. It may be that we are not satisfied with the steps taken by the United Nations, but to term it a failure is a very gross

exaggeration, for as my colleague the Minister of Works has said, if it were not for the presence of the United Nations in the Congo that country not only would be under the law of savagery, but it would be worse than what has been described by the Honourable Mover of the motion. Sir, the fact remains that within its terms of reference the United Nations has done some good work in the Congo. It may not be 100 per cent effective, but it has, I think, managed to contain the situation in the Congo. And he goes on to say that the United Nations is being used by capitalists. Sir, he is a very bold man who dare say that the United Nations can be used by any power, because the United Nations by nature consists of nearly 100 members and no nation can make use of the United Nations without a resolution approved by the United Nations itself. Probably what he meant to say was that these capitalists were trying to sabotage the work of the United Nations in the Congo. Well, that is entirely a different matter, but to say that the United Nations is being used by the capitalists, I am sorry to say, is to display his ignorance of the work of the United Nations.

And then his Honourable colleague the Member for Ipoh says that Malaya has become the tool of the United Nations in the Congo. Sir, if we are the tool of the United Nations in the Congo we are proud of becoming that tool (*Applause*) because our troops are there to help a struggling nation—to use the words of the Mover—a nation of tribes ruled by lawless savagery. We are there helping to restore law and order and giving that newly independent country a helping hand.

The Honourable Member for Ipoh said that the United Nations force is used to prop Kasavubu, to prop dictatorship in the Congo. Well, Sir, if that were true, there would be no more problems in the Congo, there would be no withdrawals of the troops from Congo now by all these other nations who, by implication, I presume, must be supporting the other contender in the Congo. The Honourable Member is very ungenerous when he says that our

boys are doing a disservice to the country by going to the Congo, whilst the Member for Menglembu was just the opposite. He was very generous: he praised our boys for having gone there. Now, what are we to make from these conflicting statements? I suppose because of these conflicting statements, because of all these inconsistencies among Members of the Opposition, the glory of the Alliance shines greater. (*Applause*).

Sir, I come now to the very section of his speech which I think on the whole is very, very constructive, although in some parts I would like to criticise. For example, although I think it is a very common desire to effect quick settlements, I am afraid it cannot be done by the United Nations to ensure peace and order by military occupation of the Congo. Now, the United Nations act on three principles: (i) by conciliation, (ii) by mediation, and (iii) by reconciliation.

I think at the moment it is in the stage of trying to mediate, and, as the Honourable Prime Minister will tell the House, it is working towards a stage whereby it will be able to reconcile to the principle of reconciliation in the Congo. He suggested that there should be a fresh resolution in the United Nations for more effective steps. I agree with him, and I think he knows that those things are being done in the United Nations. But what I personally quarrel with this motion is the fact that in the first part it says: "This House views with grave concern the failure of the United Nations to take effective steps, . . .". I do not think I can agree with him on that; to term it a failure, as I said just now, is a very gross exaggeration. May be we would desire more effective steps to be taken. But that, as I said just now, is being done in the United Nations.

The second part I quarrel with because I interpret it as an implied threat to the United Nations—that is, unless it take more effective steps we shall withdraw our troops. I think our attitude should be that we should urge the United Nations to take more effective steps, but so long as they are required by the United Nations and so

long as we in this House think that they will be doing a service, doing its work in trying to restore law and order to the Congo, I think we should keep our troops there. At the same time we should urge the United Nations to take more effective steps, but should not shirk or abandon our responsibility, the responsibility which this House has accepted when we first sent our troops to the Congo. At that time we did not seek any terms; we knew that the presence of our troops were required urgently by the United Nations and we responded to that call.

So, Sir, while there are many features of this motion that I personally like, there are also the implied things which I particularly dislike. Sir, before I finish my speech I would like again to say how sad I feel that my really sincere appreciation—I must say I am not trying to be patronising—of the speech of the Honourable Mover of this motion was thoroughly spoiled by his colleague the Member for Ipoh. *(Applause)*.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar (Kuala Trengganu Selatan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat is a very able Member of this House and is also a very able member of his own profession, but I was surprised that he should have raised certain constitutional issues, about which he should have known better, and I would advise him to study the elementary principles of our own Constitution before he says what he did say, in that the executive authority of the Federation is vested in the Prime Minister. Now, Article 39 of our Constitution says: "The executive authority of the Federation shall be vested in the Yang di-Pertuan Agong", not in the Prime Minister. I am unaware whether the Congo today has a Constitution or not. We have been told by the Honourable Mover of this motion that the present President of the Congo, Mr. Kasavubu, was elected to that post by his Prime Minister, Mr. Patrice Lumumba. That may be a fact, I do not know. But, on the other hand, we have the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat who said that the President of the Congo was a self-appointed man. Two contradictory

statements! Now, assuming that the Congo has not at the present moment a Constitution, what is the position? Without a Constitution to guide the administration, then all powers would normally vest in the President, Mr. Kasavubu. If there is a Constitution, then he would be bound by the provisions of that Constitution. It may be that Mr. Kasavubu was elected by Mr. Patrice Lumumba. But having once been elected as President, he has the powers which Mr. Lumumba has not and therefore it is within his discretion to appoint a new Prime Minister if he so thinks, and that is exactly what he has done at the present time, according to press reports.

Now the Federation Government is a strong supporter of the United Nations, and in response to a call from the United Nations, the Yang di-Pertuan Agong, I presume on the advice of our Prime Minister or Cabinet, sent troops from this country into the Congo for the purpose of supporting the United Nations. The United Nations on its part is pledged to uphold peace and good government in the Congo. It has no mandate to interfere in the internal policies or in the internal administration of the Congo itself, and yet we heard the Mover of this motion advocating that the United Nations should install a military dictatorship over the country. That is entirely contrary to the pledges of the United Nations itself and I fail to see how the United Nations can interfere in the internal policies or the internal administration of the Congo. This motion before this House views with grave concern the failure of the United Nations to take effective steps after the arrival of Malayan troops in the Congo. Now, was there an undertaking from this Government to the United Nations that the United Nations should take effective steps immediately after the arrival of the Malayan contingent in the Congo, or was it that this Government agreed to send troops to assist the United Nations to keep peace and order in that country?

The second half of this motion calls on the Government to withdraw Malayan troops from the Congo unless more effective steps are taken. Now, what are those effective steps we are

not told, excepting that the Mover of the resolution practically put forward a proposition to this House that the United Nations should install in the Congo a military government, or a military dictatorship. I fail to see, Mr. Speaker, any arguments, either from the Mover or the Seconder or the supporting Members of this House, which can indicate to this House a line of action we should take. It has been a negative motion, although I know the intention is very sincere. But the fact remains that the arguments produced before this House have been of a very negative nature.

The Federation Government is committed to assist the United Nations, and I fail to see how the withdrawal of our troops in the Congo can really assist or better the position as existing in the Congo today. The measure of support for the sending of troops to the Congo has been amply demonstrated in this very country when we look at the size of the *Straits Times* and the *Berita Harian* Cheer Fund which, I believe, has now topped \$50,000 mark. The support given by the people to that Fund is the indication that the population as a whole support the move of this Government to place these troops in the Congo. (Applause). And it would be wrong in my view, in view of that support, for this Government to take action to withdraw its troops just because of the insistence of a few Members of this House. (Applause).

We have, as I said, a responsible Government in this country, a Government which is honour bound to support international commitments, to support the United Nations, and, therefore, in giving that support we should not do anything hasty. Just because the U.A.R. or Morocco or Indonesia may pull out their troops, it does not mean that we should follow suit. I therefore suggest to this House to leave matters as they stand at the moment, because there is no justification for any pulling out of troops at this stage, but to let matters develop in the Congo. Because, if every nation, which is participating in the Congo today, were to pull out its troops, then the very next day there

would be a civil war in the Congo, and probably a continental civil war in the whole of Africa, and maybe a global war. (Applause).

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have no doubt that this motion has been brought to this House with all sincerity. I have also no doubt in my mind that perhaps the Honourable the Mover is not quite aware of the functions of the United Nations. My friend and colleague, the Minister of the Internal Security, has explained to the House the duties of the United Nations, and there is, therefore, no need for me to go back on that. My duty is to enlighten the Honourable Members of this House on the present functions of the United Nations with regard to the Congo. The United Nations, as the Honourable Members will be aware, acts in accordance with the mandate which was given to it, and the mandate which was given to it was moved by the Members of the Afro-Asian Group. I will, perhaps, take the Honourable Members back to the Security Council Session which deliberated on the Congo situation on the 14th of July last. After hearing Mr. Hammarskjöld's report. I now wish to quote here:

"To authorise the Secretary-General to take necessary steps, in consultation with the Government of the Republic of Congo, to provide the Government with such military assistance as may be necessary, until, through the efforts of the Congolese Government with the technical assistance of the United Nations, the National Security Forces may be able, in the opinion of the Government, to meet fully their tasks."

The Honourable Mover, I am sure, will agree with me that the duties of any National Security Force is only to maintain law and order and not to interfere with the internal affairs of that country. The preamble to resolution adopted by the Security Council on 21st July, and the substantive part of the resolution, confirm this view. I quote an extract from the preamble:

"Considering that the complete restoration of law and order in the Republic of Congo would effectively contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security and from the substantive resolution, it appeals to all States to refrain from any action that might intend to impede the restoration of law and order in that country."

Now, the Security Council's resolution adopted on the 9th of August reaffirms this that the United Nations Force in the Congo will not be a party to, or in any way intervene in, or be used to influence the outcome of any internal conflict, constitutionally or otherwise. Further, the soldiers, who went to the Congo, were given an instruction each to the effect that, if I remember aright, they must not, under any circumstances, interfere with anything which is internal. The intention, which has been reiterated time and again, is that the function of the United Nations is purely to maintain peace, law and order in that country in accordance with the mandate that was given to the Secretary-General and no more. And it was under this mandate that the Secretary-General found himself powerless to do what the Honourable Mover of this motion has asked him to do. If, as has been pointed out by the Honourable the Minister of the Internal Security, we find that the mandate has been insufficient, the best thing would be for us to move a motion by which we could strengthen the hands of Mr. Hammarskjöld, and that is exactly what we have done.

