TRANSCRIPT OF THE BROADCAST ON AUGUST 12TH AT 10.30 P.M. OVER RADIO SINGAPORE -- BEING SPEECH BY THE PRIME MINISTER, MR. LEE KUAN YEW, ON JULY 26 BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS COMMITTEE ON COLONIALISM

The United Nations Committee on Colonialism is now called to order. I invite now Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, Prime Minister of Singapore, Dr. Goh Keng Swee, Finance Minister, Mr. Teo Z'ik Tee to take their seats at the Committee's table.

I give now the floor to the distinguished Prime Minister to continue his statement.

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates:

National Archives of Singapore

Just before we adjourned for lunch I was making some general comments in reply to paragraph 4 of the Memorandum by the 19 Assemblymen and I have two further points to make in this connection. First, on the question of the military base or the military bases in Singapore. By a curious paradox the stand of my party and my Government is much more radical than the stand of those of

the petitioners. Mr. Woodhull, the distinguished spokesman for the petitioners this morning somewhat slurred over the lines when he was asked by the distinguished Polish as to the future of the British military bases. Mr. Woodhull is the adviser to the Singapore Naval Base Labour Union, and is a strong advocate on behalf of his newly-founded party the Barisan Sosialis, for the indefinite continuance of the British bases in Singapore. Mind you, I do not know if considerations of loyalty of the base workers was a factor in his making this political stand. However, as against that my Government believe that it is an unhealthy state of affairs to have one-third of Singapore's economy dependent on the British military bases. We, to a lesser extent than Malta, have a lob-sided economy and if for tomorrow for some inexplicable reasons of British economy or some change in missile or tactical warfare the bases in Singapore were to become valueless, then no less than fifty thousand families will have their bread winners out of jobs. It is, therefore, our contention that these bases should be run down gradually over the years, a phased programme of 10, 15, maybe 20 years, a programme in which as the bases shrink the workers are absorbed into new industries that will develop with the impetus that will be given to industrialization generally when Malaysia is established.

National Archives of Singapore

Singapore, an island 214 square miles, with an uncertain political position is a different proposition from Singapore as part of Malaysia -- 130,000 square miles with 10 million people as against 1.4 million in Singapore island. Therefore, we say let these bases slowly reduce themselves in importance in our economy and eventually, if for no other reason than for tactical developments in warfare the British Naval Base in Singapore one of the largest establishments of its kind in the world, may well become a useful peacetime dockyard. This, I submit, if nothing else, demonstrates the fundamental difference of approach between the petitioners and the views of the petitioners and the views of the Singapore Government. They realise the problem as much as we do. They take the opportunist line of placating the base workers and assuring them that they stand for the indefinite continuance of the bases. We do no such thing. Their next step in constitutional development despite all the equivocal explanations that were made by the petitioners this morning, Messrs. Lim Hock Siew, Woodhull and Dr. Lee Siew Choh, amounted to this: that if they cannot have merger on their terms then what they want is not independence because that is out of the question, they want a continuance of the status quo with minor alternations like removing the Internal Security Council and the Federation of Malaya's representative on it. And as far as the bases are concerned they are quite happy to leave them as British sovereign bases. We, Sir, believe that the next step in the political evolution to full independence and nationhood is to convert the

National Archives of Singapore

sovereign rights the British now have over these bases to treaty rights -- rights to be determined between the Government of the United Kingdom and the new Government of the Federation of Malaysia.

In paragraph 5, I was grateful this morning to have an admission from Mr. Woodhull himself, that the White Paper Command 33 of 1956 which I believe the petitioners have already attached to their memorandum was, in fact, negotiated directly between my Government and that of the Federation of Malaya. It is ridiculous to suggest as is suggested in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 that it was the British Government in a nefarious scheme plotting the surrender of these territories for annexation by the Federation of Malaya Government, and the Singapore Government, in the terms of paragraph 7, fully co-operating with them.

Mr. Chairman, my party is the oldest political party in Singapore. It has a history which goes back to 1950. No other party has lasted so long with such coherence. True, from time to time we have our convulsions for we are in the throes in Southeast Asia of one of the most tumultuous and probably decisive revolutionary eras of this century. But we understand that our strength and the success of the aims and objectives of our movement, namely, an independent, democratic, non-Communist, socialist Malaya and Malaysia is dependent upon our being able to carry with us the support, the enthusiastic co-operation of our

National Archives of Singapore

people. To suggest as these three paragraphs imply in its innuendo that we are selling out the rights of the people is to suggest that, in fact, we, who have grown up as a movement from the grassroots of people, have decided to abandon their movement. If that were so, then I ask you, Mr. Chairman, and distinguish delegates, to pose this one question to the petitioners, a question which they have never been able to answer: "Why is the Government of Singapore giving the choice on the mode and manner of merger to the people of Singapore when it has within the constitution and the law full rights, having obtained 33 votes to nothing in support of its recommendations in its agreement with the Federation of Malaya when it can carry out without further ado? We are here before this Committee, with great respect not because we feel there is any substance in the allegations that have been made against us, but because it is a necessary aspect of the justification and the battle for men's minds in Singapore, in Malaya, in Malaysia and, indeed, throughout the Afro-Asian world. I will not comment. I will leave, Mr. Chairman, the explanatory comments I have made in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 -- they speak for themselves.

National Archives of Singapore

Paragraph 8 is of no great moment. The only point about which I wish to stress is that had the 13 Assemblymen who broke off from our party -- my party -- in July last year on this question of merger with the Federation has so much confidence of their following, then it is strange that they should have resisted all suggestions that they should go back and renew their mandate as indeed they pledged under oath to do.