Therefore, I welcome this motion today which has enabled me to be in a position to inform the House what we are doing in support of the United Nations. The new motion which has been moved on the 6th of this month by the Secretary-General, which I would like to quote here for the benefit of the Honourable Members, reads as follows:

"The Secretary-General has asked for a strong mandate essential for the insulation of the Congo from all forms of foreign interference, Belgian interference was very much in his mind. All factions of the Congo Army are to be insulated from political activity and relieved of their normal duties of maintaining law and order. The United Nations is to undertake the re-organisation and retraining of the Congolese Army and to take full charge of maintaining law and order. Within the condition thus created conciliation can be effected of all political elements."

At the same time, India has put forward a resolution. The resolution of India as has been rightly quoted by the Honourable Mover was to the effect

that all Belgian troops must be withdrawn and everything must be done to prevent their return; and also it suggested the re-establishment of an effective Central Government through the conciliation of all political parties, including Lumumba; release of all political prisoners, especially Lumumba; the big powers to guarantee the insulation of the Congo from the cold war, insulation of all factions of the Congo Army from political life; United Nations to take full responsibility of maintaining law and order. That is why, Sir, that I feel very strongly that while this motion is being moved by the Secretary-General, we should do nothing to weaken the position of the United Nations in the Congo. (*Applause*).

Assuming that just because those other countries have withdrawn or are withdrawing their troops, we should follow suit, what would be the position of the other army of Afro-Asian nations who have gone there on the understanding that the Afro-Asian members of the United Nations have been asked by the United Nations to send their troops? What would be the position of those troops? Exposed to massacre and slaughter by these undisciplined troops of the Congo territory? We feel that once our word has been given, we must not back out. (*Applause*).

We are not only supporting the United Nations but we are at the same time maintaining and upholding the honour of our nation. But if we were to do a cowardly act by withdrawing just because troops of some other countries are withdrawing, I will never be able to defend myself to the people of this country; neither will you, as Honourable Members of this House in whose hands the faith, honour and dignity of our country lie. (*Applause*). You must remember that the function of the United Nations is not only to maintain law and order but also to help the people of the Congo by every possible act and in every possible way to give them security, aids and other help they need.

Now, let us see what aids are being rendered by the United Nations today. Apart from trying to maintain law and order, the United Nations has got their

forces there, their technical men there, in order to carry out health work, agriculture, education and every thing else. In this respect, I may tell Honourable Members that the United Nations specialist agencies have responded admirably and within a short time have been able to get things moving over there. In regard to maintaining, for instance, the health work, they have got all their medical men on the field; the UNESCO also have got their men there and have started opening schools to give education to the children of the Congo where the Belgians have left them without education and without schools; also the FAO is doing good work in agriculture, and the ICAO—that is the technical experts or men of the United Nations, are helping to get transport in that part of the world going, otherwise people would be stranded and will not be able to go anywhere at all. A large number of Congolese today are reported to be dying of starvation and urgent appeals have been made and some countries have responded generously. But many who have given their promise to help with money have not done so. Now can the United Nations be blamed for not fulfilling its mandate? Can it be blamed for ineffectiveness of its work in Congo when these countries in the United Nations who have made promises to the United Nations have not fulfilled their promises?

If we were, for instance, to leave the Congo today, what do you think would be the consequence of it? I can tell you, from information which I have received up to date, that there is not a rat, not a cat or a dog to be found in the Congo, and the next thing that will happen is that they will eat their brothers and friends there. We must make it our duty to prevent such a thing happening in the interest of humanity and that is why I feel that to ask our troops to withdraw will make us commit a crime, which our conscience will never permit us.

Sir, I do not wish to suggest that the implementation of the mandate is a matter which is not fraught with difficulties. The implementation of the mandate would, in the first instance,

require members of the United Nations to agree categorically that Congo is not to be used as a further arena of the cold war—major powers, who are involved, are in all likelihood involved because others are and because of the fear to allow others to steal a march on them. It would be but a natural step to enforce the provision regarding the channelling of all aids through the United Nations rather than through unilateral agreements if all countries are co-operating—but they are not.

We have today also a Reconciliation Commission which has gone to the Congo as agents of the United Nations to examine the affairs there on the spot and to report back to the United Nations. This Commission has already completed its work and it will be sending a report to the United Nations in a very short time; and when this report comes to the United Nations, I am sure it will not be difficult to give a new mandate to the Secretary-General with which he can deal effectively with the forces that are making trouble in the Congo.

With regard to the Government of the Congo today, it was suggested that Lumumba is the recognised Prime Minister there. After the elections, he has had sufficient majority to be returned as Prime Minister, but according to the Constitution of the Congo, the power to appoint a Prime Minister is in the President. Under Article 20 it says, "No act of the Chief of State can have effect if not countersigned by a Minister who by this single act becomes responsible for it." Also under Article 22, it is stated, "The Chief of State Designate can revoke the appointment of the Prime Minister and the Ministers." Mr. Kasavubu, who has revoked the appointment of Lumumba has, as Honourable Members know, appointed another man in his place. So far that is the recognised form of Government in the Congo, and it is for the United Nations to see that whatever Government that is there must be able to function—and that is exactly what the United Nations is doing now.

Mr. Speaker: Are you going to take much longer?

The Prime Minister: I will try to shorten my speech, as there is not very much more.

Mr. Speaker: I will suspend the meeting and you can continue at 2.30 p.m.

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 2.30 p.m.

(*Mr. Speaker in the Chair*)

SITUATION IN THE CONGO

Debate resumed.

Question again proposed.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, since the despatch of the Malayan troops abroad, we have seen open support being given by the United Nations members of various Governments to rival powers in the Congo. We have read in the Press of nations contributing arms and using their own troops in support of one rival faction as against another—and also many nations supported the claim of Lumumba to power. All these are happening at the same time gave adequate cause for concern to the United Nations, and they gave the United Nations ground to suspect their loyalty or the loyalty of their troops. In the circumstances I think it is a good thing that some of those troops at least have decided to withdraw now. If you will remember, the final paragraph of the resolution calls upon all States to refrain from direct or indirect supply of arms and other materials to any of these warring people of the Congo during the period of operation of United Nations forces, excepting that if they wish to do so or give any other help they must do so through the agency of the United Nations. Unfortunately, from reports we know, some of the arms found in the possession of the troops in the Congo have marks, which clearly indicate the origin of the country from which those arms come—in fact, certain African powers, regretfully too, speak about forming an African High Command to render unilateral military aid to the Congo. Now, these are all the things which the United Nations have to face today, and you can imagine from that how seriously impaired is the position

and the authority of the United Nations in that area in which the United Nations troops are working to maintain law and order. While all these threats are going on, there is a very very serious and real threat indeed of a civil war, unless of course the United Nations can prevent it. That is why the United Nations is at this moment sitting in New York trying to work out a plan to prevent it. If the civil war breaks out there, I fear there will be murder, arson and destruction to lives and property such as that which no country in the world has previously experienced.

The Honourable Mover has quite correctly said that the people of the Congo, particularly those in power, those with arms, are still devoid of a sense of proportion, of a sense of responsibility, and are capable of acts of barbarism. Today, if the United Nations were to remove their forces from the Congo, I feel that not only will these events—events which we fear—will happen, but I also fear for the safety of Lumumba himself. The fact that he is alive today is due in a very large measure to the presence of the United Nations forces in the Congo. All that remains to be done today is to wait for the new mandate and for the member countries of the United Nations to support this mandate by giving more troops to Mr. Hammarskjöld with which he can maintain peace and order in that territory. Lip service alone, I feel, is insufficient, as it has always proved to be. If nations, big and small, were to behave in the way we are behaving, I am confident that good sense will prevail among the leaders of the Congolese people. (*Applause*).

Sir, at the time of sending our troops, there were 18,000 combat troops from 18 nations—these are Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Liberia, Malaya, the Mali Federation, Morocco, Nigeria, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia and U.A.R. Now, three nations have withdrawn their troops and have reduced the strength of the United Nations from 18,000 to only 10,000. What can 10,000 troops do, or expected to do, against 30,000 well armed

Congolese troops under those irresponsible leaders? And yet only on the 10th of December, 1960, the President of Ghana sent me a copy of a telegram which he sent to Ceylon—Ceylon has six men there and she has decided to withdraw that six men—and in that telegram the significance of Ghana's stand was shown. I will read to you the relevant part of the telegram:

"I most earnestly appeal to you to reconsider your decision. It is imperative that the United Nations' efforts in the Congo should not be paralysed by inadequate military support at a time when its authority is so seriously being thwarted by the self-styled Colonel Mobutu. In these circumstances, I implore Your Excellency to reconsider your decision. That as long as our troops continue to serve the Congo, I am sure that our combined efforts would help to retrieve the situation. I am confident you appreciate the need and necessity for our continuing to give the fullest support to the United Nations in the present Congo situation."

But I am very sorry to have to tell this House that today I have heard that Ghana is also withdrawing her troops. Having received this telegram we, of course, gave the assurance that not only would we not withdraw our troops but we would do all we could to strengthen our troops there in order to help the United Nations to discharge their duty. That, Sir, shows the fickleness, as you will see, of some of these South-East Asian nations, who made promises to carry out their duty but who at the same time fail to show up well in their first assignment.

As you will understand, the Afro-Asian countries got this assignment to uphold peace and freedom in that country, because it was through the Afro-Asian countries that the United Nations decided to send its force there. I have no doubt that they went there with their flags flying and their drums beating. But they withdrew without having consulted the other nations who are there to do their duty as well, leaving those other nations—like Malaya for instance—insecure. Therefore, I feel that unless we send additional forces to help our own troops, they will be exposed to the greatest danger. It was said by one Member of this house just now that the duty of Malayan troops was to give protection to visiting

V.I.Ps. I would like to tell the Honourable Member that the duty of Malayan troops is not only to give protection to V.I.Ps. but that the United Nations lean very heavily on our troops and have asked them not only to maintain law and order in the Congo but also to protect the Head Office of the United Nations in Congo and guard the properties belonging to the United Nations. At one time they were helped by the Indonesian troops who were stationed with them, but today we have the help of only the Tunisian troops, while Indonesia has withdrawn more than 1,800 men. On the 29th of January, 1961, I received a telegram from the Secretary-General of the United Nations, which reads:

"All reports from Congo stress the excellence of Malayan troops—(Applause)—who are well disciplined, experienced and courageous. I assure you that your contingent is making a major contribution to the United Nations operation in the Congo. (Applause). I know that the provision of military assistance to United Nations by Malaya entails no little sacrifice. It is therefore only because I am confident of your conviction that the United Nations operation in the Congo must not be permitted to fail for the general good as well as the good of the Congo that I now approach you for further assistance. The operation depends upon maintaining the U.N. force in Congo at such strength as to ensure its effectiveness. The repatriation of some contingents and the reduction of others now makes the obtaining of additional troops for replacement a vital necessity. For this reason I urgently appeal to you to consider the provision of another contingent of Malayan troops of such size and composition as you may find possible in addition to those of your forces already serving in Congo. I am confident that this appeal will receive your most serious attention."

Therefore I would like to inform this House that our duty today is to give support and all help that is possible if we regard the United Nations as a force that exists to protect the right of man, particularly the right of small nations like ourselves. Our representative in the United Nations has been asked to support the new resolution in the Security Council, which will give the United Nations more power. But this power without reinforcement from other countries would not be sufficient to disarm the 30,000 well-armed Congolese troops under the many leaders. Therefore, the countries which support

the resolution must at the same time agree to send their forces in sufficient numbers to be able to do the duty they would wish them to do. If on the other hand, the other nations refuse to carry out or discharge their obligations, then I can assure the Members of this House that I will come back here and seek your advice as to what we should do about our troops. At the moment we have undertaken to serve there for one year, but the promise, as I say, is subject, of course, to the condition that other United Nations troops must play their part. If they fail to do so, I will, as I said just now, come back to you. But the suggestion that our troops are there to serve the interests of capitalists is a charge which has no foundation. As my colleague has explained, U.N. does not belong to one side or the other. It is there to serve mankind and the right of man to live as men. The United Nations is non-partisan. So, when a call is made to protect life and property it is our duty to answer the call, and as a new member of the U.N., I endorse what has been said by my friend and colleague that we are there to serve. And we are proud to serve this cause and our duty is to respond to the call of the Secretary-General by sending more troops and we propose to implement the two battalions we already have there, the Fourth Malay Regiment and the Federation Reconnaissance Corps. I, therefore, oppose the motion.

Wan Mustapha bin Haji Ali (Kelantan Hilir): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the motion before us in this House contains two parts. The first part reads, "That this House views with grave concern the failure of the United Nations to take effective steps, after the arrival of the Malayan troops in the Congo, to protect and preserve the democratic rights of the people of the Congo", while the second part, which is quite a reasonable version because it does not ask for the total withdrawal of the troops in the Congo, says that unless more effective steps are taken in the immediate future, our troops should be withdrawn.

Well, after hearing the speeches on this motion—in fact, four Honourable

Ministers spoke on this motion—all I can say, because of the seriousness of this motion, is that the speeches by the Ministers are not within my expectations. (*Laughter*) I mean, it seems that just because the United Nations wants our help, then we must give them.

In fact, one Honourable back-bencher stated, "We should support the United Nations until such time as we are not required." My submission is that we do not know the actual position prevailing in the Congo. We have not received much explanation from the Government side. In fact, Mr. Hammarskjöld, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, on December the 7th, in the Security Council, had explained that the reason for the United Nations' intervention is that its aim is to protect life and property within the Congo. That was the first sentence quoted by Mr. Hammarskjöld, and it seems that the sole aim of the United Nations Forces being sent there is "to protect life and property". Later on, he considered that the United Nations should be in strict neutrality; and later he even admitted in the Security Council that this course given during the Security Council was, in fact, rather firm. I mean that there could be many interpretations—in other words, Mr. Hammarskjöld was complaining because his power was restricted. He could not do much in the Congo. That was the reason why the very person, the Prime Minister, Mr. Lumumba, who had asked the United Nations to help, the very person who called them there, had been ousted.

Sir, in fact, Col. "Mob"—I do not know whether Honourable Members are aware who is Col. "Mob", and I am referring to Col. Mobutu by shortening the name to "Col. Mob" because, from the pictures, the reports and articles in the papers, it seems that he is really a mob—this Col. Mob ruled purely by naked power, with Belgian and American connivance, and the Americans had panicked, thinking that Lumumba was going Communist. If Lumumba, the Legal premier of the Congo, seems to turn Communist, that

is the fault of the United Nations and also that of the Americans.

Sir, the Honourable the Minister of Justice quoted section 8 of the Criminal Procedure Code while discussing this important matter of the Congo, and referred to the powers of the Police and the powers of the Magistrate when there is a riot or civil commotion, and mentioned that every citizen should help to maintain peace, and that where there are riots the Magistrate can command the Police Force and can order the Military Force to go and stop it. No doubt that is quite true. When there is a riot, the Police Force or army can be sent there, but it is up to the officer in charge whether to intervene in the riot or not. No doubt, the Criminal Procedure Code is merely a procedure, and not a rule of law. Let us assume that an A.S.P. has been sent with a bunch of Policemen to intervene in a riot, and the A.S.P. in charge of the Force loses his head and asks his subordinates to open fire; if those Policemen opened fire without realising that the order to open fire was not necessary or if they acted inadvertently, then they could be charged under common law for man-slaughter despite the fact that they had been instructed by their senior officer to do so. So likewise, in this business of the Congo, if the Prime Minister thought fit to send our troops there, when called legally by the elected Prime Minister of the Congo, that is Lumumba, at that stage our troops are legally entitled to remain in the Congo. But once the legal Premier has been thrown out or once the inviter, Mr. Lumumba had asked us to withdraw, and if we still remain there, then we are trespassing on their land, the same as in the case when an occupier of premises invited an Honourable Member into his house, and later there is an argument, and if the occupier informs the invited person to leave the house, and if he does not leave, then there is a trespass. Well, my submission is that, in this particular case, it would be wrong not to help the very person who had invited us to go there.

This question of the Congo is quite serious, and it might go down in history, and our children in due course,

in 20, 30 or 50 years time, may blame the Government in taking such a measure. So, I would propose that in this particular matter—and it would also be to the advantage of the Prime Minister—there should be a poll in the newspapers. Put the facts before the people as to what type of person Lumumba is and as to what type of person Col. Mob is, and have it stated that it was Lumumba who was the legally elected Premier, that he had been arrested, ill-treated and slapped by the troops of Col. Mob, and then ask the ra'ayat in this country whether they want to send our troops or whether we should withdraw them, and if the majority of the ra'ayat approve it, then later on the Prime Minister can give an excuse if our measure becomes a flop.

One Honourable Minister had mentioned about the legality of the President as well as the Prime Minister. He informed us this morning that the Prime Minister can be ousted by the Yang di-Pertuan Agong—or in this case the President—so that the Prime Minister, Mr. Lumumba, was legally dismissed by the President. That is quiet true in the Constitution, but there are practices under the Constitution which are not written. The common practice is that no Prime Minister can be dismissed at the whim and fancy of the President or the Yang di-Pertuan Agong.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think that is the point in issue.

Wan Mustapha bin Haji Ali: I just touched on that briefly because it was mentioned by the Honourable Minister personally.

Dato' Dr. Ismail: Sir, may we know who is the Minister, because what he has just said has not, I think, been spoken by anybody.

Mr. Speaker: (*To Wan Mustapha*) I do not think you need go into it any further.

Wan Mustapha bin Haji Ali: The fact is that the atrocities committed by Col. Mob. are so conspicuous. For instance, the Nigerians, who are very

conservative—even the Nigerians in this case were angry because of the ill-treatment given by Col. Mob. to Lumumba, the legal Premier of the Congo. In fact, I think most Africans nowadays look down on Col. Mob.

Again, there is a lot of complication in this Congo business, because we have read in the *Straits Times* on Tuesday that even the French Government has taken part in this matter—for instance, Colonel Trinquier, who is a colonel in the French Army was sent to reorganise the Katanga armed forces. In fact, it is stated in the *Gazette* that no French officer can take part in such interference, unless he belongs to a member of the Bloc. In spite of that, he was admitted there. There is a decree in the French Government *Gazette* stating that any person who occupies a post in a foreign army or public service, or an internal organisation of which France is not a member—in this case France is not a member—will be liable to lose his French nationality. Later, when one of the aides was asked whether in this particular case this particular Colonel would lose his French nationality, the aide replied, "I would be very surprised if the Colonel lost his French nationality." We can infer from the statement of the A.D.C. that it was a pre-arranged thing by the French Government to send this Colonel to Katanga. In fact, this Colonel stated that the United Nations troops should be withdrawn from all areas where they were not needed to protect lives and property. In other words, the United Nations, which includes our troops, is only regarded as mere policemen. After all, we have learnt from the Government that there are only about 600 of our soldiers in the Congo which has a population of 13,000,000 according to the Minister of Justice, but 30,000,000 according to our Prime Minister—I do not know which is correct. (*Laughter*). I do not know what can 600 of our troops do there. Perhaps, some people might think that after all it is a very small figure; but it is not a question of 600 or 540, it is a question of principle. Even if we send two army officers, two soldiers,

from Malaya and if this mission is illegal, then we will be regarded in years to come by historians as a party to illegality. (*Laughter*). I take it that, as we are not reinstating the elected Prime Minister of Congo, we have no business to be in the Congo.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have heard words from leading political papers and magazines that it has been prophesied that the United Nations operation in the Congo is nearing collapse (*Laughter*), and I can foresee that it will collapse soon and our troops will have to be withdrawn. In fact, this motion should have been put up by the Government, by the Prime Minister himself, months ago and not now. My only complaint is that it is so late after sending so many of our troops. (*Laughter*).