Paragraph 9, the comments that I have made there is I think a fair statement of the position. They, seven members in the Opposition elected on their own right, unlike the 13, who were elected under our banners, also want merger. They support the White Paper and they support the terms of the Referendum Bill which has now become the law of Singapore. But they have also suggested that there should be a third alternative probably to show that they are men of independent minds, that they have another alternative to offer to the people -- merger on terms no less than that to be offered to the Borneo territories.

National Archives of Singapore

Now, what are these terms? It is suggested that they are not known, that we are, in fact offering something which is vague and indefinite. Well, these terms will be published in due course in great detail and the Referendum will be held not as has been scurrilously and untruthfully suggested by the petitioning opposition on the 28th July, but at such time after everybody has had time to

consider the full implications of the three alternatives which are offered to the people for their choice.

Now, we come to the core of the problem. In paragraphs 11, 12, 13, and 14, and I think at the outset we must be clear in our minds what they have come in search of. In other words of their petition in paragraph 20: "All we seek is that there should be an honest Referendum whereby the wishes of the people can be genuinely ascertained and respected. The presence of an observer from your Committee may deter a major act of perfidy being perpetrated against our people." I think it really amounts to this: An honest Referendum, and in order that there should be an honest Referendum, the presence of an observer from the United Nations Committee. That is as far as they go and as far as they can go in the circumstances. They have admitted that the questions to be posed is a matter of internal politics, but they say the Referendum should be honest. In the process, of course, they have gone into the meat of the argument between the petitioning opposition parties and the Government, namely, the meaning of Alternative 'A', which is in the White Paper, agreed between the two governments of Singapore and the Federation, and what they claim they should be entitled to -- merger complete on equal terms. Although they have stated that this is an internal matter, they have gone into this in considerable detail and the

National Archives of Singapore

questioning this morning by the distinguished delegates from the USSR and from Poland have centred on these internal matters.

True, broad words and generalisations have been made complete on the basis of equality or the one point of equality which they have stressed is the question of automatic citizenship. I therefore ask you and your distinguished delegates, Mr. Chairman, to bear with me if I go into this in some detail, internal matter though it may be of Singapore.

Now, the allegation in paragraph 11 says: "The main objection to these proposals is that the citizens of Singapore will not become citizens of the Federation of Malaya. They maintain a separate status of citizens of Singapore. Another discrimination is that Singapore will have representation of only 11 members of the Federation Parliament, whereas proportionately we will be entitled to 25 -- to about 25. People of Singapore want all citizens to become Federation citizens with proportionate representation in the Federation Parliament".

National Archives of Singapore

And, may I read first my reply to paragraph 11: "The problem regarding common nationality but separate state citizenship set out in paragraph 14 of the Command Paper has been debated and canvassed at great length in the

Legislative Assembly and they were the subject of an exchange of letters between the Prime Ministers of Singapore and the Federation of Malaya. Only the 284,000 people born in Singapore would have automatically acquired Federation citizenship under the laws of the Federation of Malaya had Singapore never been separated by the British. That is a statement of fact. Had Singapore gone in to the Federation of Malaya in 1945 -- first in the Federation Union in 1945 and later in the Federation of Malaya in 1948, it would have been just like Penang and Malacca, and the laws of Penang and Malacca were identical to the laws of Singapore, and all subsequent developments would have been the same, and the only persons in Penang and Malacca who automatically became citizens of the Federation were those who were born in Penang and Malacca. This is a statement of fact. They can be ascertained from the constitutional documents of the Federation of Malaya. The 340,000 immigrants who registered as Singapore citizens would have had to register and qualify for citizenship under the citizenship laws of the Federal Constitution. Those who qualified in Singapore by being Commonwealth citizens with two years' residence would not have qualified as such in the Federation. Those from China, India -- and may I correct an error here -- my clause goes China, India, and other Commonwealth countries. I mean by that -- I have singled out India, although she is a Commonwealth country, because Indians as Commonwealth citizens got special privileges under the Singapore citizenship laws over and above those afforded the other

National Archives of Singapore

Commonwealth countries because of the close affinity between the peoples in this region and the migration that has taken place over the last 130 years of rule under the same British Raj.

So, I would like to correct a misimpression I have given here that Indians are required to reside, like Chinese, for 8 out of 10 years. In fact, Indians were required to reside before they registered as citizens for only two years and without any language qualification -- the ability to speak the national language, Malay. And Chinese who have resided 8 out of 10 years who were under the age of 45 and had not an elementary knowledge of Malay -- the national language -- would not have qualified. Further, in the 9 Malay States of the 11 States of the Federation of Malaya, no one who is not of Malay or aboriginal stock gets citizenship automatically or as of right.