Sir, the question of our troops being there is not a question whether it is under the common law, as the Minister of Justice has stated, but it is whether we have the constitutional right to be there. We have not heard from the Government side what is the Constitution of the Congo. However, we do know that the legally elected Premier is under arrest and is in prison, and it is the responsibility of the United Nations to see that he is not ill-treated. In fact, he should be freed and it is up to the people to decide.

I do not propose to go further, but would like to stress once again that this is a very very important motion, and not because it is initiated by a Member of the Opposition that the Honourable Members in this House should oppose it: they should consider this motion very carefully and should support it, which I am going to do.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam rises.

Mr. Speaker: I have noticed that quite a number of Honourable Members still wish to speak.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam (Setapak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-telah mendengar keterangan yang panjang daripada Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri dan Menteri Luar Negeri tentang keadaan Congo dan tentera² di-Congo itu, saya nampak tidak ada satu sebab

kenapa usul yang di-kemukakan ini harus di-tolak. Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri terang² mengatakan bahawa tidak lama lagi United Nations akan bersidang dan akan membinchangkan usul daripada Setia-Usaha Agong Bangsa² Bersatu tentang beberapa chadangan yang termasuk satu daripada-nya meluchutkan senjata tentera Congo yang 30,000 itu, dan Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri juga menyatakan bahawa Persekutuan Tanah Melayu telah memerentahkan wakil-nya supaya menyokong chadangan ini, chadangan Setia-Usaha Agong supaya tentera yang berlawan di-Congo itu di-luchutkan senjata-nya. Ini akan di-binchangkan, dan dari keterangan itu nyata bahawa yang telah lalu ini langkah yang berkesan atau effective step belum di-lakukan—baharu mahu di-lakukan, dan mengikut Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri kita akan menyokong-nya dan telah memerentahkan wakil kita di-Pertubohan Bangsa² Bersatu supaya menyokong-nya. Dan usul ini juga menyebutkan demikian supaya kalau sa-kira-nya Bangsa² Bersatu tidak dapat menjalankan langkah yang berkesan di-Congo itu menarek sahaja tentera kita yang di-hantar ka-sana itu, tetapi kalau Bangsa² Bersatu dapat melakukan tindakan² yang berkesan, askar² itu tidak payah di-tarek balek. Tetapi, kalau Bangsa² Bersatu tidak dapat menjalankan tindakan yang berkesan, dan tentera kita yang berada di-Congo itu hanya unok berada di-sana sahaja, itu tidak ada bererti, sebab Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri kita tadi juga telah menyatakan kepada kita menurut resolution Bangsa² Bersatu, di-antara lain kata-nya:

"To authorise the Secretary-General to take necessary steps, in consultation with the Government of the Republic of Congo, to provide the Government with such military assistance as may be necessary, until, through the efforts of the Congolese Government with the technical assistance of the United Nations, the National Security Forces may be able, in the opinion of the Government, to meet fully their tasks."

Memberi bantuan kepada Kerajaan Congo. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sampai pada sa'at sekarang ini Bangsa² Bersatu tidak memberi bantuan atau tidak dapat memberi bantuan kepada

Kerajaan Congo yang sah. Mana Kerajaan Congo yang sah? Kita mengatakan Kerajaan Kasavubu, tetapi kita tahu tentera² Bangsa² Bersatu itu di-anham oleh Kasavubu sendiri, Ketua tentera Bangsa² Bersatu di-suroh keluar Setia-Usaha Agong di-ugut, Tshombe juga melakukan keadaan² yang demikian itu, dan orang² yang bertindak ini mengatakan mereka mewakili Kerajaan Congo yang sah, tetapi tidak dapat memberi kerjasamanya kepada Bangsa² Bersatu, dan dengan sendiri-nya Bangsa² Bersatu tidak dapat menjalankan tindakan yang berkesan (effective).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau sa-kira-nya Pertubohan Bangsa² Bersatu dapat menjalankan tindakan yang berkesan dan tindakan yang berkesan itu haruslah pertama sa-kali menentukan menurut kemahuan dan hasrat ra'ayat Congo itu mana dia pemerentahan yang sah bagi-nya. Kalau kita memperbinchangkan soal ini, timbul pula soal siapa yang menjadi kuasa tertinggi dalam sa-suatu pemerentahan, President-kah, Agong-kah, atau Perdana Menteri-kah. Sampai² ada pula mengatakan bahawa executive powers sa-satu pemerentahan itu terletak kepada President dan terletak kepada Agong. Jadi ia boleh bertindak sa-suka hati-nya memberhentikan sa-suatu pemerentah, tetapi dalam Perlembagaan barangkali di-katakan bagitu, sa-balek-nya ada pula kelayakan yang di-sebutkan di-situ, ada pula practice yang di-jalankan orang ia-itu ia merupakan kuasa executive, tetapi kuasa politik tentu terletak kepada Perdana Menteri yang mendapat keperchayaan sa-bahagian besar ra'ayat-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita bawa kepada negeri kita ini, memang Yang di-Pertuan Agong menjadi executive powers, tetapi kuasa politik-nya tentu terserah kepada Perdana Menteri kita. Apa-kah Yang di-Pertuan Agong boleh dengan tidak berfasal² mengatakan Perdana Menteri kita keluar, jangan menjadi Perdana Menteri lagi. Saya mahu tunjukkan si-anu. Katakan di-tunjukkan-nya saya (*Ketawa*). Tentu tidak, sebab sampai sekarang ini saya belum lagi mempunyai commanding

majority dalam Kerajaan. Maka dengan sendiri-nya tentu di-sini membuktikan President-kah, atau Raja-kah hanya merupakan kuasa executive, tetapi kuasa politik-nya terus terserah kepada Perdana Menteri. Kalau ketua sa-suatu parti itu mendapat kepercayaan yang terbanyak daripada ra'ayat-nya dan kalau kita bawa soal Congo—Congo sana Perdana Menteri-nya itu dahulu di-pilih dan Perdana Menteri itu ia-lah Lumumba, Lumumba menunjukkan Kasavubu dan Kasavubu di-minta jadi President. Lumumba menjadi Perdana Menteri dengan kuat kuasa Parlimen. Parlimen yang memberi kuasa Perdana Menteri kepada Lumumba, erti-nya Lumumba maseh mempunyai kepercayaan yang besar, kerana Parlimen Congo belum pernah mengatakan tidak mempunyai kepercayaan kepada Lumumba, tiba² Kasavubu melantek sa-orang lain menjadi Perdana Menteri sa-bagaimana berita yang terakhir sekali. Apa-kah orang ini mendapat kepercayaan penuh dalam Parlimen? Kenapa Parlimen Congo tidak bersidang sekarang ini? Kenapa Pertubohan Bangsa² Bersatu sekarang ini tidak berusaha untuk memanggil Parlimen Congo itu bersidang sa-mula supaya menentukan apa-kah Parlimen Congo itu maseh perchaya kepada Lumumba, atau maseh perchaya kepada Illeo, atau mahu memilih kepada orang lain. Belum. Dan kerana tidak dapat Pertubohan Bangsa² Bersatu menjalankan usaha ini untuk menentukan apa-kah Lumumba ini sudah di-tolak oleh Parlimen Congo atau tidak, maka tentu-lah Pertubohan Bangsa² Bersatu belum menjalankan tindakan yang berkesan dan belum menjalankan tindakan yang berkesan, boleh jadi kerana tidak mahu atau tidak dapat menjalankan tindakan yang berkesan, kerana ada manusia² saperti Tshombe, atau Mobutu dan lain² itu menghalang-nya, dan dengan alasan ini maka di-kemukakan chadangan ini. Tidak ada tersebut dalam usul ini mengatakan bahawa tentera² kita itu harus di-tarek sekarang juga dengan tidak bersebab, malah di-nyatakan di-sini kalau sa-kira-nya Pertubohan Bangsa² Bersatu tidak dapat menjalankan tindakan yang berkesan—kalau

Bangsa² Bersatu dapat menjalankan tindakan yang berkesan, tidak ada usul ini.

Satu lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita telah mendengar beberapa buah negeri telah menarek tentera²-nya yang ada di-Congo itu. Pertubohan Bangsa² Bersatu belum lagi bertindak dengan tegas. Yang akan tinggal di-sana ia-lah tentera kita, dan akan di-tambah lagi. Apa akan jadi kepada tentera² kita kalau timbul tindakan² dari dua belah pehak, dari Mobutu-kah, dari Tshombe-kah, sedangkan bangsa² lain telah menarek tentera-nya dari Congo. Dan kalau keadaan berjalan sa-bagaimana sekarang juga, tindakan berkesan tidak di-jalankan oleh Pertubohan Bangsa² Bersatu, maka tentera² kita di-Congo itu yang akan menjadi umpan peluru semata². Satu hal lagi dalam soal tentera² kita, barangkali pehak pementah telah menerima beberapa rayuan daripada pehak tentera kita di-Congo. Rayuan terhadap layanan yang diterima oleh mereka di-tangan pegawai² mereka itu. Perasaan tidak puas hati sudah timbul di-kalangan tentera² kita di-sana oleh layanan pegawai²-nya yang bersikap keangkohan

Mr. Speaker: Rasa saya itu tidak ada kena-mengena dengan usul dihadapan kita ini. Kalau di-bacha pada akhir chuba tarek balek dengan syarat—effective steps are taken in the immediate future to restore democratic rights to the people of the Congo. Dia ta' chakap fasal layanan itu!