National Archives of Singapore

Mr. Chairman, the British Empire in all its vagaries created for us a legacy of great complexities. In the course of their 130 years of dominance in Malaya they brought together under varying forms of legal tutelage 9 Malay sultanates each with its own head of state who was under the protection of His Majesty the King and each with its own nationality laws. They ran three states as direct colonies -- Penang, Singapore, Malacca. In Penang, Singapore and Malacca, the British principle of jus soli -- citizenship as of right by birth in a particular

territory -- applied. And whether a man be a Chinese, an Indian or a Ceylonese, if he is born in British territory as distinct from Protectorate territory -- the 9 sultanates -- he is qualified for British nationality and became a British subject. But in the 9 sultanates the British governed through advisers and residents constitutionally working through the edict of the sultans as they did in India through the Maharajahs and the Gaikwas and all the other potentates that held sway in many parts of South East Asia before the advent of the British rule, and one of the peculiarities of this type of rule is that the local law of the Sultan applied unless the Sultan on the advice of the British altered these laws and one of the fundamental laws which the sultans insisted upon was that citizenship did not follow the place of birth. In other words, jus soli did not apply. And before the independence of Malaya in 1957, no person who was born in any of the 9 sultanates became a subject of the Sultan or British protected person as of right. My former comrade, Mr. Woodhull, for instance, is a member of an old established family in the State of Johore in the town of Batu Pahat. His father was born there, I believe, and so was he, but he had to register to acquire his State nationality -- the nationality of Johore -- and after that with the advent of independence he became by registration a citizen of the Federation of Malaya. And citizenship, therefore, political franchise, was one of the important ways in which in Malays and the indigenous peoples were able to maintain their own authority in the country whilst allowing the British the right to freely import

National Archives of Singapore

indentured labour from outside. In Malaya as in many other parts of the equatorial world the British discovered that sometimes the local population did not take to regimented and disciplined labour like tapping of rubber trees or washing of tin ore, and as in British Guiana where they brought in indentured labour, so with Malaya, and with the trials and tribulations of the Chinese Civil War in the early 19th century, large numbers of Chinese immigrants came into Malaya and the Sultans allowed them in to help the British exploit the natural resources of the country because the Malays saw no reason why they should abandon their traditional ways of life -- fishing, hunting, agriculture -- for this dreary slavehood of the British colonial system. Therefore, this is really the crux of the matter.

When the petitioner, Mr. Lim Hock Siew, this morning said, "It does not matter how historically these things came about", I say as a Marxist -- he is a Marxist -- that he cannot disregard history. Citizenship has always been a restricted right in the Federation of Malaya, and in the 9 sultanates nobody got it as of right.

National Archives of Singapore

We now claim on the basis of complete and unconditional merger that 284,000 Singapore born citizens would automatically become Federation citizens, and we have to concede that 340,000 who were not born there would, if

Singapore had never been separated from the Federation, had to qualify under Federation laws. To demand automatic conversion from Singapore citizens to Federal citizens is in effect to ask the laxer Singapore citizenship laws be considered as equivalent to the stricter laws of the Federation of Malaya. This was a condition which was completely unacceptable to the Federation Government. These easier conditions for acquisition of Singapore citizenship were never afforded to any of the 11 states in the present Federation. So, when we ask for equality, I say equality cannot be measured by talking about automatic conversion, but equality on how men acquired state rights and the same processes -- the same yardstick that applied in the 9 sultanates and the two British colonies should be applied to Singapore, and as Penang and Malacca were the two most akin to Singapore as being part of the three British colonies, the laws applicable there are the laws which we say should apply. However, I say this is not a matter on which I need have to decide, I need be the judge. There are constitutional documents which jurists can interpret, and I am quite sure there is no difficulty in getting a fair impartial tribunal to determine what complete and equal merger -- complete merger on the basis of equality as a state -- means in the context of the 11 states that constitute the Federation of Malaya.

National Archives of Singapore

At this stage may I read extracts from my letter to the Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya and his reply thereto. My letter is dated 11th

November, and I took the liberty, Mr. Chairman, to distribute copies to distinguished delegates on this Committee before the resumption this afternoon. May I read from the third paragraph of my letter: "If merger were completely on the basis of Penang, then the citizenship laws of the present Federation which applied in Penang will apply in Singapore. About 280,000 representing those born in Singapore out of the 624,000 Singapore citizens would automatically qualify for citizenship of the present Federation. This would entitle Singapore to send 14 representatives to the Central Federation legislature as this is comparable to the 14 seats which Johore's 291,000 citizens are entitled to. The remaining 340,000 citizens who were not born in Singapore would have to apply for citizenship under the present laws of the Federation which require inter alia a residential qualification and a knowledge of the national language, Malay. On the basis of the numbers in the other states in the present Federation who have qualified by application for citizenship in this way, over two-thirds, in other words, more than 230,000 will lose their present citizenship. On the other hand, the claim that Singapore citizens should automatically become Federation citizens and thereby increase the representation Singapore would be entitled to was and still is in the view of your government, namely, the Federation Government too absurd to merit serious consideration.

National Archives of Singapore

If I may just pause there and explain really what it means in the historical context of the Federation of Malaya -- what this demand means? It means, namely, this: Had Singapore never been separated in 1945, some 284,000 citizens would have automatically acquired citizenship because they were born there. Out of the 340,000 who were not born there one-third, judging from the numbers in the Federation who qualified for citizenship who were not born there, and there is no reason to suppose that there is any difference between the immigrant population in Malaya and those in Singapore, because for over 130 years the British ran these territories as one unit and allowed free migration -- inter-state migration -- in all these territories, it would have meant that another 110,000 would have acquired citizenship. This would give a total of 284,900 plus 110,000 of 394,000 citizens. I said merger on either of these terms would be unrealistic and what I meant there was this: For me and my Government to insist that all Singapore citizens should qualify, although two-thirds would not have qualified had Singapore never been separated, was something which the Federation Government would never agree to. They never conceded it to immigrants in their own 11 states. And not only to ask for citizenship but on the basis of the enlarged immigrant citizenship, to ask for proportional representation, and claim 25 seats -- they say about 25, in fact, if one works it out accurately on the basis of roughly 200,000 persons per representative in Parliament it would work out to about 24 seats, but for the purposes of

National Archives of Singapore

presentation I concede the round number of 25. That is unacceptable to the Federation Government nor is the prospect of depriving 230,000 immigrants who have already got Singapore citizenship -- one which is acceptable to my Government. Over the years 1955 and 1956 when one of the petitioners was Chief Minister, Mr. David Marshall, Singapore occupied quite a number of the headlines in the world press for disorderly if somewhat turbulent conduct. We have succeeded over the last few years to try and equalise the situation within the limitations of our position of an entrepot economy dependent on the Federation for its survival, but to deprive 230,000 citizens obviously is not a proposition which is even worth considering, for even assuming that the female part of the 230,000 would not riot, I have not the slightest doubts in my mind that the male half of the 230,000 citizens would have some very strong things to say and to do if they were suddenly to be deprived of rights which were accorded them as recently as 1958. And it is therefore to come to a fair compromise that we have agreed, first, that nobody in Singapore loses what he already has acquired. All Singapore citizens will keep their Singapore citizenship but that cannot increase the total representation of Singapore in the centre, in other words, the total parliamentary cake -- the proportion to be given to Singapore would be what it would have got had there been no separation and there were only 394,000 citizens, but this parliamentary cake, namely, for the purposes of my putative calculations, 19 representatives, will be shared by all the 624,000 citizens, in

National Archives of Singapore

other words, Singapore – 624,000 citizens will together vote for 19 representatives, which is what we claim we should be entitled to had there never been a separation. The reason being we say that Perak -- one of the sultanates with 450,000 -- had 19. So we claim putatively that 394,000 should also give us 19. And on the basis of the reserve powers, 75% of the revenue being retained in Singapore for a large measure of local autonomy we shall continue to enjoy as in Northern Ireland, we have settled at the figure 15.

May I just read out two paragraphs from my letter:

"Finally, we have agreed -- the last two paragraphs -- that Singapore would keep more than three-quarters of the revenue for the discharge of her responsibilities on education and labour, social welfare, health and all the other matters set out as State or concurrent responsibilities in the schedule annexed to our memorandum and be entitled to 15 seats in the Central Parliament of the new Federation. This arrangement has precedence in constitutional practice. Northern Ireland though part of the United Kingdom retains certain autonomous powers. In return for this though Northern Ireland would be entitled to 16 seats on the basis of electoral strength, she has only 12 because she retains autonomous powers. All this can be found in Whittakers Almanac. Should in the future Singapore surrenders some or all of her autonomous powers and state

National Archives of Singapore

revenue to the Central Government, the question of representation can be reviewed." This was the Federation Prime Minister's reply -- formal reply -- to my letter of the 11th November, dated 13th, and I read now from the second paragraph. This is his point of view: "I would like to emphasise that it cannot be assumed that the analogy of Penang or Malacca is necessarily relevant to the status of Singapore in a merger with the Federation. Article 22 of the Federation Constitution makes provision for a merger of new states on terms which do not necessarily have to follow Penang and Malacca, which were already members of the Federation when the 1957 Constitution came into force." I think this was done ex abudantio cautio because he did not -- the Federation Prime Minister -- did not wish to concede to me the right of my argument that we should be on par with Penang and Malacca.

He goes on to say: "If the stricter citizenship laws of the other states -- by which he meant the 9 sultanates -- were applied to Singapore, Singapore would not be entitled to more than 12 seats, since less persons would be eligible for citizenship and, consequently, for franchise quite apart from the question of weightage for rural areas."

National Archives of Singapore

And in the second last paragraph he says: "Consequently, it is felt that representation in the new Federation Parliament should not be based on the total number of such citizens large numbers of whom would be disenfranchised if the

Federation citizenship and rightly has explained this. He made his claim for complete merger in a speech on a motion in the Legislative Assembly of Singapore in November last year when the Command Paper setting out the Heads of Agreement come to be accepted by the Assembly by 33 votes to nil and this is what he said: “These are the official records and I would like to point out that our practice of the official records of our Legislative Assembly follow the British practice, in other words, there is first the verbatim transcript produced normally the day following the debate which is given to the Speaker
-- to the Member who spoke -- and he is entitled within a certain number of hours -- 72 hours as a rule -- to make such amendments as he thinks necessary, considering, of course, the fact that what he said was already recorded on the tape, so he can’t altogether depart from what he had said, but if there were dramatical inelegancies, he is entitled to polish up his speech.

National Archives of Singapore

And this what Mr. Marshall said: 23rd November, Column 557, at the bottom -- “And, Sir, said he, in case there is any suggestion as to when I and my Party began to believe in merger, here is a docured copy of the very first and the only platform of the Worker’s Party and its formation in December 1957,” -- a very young party as you can see it, Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is only 5 years. In the very first paragraph and in the very first sentence it says: “The basis and framework of all policy must be recognition of the fact that Singapore is

geographically, ethnically and economically part of Malaya, and the only healthy ultimate solution is integration with Malaya on an equal basis with other states."

And he goes on to emphasis this equal basis. Column 558 -- "Sir, it is miraculous -- we use that phrase -- on an equal basis with the other states" at a time when there was no question about it. They were Mr. Marshall's own words after his correction. He went on to say: "And we did not have the P.A.P. in office. It is true we did not expect any treachery." He is a man of great eloquence and like great orators he has got enormous powers of abuse. He said: "We did not suspect that the word 'merger' would be abused." But, perhaps, out of caution, Sir, which our training sometimes gives us, as I say the operative words "By Us", he means he, because there was nobody else in his party that has been trained in the law. In fact he is the only man in the party. He says that phrase "on an equal basis" was inserted at that party platform of December 1957, and he went on to say. Column 562 -- you would, Mr. Chairman, just -- I am sorry about the inability of my supplying all delegates with copies in time this afternoon, but I promise to have all delegates have copy of the official record. I had them with me, but there was some difficulty in the distribution.