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Tetapi soal layanan ini juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dapat menimbulkan

Mr. Speaker: Ta' kena-mengena dengan usul yang ada ini. Boleh bawa satu usul lagi sekali esok.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, usul ini kalau kita pandang atau kita kaji betul² bukan-lah merupakan usul kita minta tarek tentera² kita dengan tidak ada sebab. Ia memberi alasan², kenapa kita harus menarek-nya dan penjelasan Perdana Menteri tadi pun menuju ka-sana juga. Kalau sa-kira-nya dalam persidangan Bangsa² Bersatu yang akan

datang nanti, Setia-Usaha Agong Bangsa² Bersatu itu mendapat kuasa penoh boleh meluchutkan senjata tentera² Congo itu ia-itu yang akan di-sokong oleh Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. Mengikut kata Perdana Menteri kalau tidak berjalan, maka Perdana Menteri kita akan memanggil persidangan meminta nasihat dari kita. Maka ini serupa sahaja, kemudian-kah atau sekarang. Sebab di-sini juga ada di-letakkan effective steps, kalau tidak dapat di-jalankan effective steps maka ia berhenti dengan sendiri-nya. Jadi diantara keterangan Perdana Menteri dengan maksud usul ini tidak ada perbezaan sama sekali.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sunggoh pun amat-lah molek-nya bagi kita sa-telah mendengar ucapan Perdana Menteri yang menyerahkan perkara ini kepada undi, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya perchaya kalau hanya untuk menjawab tentu-lah akan dapat Menteri² yang lain di-bekalkan dengan jawapan². Perkara yang ada dalam usul ini ada-lah satu perkara yang bersangkutan-paut dengan kedudukan tentera² kita di-sana yang tidak sa-orang pun kechil nilaian-nya pada kita. Ta' berapa lama dahulu pehak Kerajaan telah menyatakan persediaan-nya bagi membahathkan perkara² yang bersangkutan dengan dasar luar negeri dari awal sampai akhir. Maka ini ada-lah satu kesempatan Parlimen ini bagi menimbang-soal ini.

Yang hairan saya dalam perbahathan dan dalam hujah² yang di-kemukakan oleh pehak Kerajaan ia-lah bahawa kita ada-lah ahli dalam United Nations dan dengan yang demikian kita berdiri di-tempat United Nations sedangkan kita mengetahui bahawa tugas kita di-Congo ia-lah mengembalikan keamanan dan undang² dalam negeri itu. Tadi sudah banyak di-perkatakan di-sini bahawa soal mengembalikan undang² keamanan tidak dapat di-jalankan oleh United Nations dan apa yang telah di-sebutkan oleh Perdana Menteri tentang adanya wakil daripada Pertubohan Bangsa² Bersatu menerusi Setia-Usaha Agong-nya supaya di-buboh demikian

ini ada-lah menunjukkan satu pengesahan kalau tidak puas hati dalam suasana yang ada dalam negeri itu sendiri. Jadi dapat di-timbulkan satu soalan kalau belum dapat Pertubohan Bangsa² Bersatu menjalankan tugasnya ada-kah patut kita terek tentera kita dan dengan tarekan tentera kita apa-kah yang untong negeri Congo atau apa-kah yang akan dapat di-betulkan dari segi keamanan dunia. Memang benar menarek tentera kita dari Congo dengan sa-mata² sahaja hendak mengelakkan diri oleh kerana perkara itu satu kekusutan yang berlaku—memang benar, tetapi apa yang di-sebutkan oleh usul ini ia-lah satu shor yang merupakan satu kawalan yang hendak memberi dasar pengekatan tentera kita dari luar. Kalau dahulu-nya kita menghantar tentera kita itu dengan rasa penoh dan rasa puas hati maka pada hari ini sa-telah kita lihat apa yang telah berlaku dan sa-telah kita lihat kekechewaan peranan United Nations dalam tugas-nya itu maka kita merasa penting bahawa sharat saperti ini kita ertikan—more effective steps are taken di-Congo yang kita kehendaki itu.

Tadi pun Perdana Menteri kita telah mengatakan bahawa sa-telah mengalami keadaan² kekusutan di-sana maka Setia-Usaha Agong Bangsa² Bersatu mengemukakan beberapa chadangan yang akan di-timbangkan dalam Dewan ini. Perluchutan senjata dan pemulehan di-Congo akan di-jalankan. Kalau di-terima dalam Dewan ini maka boleh-lah di-anggap more effective steps are taken dan tidak boleh kita menarek tentera kita itu sendiri, tetapi di-hujung perkataan Perdana Menteri telah menyebutkan sa-kira-nya keadaan di-Congo ini berubah dan sa-kira-nya kita merasa bahawa apa yang hendak di-buat oleh Dag Hammarskjold itu tidak dapat di-jalankan dan nyata tidak ada fa'edah-nya akan datang sa-mula Perdana Menteri ka-Parlimen ini meminta nasihat. Kalau usul ini di-terima tidak payah Perdana Menteri kita bersusah payah datang ka-Parlimen hendak membinchangkan usul ini, sebab ini telah di-terangkan kalau ta' ada langkah yang berkesan maka

Kerajaan akan mempunyai kuasa bagi menarek tentera-nya di-Congo itu sendiri.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soal sekarang ini ia-lah soal sama ada kita mahu menerima pengawalan dan berapa, walau pengawalan di-dirikan dalam membuat sa-suatu yang dikemukakan oleh penchadang atau tidak. Saya berasa hairan akan keberatan yang di-tujukan oleh Kerajaan dalam usul seperti ini. Boleh jadi ada orang yang menghujahkan bahawa perbuatan itu ada-lah menjadi satu censure pada United Nations, tetapi tidak penting dipandang bagitu, sebab pada diri-nya sendiri kita ada-lah meletakkan harapan kepada United Nations dan kita gantungkan keputusan kita ini dengan "unless more effective steps are taken". Jadi kalau ini pun tidak dapat di-terima oleh Kerajaan maka bererti Kerajaan tidak mahu mengadakan sa-suatu yang boleh memberi pengawasan kepada kedudukan tentera kita di-Congo itu.

Enche' K. Karam Singh (Daman-sara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are today witnessing a tragedy in the Congo and we have to bear in mind that what is happening there may be a unique sort of drama that may well go down into history for centuries to come. We know that Mr. Lumumba today is in humiliating circumstances, kept confined to jail. It was this same legal Prime Minister of the Congo who at first called the Russians to the Congo but then decided to call the United Nations into his country. Now, has the United Nations lived up to the faith and trust placed in it by Patrice Lumumba, who could have called in the Russians but did not do so? As the United Nations has failed, we ask one question. Would not a lot of people in this world be disillusioned about the intentions and good faith of the United Nations and probably have wished that Patrice Lumumba had not called in the United Nations? Mr. Speaker, Sir, today the seeds of World War III may be brewing in the Congo. One of the Honourable Ministers has said that by the United Nations going into the Congo we have sort of isolated it and prevented the two conflicting sides in the cold war from

making a hot war in the Congo. But, Mr. Speaker, Sir, we should go back to history, and we would know that sometimes individuals become historic symbols and whether we like it or not Mr. Patrice Lumumba is a symbol to hundreds of millions of people in this world. The First World War was started by the assassination of the Archduke Ferdinand of Austria. Mr. Speaker, the humiliations, insults and assault upon the person of Mr. Patrice Lumumba give us fear of his life, give us fear that his life may not be safe. And let me tell those people who feel that by keeping the contenders in the cold war from having an open fight in the Congo they may prevent a bigger war, that if anything were to happen to Mr. Patrice Lumumba, if unfortunately he were to lose his life, a Third World War may erupt from this. Let the West realise that a World War and total destruction of everything in this world can arise from this small but very significant event, which we hope will never take place.

If we go back into history about two thousand years from now, we would see a helpless man staggering under the weight of his cross going to be crucified. Mr. Speaker, Sir, in my opinion, Patrice Lumumba is today carrying the burden for the people of Africa—he is today the symbol of their salvation and is carrying the cross for his people. In this drama, I would say that Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, is playing the part of Pontius Pilate. Let us hope that that drama will never be materialised, that Mr. Lumumba will not be martyred and that he will come out of this ordeal safe. I appeal, not from the party point of view, to the Prime Minister of this country, with all the force, with all the authority of the Government and of the people of this land, to send an urgent appeal to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to the President of the United States, and to all the other important countries in this world including the authorities in the Congo, requesting them to do their best to save, what I would term, the priceless life of

Patrice Lumumba, because you may get Mobutus, you may get Tshombes, you may get Kasavubus, but you may never get

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Is that related to the motion before the House? The motion before the House is to ask the House to withdraw the Malayan troops, and it is not concerned with Lumumba at all.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: This is one of the steps, effective steps, which would justify our troops remaining there—the safety of the legal Prime Minister of that land—and I would urge that effective steps be taken to save the life of Patrice Lumumba.

Now, there is another important factor in this crisis. We know our Honourable Prime Minister has taken a stand against apartheid, but now we see that his South African friends are coming in to join the army of Mr. Tshombe. We would urge the Government of this country to stop South African intervention in the Congo before it is too late. Mr. Speaker, Sir, some members from the Ministerial Bench have said that the United Nations has no authority to intervene in the internal affairs of the Congo. Then, let me ask why did Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld stop Mr. Lumumba from broadcasting over Leopoldville Radio. If he could intervene then, why cannot he, with all the authority of the world behind him, intervene in the internal affairs of Congo and convene the Parliament of the Congo—whether the Parliament of the Congo backs Kasavubu, backs Mobutu, backs the Belgians or backs Mr. Lumumba is the internal affair of the Parliament of Congo. If the United Nations cannot do this one small act, we ask, "What is the United Nations worth?" Here is a challenge to the good name, to the good faith, to the authority of the United Nations. If Malaya, as the Ministers have professed, places its faith in the United Nations, then, I hope, they will take every step to ensure that the faith of the United Nations is not just in words but also in deeds. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Saya chuma hendak mengingatkan, point yang sudah di-chakapkan jangan-lah di-ulang. Saya nampak ramai sangat yang mengulanginya, itu membuang masa.