National Archives of Singapore

May I start at the bottom of Column 561: "Sir, the people of Singapore I believe recognise that if we want unity, if we want equal privileges, we must

carry heavy responsibilities. We must recognise that there can be no reality of unity, no identification of the Federation and Singapore. We pursue different policies in education and labour." By that he means that our special agreement which we have reached with the Federation of Malaya giving us autonomy in education and labour was undesirable.

"I do honestly believe, Sir, that the P.A.P. errs when it says that the people of Singapore will not accept the whole of Malaya should be in control of our education and labour policies. And I believe if the issues were put to the people of Singapore -- Mr. Marshall quoting his own question -- do you want unconditional merger complete or do you want the P.A.P. White Paper?" We would have 90% of the people voting for unconditional and complete merger.

I cannot, Mr. Chairman, for the life of me understand how the petitioners at this late hour try to pretend that this is not what they asked for.

National Archives of Singapore

If you and the distinguished delegates, Mr. Chairman, will see the wording of the second alternative -- Alternative 'B' -- in our White Paper -- of the Referendum -- which I have set out in paragraph 13 of the memorandum. These words were used with extreme care. They were passed in the Assembly in a formal motion. The three alternatives are:

(a) Constitutional arrangements set out in Command Paper 33 of 1961 giving Singapore autonomy in education and labour; or,

(b) and I followed the words of Mr. Marshall studiously -- complete and unconditional merger.

That is what he said "complete and unconditional merger" and what he earlier said "on an equal basis with the other 11 states," and in order that there can be no doubt whatsoever on the advice of the State Advocate-General we have added the words "in accordance with the constitutional documents of the Federation of Malaya." These constitutional documents are the Federation of Malaya Constitution 1957 -- if I may go in chronological order -- first, the Federation of Malaya agreement of 1948; second, the Federation of Malaya (Amendment) Agreement of 1952; third, the Constitution of the Federation of Malaya 1957; and fourth, the Nine Nationality Laws of the Nine Malay Sultanates. These were spelt out when I moved the motion for the adoption of the issue to be posed in the Referendum. It is not for me and I do not claim the right of judicial interpretation of these documents. These documents constitute the framework that brought in 11 states -- 9 sultanates and two Crown colonies -- into one Federation of Malaya, and I have stated in my speech then and I say now to this distinguished Committee of the United Nations that if either by analogy or by

National Archives of Singapore

precedent in any one of these 9 sultanates and two former Crown colonies there could be justification for the claim that Singapore citizens should automatically become Federation citizens, then I say let such a judicial tribunal find for itself. But, of course, the real position is this: Everybody and certainly the distinguished petitioner, Mr. David Marshall, understands what it means. It was stated this morning by two or three of the petitioners that 'B' is vague, amorphous as has never been spelt out, but that 'A' has been. Well, I was deeply flattered and touched by this generous tribute to the lucidity of Command Paper 33 of 1961, but may I point out to them that however much I would like to claim credit for the lucidity and clearness with which we have presented the proposals in the Heads of Agreement published in Command Paper 33 of 1961, they cannot be more specific, more precise than the actual words of the constitutional documents of the Federation of Malaya, and the documents are there in the archives of the State -- its constitution starting from 1948, amended in 1952, final constitution in 1957, drafted by 5 distinguished jurists from five parts of the British Commonwealth -- Britain, Australia, ,Canada, Pakistan and India.

National Archives of Singapore

How can there be any doubt what it means? And there are also the nine national laws. I see nothing imprecise. I see no reason to doubt that all we need is an impartial judicial tribunal, and it will easily make a finding on what was the

constitutional position: how did the man become a member of the State of the Federation of Malaya, how did he acquire his franchise rights?

I admit that the third alternative, "on terms no less favourable than Borneo", is vague because the Borneo terms, although parts of them have been discussed publicly, have not been crystallized in the White Paper in proper form as Alternative 'A'. But they will be. I would have thought that my political opponents would at least have given me the credit of possessing some generosity and some good sense in not putting the Referendum questions until Alternative 'C' has been published and clarified.

However, may I go on with what I have had to say in my comments with regard to paragraph 11. In the merger proposals in Command Paper 33, which will be posed as Alternative 'A' on the Referendum, all Singapore citizens will retain all their existing political rights, including the right of franchise in State elections. In addition, they will acquire a new right to elect a Federal Parliament with 15 members, making Singapore the State with the second highest representation in the Federation Parliament. Of the 11 States in the present Federation, only one, Perak, has more representatives; it has 19. Therefore, equality of status with the Federal citizen will be acquired through their status as a Malayan national.

National Archives of Singapore

The Barisan Sosialis have maintained a consistent campaign to deceive the public into believing that Singapore citizenship will be relegated to a second-class status. This campaign was marked by unprecedented virulence, as well as by a complete disregard of the truth. They have been asked in the Assembly to cite any concrete instances of inferiority in status of Singapore citizens, but they have been unable to do so, and in this respect the Workers' Party's petitioner, Mr. David Marshall, has expressed his opinion inside the Assembly and outside it, that there is no such thing as a second-class citizen, but this continues to be the principal line of attack of the Barisan Sosialis in its propaganda designed to appeal to the less well-informed sections of the population.