Che' Khadijah binti Mohamed Sidek (Dungun): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong usul ini, kerana kalau saya tidak salah Yang Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri sa-malam mengatakan usul ini di-letakkan di-atas, sa-hingga usul yang beberapa bulan berulang² di-tinggalkan, kerana menurut keterangan Yang Berhormat itu bahawa Kerajaan sa-betul-nya mahu membawa satu usul dari hal Congo ini. Tetapi oleh kerana usul ini telah di-bawa oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh, maka usul Kerajaan itu . . .

Mr. Speaker: Menglembu.

Che' Khadijah: . . . maka usul daripada Kerajaan itu tidak di-jadikan, dan usul ini di-kemukakan terlebih dahulu untok di-bahathkan. Jadi dengan alasan ini saya mengingatkan bahawa Kerajaan akan bersetuju dengan usul yang di-bawa oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Menglembu itu, tetapi nampak-nya pehak Kerajaan membangkang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya telah mendengar keterangan Ahli² Yang Berhormat dalam Dewan ini. Ada diantara-nya mengatakan tentera kita di-kirim ka-Congo itu ia-lah untok memberi kemegahan kepada Persekutuan Tanah Melayu, untok mengangkat nama negara yang baharu merdeka ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang kita mahu mendapat kemegahan dari luar negeri, tetapi kemegahan yang kita perolehi itu hendak-lah kita jalankan dengan berhati² dengan perhitungan supaya tentera² atau pemuda² kita itu tidak terkorban kerana kita hendak mendapat kemegahan itu. Dan ada yang mengatakan soal ini kita pulangkan kepada United Nations untok menyelesaikan-nya. Memang menurut usul ini sa-bagaimana yang di-katakan oleh beberapa orang Ahli Yang Berhormat tadi jikalau sa-kiranya tugas yang tegas tidak di-ambil oleh United Nations baharu-lah kita

tarek balek tentera kita itu. Tetapi di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyatakan tentera dari negeri Afro-Asian yang di-katakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu mengambil langkah dengan tidak bermuafakat dengan United Nations terlebih dahulu, saya rasa mereka itu tentu mengambil langkah sa-sudah melihat bahawa United Nations tidak mengambil langkah yang tegas dalam soal ini.

Oleh sebab itu, saya minta di-sini supaya tentera kita yang di-kirim ka-Congo itu—jikalau sa-orang Ahli Yang Berhormat tadi menyatakan untuk melihatkan keberanian pemuda dari Persekutuan Tanah Melayu mahu menyeberang laut kerana menyelamatkan negeri lain supaya tidak purak-peranda, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana menyelamatkan negara yang lain, anak² atau tentera² kita menjadi umpan pelor mereka masuk ka-dalam kanchah yang boleh membahayakan kapada jiwa mereka itu sa-hingga boleh mepurak-perandakan antara pemuda dengan ibu-bapa dan anak isteri dalam negeri kita ini. Oleh sebab itu, saya menyokong kuat usul ini.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I already know the fate of this motion. This motion is, of course, going to be rejected, but my conscience will not permit me to allow certain observations to go by without replying. Except for the Honourable the Prime Minister and the Minister of Internal Security, it seems to me that nobody else on the Government Benches, or Alliance side, has taken the trouble to understand the implications of this motion, or what I am really asking for. They have opposed it—and I do not know why they opposed it even after I have heard so many speakers.

One Honourable Member had made a long speech on the assumption that I had asked for the immediate withdrawal of our troops, but if he had taken the trouble to read a few more words further, he would certainly have found that I did not ask for the immediate withdrawal of our troops. I only asked this Government to bring to the notice of the United Nations the fact

that we are dissatisfied with the progress so far made, with the steps so far taken. I asked this Government to press for more effective steps and I said, "if no more effective steps are taken, then we should withdraw our troops."

Now, I have sent in this motion some time ago and it looks as if I anticipated the fact that the United Nations itself was not satisfied with the powers which Mr. Hammarskjöld got, because according to what the Honourable the Prime Minister said and what we read in the papers, the United Nations itself had taken steps to arm Mr. Hammarskjöld with more powers. But has anybody in this House, Ministers or anybody else who spoke, told us what is the next move. Supposing these two resolutions which are now before the Security Council are not passed, supposing it is decided not to give any more powers to Mr. Hammarskjöld, what next? Are we still going to send our troops, are we still going to let them be bogged down? That is what I am suggesting to this Government by way of this motion. And what Members of this House may fail to appreciate is this—that this motion is a matter which concerns the elected representatives of this country and the Government of the country. It is not intended to be a vote of confidence in the United Nations. If we, in this House, cannot by way of a motion, give advice to the Government, if we must hold our tongue, if we must think twice before we speak because somebody might misunderstand, then when and how are we going to give advice? A completely innocuous motion, a motion which should have been accepted without controversy, a red herring has been drawn across it to say that if you pass this motion, it will be a vote of no confidence in the United Nations.

Another aspect which most of the speakers omitted to consider is this: if no more effective steps are taken, are you going to allow our troops in the Congo to be sandwiched between two hostile elements—the armies of Colonel M. and the supporters of Mr. Lumumba with our troops in between? If one day these two armies become

strong enough to clash, and they decide to clash, what are we going to do? Are we going to take sides or not? Yet I have heard it seriously suggested that we are not going to take sides. If the two armies are going to clash, and we are in the middle, either you take sides or you get crushed by them.

Now, I think, the first speaker this morning was the Honourable the Minister of Justice, and I regret to say that he made a speech which completely took me by surprise. He paid me the compliment of being a lawyer. He enjoys the same privilege. He, himself, is a lawyer of much greater experience than I. But for him to stand up and seriously compare the duties of our troops in the Congo in the same light as the duties of a police inspector in charge of a police contingent to suppress an affray or a civil commotion, I think, that was most unworthy of him, and I do not wish to use stronger language. There is one thing which I regret very much, and that is, from his manner of delivering his speech, that it was quite obvious that he had already made up his mind on the motion—that whatever I said, even if my arguments were foolproof, the Honourable the Minister of Justice was not going to give me any hearing, because his judgment was already written down, and he was determined to read it out whether I was right or wrong. That sort of attitude, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I submit, is not one that is desirable from a person who holds such high office.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the next speaker I would like to refer to is the Honourable Member for Sitiawan. This Honourable Member somehow evokes in me a feeling of pity because, I believe, he is one of those Members who labours under the misapprehension that because he is in this House, it is mandatory for him to say something. Now, he has made certain accusations which I do not think anybody took seriously, but which I might as well mention. He accused me of saying that the United Nations had done nothing. Well, I do not recollect having said so. What I did say was that the United Nations was not doing what it should—

I did not say that the United Nations had done nothing. The United Nations has done something and it has also done a lot of wrong things. If he had said that I said the United Nations had not taken effective steps, then of course he will be quite right, because that is the whole basis of my arguments; and I did say that the United Nations was acting as a body-guard of Europeans in the Congo—they are not doing nothing, they are doing something. So he is not really correct when he says that I say that the United Nations is doing nothing. He used a phrase the meaning of which I am not sure he understood. He said, “The United Nations are doing a wonderful job.” Now, I spoke, I think, for about half an hour trying to convince the House that the United Nations has not done a wonderful job; and if the Honourable Member believed that the United Nations was doing a wonderful job, I wonder why the Honourable Member did not enlighten me so that I may, if his arguments were convincing, even withdraw the motion. But to say that the United Nations was doing a wonderful job, when somebody spoke for half an hour criticising the United Nations, I think, is just a waste of time.

The most ludicrous remarks made by him is that this motion was selfish and childish (*Laughter*). Now, if the Honourable Member . . .

Mr. Speaker: I did not hear the word “childish”.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: He did, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: If he did, I would have asked him to withdraw.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: I do not take objection to it, Sir, (*Laughter*). I do not really take exception to it because I am in good company. The Honourable the Prime Minister himself thought that this motion was of sufficient importance to be considered. And if the Honourable Member considers that I was selfish, I was childish, then I am afraid he is casting the same reflection on Members of the Alliance Government who are anxious to take this motion first. (*Laughter*).

Now, leaving the Honourable Member for Sitiawan, I would like to make a few remarks on the observations made by the Honourable the Minister for Works, Posts and Telecommunications. He started off by saying that it was a puerile motion. I do not know whether he accuses me of being puerile or whether the motion was puerile. But here, again, I am in good company, because I am in the company of his own Prime Minister, who thinks that this motion was worth discussing. So that if I am puerile, those who thought it was important and was worth discussing would be in the same bracket with me.

The Honourable the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications accuses me of saying that I would like the United Nations to chase out the Congolese army and then do what we want. Now, I do not think that I said that. What I said was that we should disarm the armed forces of the Congolese and then carry out the mandate of the United Nations, because that would render it more easy for us to carry out the mandate of the United Nations. This is entirely different from wanting to do what we like. Now, he wants to know whether I know the principles and aims of the United Nations. Well, I can assure him that I know at least some of the professed principles and aims of the United Nations, but I wonder why the Honourable Minister did not explain to this House how, with its present policy, the United Nations hopes to achieve its aims and policies in the Congo. That is what we are all interested in knowing. With your present powers, and with your present policies—you urge us to send more troops to achieve a certain policy—how do you intend to do it? Nobody has been able to answer that.

The Honourable Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications also said that it was wrong of me to say that Mr. Hammarskjöld has done nothing; and it gives me pleasure to repeat that Mr. Hammarskjöld has not done what was expected of him. And I would go further to say that all that Mr. Hammarskjöld has done so far is to adopt the attitude of issuing statements

warning So-and-So, saying: "Well, look here, I don't like you to do this, and I don't like you to do that." But when somebody says, "You can say what you like, but I am going to do it all the same," he just keeps quiet. When a man adopts that sort of attitude—pretending to adopt a position of authority and unable to back up his words—he lets his organisation down, and that is what has happened.

The Honourable Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications also doubted my knowledge of history. He wondered, I think, whether I have heard of the word "history"—whether I know anything about history. Well, I have read some history—perhaps not as extensively as he has done—and I have studied in some schools here. I have also studied in England, but perhaps not in such exclusive colleges or universities as he has done. But I know enough to say that in the history of the world you will find ample examples of countries which are oppressed by tyrants resorting to civil revolution to overthrow those tyrants. There is the classical story of the French Revolution where the people overthrew their oppressors by revolution, violent revolution. To come to contemporary history, as the Minister of Posts puts it, we have the story of South Korea where, by popular revolution, Syngman Rhee was thrown out. In between these two events you could find any number, but I do not want to bore this House. And, of course, there is the story of how Great Britain got Magna Carta. Well, these are all the things which I learned in my school. But perhaps his University—the Annamalai University—may not be teaching this sort of history. (*Laughter*).

Now I come to what the Honourable Minister of Internal Security said. Now, I don't take exception to what the Honourable Minister of Internal Security said except on one or two points which I feel that he either misheard what was said or he was under a misapprehension as to what was intended. I would, first of all, refer to his comment that I said that the Congo is a nation of tribes ruled by the law of savagery. I do not think I said that. What I said, I believe, was that

the trouble in the Congo is that it is inhabited by tribes and that some of these tribes believe in the law of savagery. That I believe to be the effect of what I said. But I certainly did not mean to say that the Congo was ruled by the law of savagery. I would be very much surprised if I did say that, and I am almost certain I did not say that.

Another point which the Minister of Internal Security made was that the Member for Ipoh had said that our troops were doing a disservice. There again, I think, he misunderstood what was said by the Member for Ipoh. What he did say was that by the Malayan troops being in the Congo, they were doing a disservice, because they were not permitted by the United Nations to do the service they were intended to do. It was not intended to be any reflection on the character or ability of the Malayan troops. That was an assurance which I gave in my speech and I would like to repeat that assurance now: that neither the Member for Ipoh nor I intend to cast any reflection whatsoever on our troops in the Congo. But they are doing no service because they are not permitted to carry out the real mandate of the United Nations. He also took exception to my statement that Europeans are the root cause of this trouble, and that capitalists are making use of the United Nations. Now I do not see why he should take exception to that. The Belgians were in the Congo; they were asked to leave, but they did not leave as they could have left. Today you find Belgian officers in Katanga and one Honourable Member from the P.M.I.P. who spoke has given an instance of a French army officer officially going to Katanga to organise paratroopers. Then there is the Foreign Legion of ex-Nazis and Fascists joining up in Katanga. Can we then say that Europeans are not interested in Katanga? They certainly are. And what is more significant and evident is this, that the United Nations, as a matter of policy, has not sent any white troops to the Congo. Are there any American troops in the Congo? There are not. It is a matter of policy. White troops will not be sent to the Congo because they know very well the hostile feelings

which the people of Congo have towards the white races which have brought so much agony to that country. Then the Honourable Minister also said it is wrong to say that capitalists are using the United Nations. It is not a question of the United Nations permitting itself to be used by the capitalists, but force of circumstances are such that the United Nations cannot afford to ignore the wishes and policies of the capitalist nations, particularly American, because who is paying for the operations in the Congo? The man who pays calls the tune and you have got to dance to his tune or he will not pay you the money. No doubt, we make our contribution, several other nations make their contributions but I do not think anybody will seriously suggest that this campaign in the Congo can go on if the Americans withdraw their financial support—it will be a flop. So, if you want to carry on in the Congo dance to the tune of the Americans who provide the money. Then another point to illustrate my argument that it is the European capitalists who are interested is this. Let us consider the position there. Which country in the world holds the largest vested interests in the Congo? Is it not the European nations, is it not the Belgians, is it not the capitalists of America? The answer is, yes.

Then he also took me up on the issue as to whether in the Congo might has prevailed over right, and he said he could not agree with that because in his view the communist forces in the Congo have been destroyed by the United Nations. So far as I know, I may be wrong and subject to correction and I am prepared to give way—there are no communist soldiers in the Congo facing the United Nations. Without any communist forces there, how do they destroy them, I fail to understand. Today we do not find communist troops in the Congo, we do not find Russian troops in the Congo, but we do find Belgian troops in the Congo.

Finally, before I come to what the Honourable the Prime Minister said, I would like to refer to my colleague the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan who by his speech

surprised me—I am very much surprised that an experienced parliamentarian of the stature of the Honourable Member should have allowed himself to use such a wrong basis for drawing an inference. He comes to the conclusion that the people of Malaya are in support of the Government's policy on the Congo because they supported the *Straits Times* Cheer Fund. If that is an indication of support of policy, then I am afraid there is something wrong, because I know there are lots of people who are willing to send a dollar, two dollars, ten dollars or a thousand dollars as they can afford because it will bring some cheer to the troops in the Congo, and not because they care a brass button what the policy is.

The Honourable the Prime Minister, who I am quite satisfied is seriously concerned about this situation and will, I have no doubt, keep the dangers of the situation constantly in his mind, has said that the United Nations must act according to its mandate. With that I agree. But my complaint is that they are not acting in accordance with the mandate to preserve law and order. As an illustration, which I gave this morning, when the United Nations finds that a man—not necessarily Patrice Lumumba—is being beaten on the streets, is being treated like an animal and is thrown into an army truck, are you preserving peace and law and order if you do not interfere and rescue the man. What kind of preservation of peace, law and order is that—when you see somebody being beaten on the streets, you turn to the other side.

I am not going to enter into a discussion on the constitutional aspects of the subject, as to whether Kasavubu has got the power, or Lumumba has got the power. We are concerned here with human decency. But acting on the assumption that Kasavubu is the legal head of the Congo, then I ask what is our stand. If we are standing really by the mandate of the United Nations, the mandate to the United Nations was to afford aid and military assistance to the legal Government of the Congo. Let us take argument of those who say that

Kasavubu is the legal head. Are you then going to take orders from Kasavubu? Are you going only to do what he asks you to do, because, according to you, that is the mandate of the United Nations? You must only do what the Head of the legal Government of the Congo wants you to do. And yet that is not what the troops are doing in the Congo. Kasavubu, hearing of the new resolutions in the Security Council, not only has expressed his disagreement but he has said, "I will arm my people to the teeth if you dare to implement those resolutions". That is what the Head of the Congo Government as recognised by the United Nations says to the United Nations—if you dare to implement your resolutions, I will arm my people to the teeth. Is that not tantamount to saying to the United Nations "You can go home". Well, then, if you are recognising Kasavubu as the legal head, if the legal head does not want you, then your duty is to go home. What right have you to stay against the desires of the legal Government of a country? But my argument is that Kasavubu in any event is not the legal head of that country. Patrice Lumumba is the only man who can be so recognised, but, as I said earlier, there is hardly any point in entering into a discussion on that subject.

The Honourable Prime Minister also expressed concern about Patrice Lumumba, and he said that his life today depends on the presence of the United Nations in the Congo. In today's newspaper, the *Straits Times*, on page 3 there is an item which is very significant. After the report of the setting up of this puppet provisional Government in the Congo, the last paragraph says this:

"Meanwhile a United Nations spokesman, questioned about new rumours that Mr. Lumumba had been killed, said he did not know whether he was alive or dead. The spokesman added 'we do not even know where he is'".

That is how well-informed the United Nations is.

Now there is a great deal of inconsistency on the part of the Government in their stand. They want to maintain peace and order; at the

same time, they say we are not interfering in the internal affairs of the Congo. Surely, Mr. Speaker, Sir, maintenance of peace and order is an internal affair of the Congo. How could you be so inconsistent—on the one hand, I am not going to interfere; on the other hand, yes, I am going to interfere.

There are one or two observations which were made by the Honourable the Prime Minister which I would like to refer to because I feel fairly certain that he did not intend to convey what perhaps he conveyed. For example, he said that Malaya will not withdraw her troops like the other nations because it would be a cowardly act. Now I do not know what he really meant by that. But if it is intended to mean that these other nations are guilty of cowardly act, then I think that is a most uncharitable thing to say about other nations. I do not that the United Arab Republic, Indonesia, Sweden or Morocco could in any way be accused of being cowardly. Their soldiers are undoubtedly as brave as any other soldiers of any other country, perhaps even more experienced. But they withdraw not because of cowardice but because of a matter of principle, the principle being—are our troops going to sacrifice their lives for an unworthy cause, whether in the name of the United Nations or not? They have, after mature consideration, come to the conclusion that they are not prepared to waste a single life in pursuance of the present policy of the United Nations in the Congo.

As I said earlier, this motion will undoubtedly be rejected, but I would like before ending to make an appeal to the Government in view of the very fast pace in which events in the Congo are moving. I in my own mind feel certain that our troops in the Congo are going to be faced with a grave crisis sooner or later when the opposing factions clash. Civil war is bound to come, whether you like it or not, and I ask this Government in pursuance of their obligations to the troops, as distinct from their obligations to the United Nations, to keep ready, or at least obtain from the United Nations sufficient assurances that should a

situation in the near future arise when it may be necessary to evacuate our troops in a hurry we will be assured of adequate transport to bring them back to our country. That is an assurance which we must seek and which we must bear in mind every day until the situation is cleared up. Any failure in that direction would be a serious disaster and if the unfortunate happens, then the responsibility for the blood of our soldiers must be on the hands of the Alliance.