Then I went on to summarize roughly what was set out in the White Paper, which is important to overcome the difficulty that we were bequeathed by the British separation of Singapore from the Federation, and its separate subsequent development in citizenship laws. We had found a solution, a formula whereby nobody in Singapore would lose anything, but, at the same time, the sum total representation in the Central Parliament cannot be increased by the laxer citizenship laws in Singapore, but there will be no distinction between Singapore citizens and Federal citizens. In paragraph 14 of the White Paper it is clearly stated -- this was an annex to the petition of the 19 Assemblymen -- that all

National Archives of Singapore

Singapore citizens will keep their citizenship and automatically become nationals of the larger Federation.

"Citizens of the present Federation will similarly become nationals of the larger Federation. Nationals of the larger Federation, whether Singapore citizens or Federation citizens, will, as nationals, have equal rights, carry the same passport, enjoy the same protection and be subject to equal duties and responsibilities under the Constitution of the larger Federation. Singapore citizens will continue to enjoy their State rights and privileges within the Constitution in Singapore. Singapore citizens will vote in Singapore for their representatives to the new Federation Parliament and citizens of the present Federation of Malaya will vote in the present Federation for their representatives to the same new Federation Parliament." The State Advocate-General furnished me with two authoritative opinions on the spelling out of the words in paragraph 14, both of which were tabled in the Singapore Legislative Assembly during the debate in November of last year.

National Archives of Singapore

In order to convey the true meaning of this paragraph, I shall now refer briefly to the explanatory note from the State advocate-General on equal rights of Federal nationals, dated November 26; I shall read the third paragraph.

"The equal rights and privileges they enjoy are set out in the present Federation Constitution, which will be the precedent for the Constitution of the new Federation; Article 8 on equality before the law; Article 9 on prohibition of banishment; Article 10 on freedom of speech, assembly and association; Article 47 on qualifications for membership of Parliament; Article 119 on qualifications of electors; Article 123 on qualifications for judges."

Now, this is important and I should like to give an illustration of what it means.

I shall first take the example of Article 8, Fundamental Rights. Article 8 (ii) now reads as follows:

"Except as expressly authorized by this Constitution, there shall be no discrimination against citizens on the ground only of religion, race, descent, or place of birth in any law, or in the appointment to any office or employment under public authority, or in the administration of any law relating to the acquisition, holding or disposition of property, or the establishment or carrying on of any trade, business, vocation or employment."

National Archives of Singapore

This is a broad declaration of the basic rights of a citizen. And from the moment of the inauguration of the Constitution of the new Federation of

Malaysia, the word “citizen” would be deleted and the word “national” would be introduced. As was explained in the other note from the State Advocate-General, dated November 23, which I have circulated, it really does not matter which term is used. It says here:

“Nationality may be defined as the legal tie which binds individuals to the State, entitles the State to protect such individuals in international relations and renders such individuals personally subject to the jurisdiction of the State.” The authority on that is Barry -- Nationality and Citizenship and the Citizenship Laws of the Commonwealth.

Nationality has two aspects; the first is from the point of view of international law and the second is from the point of view of municipal law. From the point of view of international law, the essential ingredient of nationality is the right of the State to protect its nationals and, as a corollary, the right of the State to demand allegiance from such nationals. From the point of view of municipal law, nationality gives nationals certain rights and imposes upon them certain duties. There appears to be no distinction between the terms “nationality” and “citizenship” for the purposes of the British Nationality Act of 1938. However, it is permissible to use the term “nationality” for the purposes of

National Archives of Singapore

international law and the term “citizenship” for the purposes of national and municipal law.

All it really means is this: All the fundamental rights in the Constitution will be equal among all nationals, whether they are Singapore citizens or Federation citizens. But we retain Singapore citizenship because Singapore citizens will have to share the constitutional cake of representation among themselves; we cannot increase their number, nor can they who will not have qualified under the Constitution go across to the Federation and work there -- go to Malaya and work there -- because they would not have qualified if Singapore had never been separated in the first place.

In this connection, I should like to point out a gross misrepresentation by the petitioner, Dr. Lim Hock Siew. I can only believe in mitigation, that perhaps it was due to the fact that he was trained in a medical school instead of at the legal school of the University of Singapore. He said that a Singapore citizen will be an alien in the Federation of Malaya. How can that be? He is a national of the new Federation and all the Articles will be rewritten to spell out equality between nationals. There is only one right that he would not share and that is the right to vote in the Federation in Malaya; as against that, neither is the Malayan entitled to vote in Singapore. But if he wishes to reside in Kuala Lumpur, he can qualify to vote if he can pass the national language test. So I do not see any

National Archives of Singapore

substance in that allegation. Even though I may not be here when Mr. Marshall, the legally trained member on the list of 19 petitioners, appears before this Committee, I believe that he will confirm that it would be ridiculous to suggest that a Constitution which spells out all the fundamental rights of nationals as equal makes a Singapore citizen an alien in the Federation of Malaysia. How could that be?

We chose the word "national" because the word "citizen" has already been used. But we could just as well interchange the two words and call all the members of the new Federation "citizens" and define their municipal or State rights as "nationals". But according to the State Advocate-General of Singapore, the normal practice is to use the word "national" to define a man's international status, vis-a-vis his State and the word "citizen" in respect of his municipal or national rights within the country. I therefore say, with some justification, in answer to paragraph 12, that it is querulous to suggest that, with 15 representatives in the Federation Parliament -- making Singapore the State having the second largest number of representatives of any State in the Federation Parliament -- any one of whom is entitled to be the Prime Minister or a Minister, and being members of a party which commands the majority of the House, that Singapore would be under the trusteeship of the Federation of Malaya. The

National Archives of Singapore

positions of both Singapore and Federation citizens, who are both to become Federal nationals, have been carefully explained in these two documents.

Mr. Marshall, one of the petitioners, once in a moment of passion, called it an imperialist annexation, and compared Singapore to the Federation of Malaya, as being a concubine in respect of the master; and he said this, unfortunately, to an august body of some 3,000 students at the University of Singapore last month in a forum in which he participated with me. Not unnaturally, it was pointed out to the students that the offspring of concubines do not sit around at the same table with the offspring of legitimate wives, and that Singapore will have 15 legitimate representatives in the Central Federation Parliament, the new Parliament, any one of whom is entitled to be the Prime Minister or the Minister, should his party command the majority of the members in the House, representing constituencies in the whole of Malaysia. Now, that was not my understanding of a concubine. Nevertheless, this, I am sorry to say, is really the tone in which the battle in Singapore has been carried on and has now found itself echoing in the august halls of the United Nations Trusteeship Council.

National Archives of Singapore

In paragraph 13, we have made this allegation; but it is a facade for giving the people a choice. They will be compelled to choose an alternative which,

according to the Government interpretation, means that our citizens will not have any citizenship at all -- neither Singapore nor Federal citizenship.

Now, how untruthful can it be? It is not my interpretation; I have been careful to put down, in Alternative 'B', the exact words used by Mr. Marshall, and on the advice of our State Advocate-General we have set out the constitutional documents that together define accurately how people became members of the present Federation of Malaya; and on the basis of equality the same terms are to be applicable to Singapore. But these are not my interpretations; these are interpretations which can be made by any independent body, and certainly by Mr. Marshall himself, and certainly by the petitioners. It is because they realize the significance of the error they have made in asking for complete merger that this was the consequent result, that they demanded Alternative 'B', which is not a complete and unconditional merger. It meant merger, with a special added condition. And the added condition they wanted was automatic conversion, which was never afforded to any of the States.

National Archives of Singapore

If they could produce to me an exchange of letters from them and the Federation Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya, in which he agrees to accord this, I shall willingly put this down as the fourth alternative. In fact, in January of this year, Mr. Marshall, former Chief Minister of Singapore who had

had a direct social relationship with the Prime Minister of the Federation from old associations in the past, went to see the Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya which would have been a political victory for him over me and my party, since I have been unable to extract this privilege from the Prime Minister of the Federation of Malay. He attempted again this year in June, in a formal letter, and the answer that he was given he has never dared to publish. Why? Because reason and logic are not on his side, I suggest.

National Archives of Singapore

I would like to add in this connection that the Secretary-General of the Barisan Sosialis, the 13 petitioning Assemblymen from one to 13, also wrote letters to the Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya. This is an eternal political gambit. He who can score a point over my Government will naturally win acclaim from the populace. When they can get the Federation of Malaya Prime Minister to give them a concession which he, in his negotiations with me -- having nothing to do with the British between the months of August and November last year, was not prepared to concede -- and, in fact, was unable to concede -- then they would have scored a political point over me. The Secretary-General of the Barisan Sosialis did not succeed in getting this concession.

So the question really is this: Are the three alternatives posed fair, realistic and precise, or are they not? Should, for instance, the fourth alternative be put in, because they now claim there should have been this additional condition? My submission is that to put Alternative 'D', when we know it cannot be supported in reason, precedent and analogy, from what happened in the 11 States of the present Federation of Malaya, is to offer the people something which is not in the larder. It is like putting on the menu spring chicken when you know there is no spring chicken in the kitchen. I do not say for a moment the people will choose it. In fact, I have grave doubts whether the petitioners themselves believe it to be so. The petitioners themselves have grave doubts on this, and for the purposes of

National Archives of Singapore

their presentation before this August tribunal they have taken the reasonable line that all they want is automatic conversion -- merger with equality.

But this is not true. I have one of the petitioners on record -- his actual voice -- and I have the tape here should he deny the accuracy of what I wish to say; I have the transcripts.

These are not the conditions he wants. This is only part of the conditions by which they hope to frustrate merger. We are compelled by reason, logic, and their past history to admit that merger is inevitable; but they have made it their business to frustrate it for as long as they could; and just in case the Federation Government were to agree to complete merger, then they would have two extra conditions to ask for.

National Archives of Singapore

The first extra conditions is this: Having agreed that all Singapore citizens become Federation citizens -- which is what we are asking for in Alternative 'D', the operative words -- Mr. Woodhull said this morning that all Singapore citizens automatically become Federation citizens on merger day.

I have learned it by heart; I have heard these words repeatedly so often. Supposing that were done -- I would like to be honest with this Tribunal, and would like to be honest with the Federation Prime Minister -- if he agrees to that,

he will immediately have another demand. When he says he increased the number to 25 -- in fact, out of 624,000 it would be 24, but they made it 25 -- and if that is also agreed to, which is most unlikely, they demand that there should be general elections. Both Governments, in Singapore and the Federation, should resign, dissolve themselves; and they hope that out of the two general elections perhaps two governments will emerge which may not see eye-to-eye and then merger is again delayed.