THE MINOR OFFENCES (AMENDMENT) BILL

Report of the Select Committee

The Assistant Minister of the Interior (Enche' Mohamed Ismail bin Mohamed Yusof): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move,

That the report of the Select Committee laid on the table as Paper No. DR. 5 of 1960 be approved subject to the addition of the following new clause 3 to the Bill:

"3. Section 32 of the principal Ordinance is hereby amended by deleting the figure "7" in line 6 thereof."

Sir, this House will recall at its meeting in August last year, a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Minor Offences Ordinance, 1955" was referred to a Special Select Committee by the order of this House. Consequently the Committee of Selection (Second Session) nominated the following Members to form the Members of the Select Committee:

The Honourable	Enche' Wan Mustapha bin Haji Ali
"	Enche' K. Karam Singh
"	Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam
"	Enche' Mohamed Dahari bin Haji Mohd. Ali
"	Dr. Lim Swee Aun
"	Enche' Cheah Thiam Swee
"	Enche' Mohamed Ismail bin Mohamed Yusof.

At its meeting, the Special Select Committee elected me as the Chairman, in which capacity I am now presenting this report to the House. The Special Select Committee made the following amendments to clause 2 of the Bill:

(a) In place of sub-section (5) of the proposed new section 7 of

the Minor Offences Ordinance, 1955, relating to the power to order the destruction of dogs to which objection has been raised, or has been taken, insert a new amendment, in substitution therefor, which is designed to make it clear that no criminal liability under the new section will arise in respect of persons such as trespassers who enter houses or premises without the permission of the occupier or otherwise than in the ordinary course of their duties.

- (b) The new sub-section (6) will also make it clear that no liability under the section will arise if such injury was occasioned by any wrongful act on the part of the person injured.
- (c) The amendment in Clause 3 of the Bill removes the power of the Commissioner of Police or other Police Officer authorised by him in his discretion to compound an offence under this section in view of the fact that, under the proposed amendment, the responsibility for assessing damage is placed upon the Magistrate.

Sir, I beg to move.

Enche' Cheah Theam Swee: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That the Rupabangsa or Nationality of the laid on the table as Paper No. DR. 5 of 1960 be approved subject to the addition of the following new clause 3 to the Bill:

"3. Section 32 of the principal Ordinance is hereby amended by deleting the figure "7" in line 6 thereof."

Third Reading

The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Dato' V. T. Sambanthan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Minor Offences Ordinance, 1955" be read a third time and passed.

Enche' Mohamed Ismail bin Mohamed Yusof: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read the third time and passed.

NATIONALITY OF THE PERSEKUTUAN TANAH MELAYU

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I know the procedure? (*Laughter*) I had moved this motion twice already. (*Laughter*) I presume that I will not be asked to move it a third time, since it is the continuation of the debate of last December.

Mr. Speaker: As this is a different meeting, you have to do it again (*Laughter*), but you need not say a word of what you have already said on it except to move it. Once it is seconded, I shall put the motion so that Members can debate on it.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: Well, Sir, I formally move,

That the Rupabangsa or Nationality of the Persekutuan Tanah Melayu shall be known as "Melayu".

Dr. Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Dr. Lim Swee Aun: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is odd that this motion has come up for proposal three times—two speeches were made on it and the third one a mere proposal. However, I take it that what has preceded can be debated on.

I take this opportunity to thank the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan for the compliment he paid me yesterday, and I shall remember to be as gentle as I can in handling him in the course of my debate on this motion of his. (*Laughter*).

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: Sir, on a point of order. He is completely irrelevant. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed.

Dr. Lim Swee Aun: The Honourable Member is to be congratulated on his vitality, his powers of endurance and perseverance. These qualities, in spite of his age, are indeed very remarkable, and they must certainly be the envy of the opposite sex.

(*Laughter*). I wonder, in his persistence with this motion, whether or not it is correct to say any more that there should be equal pay for equal work.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: May I make a suggestion, Sir? May I ask the Honourable Member to confine his remarks to the motion? (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker: (*To Dr. Lim Swee Aun*) Do not make your preamble too long! (*Laughter*).

Dr. Lim Swee Aun: However, Sir, after listening to the more factual arguments of the younger Deputy Prime Minister, one cannot help but feel that this motion is superfluous. It is superfluous because the Deputy Prime Minister has quoted authority to show us that nationality and citizenship are both the same and interchangeable and that it has already been accepted by this House, by this nation. On the international level, the nationality of the Federation of Malaya is the citizen of the Federation of Malaya; hence I say this motion is redundant. The Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister, like a very patient psychiatrist, has tried to rationalise the wandering mind of the Honourable Mover—and I hope he is now satisfied and is being led back to the normal path of intellect—by saying that he is not a tiger, nor a *chichak*, nor a *monyet* (*Laughter*) but that he is a citizen of the Federation of Malaya who owes his allegiance not to his kampong in Johore or the State of Trengganu but to the Yang di-Pertuan Agong, as all loyal citizens of the Federation do. (*Applause*).

During his speech the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan has asked the non-Malay Members of this House why we will not accept "Melayu" nationality but will accept "Malayan" nationality. He has further asked this is because non-Malays are prejudiced against the Melayu race and that non-Malays look down on the Melayu as an inferior race. Mr. Speaker, Sir, as a non-Malay I categorically state in this House—and I am confident that all the Chinese in the Federation of Malaya who are non-Malays, particularly the Chinese race,

will say it too—that "we do not look down on the Melayu as an inferior race." We believe and do practise the golden rule of Confucius which says that within the four seas all are brothers, and we do not subscribe to the false theory of a superior race or an inferior race.

It was only yesterday that the Prime Minister in this House remarked on the multi-racial community of this country and how in this House there are non-Malays who are working together; and the fact that this House has unanimously approved a resolution condemning the apartheid policy of South Africa is proof in itself that neither the Malays nor the non-Malays believe in a superior or inferior race.

As to the other point as to whether the non-Malays are prejudiced against the Malays, I would say, "Of course, No!" The fact that we consider the Malays as our brothers, and also the fact that in the Constitution we recognise the special position of the Malays is sufficient to prove that we are not prejudiced against the Malays. However, the Honourable Mover does not believe that in the Constitution there are special rights reserved for the Malays. If that is so, may I ask the Honourable Member whether he intends to move another motion to revoke Article 153 of the Constitution.

Now, I would like to ask why then did the non-Malays object to this motion. It is because the word "Melayu" through common usage means the Malay race, and it is dangerous if you use it in the context of nationality or citizens. It might create misunderstanding and misinterpretation. Even the Honourable Member in his speech did use the word "Melayu" to mean the Malay race and also Melayu nationality—and sometimes it can be very confusing.

The Honourable Member for Tanah Merah has asked, why is it that the U.M.N.O.—in Bahasa Kebangsaan "Pertubohan Kebangsaan Melayu Bersatu"—though it uses the words "Kebangsaan Melayu" in its political name, it will not accept "Kebangsaan

Melayu". Therein lies the danger of misinterpretation. The U.M.N.O. is a nation-wide organisation of the Malay race—and "Kebangsaan Melayu" there means the "Malay race". Similarly the M.C.A., or Malayan Chinese Association, is a nation-wide organisation of the Chinese; and the M.I.C., or the Malayan Indian Congress, which is a nation-wide political body of Indians.

Sir, the U.M.N.O. is not a national political party. What is the national party is the "Perikatan", or the Alliance; and the Alliance is composed of three political parties representing three races. Hitherto, it has also been argued if we can have Bahasa Melayu, Pakaian Melayu, therefore it follows that we must have Kebangsaan Melayu. I wish to remind this House that internationally and officially we are known as the Federation of Malaya—in Bahasa Kebangsaan "Persekutuan Tanah Melayu"—and the emphasis is on the word "Federation" or "Persekutuan" not in "Melayu" or "Tanah Melayu". Therefore, it is only rational that the nationality, or citizenship of the Federation of Malaya, is "citizen of the Federation of Malaya" or, in Bahasa Kebangsaan, "Warga Persekutuan Tanah Melayu". The nearest parallel to that which I can quote or cite is in the United Kingdom.

Sir, we know in history, England through the use of arms conquered Wales, Scotland and Ireland and managed to unite the four countries into one kingdom; and though the English were dominant they were diplomatic enough to create what is well-known as the British nationality, which term is acceptable to the English, Scot, Irish and Welsh. I think everyone is aware here that if you call an Englishman a Scotsman, he gets very angry, and similarly if you call a Scotsman as one who comes from south of the Tweed, he too gets very angry. Now, these people, though of four different countries, possibly of four different communities, are very proud of their racial origin, but because of

the common citizenship, British nationality, they will forget their individual communalism and fight for the Flag of Britain. Similar to Britain, we have the different 11 States and also a multi-racial population, and because we have independence for all of us, the only rallying point is citizenship—that is the citizenship of the Federation of Malaya, which is acceptable to all races of the people.

Sir, the Honourable Mover has repeatedly declared that he has no ulterior motive behind the motion. He vehemently declares that our Constitution does not provide special rights or privileges for the Malays, that this motion is very innocent, and his idea is that there should be a common nationality for Malays as well as non-Malays—there should be no difference, non-Malays and Malays enjoying the same rights and that in future we will build a common nation.

If we look back on our Constitutional history, just before the Second World War under the British Government, it will be seen that everybody, who was born in the Straits Settlements, is a British subject, whether he be a Malay or non-Malay, and because of that birthright the non-Malays could not be banished from Malaya—that was the rule of *jus soli*. After the war on the 30th November, 1945, the Malay National Party sponsored by the Indonesians to cater for Malays and Indonesians in this country was formed in Ipoh and the leader was Dr. Burhanuddin. In the early 1946, Sir Harold MacMichael concluded an agreement with each of the Malay Rulers of this country and created the Malayan Union on the 1st April, 1946.

Now, the Malayan Union

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, time is up. Are you going to take a long time?

Dr. Lim Swee Aun: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The meeting is adjourned to ten o'clock tomorrow morning.

Adjourned at 4.00 p.m.