I would like to read the exact words to you. They are contained in my speech on July 9. These are the official shorthand transcripts; when I left they had not yet been reproduced in printed form. This was in the radio forum which took place over Radio Singapore among my colleague Dr. Goh, the distinguished petitioner Dr. Lee Siew Choh, the distinguished petitioner Mr. David Marshall, who will come on Monday, and one other petitioner, Mr. Ong Eng Guan. This is what Lee Siew Choh said:

National Archives of Singapore

> "We would accept full and complete merger: that is, Singapore as a twelfth state of the Federation and Singapore citizens automatically becoming Malayan citizens, with proportional representation in the Federation Parliament like any other one of the present 11 States constituting the Federation of Malaya, and we are prepared to accept

merger under these conditions provided it occurs immediately and is followed by a parliamentary and general election."

What is the logic and sense of all this? It is the logic and sense of people who find themselves in an untenable position. For their own purposes they wish Singapore to continue as a colony in order that they can be part of an anti-colonial movement. If Singapore becomes independent, in the Federation of Malaysia, then the constitutional struggle against the imperialists, so far as the political plane is concerned, will be over and it will no longer be a straightforward battle against the British, as happened in the Federation of Malaya in 1957 when it became independent. The question would then no longer be one of fighting the British for independence, but rather fighting a popularly elected Government on what it would do with the political independence it has won for itself and on what are the economic and social reforms or changes that it wishes to make. And they have found out that the armed revolt, in which the Barisan Sosialis were sympathisers, failed dismally in a matter of three years. In ten years the British, though they put in nearly half-a-million men -- Army, Navy, Air Force, Home Guards, local militia -- was unable to suppress what was then an anti-colonial revolution; but two years after independence, once the political issue had been resolved, the armed revolt collapsed, similarly in Singapore and in the Borneo territories

National Archives of Singapore

I will leave this theme to be developed by my colleague, Dr. Goh, on the history of the P.A.P., for it is part and parcel of the whole issue which has been presented to this Committee. Then the Committee will be able to see the paradox, that here we have a petition from an opposition group that for its own purposes wishes colonialism to remain, that wants the State of semi-independence to go on, a group petitioning against the duly elected and constitutional Government of Singapore that wants immediate independence through merger. That really is the paradox.

It was my privilege in the last three days, whilst awaiting the arrival of the petitioners, to listen to Dr. Cheddi Jagan. I see an analogy between these petitioners and the case of British Guiana. They are like the minority group that petitioned the Petitions Committee yesterday asking that the matter not be heard: they were against independence. Quite rightly the Committee dismissed it out of hand. Yesterday the Petitions Committee, I understood, dismissed a certain telegram that came from British Guiana from certain minority factions that did not want independence but wanted a continuation of the present status quo.

National Archives of Singapore

That is really the humiliating position into which they have put themselves as a result of the tactical zig-zags in their battle against merger, against national

unity, against the national reunification for which they have so long shouted together with ourselves.

Paragraph 14, about the blank votes, I shall leave to my colleague Dr. Goh, and I think I shall leave uncommented the other printed comments of my Government. Other than this, I think I am justified in making this remark to the 17 distinguished representatives and to yourself, Mr. Chairman, that on the basis of a misrepresentation they have obtained this hearing and put this Committee to inconvenience. Although I am a servant of the people of Singapore and am expected to be at the service of all the citizens of Singapore, I think I have a right to hope, anyway, that I should not be treated too shabbily by Singapore citizens -- and certainly not by Federation citizens like Mr. Woodhull. I have waited in this chamber for four days, and in every one of their communications they have said, as in paragraph 17, "on a basis of urgency". I do not wish to underline my point too much, but I think the representatives here would not have moved with such alacrity had it not been made out to this Committee that a great perfidy was about to be perpetrated and they were therefore sending out an S.O.S.

National Archives of Singapore

Having arrived, here, I think it is short of impudence to say, as they have said in their letter of formal application for petition: "We urge that a hearing

should be held some time next week so as to enable Mr. David Marshall to join us in the presentation of our case." They speak of "some time next week."

What have all these telegrams meant then? I suggest that the veracity of the four petitioners, and of the fifth who is to come, is a matter for the 17 representatives here. But I ask them in all fairness to judge whether this is a fair presentation of the position. Where is the urgency? It is part of the false alarm, the atmosphere of emergency which they have kept up in Singapore or have tried to keep up in Singapore, in order to boost up the flagging moral of their supporters as they see the merger of Malaysia come to fruition, with the relentless logic of past history, geography and, in the words of Mr. David Marshall ethnological times. Nothing can stop it and they know it. But I am here before this Committee knowing that Malaysia will come in any case, but anxious that Malaysia will be received by the Afro-Asian world as an honoured and a friendly manner. Our political battle goes on. Our revolution goes on after Malaysia. Malaysia is one phase; we gain our political independence. There are economic and social revolutions still to carry out in the country and we shall need friends in Afro-Asia. I am not interested in the support of anti-Communists and there is no reason for me to take an anti-Communist line, or, as Mr. Woodhull suggested this morning, to shout hysterically anti-Communist slogans to confuse the issue.

National Archives of Singapore

I have left with each representative a copy of some speeches I had to make, a series of talks to explain how it came to be that my former comrades and I parted company in the struggle for social justice, for a more equal and more just society in Malaysia. But I am seeking and I have sought and will continue to seek the support of the non-aligned Afro-Asian countries, whose history is akin to us, whose problems are also akin to us, and whose support and function will be invaluable in the next stage of our battle for a better life in the economic and social plane.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I ask you to give my colleague, Dr. Goh, an opportunity to go into a little bit of detail on the history of this issue before the Committee.

National Archives of Singapore

August, 12, 1962.